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The following is an analysis of the various tax costs for an agricultural processing company doing business in the following cities:

Bismarck, North Dakota Sioux Falls, South Dakota Des Moines, Iowa<br>Eau Claire, Wisconsin<br>Omaha, Nebraska<br>San Jose, California<br>Edina, Minnesota<br>Greeley, Colorado<br>Richmond, Virginia<br>Great Falls, Montana<br>Chicago, Illinois

This ten-year analysis was conducted for the North Dakota Department of Commerce and is limited to a review of property taxes, workers' compensation insurance, state and local sales tax, unemployment insurance and corporate income tax.

The research for this report was conducted during the month of December 2002, and all information is effective as of December 31, 2002. The raw data was obtained from a variety of sources, including private information bureaus, various Internet web sites, and materials and information provided by various state agencies. The 11 communities used in the analysis were selected by the Department of Commerce, who also provided the working parameters for the Subject business, including asset size, revenue and expense projections, employment considerations, and growth factors.

The basic assumptions used for the Subject business are as follows:

- An agricultural processing company manufacturing products from milk.
- The business will build a 100,000 square foot facility on 15 acres of land at a total cost of \$12,875,00.
- The company will open its facility with approximately $\$ 25$ million of processing equipment and $\$ 1$ million of non-processing equipment.
- In year three, the company will expand its operations with an additional $\$ 6.5$ million of processing equipment.
- The company's gross sales will be $\$ 35$ million, $\$ 80$ million and $\$ 115$ million for the first three years respectively. Thereafter, sales will grow at an annual rate of $3 \%$.
- Net profits are projected to be $\$ 1.05$ million, $\$ 2.8$ million and $\$ 6.325$ million for the first three years respectively. Thereafter, the income will grow at an annual rate of $3 \%$.
- Employment for the business in the first year is projected to be 15 salaried positions with an average of $\$ 45,000$ per year and 50 non-salaried positions with an average of $\$ 15.00$ per hour. The second year's employment is projected to be 12 salaried positions with an average of $\$ 50,000$ per year and 100 non-salaried positions with an average of $\$ 15.00$ per hour. The third year's employment is projected to be 12 salaried positions with an average of $\$ 50,000$ per year and 135 non-salaried positions with an average of $\$ 17.00$ per hour. Thereafter, the number of employees and their respective salaries will increase at a rate of $3 \%$ per year.

Based upon the cost information for each community, the estimated total tax costs over the next ten years (present value at $6 \%$ ) are as follows:

| Location | Present Value Total |  | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | \$ | 2,922,344 | 1 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | \$ | 7,341,778 | 2 |
| Richmond, Virginia | \$ | 7,489,083 | 3 |
| Great Falls, Montana | \$ | 7,680,200 | 4 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | \$ | 8,873,919 | 5 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | \$ | 9,259,978 | 6 |
| Chicago, Illinois | \$ | 9,985,669 | 7 |
| Edina, Minnesota | \$ | 11,358,333 | 8 |
| San Jose, California | \$ | 11,808,558 | 9 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | \$ | 11,817,483 | 10 |
| Greeley, Colorado | \$ | 11,825,853 | 11 |

The following pages provide a community by community breakdown of the various costs and how they were calculated. Appendix A contains a comparative breakdown of the estimated total costs for each tax category by community. Appendix B through Appendix F contains the calculations for each of the five tax categories by community.

It is important to note that several communities in this study offer special incentive and abatement programs for qualifying businesses. The vast majority of these programs are tied to specific conditions, circumstances or location. Where appropriate and determinable, the various incentive programs have been included in this analysis. However, many such programs require negotiations with one or more state or local organizations, site specific locations (e.g., enterprise zones), defined hiring or training criteria, match funding from local organizations, or other determining factors. Since such specific criteria is outside of the scope of this study, some community incentive programs may not have been included. There are circumstances where additional investigation and consideration of these programs may be appropriate and the impact on the overall cost of doing business could be significant.

This tax analysis was prepared from information and assumptions furnished to Eide Bailly LLP as of December 31, 2002. Due to the varying nature of taxes, the rates and assumptions used in this analysis are likely to be adjusted by local, state or federal authorities after 2002, and may no longer be appropriate. It is also important to note, these may not be the only taxes that are applicable in each of the locations.

Respectfully yours,
EIDE BAILLY LLP

Timothy Moore, CPA

## Property Taxes

(See Appendix B for the calculation of the estimated costs)

| Location |  | Property Taxes |  | Rank |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota |  | $\$$ | - | 1 |
| Great Falls, Montana |  | $\$$ | $2,336,937$ | 2 |
| Richmond, Virginia |  | $\$$ | $3,125,551$ | 3 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota |  | $\$$ | $3,310,124$ | 4 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin |  | $\$$ | $3,580,049$ | 5 |
| Des Moines, Iowa |  | $\$$ | $3,911,701$ | 6 |
| Omaha, Nebraska |  | $\$$ | $4,409,321$ | 7 |
| Greeley, Colorado |  | $\$$ | $4,441,878$ | 8 |
| Chicago, Illinois |  | $\$$ | $4,815,744$ | 9 |
| San Jose, California |  | $\$$ | $5,530,341$ | 9 |
| Edina, Minnesota |  | $\$$ | $5,964,760$ | 10 |

All of the states in this analysis have some form of property tax. Property taxes are local taxes, and are the primary source of dollars for school systems, counties, municipalities, and other local government units. Typically, their administration is a local responsibility. The authority of the state is limited to assisting local government units in making real estate tax assessments that are fair and in compliance with the law. State governments do not collect or use property taxes, however, they can centrally assess the property of large companies.

There are two types of property that are taxed, real property and personal property. Real property is defined as real estate, such as land, buildings, and land improvements. It is important to note that equipment and vehicles are not classified as real property, but rather personal property. Personal property is simply defined as anything that is not real property. Each individual state defines personal property differently and some states do not tax personal property, while other states do. In some states, personal property taxes are called Use Taxes. Use Taxes are typically added onto the existing sales tax in a city, county, and/or state. Taxes have been calculated in the sales and use tax analysis section of this report.

The general formula for calculating real property taxes for all of the states is as follows:

* Fair Market Value multiplied by an assessed rate equals the assessed value;
* Assessed Value divided by 1 or 10 or 100 or 1,000 dollars equals the taxable value; and,
* Taxable Value times the mill levy equals real property taxes.

The general formula for calculating personal property taxes is as follows:

* Fair Market Value or taxable value times the mill levy equals personal property taxes.


## Assumptions

The assumptions for the calculation of the personal and real property taxes are as follows:

* The Subject business will own buildings and land (real property) with a fair market value of $\$ 12,875,000$;
* The buildings and the land will appreciate at a rate of $3 \%$ a year throughout the analysis period;
* The Subject business will own processing equipment (personal property) with a fair market value of $\$ 25$ million and non-processing equipment with a value of $\$ 1$ million;
* In year three, the Subject business will expand the facility and purchase another $\$ 6,500,000$ in processing equipment;
* These costs are assumed to be the fair market value of the assets;
* The mill levy rates are the same for both personal and real property unless otherwise noted; and,
* We have not included any special assessments or other additions that may be added to a Subject business' property tax bill.
For the purposes of the analysis, it is assumed that all states will increase their current levy rates by $3 \%$ annually.


## Bismarck, North Dakota

North Dakota has an assessed rate of $50 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 48.372 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value in Bismarck, North Dakota. North Dakota offers an incentive for qualifying businesses to obtain an exemption on real property taxes for a period of five years. However, for agricultural processing companies, North Dakota has made special provision to extend this timeframe to a ten-year period. Since, the Subject business is an agricultural processing company, it is assumed the Subject business qualifies and the full abatement period is offered.

North Dakota does not impose a tax on personal property.

## Sioux Falls, South Dakota

South Dakota has an assessed rate of $100 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 25.757 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. South Dakota offers an incentive for qualifying businesses to obtain an exemption on real property taxes for the first five years of operation according to the schedule below. It is assumed the Subject business qualifies and takes advantage of this incentive for the five-year period.

| Year 1 | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Year 2 | $80 \%$ |
| Year 3 | $60 \%$ |
| Year 4 | $40 \%$ |
| Year 5 | $20 \%$ |
| Years 6-10 | $0 \%$ |

South Dakota does not impose a tax on personal property.

## Des Moines, Iowa

Iowa has an assessed rate of $51.667 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 44.425 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value in Des Moines, Iowa. Based on research and conversations with applicable state and local representatives, no incentive programs for real estate taxes were found for this location.

Iowa does not impose a tax on personal property.

## Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Wisconsin has an assessed rate of $100 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 21.007 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value. Based on research and conversations with applicable state and local representatives, no incentive programs for real estate taxes were found for this location.

Wisconsin imposes a tax on personal property. However, for the Subject business an abatement program is available that exempts all personal property purchased for the use in the production process from being taxed, as long as the business meets qualifying requirements. It is assumed that the Subject business would be classified accordingly and, therefore, would be able to take full advantage of this program. Based on this assumption, no calculation of personal property taxes is included in this analysis of Wisconsin property taxes.

## Edina, Minnesota

Minnesota has a very complex formula for calculating property taxes. Per a conversation with a representative of the assessing department for the city of Edina, estimating real property taxes will be the simplest by using an assessed rate of $100 \%$ and the effective levy rate for real property, which is 0.035 per $\$ 1$ of taxable value. Based on research and conversations with applicable state and local representatives, no incentive programs for real estate taxes were found for this location.

Minnesota has a mortgage transfer tax for all real property to which a mortgage is applied. The tax is equal to $\$ 2.30$ per $\$ 1,000$ of value. Since the financing for the property was not specified, it cannot be determined if this tax should be applied and therefore, was not included.

Minnesota imposes a tax on personal property. However, for new or expanding businesses an abatement program is available that exempts all personal property from being taxed for the first 10 to 20 years of operation. It is assumed that the Subject business qualifies for this abatement program. For this reason no calculation of personal property taxes is included in this analysis of Minnesota property taxes.

## Great Falls, Montana

Montana has an assessed rate of $3.5 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 577.2 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value. Montana offers an incentive for qualifying businesses to obtain an exemption on real property taxes for the first ten years of operation according to the schedule below. It is assumed the Subject business qualifies and takes advantage of this incentive program for the full ten-year period.

| Year 1 | $50 \%$ | Year 6 | $40 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Year 2 | $50 \%$ | Year 7 | $30 \%$ |
| Year 3 | $50 \%$ | Year 8 | $20 \%$ |
| Year 4 | $50 \%$ | Year 9 | $10 \%$ |
| Year 5 | $50 \%$ | Year 10 | $0 \%$ |

Montana imposes a tax only on depreciable personal property. Montana uses its own depreciation schedules. The applicable schedule for determining the appropriate depreciation factors depends on the classification of the equipment under Montana statute. Montana offers an abatement program for agricultural processing businesses that exempts all personal property from being taxed. For this reason no calculation of personal property taxes were included in the analysis of Montana property taxes.

## Omaha, Nebraska

Nebraska has an assessed rate of $100 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 2.5873 per $\$ 100$ of taxable value. Based on research and conversations with applicable state and local representatives, no incentive programs for real estate taxes were found for this location.

Nebraska imposes a tax only on depreciable personal property. Nebraska uses the federal income tax modified asset cost recovery system (MACRS) for determining the appropriate depreciation factors. Nebraska offers an abatement program for new or expanding businesses that exempts all personal property from being taxed after the date of qualification. It is assumed that the Subject business qualifies for this abatement program. For this reason, a calculation of personal property taxes was not included in this analysis of the Nebraska property taxes.

## Greeley, Colorado

Colorado has an assessed rate of $29 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 89.876 per $\$ 1,000$ of taxable value. Based on research and conversations with applicable state and local representatives, no incentive programs for real estate taxes were found for this location.

Colorado imposes a tax on personal property. However, for the Subject business an abatement program is available that exempts all personal property purchased for the use in the production process from being taxed. It is assumed that the Subject business will take full advantage of this program. Based on this assumption, a calculation of personal property taxes was not included in the analysis of Colorado property taxes.

## Chicago, Illinois

Illinois has an assessed rate of $36 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 7.692 per $\$ 100$ of taxable value. Chicago also imposes a real estate transfer tax when the real estate is purchased. The real estate transfer tax is calculated by taking the purchase price divided by $\$ 500$ to get to the taxable value. The taxable value is then multiplied by $\$ 3.75$ to get the real estate transfer tax.

Illinois does not impose a tax on personal property.
No incentive programs were found for the city of Chicago, Cook County, or the state of Illinois for property taxes.

## San Jose, California

California has an assessed rate of $100 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 0.011 per $\$ 1$ of taxable value.

California imposes a tax on personal property. California calculates personal property taxes slightly different than the rest of the locations in this study. California's formula produces a constant tax and the formula is as follows: fair market value of the property times the mill levy rate. The mill levy rate for personal property is $1.2 \%$ and according to the Santa Clara County assessor's office, this levy rate is a constant levy rate and will not increase.

No incentive programs were found for the city of San Jose, Santa Clara County, or the state of California for property taxes.

## Richmond, Virginia

Virginia has an assessed rate of $100 \%$ for property tax calculations and the current levy rate for real property is 1.38975 per $\$ 100$ of taxable value. Virginia offers an incentive for qualifying businesses to obtain an exemption on real property taxes through negotiations with local authorities. Based on the research, it is assumed that the Subject business will negotiate to and receive a $50 \%$ exemption of the applicable real property taxes for a period of ten years.

Virginia imposes a tax on personal property and uses the general personal property tax formula described above. The mill levy for personal property for the Subject business is $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 100$. There were no incentive or abatement programs found for personal property taxes for this location.

## Unemployment Insurance

(See Appendix C for the calculation of the estimated costs)

| Location | Unemployment Insurance |  | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | \$ | 155,733 | 1 |
| Richmond, Virginia | \$ | 237,714 | 2 |
| Greeley, Colorado | \$ | 249,414 | 3 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | \$ | 282,852 | 4 |
| San Jose, California | \$ | 362,061 | 5 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | \$ | 363,174 | 6 |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | \$ | 369,391 | 7 |
| Chicago, Illinois | \$ | 416,058 | 8 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | \$ | 422,123 | 9 |
| Edina, Minnesota | \$ | 447,474 | 10 |
| Great Falls, Montana | \$ | 498,587 | 11 |

Unemployment insurance is a form of social insurance designed to provide unemployment benefits to help workers replace some of their lost wages after they have become unemployed through no fault of their own, such as by a layoff. The benefits allow workers enough time to look for a job reasonably similar to the one they had. It also helps an employer by keeping experienced workers in the area and available to return to the employer when times get better. Finally, it helps the entire community during an economic downturn, because unemployment benefits are spent locally to buy food, clothing, and other necessities of life that local merchants sell. Unemployment insurance taxes are required to be paid by an employer. The tax is based on a formula that uses the employer's past experience with the unemployment of its workers, and the size of its payroll as a measure of its potential risk of unemployment.

