# For the Instructor: <br> Teaching Note on Crotalus Circuits 

This case gives students a chance to analyze a pollution prevention project from several different perspectives. Henry Dean, a lending officer with Rochester National Bank (RNB), must decide whether to approve a request to increase Crotalus Circuits' loan amount by $\$ 250,000$ to fund the purchase of a new process technology. In analyzing this case, students should seek to answer the following questions:

- How well is Crotalus Circuits doing? Is its recent loss cause for concern?
- Does the proposal to implement non-formaldehyde electroless plating make financial sense?
- What risks are inherent in Crotalus' current process technology? In the proposed change?
- If RNB agrees to the additional loan amount, when can they expect to see repayment?

Several study questions are attached at the end of the case for instructors wishing to use them. Answers to these questions are addressed in this teaching note.

## Crotalus Circuits Financial Health

A historical Sources and Uses of Funds Statement is attached as Exhibit TN-1. In 1996, Crotalus completed the final phase of a capital expansion project and added significantly to its fixed asset base. Most of this transaction was funded by long-term debt, although working capital flows were also readjusted to provide as much financing as feasible. Sources and uses in earlier years followed a more typical pattern of inflows and outflows. Exhibit TN-2 provides five years of historical ratios. The firm's liquidity has been improving slowly, although it remains below the industry average. Crotalus' inventory turnover exceeds industry averages, but its average collection period lags slightly behind its peers ( 66 days vs. 58 days). Debt ratios have improved but remain significantly above industry averages.

Coverage ratios are below average but, excepting this past year, have still remained at healthy levels. Profitability is excellent. Except for last year, Crotalus' financial statements show a generally healthy company. Therefore, the key question is this: Is last year an anomaly, or a predictor of things to come?

## Investment Analysis

This case can be approached in many ways. A first step might be to compute the proposed investment project's NPV. Exhibit TN-3 presents information on the financial return of the non-formaldehyde electroless copper technology. Major assumptions include a $\$ 250,000$ initial outlay, all of which is assumed to be depreciable over a five-year MACRS period ${ }^{1}$; a 33\% marginal tax rate; and a $12 \%$ hurdle rate. No credit is given for the sale of existing assets or recovery of capital costs at the end of the project's 5-year expected life, making these figures conservative estimates. (The project's continuing value in Year 5 is estimated as a level perpetuity: Year 5 cash flows $\div$ discount rate). Annual savings of $\$ 23,811$ are computed based on the following assumptions:

1) Savings in materials costs $=$ $(.25)(\$ 44,790)=\$ 11,198$
[Exhibit 6]
2) Savings in water usage $=$ $[(11.6-3.74) / 11.6](\$ 6,503)=\$ 4,406$
[Exhibit 5]
3) Savings in electricity usage $=$ [(568.3-269.9/568.3] $(\$ 2,757)=\$ 1,448$ [Exhibit 5]
4) Savings in permitting costs $=$ $(.25)(\$ 13,642)=\$ 3,411$
[Exhibit 6]
5) Savings in maintenance costs $=$ $(.25)(\$ 13,395)=\$ 3,349$
[Exhibit 6]
[^0]To the extent production grows, these savings also understate the true benefits of switching to a nonformaldehyde electroless copper process. Crotalus' after-tax cost of debt equals $(.10)(1-.33)=6.7 \%$. The $12 \%$ hurdle rate assumes a total debt/assets ratio of $56 \%$ and a $6.7 \%$ after-tax cost of debt, implying an equity cost of 18.75 percent $[12=(.56)(6.7)+(.44)(x) ; x=18.75]$. This figure probably overstates the project's true hurdle rate but, again, errs on the side of conservatism. The technology is relatively new, after all! Factoring in all of these assumptions results in a net present value of $-\$ 28,076$ and an IRR of $8.53 \%$. On a purely financial basis, with these assumptions, the project just barely misses paying for itself.

