

Executive Summary

- (At least) four questions we should be asking ourselves:

QUESTION	INITIAL ASSESSMENT
<p>1) Is the current proposal better than the existing agreement?</p>	<p>Unequivocally, YES. NPV is greater by more than 60% even if extension is not elected by TCF Bank. Only caveat – how valuable is the call option (i.e. right to extend) we’re giving to TCF?</p>
<p>2) Is the current proposal in line with market comparables?</p>	<p>YES. Both current and proposed arrangements appear to be <u>top quartile</u> vs. limited universe of other University’s w/ naming rights sponsors</p>
<p>3) Is the current proposal in line with intrinsic / fundamental value of the naming rights?</p>	<p>YES. Academic research suggests average annual naming rights price of \$1.7M.</p>
<p>4) Does the current proposal reflect an equitable surplus distribution between both parties (i.e. what is this worth to TCF Bank?)</p>	<p>NO IDEA. But worth exploring / factoring in to negotiation strategy.</p>

Question # 1 – Is the current proposal better than the existing agreement?

Summary

- ❖ The \$8M upfront payment drastically dwarfs the relatively de minimus decline in installment payment (\$69k/year decline) making the proposal attractive even if the extension is not elected by TCF.
- ❖ Given the proposal does not envision a tick-up in the installment payment during the 2030's, the tough question is whether we are willing to "sell the call option" to TCF Bank and lock in the \$1.36M/yr rate. (See slide 5 for more thoughts on the topic.)

NPV Analysis Summary

- ❖ The NPV of the proposal is ~63% higher than the current agreement, even if the extension is not elected by TCF.
- ❖ ~1/3 of the value (NPV) of the proposal w/ extension is attributable to the cash flow associated w/ the extension (i.e. \$4M in ~2020 and installment payments during the 2030s).

<i>\$ (in mm)</i>	Net CF	NPV
Current Agreement	\$ 17.1	\$ 12.8
Proposed (w/out extension)	\$ 25.6	\$ 20.8
Proposed (w/ extension)	\$ 44.5	\$ 30.8

NPV Discount Rate Sensitivity

- ❖ Assuming a 4.8% cost of capital (equivalent to current 10-year Muni Aa yields)
- ❖ Chosen discount rate assumption has no impact on relative attractiveness, just the order of magnitude.

<i>\$ (in mm)</i>	Discount Rate / Cost of Capital					
	3%	4%	4.80%	6%	7%	8%
Current Agreement	\$ 14.2	\$ 13.4	\$ 12.8	\$ 12.0	\$ 11.4	\$ 10.8
Proposed (w/out extension)	\$ 22.4	\$ 21.5	\$ 20.8	\$ 19.9	\$ 19.3	\$ 18.6
Proposed (w/ extension)	\$ 34.8	\$ 32.5	\$ 30.8	\$ 28.6	\$ 27.1	\$ 25.7

NPV Analysis – Cumulative NPV Trendline

- ❖ Cumulative NPV analysis demonstrates the composition of the NPV associated with the timing of each cash flow, in this case affirming the obvious that the lump sum payments are drivers.