## Assumptions

The assumptions regarding unemployment insurance for the Subject business are as follows:

* The Subject will employ persons for the ten-year period as found in the schedule below. These employee numbers are based on the same information as provided for determining the workers' compensation premiums.


## Number of Employees

|  | Salaried | Hourly |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Year 1 | 15 | 50 |
| Year 2 | 12 | 100 |
| Year 3 | 12 | 135 |
| Year 4 | 12 | 139 |
| Year 5 | 12 | 143 |
| Year 6 | 13 | 147 |
| Year 7 | 13 | 151 |
| Year 8 | 14 | 156 |
| Year 9 | 14 | 161 |
| Year 10 | 14 | 166 |

* It is assumed the federal and state salary limits will be held constant for the entire tenyear period of the analysis. It must be noted that some states increase their salary limit annually. For example, North Dakota and Minnesota generally increase their salary limits every one or two years. However, because of the uncertainty of these adjustments, this adjustment has been disregarded in the comparison and calculation of estimated costs.
* It is assumed the federal unemployment tax rate will be held constant over the ten-year period of the analysis. The current federal unemployment tax rate is $0.80 \%$ on the first $\$ 7,000$ of wages for each employee.
* The state unemployment tax rate varies by state. The unemployment tax rate that was used in the calculations is called the new employer rate. Typically, this rate would only be used for businesses during their first few years of operations. After the time period for using the new employer rate has expired an "experience rate" will be used. The new employer time period has typically been one to five years. Each state has its own formula for calculating the experience rate for a business, usually based on the balance owed to the state, payroll size, the business' potential risk of unemployment, and the past experience with the unemployment of its workers. For purposes of this analysis, each state provided an estimated average experience rate for businesses in their state. The analysis assumed that the experience rate became effective after the new employer had expired and were held constant for the remaining term of the study.

| State | Unemployment Ins. Rates |  | \# of Years \# of Years "New" Rate is | Wage Base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New | Experience |  |  |
| North Dakota | 2.08\% | 0.94\% | 2 | 18,000 |
| South Dakota | 1.2\% (see Note 2) | 0.61\% | 3 | 7,000 |
| Iowa | 1.036\% | 1.27\% | 4 | 19,200 |
| Wisconsin | 3.25\% | 1.40\% | 3 | 10,500 |
| Minnesota | 1.42\% | 1.08\% (see Note 3) | 2 | 22,000 |
| Montana | 1.63\% (see Note 1) | 1.37\% | 3 | 19,700 |
| Nebraska | 3.50\% | 1.86\% | 1 | 7,000 |
| Colorado | 1.70\% | 1.10\% | 1 | 10,000 |
| Illinois | 3.30\% | 2.28\% | 3 | 9,000 |
| California | 3.40\% | 2.50\% | 3 | 7,000 |
| Virginia | 2.50\% | 0.975\% | 3 | 8,000 |

Note 1: Montana has a different new employer rate for each industry. The new employer rate for an ag processing company is $1.63 \%$.

Note 2: South Dakota has a new employer rate of $1.2 \%$ for year one and $1.0 \%$ for years two and three.

Note 3: Minnesota has a surcharge to provide funds to pay interest on anticipated loans from the Federal government because of borrowing to keep their UI Trust Fund solvent. That surcharge has been calculated into the full "experience rate" period, as converservations with Minnesota UI officials indicated.

Note 4: "Highlights of State Unemployment Compensation Laws" January 2002, published by the National Foundation for Unemployment Compensation and Workers' Compensation, notes that several of the comparative states have surtaxes under their State unemployment insurance laws for various purposes. In responding to questions for this analysis, several of the states did not identify such surtaxes. However, the reader is cautioned that such surtaxes could apply and ultimately increase the cost of insurance.

* It is assumed the federal unemployment tax rate will be held constant over the ten-year period of the analysis. The current federal unemployment percentage is $0.80 \%$ on the first $\$ 7,000$ of wages for each employee.
* Research indicates the basic formula for calculating state unemployment taxes is the same for every state. The following formula has been used for calculating the federal and state unemployment taxes for each location:
- Multiply the number of employees by the salary limit and then multiply by the unemployment tax rate.
- Add both the federal unemployment taxes and the state unemployment taxes to get the total unemployment taxes.

None of the communities in this analysis offered an incentive for this cost. Therefore, the only difference in the costs is a direct result of the differences in the unemployment tax rates of each state.

## Bismarck, North Dakota

The current tax rate for new companies is $2.08 \%$ of the first $\$ 18,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first two years, after that an experience rate is applied based on the balance owed and benefits paid.

## Sioux Falls, South Dakota

The current tax rate for new companies is $1.20 \%$ of the first $\$ 7,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first three years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the following factors: amount of taxable payroll for the last three years, contributions paid in, claims paid out, interest credited/pool charges, and the reserve ratio (set by the South Dakota Legislature).

## Des Moines, Iowa

The current tax rate for new companies is $1.04 \%$ of the first $\$ 19,200$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first five years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the following factors: total funds available to pay benefits on the rate computation date, the total wages paid by all contributory employers during the first four of the five calendar quarters immediately preceding the rate computation date, and the highest 12 consecutive month benefit cost ratio during the ten-year period ending on the rate computation date.

## Eau Claire, Wisconsin

The current tax rate for new companies is $3.25 \%$ of the first $\$ 10,500$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first three years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the activity in the business' unemployment insurance account.

## Edina, Minnesota

The current tax rate for new companies is $1.42 \%$ of the first $\$ 22,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first five years of business, after that an experience rate is applied and is determined by the State of Minnesota.

## Great Falls, Montana

The current tax rate for new companies is $1.63 \%$ of the first $\$ 19,700$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first three years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the contributions made in the past and the business' reserve ratio.

## Omaha, Nebraska

The current tax rate for new companies is $3.50 \%$ of the first $\$ 7,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first two years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the business' reserve ratio.

## Greeley, Colorado

The current tax rate for new companies is $1.70 \%$ of the first $\$ 10,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first year of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the reserve in the employer's experience rating account and the balance in the unemployment insurance trust fund on July 1 of each year.

## Chicago, Illinois

The current tax rate for new companies is $3.30 \%$ of the first $\$ 9,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first three years of business, after that an experience rate is applied based on the business' benefit ratio.

## San Jose, California

The current tax rate for new companies is $3.40 \%$ of the first $\$ 7,000$ of wages for each employee. The new employer rate applies for the first three years of business, after that an experience rate is applied. It could not be determined how the experience rate is calculated.

## Richmond, Virginia

The current tax rate for new companies is $2.50 \%$ of the first $\$ 8,000$ of wages for each employee. Information pertaining to the time period for the new employer rate and how the experience rate is calculated could not be determined.

## Sales and Use Tax

(See Appendix D for the calculation of the estimated costs)

| Location | Sales \& Use Tax |  | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Great Falls, Montana | \$ | - | 1 |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | \$ | 60,000 | 2 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | \$ | 70,000 | 3 |
| Richmond, Virginia | \$ | 337,500 | 4 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | \$ | 412,500 | 5 |
| Greeley, Colorado | \$ | 501,500 | 6 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | \$ | 510,000 | 7 |
| Edina, Minnesota | \$ | 552,500 | 8 |
| San Jose, California | \$ | 701,250 | 9 |
| Chicago, Illinois | \$ | 765,000 | 10 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | \$ | 2,400,000 | 11 |

## Assumptions

The assumptions regarding the calculation of each community's sales and use tax was that the Subject business would purchase $\$ 25$ million of new processing equipment and $\$ 1$ million of nonprocessing equipment in the first year of operations. In year three, the company would expand its operations by adding $\$ 6,500,000$ of processing equipment, all of which would be used directly in the business process. The sales and use tax analysis for equipment was, therefore, performed for the first and third years only. Any purchases of equipment or other merchandise in year two and years four through ten were not included or looked at in this analysis.

All states in this analysis, except Nebraska, North Dakota and Montana apply a sales and use tax to construction materials. It was, therefore, assumed that $60 \%$ of the total building cost would be apportioned to construction materials and taxed accordingly.

All states in this analysis, except Montana, apply sales and use tax to certain purchases used in the company's normal operations, e.g., supplies, utilities, and software. Some states will apply a reduced rate or exempt certain items, such as electricity, water, and telephone, from this tax. Given that specific operating results were not projected for the Subject business, this analysis has not included the tax on consumable items in the calculation of the sales and use tax. The applicable rates and exempted property are available for most states on their individual web sites.

It is assumed that every city, county and state add their applicable sales and use tax percentages to produce an effective sales and use tax percentage, and the taxes are paid directly to a combination of the city, county, or state governments. All sales and use tax were calculated by taking the effective sales and use tax percentage multiplied by the value of the merchandise or equipment purchased. This formula was used for the sales and use tax applicable to Subject business in its first year of operation. The following page contains a schedule of the city, county, and state sales and use tax percentages and the combined effective sales and use tax percentage.

## Sales and Use Tax Breakdown

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{lcccc} & \begin{array}{c}\text { State Sales \& } \\ \text { Use Tax Rate }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}\text { City and/or } \\ \text { County Sales } \\ \text { Tax Rate }\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Effective Sales } \\ \text { Tax }\end{array}\right) \begin{array}{c}\text { Tax } \\ \text { Percentage }\end{array}\right]$

Research showed that every state has an exemption for equipment purchased for an agricultural processing plant. The one exception is South Dakota, which does not have an exemption for either the first year or the expansion in year three.

## Bismarck, North Dakota

The City of Bismarck has a $1 \%$ city sales tax on all purchases of personal property not exempted by other state or local programs. This sales tax is capped at $\$ 25$ for any single purchase and would apply to the computer equipment purchased in year one and all other purchases of personal property. However, this cap limitation was not considered in calculating the applicable sales and use tax since the individual purchase order size and the number of purchases could not be estimated.

## State Income Taxes

(See Appendix E for the calculation of the estimated costs)

| Location |  | State <br> Income Tax |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Rank |  |  |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota |  | - |  | 1 |
| Omaha, Nebraska |  | 731,455 |  | 2 |
| Bismarck, North Dakota |  | $\$$ | $2,784,011$ |  |
| Greeley, Colorado |  | $\$$ | $3,160,364$ |  |
| Chicago, Illinois |  | $\$$ | $3,407,166$ |  |
| San Jose, California |  | $\$$ | $3,678,347$ |  |
| Richmond, Virginia |  | $\$$ | $3,745,145$ |  |
| Great Falls, Montana |  | $\$$ | $4,607,443$ |  |
| Des Moines, Iowa |  | $\$$ | $4,868,204$ |  |

## Assumptions

There are many differences between the net income of a business and its taxable income. Some of these differences are due to different accounting procedures or additional deductions. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that net income for the Subject business will be the same as its taxable income. One deduction, the state income tax deduction, has been incorporated into the analysis of the federal income taxes.

The analysis assumes a net profit of $\$ 1,050,000$ for the first year of operation, a net profit of $\$ 2,800,000$ for the second year of operation, and a net profit of $\$ 6,235,000$ for the third year of operation. For years four through ten, it is assumed that the Subject's net income will increase at an annual rate of $3 \%$.

## Apportionment

Corporations that conduct business in more than one state must determine the portion of its net income that is subject to tax in each state by using an apportionment factor. Apportionment is a means by which the company's income is divided among the states in which business is conducted. There is a general formula for calculating the apportionment factor to be applied to corporation taxable income:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Sales within a state divided by total corporate sales } & =\text { Sales Factor } \\
\text { + Payroll within a state divided by total corporate payroll } & =\text { Payroll Factor } \\
\text { + Property within a state divided by total corporate property } & =\text { Property Factor } \\
\hline \text { Apportionment Factor } & =\text { Sum of Factors } / 3
\end{aligned}
$$

The above formula is used by a majority of the states in this analysis. However, there are differences such as some states weigh the sales factor more heavily, while other states use only the sales factor. For the states in this analysis, the applicable formulas are found below. It must be noted that the property within a state includes fixed assets, inventories, and rent payments. The factors and calculation of the applicable apportionment percentage are found in Appendix E.

## Apportionment Formulas by State

- North Dakota follows the general apportionment factor formula.
- South Dakota does not impose a state corporate income tax and thus no apportionment.
- Iowa only uses the sales factor for the apportionment computation in calculating corporate income taxes.
- Wisconsin follows the general apportionment factor formula, except it weighs sales twice as heavily as the payroll or property factor.
- Minnesota's apportionment formula is:

$$
\text { App. Factor }=(\text { Sales Factor x } 75 \%)+(\text { Payroll Factor x 12.5\% })+(\text { Prop. Factor x } 12.5 \%)
$$

- Montana follows the general apportionment factor formula.
- Nebraska only uses the sales factor for the apportionment computation in calculating corporate income taxes.
- Colorado follows the general apportionment factor formula.
- Illinois only uses the sales factor for the apportionment computation in calculating corporate income taxes.
- California follows the general apportionment factor formula, except it weighs sales twice as heavily as the payroll or property factor.
- Virginia follows the general apportionment factor formula, except it weighs sales twice as heavily as the payroll or property factor.


## Tax Calculations

Most state income taxes are calculated by taking the business' taxable income times the applicable state income tax rate. However, some states compute income taxes similar to the federal income tax calculation. In this analysis, three states computed state income taxes by using tax brackets. These states were North Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska. A description of how to calculate the state income taxes for these states is found on the next page.

State income taxes also allow additional deductions that are not deductible for federal income tax purposes. Any special state income tax incentives offered by the state have been included in calculating the state's income tax liability if such incentives are applicable to the circumstances of the Subject business. These state incentives include:

## Bismarck, North Dakota

North Dakota offers a five-year state income tax abatement for qualified new businesses.

## Des Moines, Iowa

Iowa has a new jobs tax credit for businesses increasing the number of jobs by $10 \%$. The credit is $\$ 1,152$ per new employee.

## Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Wisconsin has a fuel tax credit for fuel and electricity used in a manufacturing process. The credit was not applied since operating assumptions were not considered in this analysis.

## Great Falls, Montana

The state of Montana offers a New or Expanding Industry Wage Credit for manufacturing businesses. The credit is $1 \%$ of the wages paid to new employees for the first three years of operation.