## Environmental Risks and Benefits

Students may argue for accepting the non-formaldehyde project because of the many non-quantitative benefits not captured in the discounted cash flow methodology. Human health risks are not accurately assessed in current models, for instance. Likewise, the decreased likelihood of a spill engendering Superfund liability also is not included. Factors enticing Dean to approve an additional $\$ 250,000$ loan to Crotalus Circuits include:

1. Improved environmental reputation
2. Decreased (as yet unquantified) future costs
3. Decreased environmental risk
4. Avoidance of lender liability

EXHIBIT TN-1: CROTALUS CIRCUITS' HISTORICAL SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS (\$ THOUSANDS)

| ASSETS | Dec-96 |  | Dec-95 |  | Dec-94 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Source | Use | Source | Use | Source | Use |
| Cash \& Equivalents | \$575 |  | \$ 0 | \$263 | \$ 0 | \$402 |
| Net Receivables | 521 | 0 | 0 | 878 | 0 | 224 |
| Inventories | 432 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 60 |
| Prepaid Expenses | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Other Current Assets | 0 | 471 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 6 |
| Total Current Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Plant, Property \& Equipment <br> - Accumulated Depreciation | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ 106 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,081 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ 117 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 736 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | \$ 0 | $\begin{array}{r}\$ 275 \\ 90 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Net Plant, Property \& Equipment Other Assets | \$0 | \$ 234 | \$ 0 | \$106 | \$72 | \$ 0 |
| Total Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLAIMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Portion of Long-term Debt | \$ 2 | \$ 0 | \$ 1 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$199 |
| Notes Payable | 285 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accounts Payable | 0 | 335 | 432 | 0 | 135 | 0 |
| Taxes Payable | 0 | 7 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Accrued Expenses | 0 | 647 | 633 | 0 | 268 | 0 |
| Other Current Liabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 58 | 0 |
| Total Current Liabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long Term Debt | \$893 |  | \$ 0 |  | \$114 | \$ 0 |
| Investment Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Liabilities | 0 | 48 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Common Stock | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Capital Surplus | 35 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 109 | 0 |
| Retained Earnings | 0 | 33 | 925 | 0 | 614 | 0 |
| Less: Treasury Stock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Common Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL SOURCES/USES | \$2,856 | \$2,856 | \$2,567 | \$2,567 | \$1,372 | \$1,372 |

2 - Crotalus Case Note August 1998

Factors discouraging him from loaning the money might be:

1. Over-indebtedness (high debt ratio, poor liquidity)
2. Poor financial planning (Crotalus is growing too fast; even without the new process, it will need approximately $\$ 152,000$ in additional financing next year- see Exhibit TN-5)
3. Uncertain demand

Students should be pressed to think carefully about how a change in Crotalus' manufacturing technology affects its various stakeholders (i.e., shareholders, community groups, employees, suppliers, financial institutions, etc.). It might be argued, for instance, that

RNB should make the loan at a rate less than the $10 \%$ charged on the currently outstanding loan balance because implementation of a non-formaldehyde process reduces overall risk.

## Repayment - When and How

Exhibits TN-4 and TN-5 present five-year pro forma forecast income statements and balance sheets using the percentage of sales method. Sales are expected to increase at a $15 \%$ annual rate; the remaining assumptions can be found at the base of the respective exhibits. The most important thing to note from these exhibits is that, regardless of the new investment, Crotalus will need additional funds to fuel its planned growth. In fact, Crotalus is expanding at a rate well beyond its

## EXHIBIT TN-2: CROTALUS CIRCUITS' HISTORICAL RATIOS (\$ THOUSANDS)

|  | Dec-96 | Dec-95 | Dec-94 | Dec-93 | Dec-92 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Liquidity Ratios |  |  |  |  |  | Definition |
| Current Ratio | 1.79 | 1.73 | 1.83 | 1.66 | 1.58 | Current assets/Current liabilities |
| Quick Ratio | 1.51 | 1.37 | 1.43 | 1.25 | 1.14 | (CA - Inv)/CL |