## Omaha, Nebraska

Nebraska has an Employment and Investment Growth Act that offers a state income tax credit of $5 \%$ of the taxable wages for 30 or more new full-time equivalent employees. In addition, the state offers a $10 \%$ earned investment credit on qualified property and a credit refund on sales and use tax paid on otherwise non-refundable purchases.

## Chicago, Illinois

Illinois offers a $5 \%$ credit for investing in a processing business, plus a $5 \%$ credit if employment is increased over $1 \%$.

## San Jose, California

California offers a Manufacturer's Investment Credit (available to agricultural processing) of 6\% of the cost of qualified property.

## Richmond, Virginia

The state of Virginia offers a Major Business Facility Job Tax Credit for new jobs over 100. The state income tax credit is equal to $\$ 1,000$ for each new job over the qualifying number.

## Incentives, Credits and Abatements

Several states offer additional incentive, credit and abatement programs tied to specific qualifying requirements, e.g., locating in Enterprise Zones. Programs that have specific qualifying conditions were not included in this analysis if those conditions required approval by one or more boards and the approval was not routinely given. In addition, other incentive programs were not included if they required specific company actions or additional conditions, and such actions were beyond the assumptions of this analysis. However, the impact to the overall cost of doing business in some communities could be significantly lower if the business took advantage of these special incentives.

## Federal Taxes

In addition to the special incentives offered by the various states, a deduction for federal income taxes has been included if that deduction applies in calculating the state tax. Only two states have a deduction for federal income taxes. North Dakota allows $100 \%$ of federal income taxes to be deducted and Iowa allows $50 \%$ of the federal income taxes to be deducted. These deductions have been included in calculating the income taxes in those states.

It is assumed that these federal and state income tax rates will be held constant throughout the ten-year period of the analysis. The federal taxes have been computed on the following tax rate schedule:

| Tax Rate on excess <br> over Base Taxable <br> Income | Base Taxable <br> Income | Tax on Base |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| $35.00 \%$ | $\$$ | $18,333,333$ | $\$$ | $6,416,667$ |
| $38.00 \%$ | $\$$ | $15,000,000$ | $\$$ | $5,150,000$ |
| $35.00 \%$ | $\$$ | $10,000,000$ | $\$$ | $3,400,000$ |
| $34.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 335,000 | $\$$ | 113,900 |
| $39.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 22,250 |
| $34.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 13,750 |
| $25.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 50,000 | $\$$ | 7,500 |
| $15.00 \%$ |  | - | - |  |

The state income tax rates as of January 1, 2002, are as follows:

| State | Tax Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
|  |  |
| California | 8.84 |
| Colorado | 4.63 |
| Illinois | 7.3 |
| Iowa | $6.0-12.0$ |
| Minnesota | 9.8 |
| Montana | 6.75 |
| Nebraska | $5.58-7.81$ |
| North Dakota | $3.0-10.5$ |
| South Dakota | --- |
| Wisconsin | 7.9 |
| Virginia | 6 |

## Bismarck, North Dakota

State income taxes for North Dakota are calculated much like the federal income taxes. A 100\% deduction for federal income taxes is allowed in the state of North Dakota. Therefore, before determining the appropriate tax bracket, the federal income taxes are subtracted from taxable income. This will become the state taxable income level in North Dakota for the purpose of this analysis.

After the state taxable income level is determined, the procedure for calculating the state income taxes is identical to the procedure for calculating federal income taxes. A business will first determine its tax bracket. Then the business will multiply the tax rate for that bracket by the business' taxable income less the base taxable income for its tax bracket. This product will then be added to the taxes on the base taxable income for the total North Dakota state income taxes. The tax rate schedule for North Dakota is found below:

Tax Rate on excess

| over Base Taxable <br> Income | Base Taxable <br> Income | Tax on Base |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10.50 \%$ | $\$$ | 50,000 | $\$$ | 3,585 |
| $9.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 30,000 | $\$$ | 1,785 |
| $7.50 \%$ | $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 1,035 |
| $6.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 8,000 | $\$$ | 315 |
| $4.50 \%$ | $\$$ | 3,000 | $\$$ | 90 |
| $3.00 \%$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - |

## Des Moines, Iowa

State income taxes for Iowa are also calculated much like the federal income taxes. A 50\% deduction for federal income taxes is allowed for Iowa state income taxes. Therefore, before determining the appropriate tax bracket, $50 \%$ of the federal income taxes are subtracted from taxable income. This will become the state taxable income level in Iowa for the purpose of this analysis.

After the state taxable income level is determined, a business will establish into which bracket it fits. Then the business will multiply the tax rate for that bracket by the business' taxable income less the base taxable income for its tax bracket. This product will then be subtracted by the applicable amount in the Iowa tax schedule to determine the Iowa state income taxes. Below is the tax rate schedule for Iowa:

| Tax Rate | If Taxable Income <br> is greater than $\ldots$ |  | Amount to Subtract <br> from Base Tax |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $12.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 250,000 | $\$$ | 7,500 |
| $10.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 2,500 |
| $8.00 \%$ | $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 500 |
| $6.00 \%$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - |

## Omaha, Nebraska

State income taxes for Nebraska are also calculated much like the federal income taxes. A deduction for federal income taxes is not allowed for Nebraska state income taxes. Therefore, a business will first determine which bracket it is in. Then the business will multiply the tax rate for that bracket by the business' taxable income less the base taxable income for its tax bracket. This product will then be added to the taxes on the base taxable income for the total Nebraska state income taxes. Below is the tax rate schedule for Nebraska:

| If Taxable Income <br> is greater than $\ldots$ |  |  |  | Tax on Base |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $7.81 \%$ | $\$$ | 50,000 | $\$$ | 2,790 |
| $5.58 \%$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - |

## Workers' Compensation Insurance

(See Appendix F for the calculation of the estimated costs)

| Location | Workers' <br> Compensation Insurance |  | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | \$ | 1,204,785 | 1 |
| Richmond, Virginia | \$ | 2,871,744 | 2 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | \$ | 2,980,204 | 3 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | \$ | 3,230,782 | 4 |
| Edina, Minnesota | \$ | 3,297,926 | 5 |
| Great Falls, Montana | \$ | 3,497,728 | 6 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | \$ | 4,010,467 | 7 |
| Chicago, Illinois | \$ | 4,481,053 | 8 |
| San Jose, California | \$ | 6,462,725 | 9 |
| Greeley, Colorado | \$ | 8,224,036 | 10 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | \$ | 11,407,838 | 11 |

In most states, employers are required to handle their statutory workers' compensation liability by purchasing an insurance policy from a private insurer. If a company is large enough, many states allow an employer to self-insure this liability, and those particular requirements vary considerably state by state. But generally, this option is only viable for employers with very large state payrolls. Most employers need to buy an insurance policy to cover this exposure. However, there are four states that require businesses to purchase their insurance for workers' compensation from a state fund, including North Dakota, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Because workers' compensation is a requirement for a business in every state, it is assumed that there are not any incentives relating to a reduction or elimination of workers' compensation insurance in any state, for new or existing businesses, during the analysis period.

The basic method of calculating a business' workers' compensation insurance premium is to multiply the remuneration figure of a business by a rate per one hundred dollars. The most common remuneration figure is payroll. There are different classifications, which apply to different industries, and each classification will carry its own particular rate per hundred dollars of payroll. The theory is that the rate should vary to reflect the varying exposure to injury of different kinds of work. For example, a bank teller is normally subject to considerably less workplace risk of injury than is a steelworker, thus the rate for the bank teller's classification code will be much lower than the rate for the steelworker's classification code. There are a couple of workplace exposures that are normally broken out into their own classifications for calculating the premium. The most common one is a clerical employee, which is generally an office employee not involved in the production of the actual product. For the Subject business, the classification codes provided by the National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI) have been used. Currently, the classification codes applicable to the Subject business are as follows:

| Code - Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8810-$ Clerical employees |
| $2039-\quad$ Manufacturing of ice cream and other frozen dairy products |

Other adjustments to the premium are typically made to lower or raise the premium based on the specific activities of the business. The most common adjustments are (1) a modification factor, (2) a premium discount, and (3) assigned risk adjustments. A modification factor is based on experience, level of payroll, the number of claims that are filed each year in the business' industry, and the current account balance owed to the state or insurance carrier. A premium discount is simply a size discount, based on the size of the premium. Assigned risk adjustments are typically due to a mechanism set up by the state so that the business can obtain workers' compensation insurance even when private insurance companies are not willing to write such insurance on a voluntary basis. These adjustments have not been included in this analysis because of the variability of these factors.

## Assumptions

The assumptions for the calculation of workers' compensation insurance is that the Subject business will employ 15 salaried employees with an average salary of $\$ 45,000$ a year and 50 hourly employees with an average wages of $\$ 30,000$ a year. For year two, it is assumed that the Subject business will employ 12 salaried employees and 100 hourly employees with wages of $\$ 50,000$ a year and $\$ 30,000$ a year, respectively. For year three, it is assumed the Subject business will employ 12 salaried employees and 135 hourly employees with wages of $\$ 50,000$ a year and $\$ 34,000$ a year respectively. For years four through ten, it is assumed that the Subject's employees and their respective salaries will increase on an annual basis of $3 \%$ a year.

It is assumed that the insurance rates for workers' compensation premiums will remain constant over the next ten years. It is also assumed that all states that are members of the National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI) do not have payroll limitations. At the time of this analysis, the states included in the analysis that were not members of NCCI were North Dakota, Wisconsin, and California. Of these three states, North Dakota was the only state with a payroll limitation of $\$ 17,400$ in 2002 . For purposes of this analysis, this payroll limit was increased by an average of $3 \%$ every two years.

Research indicated that none of the locations offered an incentive for workers' compensation insurance.

## Bismarck, North Dakota

Per a phone conversation with the North Dakota Workers' Compensation office, North Dakota's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.31$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is \$4.85.

## Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Per a phone conversation with an NCCI representative, South Dakota's workers compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 was $\$ 0.45$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 7.96$.

## Des Moines, Iowa

Per a phone conversation with an NCCI representative, Iowa's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.38$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 6.41$.

## Eau Claire, Wisconsin

According to the Wisconsin Compensation Rating Bureau's web site, Wisconsin's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.30$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 5.92$.

## Edina, Minnesota

According to the Minnesota Workers' Compensation Insurer's Association web site, Minnesota's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.34$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is \$6.55.

## Great Falls, Montana

Per a phone conversation with a Montana State Fund representative, Montana's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.55$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 6.92$.

## Omaha, Nebraska

Per a phone conversation with a Traveler's Insurance representative, Nebraska's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.52$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 22.75$.

## Greeley, Colorado

Per a phone conversation with a Pinnacle Insurance representative, Colorado's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.38$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 16.40$.

## Chicago, Illinois

Per a phone conversation with an NCCI representative, Illinois' workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.39$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 8.91$.

## San Jose, California

According to the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau of California's web site, California's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 1.20$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 12.76$.

## Richmond, Virginia

Per a phone conversation with a NCCI representative, Virginia's workers' compensation rate for NCCI code 8810 is $\$ 0.18$ and for the NCCI Code 2039 the rate is $\$ 5.72$.

## SUMMARY OF TOTAL COSTS

| Location | Real Estate Taxes |  | 焦 | Unemployment Insurance |  |  | Sales \& Use Tax |  | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\text { In }}$ | Income Taxes |  | $\underset{\text { N }}{\text { N }}$ | Workers' <br> Compensation <br> Insurance |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 華 } \\ & \text { تِ } \end{aligned}$ | Present Value <br> Total <br> (discount rate 6\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | \$ | - | 1 | \$ | 369,391 | 7 | \$ | 60,000 | 2 | \$ | 2,784,011 | 3 | \$ | 1,204,785 | 1 | \$ | 2,922,344 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | \$ | 3,310,124 | 4 | \$ | 155,733 | 1 | \$ | 2,400,000 | 11 | \$ | - | 1 | \$ | 4,010,467 | 7 | \$ | 7,341,778 |
| Richmond, Virginia | \$ | 3,125,551 | 3 | \$ | 237,714 | 2 | \$ | 337,500 | 4 | \$ | 3,745,145 | 7 | \$ | 2,871,744 | 2 | \$ | 7,489,083 |
| Great Falls, Montana | \$ | 2,336,937 | 2 | \$ | 498,587 | 11 | \$ | - | 1 | \$ | 4,607,443 | 8 | \$ | 3,497,728 | 6 | \$ | 7,680,200 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | \$ | 3,580,049 | 5 | \$ | 363,174 | 6 | \$ | 412,500 | 5 | \$ | 5,029,857 | 10 | \$ | 2,980,204 | 3 | \$ | 8,873,919 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | \$ | 3,911,701 | 6 | \$ | 422,123 | 9 | \$ | 510,000 | 7 | \$ | 4,868,204 | 9 | \$ | 3,230,782 | 4 | \$ | 9,259,978 |
| Chicago, Illinois | \$ | 4,815,744 | 9 | \$ | 416,058 | 8 | \$ | 765,000 | 10 | \$ | 3,407,166 | 5 | \$ | 4,481,053 | 8 | \$ | 9,985,669 |
| Edina, Minnesota | \$ | 5,964,760 | 11 | \$ | 447,474 | 10 | \$ | 552,500 | 8 | \$ | 5,564,939 | 11 | \$ | 3,297,926 | 5 | , | 11,358,333 |
| San Jose, California | \$ | 5,530,341 | 10 | \$ | 362,061 | 5 | \$ | 701,250 | 9 | \$ | 3,678,347 | 6 | \$ | 6,462,725 | 9 | \$ | 11,808,558 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | \$ | 4,409,321 | 7 | \$ | 282,852 | 4 | \$ | 70,000 | 3 | \$ | 731,455 | 2 | \$ | 11,407,838 | 11 | \$ | 11,817,483 |
| Greeley, Colorado | \$ | 4,441,878 | 8 | \$ | 249,414 | 3 | \$ | 501,500 | 6 | \$ | 3,160,364 | 4 | \$ | 8,224,036 | 10 | \$ | 11,825,853 |

## PROPERTY TAXES COMPARISON

| Location | Mill Levy | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate Per } \\ \$ 1 / \$ 10 / \\ \$ 100 / \$ 1,000 \end{gathered}$ | Real Property |  | Personal Property |  | Total Tax <br> Pain in <br> 10 Years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Assessed <br> Rate <br> (if applicable) | Incentive <br> Program <br> Available | Incentive <br> Program <br> Available | Deprec. <br> Factor <br> (if applicable) |  |  |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | 48.37200 | 1,000 | None | None | See Note 1 | N/A | \$ |  |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | 25.75700 | 1,000 | None | None | See Note 1 | N/A | \$ | 3,310,124 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 44.42500 | 1,000 | None | None | See Note 1 | N/A | \$ | 3,911,701 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | 21.00700 | 1,000 | None | None | None | Yes | \$ | 3,580,049 |
| Edina, Minnesota | 0.03500 | 1 | None | None | See Note 2 | N/A | \$ | 5,964,760 |
| Great Falls, Montana | 577.20000 | 1,000 | None | None | None | Yes | \$ | 2,336,937 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | 2.58730 | 100 | None | None | See Note 3 | N/A | \$ | 4,409,321 |
| Greeley, Colorado | 89.87600 | 1,000 | None | None | See Note 4 | N/A | \$ | 4,441,878 |
| Chicago, Illinois | 7.69200 | 100 | None | None | See Note 1 | N/A | \$ | 4,815,744 |
| San Jose, California | 0.01200 | 1 | None | None | None | No | \$ | 5,530,341 |
| Richmond, Virginia | 3.50000 | 100 | None | None | None | Yes | \$ | 3,125,551 |

Note 1: These states do not impose a tax on personal property.
Note 2: Minnesota offers an abatement program that exempts all personal property from being taxed for the first 10 to 20 years of operation.
Note 3: Nebraska offers an abatement program for new or expanding businesses that exempts all personal property from being taxed after the date of qualification Note 4: Colorado offers an abatement program that exempts all personal property that will be used in the income producing process from being taxed.