## Activity Ratios

| Inventory Turnover | 8.88 x | 7.99 x | 8.13 x | 7.22 x | 7.14 x | COGS/Ending Inventory |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Avg Collect Period | 66 days | 65 days | 51 days | 52 days | 48 days | Accts Rec'vble/(Sales/365) |
| Avg Payment Period | 45 days | 45 days | 34 days | 33 days | 32 days | Accts Payable/(COGS/365) |
| Total Asset Turnover | 1.06 x | 1.42 x | 1.48 x | 1.42 x | 1.43 x | Sales/Total Assets |
| Debt Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Debt Ratio | $56.2 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ | $61.4 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | Total Debt/Total Assets |
| Times Interest Earned | -.24 x | 23.1 x | 18.67 x | 13.24 x | 7.37 x | EBIT/Interest |

Profitability Ratios

| Gross Profit Margin | $-0.3 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | EBIT/Sales |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Net Profit Margin | $-1.6 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | Adj Net Income/Sales |
| Return on Equity (ROE) | $-3.8 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | Adj Net Income/Total Equity |
| Return on Assets (ROA) | $-1.7 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | Adj Net Income/Total Assets |
| Sustainable Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Profit Margin (P) | $-1.6 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | Adj Net Income/Sales |
| Retention Rate (R) | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | (Adj NI - Dividends)/Adj NI |
| Total Asset Turnover (A) | 1.06 x | 1.42 x | 1.48 x | 1.42 x | 1.43 x | Sales/Total Assets |
| Equity Multiplier (T-hat) | 2.29 x | 3.03 x | 3.02 x | 3.47 x |  | Assets/Beg Equity |
| Sust'able Growth (g*) | $-3.8 \%$ | $35.8 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ |  | $\mathrm{P}^{*} \mathrm{R}^{*} \mathrm{~A}^{*}$ T-hat |


| Growth Rates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sales | $-24.3 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $21.0 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ |
| Inventory | $-38.1 \%$ | $28.7 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| Accounts Receivable | $-22.5 \%$ | $60.9 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ |
| Accounts Payable | $-30.2 \%$ | $63.7 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ |
| Property, net | $30.6 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |

sustainable growth (around 5\%) and will run into immediate problems within the next two years. In addition to its overly optimistic sales growth, expanding its asset base by $20 \%$ per year puts a severe strain on the firm's financing capabilities. Reducing either of these figures would be helpful. Another source of assistance might arise from improvements in the nonformaldehyde electroless copper process. The new process slashes total operating time from 316 days to 142 days (about 55 percent) - if inventories could be reduced by a concomitant amount, the firm would significantly increase its financing flexibility. Additional slack might come from decreasing cash balances (currently $11 \%$ of sales) and improving collections of accounts receivable.

If sales develop as planned, Crotalus will need additional funds immediately (exclusive of the \$250,000
to fund the electroplating project). In fact, if the firm continues along this path, something must eventually give. RNB should consider its options in the event Crotalus does not repay the loan as planned. Pro forma ratios (Exhibit TN-6) aren't very encouraging.

Fundamentally, this is Crotalus' problem now. A couple of quick fixes (i.e., improving collections or decreasing inventories) can to improve things, but Crotalus will continue to need external financing unless it slows its growth. With respect to the environmental wild card, Henry Dean is caught between a rock and a hard place: If RNB extends the loan, it avoids lender liability for the foreclosed assets, but may be giving up possible recoupment of principal; if it stops lending and/or calls the loan, Crotalus may crash and burn on its own, throwing RNB open to potential environmental liabilities.

## EXHIBIT TN-3: CROTALUS CIRCUITS' INVESTMENT ANALYSIS



## Lender Liability Issues

How significant is the threat of lender liability? This case is intended as a vehicle for increasing students' awareness of this issue. Although the threat is there, it's not yet a widespread phenomenon. Consequently, a fairly qualitative discussion is appropriate here. Briefly discussing each of the legal cases in Exhibit 8 may prove useful in stimulating student discussion. Note that Crotalus' facilities are in a former paint factory - what unknown solvents and contaminants might still lurk there? An interesting question to pursue might be a calculation of Crotalus' liquidation value, should RNB foreclose. How severe is the problem of environmental stigma? Will RNB be able to find a buyer for Crotalus' assets?