## UNEMPLOYMENT TAX COMPARISON

| State | Unemployment Ins. Rates |  | \# of Years <br> \# of Years <br> "New" Rate is | Wage Base | Total Tax Pain in 10 Years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New | Experience |  |  |  |  |
| North Dakota | 2.08\% | 0.94\% | 2 | 18,000 | \$ | 369,391 |
| South Dakota | 1.2\% (see Note 2) | 0.61\% | 3 | 7,000 | \$ | 155,733 |
| Iowa | 1.036\% | 1.27\% | 4 | 19,200 | \$ | 422,123 |
| Wisconsin | 3.25\% | 1.40\% | 3 | 10,500 | \$ | 363,174 |
| Minnesota | 1.42\% | 1.08\% (see Note 3) | 2 | 22,000 | \$ | 447,474 |
| Montana | 1.63\% (see Note 1) | 1.37\% | 3 | 19,700 | \$ | 498,587 |
| Nebraska | 3.50\% | 1.86\% | 1 | 7,000 | \$ | 282,852 |
| Colorado | 1.70\% | 1.10\% | 1 | 10,000 | \$ | 249,414 |
| Illinois | 3.30\% | 2.28\% | 3 | 9,000 | \$ | 416,058 |
| California | 3.40\% | 2.50\% |  | 7,000 | \$ | 362,061 |
| Virginia | 2.50\% | 0.975\% | 3 | 8,000 | \$ | 237,714 |

Note 1: Montana has a different new employer rate for each industry. The new employer rate for an ag processing company is $1.63 \%$.

Note 2: South Dakota has a new employer rate of $1.2 \%$ for year one and $1.0 \%$ for years two and three.

Note 3: Minnesota has a surcharge to provide funds to pay interest on anticipated loans from the Federal government because of borrowing to keep their UI Trust Fund solvent. That surcharge has been calculated into the full "experience rate" period, as converservations with Minnesota UI officials indicated.

Note 4: "Highlights of State Unemployment Compensation Laws" January 2002, published by the National Foundation for Unemployment Compensation and Workers' Compensation, notes that several of the comparative states have surtaxes under their State unemployment insurance laws for various purposes. In responding to questions for this analysis, several of the states did not identify such surtaxes. However, the reader is cautioned that such surtaxes could apply and ultimately increase the cost of insurance.

## SALES AND USE TAX COMPARISON

|  | State Sales Tax Rate | Local Sales Tax Rate | Effective <br> Sales Tax <br> Rate | Exemption for <br> Michinery and Equip. | Exemption for Computer Equip. | Exemption for Construction Materials |  | otal Tax Paid in <br> 0 Years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | 5.00\% | 1.00\% | 6.00\% | Yes | No | Yes | \$ | 60,000 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | 4.00\% | 2.00\% | 6.00\% | No | No | No | \$ | 2,400,000 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 5.00\% | 1.00\% | 6.00\% | Yes | No | No | \$ | 510,000 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | 5.00\% | 0.50\% | 5.50\% | Yes | Yes | No | \$ | 412,500 |
| Edina, Minnesota | 6.50\% | 0.00\% | 6.50\% | Yes | No | No | \$ | 552,500 |
| Great Falls, Montana | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$ | - |
| Omaha, Nebraska | 5.50\% | 1.50\% | 7.00\% | Yes | No | Yes | \$ | 70,000 |
| Greeley, Colorado | 2.90\% | 3.00\% | 5.90\% | Yes | No | No | \$ | 501,500 |
| Chicago, Illinois | 6.25\% | 2.75\% | 9.00\% | Yes | No | No | \$ | 765,000 |
| San Jose, California | 7.25\% | 1.00\% | 8.25\% | Yes | No | No | \$ | 701,250 |
| Richmond, Virginia | 3.50\% | 1.00\% | 4.50\% | Yes | Yes | No | \$ | 337,500 |

## STATE INCOME TAXES COMPARISON

| State | Tax Rate | Apportionment Percentage | Incentive <br> Programs | Total Tax <br> Pain in 10 Years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Dakota | 3.0\%-10.5\% | 2.10\% | Note 6 | \$ | 2,784,011 |
| South Dakota | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  | \$ | - |
| Iowa | 6.0\%-12.0\% | 0.89\% | Note 3 | \$ | 4,868,204 |
| Wisconsin | 7.90\% | 1.80\% | Note 7 | , | 5,029,857 |
| Minnesota | 9.80\% | 1.34\% |  | \$ | 5,564,939 |
| Montana | 6.75\% | 2.10\% | Note 4 | \$ | 4,607,443 |
| Nebraska | 5.58\%-7.81 | 0.89\% | Note 5 | \$ | 731,455 |
| Colorado | 4.63\% | 2.10\% |  | \$ | 3,160,364 |
| Illinois | 7.30\% | 0.89\% | Note 2 | \$ | 3,407,166 |
| California | 8.84\% | 1.80\% | Note 1 | \$ | 3,678,347 |
| Virginia | 6.00\% | 1.80\% | Note 8 | \$ | 3,745,145 |

Note 1: Tax credit of $6 \%$ of the cost of qualified property
Note 2: $5 \%$ credit for manufacturing business, plus $5 \%$ if employment is increased by $1 \%$
Note 3: $10 \%$ credit for increasing jobs by $10 \%-\$ 1,152$ per qualified employee
Note 4: Tax credit of $1 \%$ of wages paid to new employees for three years
Note 5: 5\% tax credit for 30 or more new employees, plus $10 \%$ credit for qualified property, plus refund on sales and use tax paid on qualified purchases
Note 6: Five-year income tax abatement
Note 7: Fuel tax credit for energy used in manufacturing process
Note 8: New jobs credit of $\$ 1,000$ per new job over 100

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION INSURANCE COMPARISON

| North Dakota | Rate for <br> Salaried <br> Positions |  | Rate for <br> Salaried <br> Positions |  | Wage Base | Incentive <br> Programs |  | Total Tax <br> Paid in <br> 10 Years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | 0.31 | \$ | 4.85 | \$17,400 * | None | \$ | 1,204,785 |
| South Dakota | \$ | 0.45 | \$ | 7.96 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 4,010,467 |
| Iowa | \$ | 0.38 | \$ | 6.41 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 3,230,782 |
| Wisconsin | \$ | 0.30 | \$ | 5.92 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 2,980,204 |
| Minnesota | \$ | 0.34 | \$ | 6.55 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 3,297,926 |
| Montana | \$ | 0.55 | \$ | 6.92 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 3,497,728 |
| Nebraska | \$ | 0.52 | \$ | 22.75 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 11,407,838 |
| Colorado | \$ | 0.38 | \$ | 16.40 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 8,224,036 |
| Illinois | \$ | 0.39 | \$ | 8.91 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 4,481,053 |
| California | \$ | 1.20 | \$ | 12.76 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 6,462,725 |
| Virginia | \$ | 0.18 | \$ | 5.72 | 100\% of Salaries | None | \$ | 2,871,744 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY
Bismarck, North Dakota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 43,004 | \$ | 85,037 | \$ | 117,208 | \$ | 120,661 | \$ | 126,903 | \$ | 130,490 | \$ | 136,967 | \$ | 141,535 | \$ | 149,186 | \$ | 153,794 | \$ | 1,204,785 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 27,976 |  | 48,205 |  | 33,104 |  | 34,005 |  | 34,906 |  | 36,032 |  | 36,933 |  | 38,284 |  | 39,410 |  | 40,536 |  | 369,391 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 60,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 60,000 |
| Property Tax |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Income Taxes |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 513,333 |  | 533,544 |  | 556,157 |  | 578,736 |  | 602,241 |  | 2,784,011 |
| Total |  | 130,980 |  | 133,242 |  | 150,312 |  | 154,666 |  | 161,809 |  | 679,855 |  | 707,444 |  | 735,976 |  | 767,332 |  | 796,570 |  | 4,418,187 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 123,567 |  | 118,585 |  | 126,202 |  | 122,511 |  | 120,920 |  | 479,298 |  | 470,521 |  | 461,751 |  | 454,184 |  | 444,805 |  | 2,922,344 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ 122,438 | \$ | 241,500 | \$ | 368,064 | \$ | 390,256 | \$ | 413,453 | \$ | 437,931 | \$ | 463,258 | \$ | 493,104 | \$ | 524,049 | \$ | 556,414 | \$ | 4,010,467 |
| Unemployment Insurance | 9,100 |  | 14,112 |  | 18,522 |  | 14,904 |  | 15,299 |  | 15,792 |  | 16,187 |  | 16,779 |  | 17,273 |  | 17,766 |  | 155,733 |
| Sales and Use Tax | 2,010,000 |  | - |  | 390,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,400,000 |
| Property Tax | - |  | 70,363 |  | 149,297 |  | 237,584 |  | 336,070 |  | 445,671 |  | 472,813 |  | 501,607 |  | 532,155 |  | 564,563 |  | 3,310,124 |
| Income Taxes | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total | 2,141,538 |  | 325,975 |  | 925,883 |  | 642,744 |  | 764,822 |  | 899,394 |  | 952,258 |  | 1,011,490 |  | 1,073,476 |  | 1,138,743 |  | 9,876,324 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs | 2,020,326 |  | 290,118 |  | 777,371 |  | 509,117 |  | 571,552 |  | 634,073 |  | 633,347 |  | 634,609 |  | 635,391 |  | 635,874 |  | 7,341,778 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Des Moines, Iowa

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 98,715 | \$ | 194,580 | \$ | 296,499 | \$ | 314,373 | \$ | 333,056 | \$ | 352,781 | \$ | 373,180 | \$ | 397,228 | \$ | 422,152 | \$ | 448,219 | \$ | 3,230,782 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 16,569 |  | 28,550 |  | 37,472 |  | 38,492 |  | 46,475 |  | 47,974 |  | 49,174 |  | 50,973 |  | 52,472 |  | 53,971 |  | 422,123 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 510,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 510,000 |
| Property Tax |  | 295,521 |  | 313,518 |  | 332,611 |  | 352,867 |  | 374,357 |  | 397,155 |  | 421,342 |  | 447,002 |  | 474,224 |  | 503,104 |  | 3,911,701 |
| Income Taxes |  | 80,285 |  | 340,584 |  | 499,379 |  | 514,585 |  | 530,248 |  | 546,380 |  | 562,996 |  | 580,111 |  | 597,740 |  | 615,897 |  | 4,868,204 |
| Total |  | 1,001,090 |  | 877,232 |  | 1,165,961 |  | 1,220,317 |  | 1,284,136 |  | 1,344,290 |  | 1,406,692 |  | 1,475,314 |  | 1,546,587 |  | 1,621,191 |  | 12,942,809 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 944,428 |  | 780,736 |  | 978,941 |  | 966,613 |  | 959,635 |  | 947,725 |  | 935,591 |  | 925,612 |  | 915,425 |  | 905,273 |  | 9,259,978 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 90,825 | \$ | 179,400 | \$ | 273,528 | \$ | 290,027 | \$ | 307,272 | \$ | 325,451 | \$ | 344,280 | \$ | 366,449 | \$ | 389,455 | \$ | 413,517 | \$ | 2,980,204 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 25,821 |  | 44,492 |  | 58,396 |  | 30,653 |  | 31,465 |  | 32,480 |  | 33,292 |  | 34,510 |  | 35,525 |  | 36,540 |  | 363,174 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 412,500 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 412,500 |
| Property Tax |  | 270,465 |  | 286,936 |  | 304,411 |  | 322,950 |  | 342,617 |  | 363,483 |  | 385,619 |  | 409,103 |  | 434,017 |  | 460,449 |  | 3,580,049 |
| Income Taxes |  | 235,105 |  | 357,005 |  | 485,098 |  | 503,179 |  | 521,954 |  | 542,201 |  | 562,472 |  | 584,860 |  | 607,320 |  | 630,663 |  | 5,029,857 |
| Total |  | 1,034,716 |  | 867,834 |  | 1,121,433 |  | 1,146,808 |  | 1,203,308 |  | 1,263,615 |  | 1,325,662 |  | 1,394,922 |  | 1,466,318 |  | 1,541,169 |  | 12,365,784 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 976,151 |  | 772,372 |  | 941,555 |  | 908,386 |  | 899,232 |  | 890,849 |  | 881,698 |  | 875,174 |  | 867,913 |  | 860,589 |  | 8,873,919 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Edina, Minnesota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 10 |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 100,545 | \$ | 198,540 | \$ | 302,685 | \$ | 320,941 | \$ | 340,023 | \$ | 360,143 | \$ | 380,977 | \$ | 405,512 | \$ | 430,968 | \$ | 457,592 | \$ | 3,297,926 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 23,946 |  | 41,261 |  | 43,159 |  | 44,334 |  | 45,508 |  | 46,976 |  | 48,150 |  | 49,912 |  | 51,380 |  | 52,848 |  | 447,474 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 552,500 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 552,500 |
| Property Tax |  | 450,625 |  | 478,068 |  | 507,182 |  | 538,070 |  | 570,838 |  | 605,602 |  | 642,483 |  | 681,611 |  | 723,121 |  | 767,159 |  | 5,964,760 |
| Income Taxes |  | 217,993 |  | 391,552 |  | 548,610 |  | 567,256 |  | 586,557 |  | 606,999 |  | 627,693 |  | 649,944 |  | 672,491 |  | 695,843 |  | 5,564,939 |
| Total |  | 1,345,609 |  | 1,109,421 |  | 1,401,637 |  | 1,470,601 |  | 1,542,926 |  | 1,619,720 |  | 1,699,304 |  | 1,786,978 |  | 1,877,960 |  | 1,973,443 |  | 15,827,598 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 1,269,447 |  | 987,385 |  | 1,176,814 |  | 1,164,863 |  | 1,153,029 |  | 1,141,903 |  | 1,130,207 |  | 1,121,150 |  | 1,111,564 |  | 1,101,970 |  | 11,358,333 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Great Falls, Montana