## The Decision

As with most cases, there are no right answers, only good arguments. This is a close call - the project just barely makes financial sense, though there are clear environmental and health benefits, to be sure. However, the technology is as yet unproven and carries substantial risks in this highly competitive market. Moreover, probably Crotalus needs to address its overall future growth strategy before committing to a decision. To the extent Dean realizes this but Sawyer does not, there is likely to be some conflict, because Sawyer will probably balk at certain restrictions Dean will place upon the loan. On the other hand, the last thing Dean and RNB want is to take ownership of a Superfund site. Implementation of a non-formaldehyde electroless copper process would seem to be one step in reducing this risk.

## EXHIBIT TN-4: CROTALUS CIRCUITS' PRO FORMA INCOME STATEMENTS (\$ THOUSANDS)

|  | Dec-97 | Dec-98 | Dec-99 | Dec-00 | Dec-01 | Dec-02 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sales | $\$ 11,431$ | $\$ 13,146$ | $\$ 15,117$ | $\$ 17,385$ | $\$ 19,993$ | $\$ 22,992$ |
| - Cost of Goods Sold | $(\$ 7,870)$ | $(\$ 9,053)$ | $(\$ 10,414)$ | $(\$ 11,979)$ | $(\$ 13,778)$ | $(\$ 15,847)$ |
| Gross Profit | $\$ 3,561$ | $\$ 4,092$ | $\$ 4,703$ | $\$ 5,406$ | $\$ 6,215$ | $\$ 7,145$ |
| - Selling Expense | $(\$ 2,165)$ | $(\$ 2,491)$ | $(\$ 2,866)$ | $(\$ 3,296)$ | $(\$ 3,792)$ | $(\$ 4,362)$ |
| EBITDA | $\$ 1,396$ | $\$ 1,601$ | $\$ 1,838$ | $\$ 2,110$ | $\$ 2,423$ | $\$ 2,783$ |
| - Depreciation, Depletion \& Amortization | $(\$ 1,007)$ | $(\$ 1,246)$ | $(\$ 1,495)$ | $(\$ 1,794)$ | $(\$ 2,153)$ | $(\$ 2,583)$ |
| Operating Profit (EBIT) | $\$ 389$ | $\$ 356$ | $\$ 343$ | $\$ 316$ | $\$ 270$ | $\$ 200$ |
| - Interest Expense | $(\$ 201)$ | $(\$ 210)$ | $(\$ 274)$ | $(\$ 356)$ | $(\$ 461)$ | $(\$ 594)$ |
| +/- Non-operating Expense | $\$ 114$ | $\$ 131$ | $\$ 151$ | $\$ 174$ | $\$ 200$ | $\$ 230$ |
| Earnings Before Tax | $\$ 302$ | $\$ 277$ | $\$ 220$ | $\$ 134$ | $\$ 9$ | $(\$ 165)$ |
| - Total Income Tax | $(\$ 100)$ | $(\$ 91)$ | $(\$ 73)$ | $(\$ 44)$ | $(\$ 3)$ | $\$ 54$ |
| Income w/o Extra Items \& Discont'd Ops | $\$ 202$ | $\$ 186$ | $\$ 148$ | $\$ 90$ | $\$ 6$ | $(\$ 110)$ |
| +/- Extraordinary Items | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| +/- Discontinued Operations | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Adjusted Net Income | $\$ 202$ | $\$ 186$ | $\$ 148$ | $\$ 90$ | $\$ 6$ | $(\$ 110)$ |

## Assumptions

[^1]EXHIBIT TN-5: CROTALUS CIRCUITS' PRO FORMA BALANCE SHEETS (\$THOUSANDS)

| ASSETS | Dec-97 | Dec-98 | Dec-99 | Dec-00 | Dec-01 | Dec-02 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cash \& Equivalents | $\$ 1,257$ | $\$ 1,446$ | $\$ 1,663$ | $\$ 1,912$ | $\$ 2,199$ | $\$ 2,529$ |
| Net Receivables | 1,816 | 2,089 | 2,402 | 2,763 | 3,177 | 3,653 |
| Inventories | 914 | 1,052 | 1,209 | 1,391 | 1,599 | 1,839 |
| Prepaid Expenses | 114 | 131 | 151 | 174 | 200 | 230 |
| Other Current Assets | 572 | 657 | 756 | 869 | 1,000 | 1,150 |
| Total Current Assets | $\$ 4,674$ | $\$ 5,375$ | $\$ 6,182$ | $\$ 7,109$ | $\$ 8,175$ | $\$ 9,401$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Plant, Property \& Equipment | $\$ 8,304$ | $\$ 9,965$ | $\$ 11,958$ | $\$ 14,350$ | $\$ 17,220$ | $\$ 20,664$ |
| $\quad$ Accumulated Depreciation | $(3,557)$ | $(4,802)$ | $(6,297)$ | $(8,091)$ | $(10,244)$ | $(12,827)$ |
| Net Plant, Property \& Equipment | $\$ 4,748$ | $\$ 5,163$ | $\$ 5,661$ | $\$ 6,259$ | $\$ 6,977$ | $\$ 7,838$ |
| Other Assets | 572 | 657 | 756 | 869 | 1,000 | 1,150 |
| Total Assets | $\$ 9,993$ | $\$ 11,195$ | $\$ 12,599$ | $\$ 14,237$ | $\$ 16,151$ | $\$ 18,389$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLAIMS | Dec-97 | Dec-98 | Dec-99 | Dec-00 | Dec-01 | Dec-02 |
| Current Portion of Long-term Debt | $\$ 175$ | $\$ 200$ | $\$ 200$ | $\$$ | 200 | $\$ 200$ |
| Notes Payable | 152 | 966 | 1,988 | 3,238 | 4,772 | 6,600 |
| Accounts Payable | 800 | 920 | 1,058 | 1,217 | 1,400 | 1,609 |
| Taxes Payable | 114 | 131 | 151 | 174 | 200 | 230 |
| Accrued Expenses | 1,486 | 1,709 | 1,965 | 2,260 | 2,599 | 2,989 |
| Other Current Liabilities | 114 | 131 | 151 | 174 | 200 | 230 |
| Total Current Liabilities | $\$ 2,842$ | $\$ 4,058$ | $\$ 5,514$ | $\$ 7,263$ | $\$ 9,370$ | $\$ 11,918$ |
| Long Term Debt | 1,772 | 1,572 | 1,372 | 1,172 | 972 | 772 |
| Investment Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Liabilities | 1,080 | 1,080 | 1,080 | 1,080 | 1,080 | 1,080 |
| Common Stock | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 |
| Capital Surplus | 1,116 | 1,116 | 1,116 | 1,116 | 1,116 | 1,116 |
| Retained Earnings | 3,005 | 3,191 | 3,339 | 3,429 | 3,435 | 3,325 |
| Less: Treasury Stock | $(12)$ | $(12)$ | $12)$ | $(12)$ | $12)$ | $(12)$ |
| Common Equity | $\$ 4,299$ | $\$ 4,485$ | $\$ 4,633$ | $\$ 4,723$ | $\$ 4,729$ | $\$ 4,619$ |
| Total Claims | $\$ 9,993$ | $\$ 11,195$ | $\$ 12,599$ | $\$ 14,237$ | $\$ 16,151$ | $\$ 18,389$ |


| Additional Financing Needed | $\$ 152$ | $\$ 966$ | $\$ 1,988$ | $\$ 3,238$ | $\$ 4,772$ | $\$ 6,660$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Assumptions