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 107,513 | \$ | 210,900 | \$ | 320,928 | \$ | 340,249 | \$ | 360,445 | \$ | 381,842 | \$ | 403,894 | \$ | 429,967 | \$ | 456,907 | \$ | 485,084 | \$ | 3,497,728 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 24,512 |  | 42,236 |  | 55,435 |  | 49,209 |  | 50,513 |  | 52,142 |  | 53,446 |  | 55,401 |  | 57,031 |  | 58,660 |  | 498,587 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Property Tax |  | 130,050 |  | 137,970 |  | 146,373 |  | 155,287 |  | 164,744 |  | 209,732 |  | 259,589 |  | 314,741 |  | 375,647 |  | 442,804 |  | 2,336,937 |
| Income Taxes |  | 234,702 |  | 328,599 |  | 438,892 |  | 456,077 |  | 473,951 |  | 493,398 |  | 512,762 |  | 534,426 |  | 556,058 |  | 578,577 |  | 4,607,443 |
| Total |  | 496,777 |  | 719,706 |  | 961,628 |  | 1,000,823 |  | 1,049,654 |  | 1,137,114 |  | 1,229,690 |  | 1,334,535 |  | 1,445,643 |  | 1,565,125 |  | 10,940,695 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 468,660 |  | 640,538 |  | 807,383 |  | 792,752 |  | 784,406 |  | 801,665 |  | 817,867 |  | 837,287 |  | 855,676 |  | 873,966 |  | 7,680,200 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Omaha, Nebraska

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 344,760 | \$ | 685,620 | \$ | 1,047,345 | \$ | 1,110,634 | \$ | 1,176,790 | \$ | 1,246,183 | \$ | 1,318,406 | \$ | 1,403,094 | \$ | 1,491,350 | \$ | 1,583,658 | \$ | 11,407,838 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 19,565 |  | 20,854 |  | 27,371 |  | 28,116 |  | 28,861 |  | 29,792 |  | 30,537 |  | 31,654 |  | 32,585 |  | 33,516 |  | 282,852 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 70,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 70,000 |
| Property Tax |  | 333,115 |  | 353,402 |  | 374,924 |  | 397,757 |  | 421,980 |  | 447,679 |  | 474,942 |  | 503,866 |  | 534,552 |  | 567,106 |  | 4,409,321 |
| Income Taxes |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 256,299 |  | 475,156 |  | 731,455 |
| Total |  | 767,440 |  | 1,059,876 |  | 1,449,640 |  | 1,536,506 |  | 1,627,631 |  | 1,723,653 |  | 1,823,885 |  | 1,938,614 |  | 2,314,785 |  | 2,659,436 |  | 16,901,466 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 724,003 |  | 943,290 |  | 1,217,118 |  | 1,217,067 |  | 1,216,328 |  | 1,215,175 |  | 1,213,066 |  | 1,216,286 |  | 1,370,121 |  | 1,485,029 |  | 11,817,483 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY
Greeley, Colorado

|  | YEAR <br> 1 | YEAR <br> 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ 248,565 | \$ 494,280 | \$ | 755,040 | \$ | 800,664 | \$ | 848,356 | \$ | 898,384 | \$ | 950,449 | \$ | 1,011,503 | \$ | 1,075,126 | \$ | 1,141,670 | \$ | 8,224,036 |
| Unemployment Insurance | 14,690 | 18,592 |  | 24,402 |  | 25,066 |  | 25,730 |  | 26,560 |  | 27,224 |  | 28,220 |  | 29,050 |  | 29,880 |  | 249,414 |
| Sales and Use Tax | 501,500 | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 501,500 |
| Property Tax | 335,575 | 356,011 |  | 377,692 |  | 400,694 |  | 425,096 |  | 450,984 |  | 478,449 |  | 507,587 |  | 538,499 |  | 571,293 |  | 4,441,878 |
| Income Taxes | 160,989 | 225,395 |  | 301,047 |  | 312,835 |  | 325,096 |  | 338,434 |  | 351,717 |  | 366,577 |  | 381,415 |  | 396,861 |  | 3,160,364 |
| Total | 1,261,318 | 1,094,278 |  | 1,458,181 |  | 1,539,259 |  | 1,624,277 |  | 1,714,362 |  | 1,807,838 |  | 1,913,886 |  | 2,024,089 |  | 2,139,704 |  | 16,577,193 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) | 0.9434 | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs | 1,189,927 | 973,907 |  | 1,224,289 |  | 1,219,247 |  | 1,213,822 |  | 1,208,625 |  | 1,202,393 |  | 1,200,772 |  | 1,198,058 |  | 1,194,811 |  | 11,825,853 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Chicago, Illinois

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers'Compensation Tax | \$ | 136,283 | \$ | 269,640 | \$ | 411,309 | \$ | 436,129 | \$ | 462,074 | \$ | 489,389 | \$ | 517,715 | \$ | 551,031 | \$ | 585,642 | \$ | 621,841 | \$ | 4,481,053 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 22,945 |  | 39,536 |  | 51,891 |  | 39,441 |  | 40,486 |  | 41,792 |  | 42,837 |  | 44,404 |  | 45,710 |  | 47,016 |  | 416,058 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 765,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 765,000 |
| Property Tax |  | 453,087 |  | 378,237 |  | 401,271 |  | 425,709 |  | 451,634 |  | 479,139 |  | 508,318 |  | 539,275 |  | 572,117 |  | 606,959 |  | 4,815,744 |
| Income Taxes |  | - |  | 170,333 |  | 330,612 |  | 379,433 |  | 390,816 |  | 402,268 |  | 414,617 |  | 426,569 |  | 439,664 |  | 452,854 |  | 3,407,166 |
| Total |  | 1,377,314 |  | 857,746 |  | 1,195,083 |  | 1,280,712 |  | 1,345,010 |  | 1,412,587 |  | 1,483,487 |  | 1,561,279 |  | 1,643,133 |  | 1,728,670 |  | 13,885,021 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 1,299,358 |  | 763,394 |  | 1,003,392 |  | 1,014,452 |  | 1,005,126 |  | 995,874 |  | 986,667 |  | 979,546 |  | 972,570 |  | 965,289 |  | 9,985,669 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY
San Jose, California


## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## COMPARATIVE COST SUMMARY

Richmond, Virginia

|  |  | YEAR $1$ |  | YEAR <br> 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation Tax | \$ | 87,015 | \$ | 172,680 | \$ | 263,628 | \$ | 279,549 | \$ | 296,192 | \$ | 313,676 | \$ | 331,845 | \$ | 353,178 | \$ | 375,380 | \$ | 398,601 | \$ | 2,871,744 |
| Unemployment Insurance |  | 16,640 |  | 28,672 |  | 37,632 |  | 20,234 |  | 20,770 |  | 21,440 |  | 21,976 |  | 22,780 |  | 23,450 |  | 24,120 |  | 237,714 |
| Sales and Use Tax |  | 337,500 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 337,500 |
| Property Tax |  | 332,132 |  | 320,247 |  | 360,694 |  | 345,159 |  | 329,998 |  | 315,234 |  | 300,889 |  | 286,991 |  | 273,565 |  | 260,642 |  | 3,125,551 |
| Income Taxes |  | 178,561 |  | 267,143 |  | 352,762 |  | 365,161 |  | 382,087 |  | 407,466 |  | 422,860 |  | 439,197 |  | 456,256 |  | 473,651 |  | 3,745,145 |
| Total |  | 951,847 |  | 788,742 |  | 1,014,716 |  | 1,010,104 |  | 1,029,048 |  | 1,057,815 |  | 1,077,571 |  | 1,102,146 |  | 1,128,651 |  | 1,157,014 |  | 10,317,654 |
| Present Value \% (at 6\%) |  | 0.9434 |  | 0.8900 |  | 0.8396 |  | 0.7921 |  | 0.7473 |  | 0.7050 |  | 0.6651 |  | 0.6274 |  | 0.5919 |  | 0.5584 |  |  |
| Present Value of Total Costs |  | 897,973 |  | 701,980 |  | 851,956 |  | 800,103 |  | 769,007 |  | 745,760 |  | 716,692 |  | 691,486 |  | 668,049 |  | 646,077 |  | 7,489,083 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Bismarck, North Dakota

|  | YEAR <br> 1 | YEAR <br> 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 6,437,500 | 6,630,625 | 6,829,544 | 7,034,430 | 7,245,463 | 7,462,827 | 7,686,712 | 7,917,313 | 8,154,833 | 8,399,478 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$10 | 0.48372 | 0.49823 | 0.51318 | 0.52857 | 0.54443 | 0.56076 | 0.57759 | 0.59491 | 0.61276 | 0.63114 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | 311,395 | 330,359 | 350,478 | 371,822 | 394,466 | 418,489 | 443,974 | 471,012 | 499,697 | 530,129 |  |  |
| \% of Taxes Exempt | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Net Property Taxes | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | - |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,261,250 | 13,659,088 | 14,068,860 | 14,490,926 | 14,925,654 | 15,373,423 | 15,834,626 | 16,309,665 | 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Mill Levy rate per \$ 1,000 | 25.75700 | 26.52971 | 27.32560 | 28.14537 | 28.98973 | 29.85942 | 30.75521 | 31.67786 | 32.62820 | 33.60704 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | 331,621 | 351,817 | 373,243 | 395,973 | 420,088 | 445,671 | 472,813 | 501,607 | 532,155 | 564,563 |  |  |
| \% of Taxes Exempt | 100\% | 80\% | 60\% | 40\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Net Property Taxes | \$ | \$ 70,363 | \$ 149,297 | \$ 237,584 | \$ 336,070 | \$ 445,671 | \$ 472,813 | \$ 501,607 | \$ 532,155 | \$ 564,563 | \$ | 3,310,124 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Des Moines, Iowa

|  | YEAR 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% | 51.667\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 6,652,126 | 6,851,690 | 7,057,241 | 7,268,958 | 7,487,027 | 7,711,638 | 7,942,986 | 8,181,276 | 8,426,715 | 8,679,516 |  |  |
| Mill Levy rate per \$1,000 | 44.42500 | 45.75775 | 47.13048 | 48.54440 | 50.00073 | 51.50075 | 53.04577 | 54.63715 | 56.27626 | 57.96455 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 295,521 | \$ 313,518 | \$ 332,611 | \$ 352,867 | \$ 374,357 | \$ 397,155 | \$ 421,342 | \$ 447,002 | \$ 474,224 | \$ 503,104 | \$ | 3,911,701 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,261,250 | 13,659,088 | 14,068,860 | 14,490,926 | 14,925,654 | 15,373,423 | 15,834,626 | 16,309,665 | 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Mill Levy rate per \$ 1,000 | 21.00700 | 21.63721 | 22.28633 | 22.95492 | 23.64356 | 24.35287 | 25.08346 | 25.83596 | 26.61104 | 27.40937 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 270,465 | \$ 286,936 | \$ 304,411 | \$ 322,950 | \$ 342,617 | \$ 363,483 | \$ 385,619 | \$ 409,103 | \$ 434,017 | \$ 460,449 | \$ | 3,580,049 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS
Edina, Minnesota

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,261,250 | 13,659,088 | 14,068,860 | 14,490,926 | 14,925,654 | 15,373,423 | 15,834,626 | 16,309,665 | 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$1 | 0.03500 | 0.03605 | 0.03713 | 0.03825 | 0.03939 | 0.04057 | 0.04179 | 0.04305 | 0.04434 | 0.04567 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 450,625 | \$ 478,068 | \$ 507,182 | \$ 538,070 | \$ 570,838 | \$ 605,602 | \$ 642,483 | \$ 681,611 | \$ 723,121 | \$ 767,159 | \$ | 5,964,760 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Great Falls, Montana

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 8 | YEAR <br> 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 450,625 | 464,144 | 478,068 | 492,410 | 507,182 | 522,398 | 538,070 | 554,212 | 570,838 | 587,963 |  |  |
| Mill Levy rate per \$1,000 | 577.20000 | 594.51600 | 612.35148 | 630.72202 | 649.64369 | 669.13300 | 689.20699 | 709.88320 | 731.17969 | 753.11508 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | 260,101 | 275,941 | 292,746 | 310,574 | 329,488 | 349,554 | 370,841 | 393,426 | 417,385 | 442,804 |  |  |
| \% of Taxes Exempt | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 40\% | 30\% | 20\% | 10\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 130,050 | \$ 137,970 | \$ 146,373 | \$ 155,287 | \$ 164,744 | \$ 209,732 | \$ 259,589 | \$ 314,741 | \$ 375,647 | \$ 442,804 | \$ | 2,336,937 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Omaha, Nebraska

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,261,250 | 13,659,088 | 14,068,860 | 14,490,926 | 14,925,654 | 15,373,423 | 15,834,626 | 16,309,665 | 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$100 | 2.58730 | 2.66492 | 2.74487 | 2.82721 | 2.91203 | 2.99939 | 3.08937 | 3.18205 | 3.27751 | 3.37584 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 333,115 | \$ 353,402 | \$ 374,924 | \$ 397,757 | \$ 421,980 | \$ 447,679 | \$ 474,942 | \$ 503,866 | \$ 534,552 | \$ 567,106 | \$ | 4,409,321 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Greeley, Colorado

|  | YEAR $1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$ 13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 3,733,750 | 3,845,763 | 3,961,136 | 4,079,969 | 4,202,369 | 4,328,440 | 4,458,293 | 4,592,042 | 4,729,803 | 4,871,697 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$1000 | 89.87600 | 92.57228 | 95.34945 | 98.20993 | 101.15623 | 104.19092 | 107.31664 | 110.53614 | 113.85223 | 117.26779 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 335,575 | \$ 356,011 | \$ 377,692 | \$ 400,694 | \$ 425,096 | \$ 450,984 | \$ 478,449 | \$ 507,587 | \$ 538,499 | \$ 571,293 | \$ | 4,441,878 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Chicago, Illinois

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$13,261,250 | \$13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$ 15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% | 36\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 4,635,000 | 4,774,050 | 4,917,272 | 5,064,790 | 5,216,733 | 5,373,235 | 5,534,432 | 5,700,465 | 5,871,479 | 6,047,624 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$100 | 7.69200 | 7.92276 | 8.16044 | 8.40526 | 8.65741 | 8.91714 | 9.18465 | 9.46019 | 9.74400 | 10.03632 |  |  |
| Real Property Taxes | 356,524 | 378,237 | 401,271 | 425,709 | 451,634 | 479,139 | 508,318 | 539,275 | 572,117 | 606,959 |  |  |
| Real Estate Transfer Tax (See Note Below) | 96,563 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 453,087 | \$ 378,237 | \$ 401,271 | \$ 425,709 | \$ 451,634 | \$ 479,139 | \$ 508,318 | \$ 539,275 | \$ 572,117 | \$ 606,959 | \$ | 4,815,744 |

Note: Real Estate Transfer tax is calculated at $\$ 3.75$ per $\$ 500$ of the purchase price

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

San Jose, California

|  | YEAR <br> 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | 12,875,000 | 13,132,500 | 13,395,150 | 13,663,053 | 13,936,314 | 14,215,040 | 14,499,341 | 14,789,328 | 15,085,115 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% | 102\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,132,500 | 13,395,150 | 13,663,053 | 13,936,314 | 14,215,040 | 14,499,341 | 14,789,328 | 15,085,115 | 15,386,817 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$1 | 0.01100 | 0.01133 | 0.01167 | 0.01202 | 0.01238 | 0.01275 | 0.01313 | 0.01353 | 0.01393 | 0.01435 |  |  |
| Real Property Taxes | 141,625 | 148,791 | 156,320 | 164,230 | 172,540 | 181,270 | 190,443 | 200,079 | 210,203 | 220,839 |  |  |
| Taxable Value | 26,000,000 | 26,000,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$100 | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% | 1.20\% |  |  |
| Personal Property Taxes | 312,000 | 312,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 453,625 | \$ 460,791 | \$ 546,320 | \$ 554,230 | \$ 562,540 | \$ 571,270 | \$ 580,443 | \$ 590,079 | \$ 600,203 | \$ 610,839 | \$ | 5,530,341 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## REAL ESTATE TAX ANALYSIS

Richmond, Virginia

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Value of Prop. | \$ 12,875,000 | \$13,261,250 | \$ 13,659,088 | \$ 14,068,860 | \$ 14,490,926 | \$ 14,925,654 | \$15,373,423 | \$ 15,834,626 | \$ 16,309,665 | \$ 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Assessed Rate | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Assessed Value of Prop. | 12,875,000 | 13,261,250 | 13,659,088 | 14,068,860 | 14,490,926 | 14,925,654 | 15,373,423 | 15,834,626 | 16,309,665 | 16,798,955 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$100 | 1.38975 | 1.43144 | 1.47439 | 1.51862 | 1.56418 | 1.61110 | 1.65943 | 1.70922 | 1.76049 | 1.81331 |  |  |
| Real Property Taxes | 178,930 | 189,827 | 201,388 | 213,652 | 226,664 | 240,467 | 255,112 | 270,648 | 287,131 | 304,617 |  |  |
| \% of Taxes Exempt | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |
| Net Real Property Taxes | 89,465 | 94,914 | 100,694 | 106,826 | 113,332 | 120,234 | 127,556 | 135,324 | 143,565 | 152,308 |  |  |
| Market Value of Equip. | 26,000,000 | 26,000,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 | 32,500,000 |  |  |
| Depreciation Factor | 0.93333 | 0.86667 | 0.80000 | 0.73333 | 0.66667 | 0.60000 | 0.53333 | 0.46667 | 0.40000 | 0.33333 |  |  |
| Taxable Value | 24,266,667 | 22,533,333 | 26,000,000 | 23,833,333 | 21,666,667 | 19,500,000 | 17,333,333 | 15,166,667 | 13,000,000 | 10,833,333 |  |  |
| Mill Levy Rate per \$100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Personal Property Taxes | 242,667 | 225,333 | 260,000 | 238,333 | 216,667 | 195,000 | 173,333 | 151,667 | 130,000 | 108,333 |  |  |
| Total Property Taxes | \$ 332,132 | \$ 320,247 | \$ 360,694 | \$ 345,159 | \$ 329,998 | \$ 315,234 | \$ 300,889 | \$ 286,991 | \$ 273,565 | \$ 260,642 | \$ | 3,125,551 |

## APPENDIX C - UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Bismarck, North Dakota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 1,170,000 | 2,016,000 | 2,646,000 | 2,718,000 | 2,790,000 | 2,880,000 | 2,952,000 | 3,060,000 | 3,150,000 | 3,240,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 2.08\% | 2.08\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% | 0.94\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 24,336 | 41,933 | 24,872 | 25,549 | 26,226 | 27,072 | 27,749 | 28,764 | 29,610 | 30,456 | 286,567 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 27,976 | \$ 48,205 | \$ 33,104 | \$ 34,005 | \$ 34,906 | \$ 36,032 | \$ 36,933 | \$ 38,284 | \$ 39,410 | \$ 40,536 | \$ 369,391 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  |  | YEAR <br> 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 3 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 5 |  | YEAR <br> 6 |  | YEAR <br> 7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 155 |  | 160 |  | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | \$ 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 |  | ,029,000 |  | ,057,000 |  | ,085,000 |  | 1,120,000 |  | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 |  | 8,232 |  | 8,456 |  | 8,680 |  | 8,960 |  | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 |  | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |  |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 |  | ,029,000 |  | ,057,000 |  | ,085,000 |  | 120,000 |  | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 1.20\% |  | 1.00\% |  | 1.00\% |  | 0.61\% |  | 0.61\% |  | 0.61\% |  | 0.61\% | 0.61\% | 0.61\% | 0.61\% |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 5,460 |  | 7,840 |  | 10,290 |  | 6,448 |  | 6,619 |  | 6,832 |  | 7,003 | 7,259 | 7,473 | 7,686 |  | 72,909 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | \$ 9,100 | \$ | 14,112 | \$ | 18,522 | \$ | 14,904 | \$ | 15,299 | \$ | 15,792 | \$ | 16,187 | \$ 16,779 | \$ 17,273 | \$ 17,766 | \$ | 155,733 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Des Moines, Iowa

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 |  | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 19,200 |  | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 | 19,200 |  |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 1,248,000 |  | 2,150,400 | 2,822,400 | 2,899,200 | 2,976,000 | 3,072,000 | 3,148,800 | 3,264,000 | 3,360,000 | 3,456,000 |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 1.04\% |  | 1.04\% | 1.04\% | 1.04\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 1.27\% |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 12,929 |  | 22,278 | 29,240 | 30,036 | 37,795 | 39,014 | 39,990 | 41,453 | 42,672 | 43,891 |  | 339,299 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 16,569 | \$ | \$ 28,550 | \$ 37,472 | \$ 38,492 | \$ 46,475 | \$ 47,974 | \$ 49,174 | \$ 50,973 | \$ 52,472 | \$ 53,971 | \$ | 422,123 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  |  | YEAR <br> 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 |  | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 10,500 |  | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 |  |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 682,500 |  | 1,176,000 | 1,543,500 | 1,585,500 | 1,627,500 | 1,680,000 | 1,722,000 | 1,785,000 | 1,837,500 | 1,890,000 |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 3.25\% |  | 3.25\% | $3.25 \%$ | 1.40\% | 1.40\% | 1.40\% | 1.40\% | 1.40\% | 1.40\% | 1.40\% |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 22,181 |  | 38,220 | 50,164 | 22,197 | 22,785 | 23,520 | 24,108 | 24,990 | 25,725 | 26,460 |  | 280,350 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 25,821 | \$ | \$ 44,492 | \$ 58,396 | \$ 30,653 | \$ 31,465 | \$ 32,480 | \$ 33,292 | \$ 34,510 | \$ 35,525 | \$ 36,540 | \$ | 363,174 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Edina, Minnesota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 22,000 |  | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 1,430,000 |  | 2,464,000 | 3,234,000 | 3,322,000 | 3,410,000 | 3,520,000 | 3,608,000 | 3,740,000 | 3,850,000 | 3,960,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 1.42\% |  | 1.42\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% | 1.08\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 20,306 |  | 34,989 | 34,927 | 35,878 | 36,828 | 38,016 | 38,966 | 40,392 | 41,580 | 42,768 | 364,650 |
| Total Unemployment Tax |  | 23,946 | \$ | 41,261 | \$ 43,159 | \$ 44,334 | \$ 45,508 | \$ 46,976 | \$ 48,150 | \$ 49,912 | \$ 51,380 | \$ 52,848 | \$ 447,474 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Great Falls, Montana

|  |  | YEAR <br> 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 | 19,700 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 1,280,500 | 2,206,400 | 2,895,900 | 2,974,700 | 3,053,500 | 3,152,000 | 3,230,800 | 3,349,000 | 3,447,500 | 3,546,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 1.63\% | 1.63\% | 1.63\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% | 1.37\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 20,872 | 35,964 | 47,203 | 40,753 | 41,833 | 43,182 | 44,262 | 45,881 | 47,231 | 48,580 | 415,763 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | \$ 24,512 | \$ 42,236 | \$ 55,435 | \$ 49,209 | \$ 50,513 | \$ 52,142 | \$ 53,446 | \$ 55,401 | \$ 57,031 | \$ 58,660 | \$ 498,587 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Omaha, Nebraska

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 3 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 155 |  | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 |  | 1,029,000 |  | 1,057,000 |  | 1,085,000 |  | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 |  | 8,232 |  | 8,456 |  | 8,680 |  | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 |  | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |  |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 |  | 1,029,000 |  | 1,057,000 |  | 1,085,000 |  | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 3.50\% |  | 1.86\% |  | 1.86\% |  | 1.86\% |  | 1.86\% |  | 1.86\% | 1.86\% | 1.86\% | 1.86\% | 1.86\% |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 15,925 |  | 14,582 |  | 19,139 |  | 19,660 |  | 20,181 |  | 20,832 | 21,353 | 22,134 | 22,785 | 23,436 |  | 200,028 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 19,565 | \$ | 20,854 | \$ | 27,371 | \$ | 28,116 | \$ | 28,861 | \$ | 29,792 | \$ 30,537 | \$ 31,654 | \$ 32,585 | \$ 33,516 | \$ | 282,852 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Greeley, Colorado

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 |  | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 10,000 |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 650,000 |  | 1,120,000 | 1,470,000 | 1,510,000 | 1,550,000 | 1,600,000 | 1,640,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,750,000 | 1,800,000 |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 1.70\% |  | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% | 1.10\% |  |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 11,050 |  | 12,320 | 16,170 | 16,610 | 17,050 | 17,600 | 18,040 | 18,700 | 19,250 | 19,800 |  | 166,590 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 14,690 | \$ | 18,592 | \$ 24,402 | \$ 25,066 | \$ 25,730 | \$ 26,560 | \$ 27,224 | \$ 28,220 | \$ 29,050 | \$ 29,880 | \$ | 249,414 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Chicago, Illinois

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 8 | YEAR <br> 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 9,000 |  | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 585,000 |  | ,008,000 | 1,323,000 | 1,359,000 | 1,395,000 | 1,440,000 | 1,476,000 | 1,530,000 | 1,575,000 | 1,620,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 3.30\% |  | 3.30\% | 3.30\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% | 2.28\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 19,305 |  | 33,264 | 43,659 | 30,985 | 31,806 | 32,832 | 33,653 | 34,884 | 35,910 | 36,936 | 333,234 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 22,945 | \$ | 39,536 | \$ 51,891 | \$ 39,441 | \$ 40,486 | \$ 41,792 | \$ 42,837 | \$ 44,404 | \$ 45,710 | \$ 47,016 | \$ 416,058 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

San Jose, California

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | YEAR <br> 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 3.40\% |  | 3.40\% | 3.40\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 15,470 |  | 26,656 | 34,986 | 26,425 | 27,125 | 28,000 | 28,700 | 29,750 | 30,625 | 31,500 | 279,237 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 19,110 | \$ | 32,928 | \$ 43,218 | \$ 34,881 | \$ 35,805 | \$ 36,960 | \$ 37,884 | \$ 39,270 | \$ 40,425 | \$ 41,580 | \$ 362,061 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ANALYSIS

Richmond, Virginia

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Employees |  | 65 |  | 112 | 147 | 151 | 155 | 160 | 164 | 170 | 175 | 180 |  |
| Federal Salary Limit (per employee) | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 |  |
| Federal Taxable Wage Base |  | 455,000 |  | 784,000 | 1,029,000 | 1,057,000 | 1,085,000 | 1,120,000 | 1,148,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,260,000 |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% | 0.80\% |  |
| Federal Unemployment Tax |  | 3,640 |  | 6,272 | 8,232 | 8,456 | 8,680 | 8,960 | 9,184 | 9,520 | 9,800 | 10,080 | 82,824 |
| State Salary Limit (per employee) |  | 8,000 |  | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 |  |
| State Taxable Wage Base |  | 520,000 |  | 896,000 | 1,176,000 | 1,208,000 | 1,240,000 | 1,280,000 | 1,312,000 | 1,360,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,440,000 |  |
| State Unemployment Tax Percentage |  | 2.50\% |  | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% | 0.98\% |  |
| State Unemployment Tax |  | 13,000 |  | 22,400 | 29,400 | 11,778 | 12,090 | 12,480 | 12,792 | 13,260 | 13,650 | 14,040 | 154,890 |
| Total Unemployment Tax | \$ | 16,640 | \$ | 28,672 | \$ 37,632 | \$ 20,234 | \$ 20,770 | \$ 21,440 | \$ 21,976 | \$ 22,780 | \$ 23,450 | \$ 24,120 | \$ 237,714 |


|  | Machinery | Furniture, <br> Fixtures and Equipment | Construction Materials | Total Taxable Purchases | State Sales Tax Rate | Local Sales Tax Rate | Effective Sales <br> Tax Rate | Sales Taxes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck, North Dakota | - | 1,000,000 | - | 1,000,000 | 5.00\% | 1.00\% | 6.00\% | 60,000 |
| Sioux Falls, South Dakota | 31,500,000 | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 40,000,000 | 4.00\% | 2.00\% | 6.00\% | 2,400,000 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | - | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 5.00\% | 1.00\% | 6.00\% | 510,000 |
| Eau Claire, Wisconsin | - | - | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 5.00\% | 0.50\% | 5.50\% | 412,500 |
| Edina, Minnesota | - | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 6.50\% | 0.00\% | 6.50\% | 552,500 |
| Great Falls, Montana | - |  |  | - | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | - |
| Omaha, Nebraska | - | 1,000,000 | - | 1,000,000 | 5.50\% | 1.50\% | 7.00\% | 70,000 |
| Greeley, Colorado | - | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 2.90\% | 3.00\% | 5.90\% | 501,500 |
| Chicago, Illinois | - | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 6.25\% | 2.75\% | 9.00\% | 765,000 |
| San Jose, California | - | 1,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 7.25\% | 1.00\% | 8.25\% | 701,250 |
| Richmond, Virginia | - |  | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 3.50\% | 1.00\% | 4.50\% | 337,500 |

*Note: The $\$ 31.5$ million of purchased machinery is the total purchases for years 1 ( $\$ 25$ million) and $3(\$ 6.5$ million). The appropriate sales and use tax has been applied to the year the machiner was purchased: year $1-\$ 1.5$ million and year $3-\$ 390,000$.

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Bismarck, North Dakota

|  |  | YEAR <br> 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Tax Rate |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 60,000 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  | YEAR <br> 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 4 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. | 25,000,000 |  | - |  | 6,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures | 1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Supplies | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. | 33,500,000 |  | - |  | 6,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | $\underline{\text { \$ 2,010,000 }}$ | \$ | - | \$ | 390,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,400,000 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Des Moines, Iowa

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & \hline 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | OTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. | - |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Supplies | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. | 8,500,000 |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  | 6.00\% |  |  |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ 510,000 |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 510,000 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  |  | YEAR |  | YEAR |  | YEAR |  | YEAR $4$ |  | YEAR |  | YEAR <br> 6 |  | YEAR |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR $10$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 412,500 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | \$ | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 412,500 |

AG PROCESSING BUSINESS
SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS
Edina, Minnesota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 8,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  | 6.50\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 552,500 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 552,500 |

AG PROCESSING BUSINESS SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Great Falls, Montana

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | YEAR <br> 8 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Omaha, Nebraska

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 70,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 70,000 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS
Greeley, Colorado

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 8,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  | 5.90\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 501,500 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 501,500 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS

Chicago, Illinois

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 8,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  | 9.00\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 765,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 765,000 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS
San Jose, California

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | 1,000,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 8,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  | 8.25\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 701,250 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 701,250 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

SALES \& USE TAX ANALYSIS
Richmond, Virginia

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Electricity |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Machinery and Equip. |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Furniture and Fixtures |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Construction Supplies |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Taxabe Trans. |  | 7,500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Effective Sales Tax Rate |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  | 4.50\% |  |  |
| Total Sales Tax | \$ | 337,500 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 337,500 |

## APPENDIX E - INCOME TAXES

## APPORTIONMENT CALCULATIONS

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales Factor | 0.89\% | 1.95\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% |
| Payroll Factor | 0.89\% | 1.42\% | 1.98\% | 2.03\% | 2.08\% | 2.15\% | 2.20\% | 2.28\% | 2.34\% | 2.41\% |
| Fixed Assets \& Inventories Factor | 4.52\% | 4.84\% | 5.75\% | 5.79\% | 5.84\% | 5.88\% | 5.93\% | 5.97\% | 6.02\% | 6.07\% |
| Apportionment Factor - ND, MT, \& CO | 2.10\% | 2.74\% | 3.48\% | 3.51\% | 3.54\% | 3.58\% | 3.61\% | 3.65\% | 3.69\% | 3.73\% |
| Apportionment Factor - WI, VA, \& CA | 1.80\% | 2.54\% | 3.28\% | 3.31\% | 3.33\% | 3.36\% | 3.38\% | 3.42\% | 3.44\% | 3.47\% |
| Apportionment Factor - IA, NE, \& IL | 0.89\% | 1.95\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% |
| Apportionment Factor - MN | 1.34\% | 2.25\% | 2.99\% | 3.01\% | 3.02\% | 3.03\% | 3.04\% | 3.06\% | $3.07 \%$ | 3.09\% |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS <br> Bismarck, North Dakota

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 2.10\% | 2.74\% | $3.48 \%$ | 3.51\% | 3.54\% | 3.58\% | $3.61 \%$ | 3.65\% | 3.69\% | 3.73\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 3,477,074 | 4,868,134 | 6,502,099 | 6,756,697 | 7,021,504 | 7,309,598 | 7,596,471 | 7,917,425 | 8,237,899 | 8,571,507 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | $(1,143,957)$ | $(1,601,616)$ | $(2,139,191)$ | $(2,222,953)$ | $(2,310,075)$ | $(2,404,858)$ | $(2,499,239)$ | $(2,604,833)$ | $(2,710,269)$ | $(2,820,026)$ |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 2,333,116 | 3,266,518 | 4,362,908 | 4,533,744 | 4,711,429 | 4,904,741 | 5,097,232 | 5,312,592 | 5,527,630 | 5,751,481 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 243,312 | 341,319 | 456,440 | 474,378 | 493,035 | 513,333 | 533,544 | 556,157 | 578,736 | 602,241 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(243,312)$ | $(341,319)$ | $(456,440)$ | $(474,378)$ | $(493,035)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | - | - | - | - | - | 513,333 | 533,544 | 556,157 | 578,736 | 602,241 | \$ | 2,784,011 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 513,333 | \$ 533,544 | \$ 556,157 | \$ 578,736 | \$ 602,241 | \$ | 2,784,011 |

[^0]Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State Income Tax Rate |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| State Income Tax |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | \$ |  | - |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS

Des Moines, Iowa

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 |  | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 0.89\% | 1.95\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% |  | 2.70\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 1,472,820 | 3,471,809 | 5,055,642 | 5,207,311 | 5,363,531 | 5,524,436 | 5,690,170 | 5,860,875 | 6,036,701 |  | 6,217,802 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | $(242,279)$ | $(571,113)$ | $(831,653)$ | $(856,603)$ | $(882,301)$ | $(908,770)$ | $(936,033)$ | $(964,114)$ | $(993,037)$ |  | $(1,022,828)$ |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 1,230,541 | 2,900,696 | 4,223,989 | 4,350,708 | 4,481,230 | 4,615,667 | 4,754,137 | 4,896,761 | 5,043,664 |  | 5,194,973 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% | 12.00\% |  | 12.00\% |  |  |
| Base State Income Tax | 147,665 | 348,084 | 506,879 | 522,085 | 537,748 | 553,880 | 570,496 | 587,611 | 605,240 |  | 623,397 |  |  |
| Less Amount to Subtract | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ | $(7,500)$ |  | $(7,500)$ |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 155,165 | 355,584 | 514,379 | 529,585 | 545,248 | 561,380 | 577,996 | 595,111 | 612,740 |  | 630,897 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(74,880)$ | $(54,144)$ | $(40,320)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | 80,285 | 340,584 | 499,379 | 514,585 | 530,248 | 546,380 | 562,996 | 580,111 | 597,740 |  | 615,897 | \$ | 4,868,204 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ 80,285 | \$ 340,584 | \$ 499,379 | \$ 514,585 | \$ 530,248 | \$ 546,380 | \$ 562,996 | \$ 580,111 | \$ 597,740 | \$ | 615,897 | \$ | 4,868,204 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 |  | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 1.80\% | 2.54\% | $3.28 \%$ | 3.31\% | 3.33\% | 3.36\% | 3.38\% | 3.42\% | 3.44\% |  | 3.47\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 |  | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 |  | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% | 7.90\% |  | 7.90\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 235,105 | 357,005 | 485,098 | 503,179 | 521,954 | 542,201 | 562,472 | 584,860 | 607,320 |  | 630,663 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | 235,105 | 357,005 | 485,098 | 503,179 | 521,954 | 542,201 | 562,472 | 584,860 | 607,320 |  | 630,663 | \$ | 5,029,857 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ 235,105 | \$ 357,005 | \$ 485,098 | \$ 503,179 | \$ 521,954 | \$ 542,201 | \$ 562,472 | \$ 584,860 | \$ 607,320 | \$ | 630,663 | \$ | 5,029,857 |
|  | AG PROCESSING BUSINESS INCOME TAX ANALYSIS Edina, Minnesota |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 |  | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 1.34\% | 2.25\% | 2.99\% | 3.01\% | 3.02\% | 3.03\% | 3.04\% | 3.06\% | 3.07\% |  | 3.09\% |  |  |
| State Net Book Income | 2,224,415 | 3,995,431 | 5,598,063 | 5,788,331 | 5,985,270 | 6,193,872 | 6,405,033 | 6,632,081 | 6,862,150 |  | 7,100,441 |  |  |
| Ded. for Fed. Income Taxes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 2,224,415 | 3,995,431 | 5,598,063 | 5,788,331 | 5,985,270 | 6,193,872 | 6,405,033 | 6,632,081 | 6,862,150 |  | 7,100,441 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% | 9.80\% |  | 9.80\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 217,993 | 391,552 | 548,610 | 567,256 | 586,557 | 606,999 | 627,693 | 649,944 | 672,491 |  | 695,843 | \$ | 5,564,939 |
| Total State Income Tax | $\underline{\text { \$ 217,993 }}$ | \$ 391,552 | \$ 548,610 | \$ 567,256 | \$ 586,557 | \$ 606,999 | \$ 627,693 | \$ 649,944 | \$ 672,491 | \$ | 695,843 | \$ | 5,564,939 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS

Great Falls, Montana

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 |  | 9,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 2.10\% | 2.74\% | 3.48\% | 3.51\% | 3.54\% | 3.58\% | 3.61\% | 3.65\% | 3.69\% |  | 3.73\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 3,477,074 | 4,868,134 | 6,502,099 | 6,756,697 | 7,021,504 | 7,309,598 | 7,596,471 | 7,917,425 | 8,237,899 |  | 8,571,507 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 3,477,074 | 4,868,134 | 6,502,099 | 6,756,697 | 7,021,504 | 7,309,598 | 7,596,471 | 7,917,425 | 8,237,899 |  | 8,571,507 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% | 6.75\% |  | 6.75\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 234,702 | 328,599 | 438,892 | 456,077 | 473,951 | 493,398 | 512,762 | 534,426 | 556,058 |  | 578,577 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(21,750)$ | $(14,250)$ | $(11,900)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | 234,702 | 328,599 | 438,892 | 456,077 | 473,951 | 493,398 | 512,762 | 534,426 | 556,058 |  | 578,577 | \$ | 4,607,443 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ 234,702 | \$ 328,599 | \$ 438,892 | \$ 456,077 | \$ 473,951 | \$ 493,398 | \$ 512,762 | \$ 534,426 | \$ 556,058 | \$ | 578,577 | \$ | 4,607,443 |
|  | AG PROCESSING BUSINESS INCOME TAX ANALYSIS Omaha, Nebraska |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | TOTAL |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 |  | 9,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 0.89\% | 1.95\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% |  | 2.70\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 1,472,820 | 3,471,809 | 5,055,642 | 5,207,311 | 5,363,531 | 5,524,436 | 5,690,170 | 5,860,875 | 6,036,701 |  | 6,217,802 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 1,472,820 | 3,471,809 | 5,055,642 | 5,207,311 | 5,363,531 | 5,524,436 | 5,690,170 | 5,860,875 | 6,036,701 |  | 6,217,802 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% | 7.81\% |  | 7.81\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 115,027 | 271,148 | 394,846 | 406,691 | 418,892 | 431,458 | 444,402 | 457,734 | 471,466 |  | 485,610 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(115,027)$ | $(271,148)$ | $(394,846)$ | $(406,691)$ | $(418,892)$ | $(431,458)$ | $(444,402)$ | $(457,734)$ | $(215,168)$ |  | $(10,454)$ |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 256,299 |  | 475,156 | \$ | 731,455 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 256,299 | \$ | 475,156 | \$ | 731,455 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS

Greeley, Colorado

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 2.10\% | 2.74\% | 3.48\% | 3.51\% | 3.54\% | 3.58\% | 3.61\% | 3.65\% | 3.69\% | 3.73\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 3,477,074 | 4,868,134 | 6,502,099 | 6,756,697 | 7,021,504 | 7,309,598 | 7,596,471 | 7,917,425 | 8,237,899 | 8,571,507 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 3,477,074 | 4,868,134 | 6,502,099 | 6,756,697 | 7,021,504 | 7,309,598 | 7,596,471 | 7,917,425 | 8,237,899 | 8,571,507 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% | 4.63\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 160,989 | 225,395 | 301,047 | 312,835 | 325,096 | 338,434 | 351,717 | 366,577 | 381,415 | 396,861 | \$ | 3,160,364 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ 160,989 | \$ 225,395 | \$ 301,047 | \$ 312,835 | \$ 325,096 | \$ 338,434 | \$ 351,717 | \$ 366,577 | \$ 381,415 | \$ 396,861 | \$ | 3,160,364 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS

Chicago, Illinois

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 0.89\% | 1.95\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% | 2.70\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 1,472,820 | 3,471,809 | 5,055,642 | 5,207,311 | 5,363,531 | 5,524,436 | 5,690,170 | 5,860,875 | 6,036,701 | 6,217,802 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 1,472,820 | 3,471,809 | 5,055,642 | 5,207,311 | 5,363,531 | 5,524,436 | 5,690,170 | 5,860,875 | 6,036,701 | 6,217,802 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% | 7.30\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 107,516 | 253,442 | 369,062 | 380,134 | 391,538 | 403,284 | 415,382 | 427,844 | 440,679 | 453,900 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(107,516)$ | $(83,109)$ | $(38,450)$ | (700) | (721) | $(1,016)$ | (765) | $(1,275)$ | $(1,015)$ | $(1,045)$ |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | - | 170,333 | 330,612 | 379,433 | 390,816 | 402,268 | 414,617 | 426,569 | 439,664 | 452,854 | \$ | 3,407,166 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ | \$ 170,333 | \$ 330,612 | \$ 379,433 | \$ 390,816 | \$ 402,268 | \$ 414,617 | \$ 426,569 | \$ 439,664 | \$ 452,854 | \$ | 3,407,166 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> INCOME TAX ANALYSIS <br> San Jose, California

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 1.80\% | 2.54\% | 3.28\% | 3.31\% | 3.33\% | 3.36\% | 3.38\% | 3.42\% | 3.44\% | 3.47\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% | 8.84\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 263,079 | 399,484 | 542,819 | 563,051 | 584,060 | 606,716 | 629,399 | 654,451 | 679,584 | 705,704 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | $(263,079)$ | $(399,484)$ | $(542,819)$ | $(563,051)$ | $(181,567)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | - | - | - | - | 402,493 | 606,716 | 629,399 | 654,451 | 679,584 | 705,704 | \$ | 3,678,347 |
| Total State Income Tax | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 402,493 | \$ 606,716 | \$ 629,399 | \$ 654,451 | \$ 679,584 | \$ 705,704 | \$ | 3,678,347 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS <br> NCOME TAX ANALYSIS <br> Richmond, Virginia

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Net Book Income | 165,587,000 | 177,800,000 | 186,949,286 | 192,557,764 | 198,334,497 | 204,284,532 | 210,413,068 | 216,725,460 | 223,227,224 | 229,924,041 |  |  |
| Apportionment Factor | 1.80\% | 2.54\% | 3.28\% | 3.31\% | 3.33\% | 3.36\% | 3.38\% | 3.42\% | 3.44\% | 3.47\% |  |  |
| State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| Less: Allocation of Fed Tax | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - - | - - |  |  |
| Net State Taxable Income | 2,976,010 | 4,519,053 | 6,140,485 | 6,369,350 | 6,607,010 | 6,863,308 | 7,119,896 | 7,403,287 | 7,687,600 | 7,983,080 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% |  |  |
| State Income Tax | 178,561 | 271,143 | 368,429 | 382,161 | 396,421 | 411,798 | 427,194 | 444,197 | 461,256 | 478,985 |  |  |
| State Income Tax Credits | - | $(4,000)$ | $(15,667)$ | $(17,000)$ | $(14,333)$ | $(4,333)$ | $(4,333)$ | $(5,000)$ | $(5,000)$ | $(5,334)$ |  |  |
| Adjusted State Income Taxes | 178,561 | 267,143 | 352,762 | 365,161 | 382,087 | 407,466 | 422,860 | 439,197 | 456,256 | 473,651 | \$ | 3,745,145 |
| Total State Income Tax | $\underline{\text { \$ 178,561 }}$ | \$ 267,143 | \$ 352,762 | \$ 365,161 | \$ 382,087 | \$ 407,466 | \$ 422,860 | \$ 439,197 | \$ 456,256 | \$ 473,651 | \$ | 3,745,145 |

## APPENDIX F - WORKERS' COMPENSATION INSURANCE

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS <br> Bismarck, North Dakota

|  |  | YEAR <br> 1 |  | YEAR $2$ |  | YEAR $3$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 17,400 |  | 17,400 |  | 17,800 |  | 17,800 |  | 18,200 |  | 18,200 |  | 18,600 |  | 18,600 |  | 19,000 |  | 19,000 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 870,000 |  | 1,740,000 |  | 2,403,000 |  | 2,474,200 |  | 2,602,600 |  | 2,675,400 |  | 2,808,600 |  | 2,901,600 |  | 3,059,000 |  | ,154,000 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  | 4.85 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 42,195 | \$ | 84,390 | \$ | 116,546 | \$ | 119,999 | \$ | 126,226 | \$ | 129,757 | , | 136,217 | \$ | 140,728 | \$ | 148,362 | \$ | 152,969 | \$ | 1,197,387 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 17,400 |  | 17,400 |  | 17,800 |  | 17,800 |  | 18,200 |  | 18,200 |  | 18,600 |  | 18,600 |  | 19,000 |  | 19,000 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 261,000 |  | 208,800 |  | 213,600 |  | 213,600 |  | 218,400 |  | 236,600 |  | 241,800 |  | 260,400 |  | 266,000 |  | 266,000 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 809 | \$ | 647 | \$ | 662 | \$ | 662 | \$ | 677 | \$ | 733 | \$ | 750 | \$ | 807 | \$ | 825 | \$ | 825 | \$ | 7,397 |
| Total | \$ | 43,004 | \$ | 85,037 | \$ | 117,208 | \$ | 120,661 |  | 126,903 | \$ | 130,490 | \$ | 136,967 | \$ | 141,535 | \$ | 149,186 | \$ | 153,794 | \$ | 1,204,785 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

|  | YEAR <br> 1 | YEAR <br> 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers | 50 | 100 | 135 | 139 | 143 |  | 147 | 151 | 156 | 161 | 166 |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax | 30,000 | 30,000 | 34,000 | 35,020 | 36,071 |  | 37,153 | 38,268 | 39,416 | 40,598 | 41,816 |  |
| Taxable Payroll | 1,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 4,590,000 | 4,867,780 | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 | 5,778,468 | 6,148,896 | 6,536,278 | 6,941,456 |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 |  | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 | 7.96 |  |
| Subtotal | \$ 119,400 | \$ 238,800 | \$ 365,364 | \$ 387,475 | \$ 410,589 | \$ | 434,735 | \$ 459,966 | \$ 489,452 | \$ 520,288 | \$ 552,540 | \$ 3,978,609 |

Clerical:

| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 3,038 | \$ | 2,700 | \$ | 2,700 | \$ | 2,781 | \$ | 2,864 | \$ | 3,196 | \$ | 3,292 | \$ | 3,652 | \$ | 3,761 | \$ | 3,874 |  | 31,858 |
| Total | \$ | 122,438 | \$ | 241,500 | \$ | 368,064 | \$ | 390,256 | \$ | 413,453 | \$ | 437,931 | \$ | 463,258 | \$ | 493,104 | \$ | 524,049 | \$ | 556,414 |  | 4,010,467 |

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

Des Moines, Iowa

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 |  | 39,416 |  | 40,598 |  | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | ,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 |  | 6,148,896 |  | 6,536,278 |  | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  | 6.41 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 96,150 | \$ | 192,300 | \$ | 294,219 | \$ | 312,025 | \$ | 330,638 | \$ | 350,082 | \$ | 370,400 | \$ | 394,144 | \$ | 418,975 | \$ | 444,947 | \$ | 3,203,880 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 2,565 | \$ | 2,280 | \$ | 2,280 | \$ | 2,348 | \$ | 2,419 | \$ | 2,699 | \$ | 2,780 | \$ | 3,084 | \$ | 3,176 | \$ | 3,271 | \$ | 26,902 |
| Total | \$ | 98,715 | \$ | 194,580 | \$ | 296,499 | \$ | 314,373 | \$ | 333,056 | \$ | 352,781 | \$ | 373,180 | \$ | 397,228 | \$ | 422,152 | \$ | 448,219 | \$ | 3,230,782 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 |  | 39,416 |  | 40,598 |  | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 |  | 6,148,896 |  | 6,536,278 |  | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  | 5.92 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 88,800 | \$ | 177,600 | \$ | 271,728 | \$ | 288,173 | \$ | 305,363 | \$ | 323,320 | \$ | 342,085 | \$ | 364,015 | \$ | 386,948 | \$ | 410,934 | \$ | 2,958,965 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 2,025 | \$ | 1,800 | \$ | 1,800 | \$ | 1,854 | \$ | 1,910 | \$ | 2,131 | \$ | 2,195 | \$ | 2,434 | \$ | 2,507 | \$ | 2,583 | \$ | 21,239 |
| Total | \$ | 90,825 | \$ | 179,400 | \$ | 273,528 | \$ | 290,027 | \$ | 307,272 | \$ | 325,451 | \$ | 344,280 | \$ | 366,449 | \$ | 389,455 | \$ | 413,517 | \$ | 2,980,204 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS
Edina, Minnesota

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 |  | 39,416 |  | 40,598 |  | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 |  | 6,148,896 |  | 6,536,278 |  | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.55 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 98,250 | \$ | 196,500 | \$ | 300,645 | \$ | 318,840 | \$ | 337,859 | \$ | 357,728 | \$ | 378,490 | \$ | 402,753 | \$ | 428,126 | \$ | 454,665 | \$ | 3,273,855 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 2,295 | \$ | 2,040 | \$ | 2,040 | \$ | 2,101 | \$ | 2,164 | \$ | 2,415 | \$ | 2,487 | \$ | 2,759 | \$ | 2,842 | \$ | 2,927 | \$ | 24,071 |
| Total | \$ | 100,545 | \$ | 198,540 | \$ | 302,685 | \$ | 320,941 | \$ | 340,023 | \$ | 360,143 | \$ | 380,977 | \$ | 405,512 | \$ | 430,968 | \$ | 457,592 | \$ | 3,297,926 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS
Great Falls, Montana

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers | 50 | 100 | 135 | 139 | 143 |  | 147 | 151 | 156 | 161 | 166 |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax | 30,000 | 30,000 | 34,000 | 35,020 | 36,071 |  | 37,153 | 38,268 | 39,416 | 40,598 | 41,816 |  |
| Taxable Payroll | 1,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 4,590,000 | 4,867,780 | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 | 5,778,468 | 6,148,896 | 6,536,278 | 6,941,456 |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 |  | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 | 6.92 |  |
| Subtotal | \$ 103,800 | \$ 207,600 | \$ 317,628 | \$ 336,850 | \$ 356,944 | \$ | 377,935 | \$ 399,870 | \$ 425,504 | \$ 452,310 | \$ 480,349 | \$ 3,458,791 |


| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |  | 0.55 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 3,713 |  | 3,300 | \$ | 3,300 | \$ | 3,399 | \$ | 3,501 | \$ | 3,906 | \$ | 4,024 | \$ | 4,463 | \$ | 4,597 | \$ | 4,735 |

## Omaha, Nebraska

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 | 135 | 139 | 143 |  | 147 | 151 | 156 | 161 | 166 |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 | 34,000 | 35,020 | 36,071 |  | 37,153 | 38,268 | 39,416 | 40,598 | 41,816 |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 | 4,590,000 | 4,867,780 | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 | 5,778,468 | 6,148,896 | 6,536,278 | 6,941,456 |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 22.75 |  | 22.75 | 22.75 | 22.75 | 22.75 |  | 22.75 | 22.75 | 22.75 | 22.75 | 22.75 |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 341,250 | \$ | 682,500 | \$ 1,044,225 | \$ 1,107,420 | \$ 1,173,480 | \$ | 1,242,489 | \$ 1,314,601 | \$ 1,398,874 | \$ 1,487,003 | \$ 1,579,181 | \$ 11,371,024 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 51,500 | 53,045 |  | 54,636 | 56,275 | 57,963 | 59,702 | 61,493 |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 | 600,000 | 618,000 | 636,540 |  | 710,268 | 731,575 | 811,482 | 835,828 | 860,902 |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.52 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 3,510 | \$ | 3,120 | \$ 3,120 | \$ 3,214 | \$ 3,310 | \$ | 3,693 | \$ 3,804 | \$ 4,220 | \$ 4,346 | \$ 4,477 | \$ 36,814 |
| Total | \$ | 344,760 | \$ | 685,620 | \$ 1,047,345 | \$ 1,110,634 | \$ 1,176,790 | \$ | 1,246,183 | \$ 1,318,406 | \$ 1,403,094 | \$ 1,491,350 | \$ 1,583,658 | \$ 11,407,838 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

## Greeley, Colorado

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 | 156 | 161 | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 | 39,416 | 40,598 | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 | 6,148,896 | 6,536,278 | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 |  | 16.40 | 16.40 | 16.40 | 16.40 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 246,000 | \$ | 492,000 | \$ | 752,760 | \$ | 798,316 | \$ | 845,937 | \$ | 895,685 | \$ | 947,669 | \$ 1,008,419 | \$ 1,071,950 | \$ 1,138,399 | \$ | 8,197,134 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 | 57,963 | 59,702 | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 | 811,482 | 835,828 | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 |  | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 2,565 | \$ | 2,280 | \$ | 2,280 | \$ | 2,348 | \$ | 2,419 | \$ | 2,699 | \$ | 2,780 | \$ 3,084 | \$ 3,176 | \$ 3,271 | \$ | 26,902 |
| Total | \$ | 248,565 | \$ | 494,280 | \$ | 755,040 | \$ | 800,664 | \$ | 848,356 | \$ | 898,384 | \$ | 950,449 | \$ 1,011,503 | \$ 1,075,126 | \$ 1,141,670 | \$ | 8,224,036 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

## Chicago, Illinois

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 |  | 39,416 |  | 40,598 |  | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 |  | 6,148,896 |  | 6,536,278 |  | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  | 8.91 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 133,650 | \$ | 267,300 | \$ | 408,969 | \$ | 433,719 | \$ | 459,591 | \$ | 486,619 | \$ | 514,861 | \$ | 547,867 | \$ | 582,382 | \$ | 618,484 | \$ | 4,453,443 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  | 0.39 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 2,633 | \$ | 2,340 | \$ | 2,340 | \$ | 2,410 | \$ | 2,483 | \$ | 2,770 | \$ | 2,853 | \$ | 3,165 | \$ | 3,260 | \$ | 3,358 | \$ | 27,610 |
| Total | \$ | 136,283 | \$ | 269,640 | \$ | 411,309 | \$ | 436,129 | \$ | 462,074 | \$ | 489,389 | \$ | 517,715 | \$ | 551,031 | \$ | 585,642 | \$ | 621,841 | \$ | 4,481,053 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

San Jose, California

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YEAR } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manufacturing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 50 |  | 100 |  | 135 |  | 139 |  | 143 |  | 147 |  | 151 |  | 156 |  | 161 |  | 166 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 34,000 |  | 35,020 |  | 36,071 |  | 37,153 |  | 38,268 |  | 39,416 |  | 40,598 |  | 41,816 |  |  |
| Taxable Payroll |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 4,590,000 |  | 4,867,780 |  | 5,158,153 |  | 5,461,491 |  | 5,778,468 |  | 6,148,896 |  | 6,536,278 |  | 6,941,456 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  | 12.76 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 191,400 | \$ | 382,800 | \$ | 585,684 | \$ | 621,129 | \$ | 658,180 | \$ | 696,886 | \$ | 737,333 | \$ | 784,599 | \$ | 834,029 | \$ | 885,730 | \$ | 6,377,770 |
| Clerical: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Workers |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Payroll Subject to Tax |  | 45,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,500 |  | 53,045 |  | 54,636 |  | 56,275 |  | 57,963 |  | 59,702 |  | 61,493 |  |  |
| Payroll |  | 675,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 618,000 |  | 636,540 |  | 710,268 |  | 731,575 |  | 811,482 |  | 835,828 |  | 860,902 |  |  |
| Rate per \$100 of Payroll |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  | 1.20 |  |  |
| Subtotal | \$ | 8,100 | \$ | 7,200 | \$ | 7,200 | \$ | 7,416 | \$ | 7,638 | \$ | 8,523 | \$ | 8,779 | \$ | 9,738 | \$ | 10,030 | \$ | 10,331 | \$ | 84,955 |
| Total | \$ | 199,500 | \$ | 390,000 | \$ | 592,884 | \$ | 628,545 | \$ | 665,819 | \$ | 705,409 | \$ | 746,111 | \$ | 794,337 | \$ | 844,059 | \$ | 896,061 | \$ | 6,462,725 |

## AG PROCESSING BUSINESS

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION TAX ANALYSIS

Richmond, Virginia



[^0]:    Note: See State Income Tax Analysis for a further explanation regarding North Dakota
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