| - cash \& equivalents at $11 \%$ of sales | - other assets $=5 \%$ of sales | • LTD $=$ prev LTD - curr LTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - 58 day avg collection period | - current LTD $=\$ 1600 / 10+250 / 10$ (in 1998) | • remaining accounts are |
| - inventories at $8 \%$ of sales | - notes payable $=$ PLUG | fixed except retained earnings |
| - prepaid expenses at $1 \%$ of sales | - accounts payable at $7 \%$ of sales | • retained earnings = prev RE |
| - other current assets at $5 \%$ of sales | - taxes payable at $1 \%$ of sales | + net income from I/S |
| - gross PPE grows at $20 \%$ annual rate + initial $\$ 250 \mathrm{~K}$ | - accrued expenses at $13 \%$ of sales |  |
| - accum depreciation $=$ previous $+I / S$ change | - other current liabilities at $1 \%$ of sales |  |

## EXHIBIT TN-6: CROTALUS CIRUITS' PRO FORMA RATIOS

|  | Dec-97 | Dec-98 | Dec-99 | Dec-00 | Dec-01 | Dec-02 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liquidity Ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Ratio | 1.64 | 1.32 | 1.12 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.79 |
| Quick Ratio | 1.32 | 1.07 | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.70 | 0.63 |

Activity Ratios

| Inventory Turnover | $8.61 \times$ | $8.61 \times$ | $8.61 \times$ | $8.61 \times$ | $8.61 \times$ | 8.62 x |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Avg Collect Period | 58 days | 58 days | 58 days | 58 days | 58 days | 58 days |
| Avg Payment Period | 37 days | 37 days | 37 days | 37 days | 37 days | 37 days |
| Total Asset Turnover | 1.14 x | $1.17 \times$ | $1.2 \times$ | 1.22 x | 1.24 x | 1.25 x |

Debt Management

| Total Debt Ratio | $57.0 \%$ | $59.9 \%$ | $63.2 \%$ | $66.8 \%$ | $70.7 \%$ | $74.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Times Interest Earned | 1.93 x | 1.69 x | 1.25 x | .89 x | .59 x | .34 x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profitability Ratios | $3.4 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Gross Profit Margin | $1.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Net Profit Margin | $4.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $-2.4 \%$ |
| Return on Equity (ROE) | $2.0 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| Return on Assets (ROA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Sustainable Growth | $1.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net Profit Margin (P) | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Retention Rate (R) | $1.14 \times$ | $1.17 \times$ | $1.2 \times$ | $1.22 \times$ | $1.24 \times$ | $1.25 \times$ |
| Total Asset Turnover (A) | $2.44 \times$ | $2.25 \times$ | $1.71 \times$ | $1.97 \times$ | $2.24 \times$ | .$x$ |
| Equity Multiplier (T-hat) | $4.9 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |


| Growth Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Sales | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| Inventory | $30.1 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| Accounts Receivable | $1.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| Accounts Payable | $3.2 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| Property, net | $14.1 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ |

## The National Pollution Prevention Center

 for Higher EducationUniversity of Michigan, Dana Building
430 East University Ave.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1115

- Phone: 734-764-1412
- Fax: 734-647-5841
- E-mail: nppc@umich.edu

The mission of the NPPC is to promote sustainable development by educating students, faculty, and professionals about pollution prevention; create educational materials; provide tools and strategies for addressing relevant environmental problems; and establish a national network of pollution prevention educators. In addition to developing educational materialsand conducting research, the NPPC also offers an internship program, professional education and training, and conferences.

## Your Input is Welcome!

We are very interested in your feedback on these materials.
Please take a moment to offer your comments and communicate them to us. Also contact us if you wish to receive a documents list, order any of our materials, collaborate on or review NPPC resources, or be listed in our Directory of Pollution Prevention in Higher Education.

## We're Online!

The NPPC provides information on its programs and educational materials through the Internet's Worldwide Web; our URL is: http://www.umich.edu/~nppcpub/
Please contact us if you have comments about our online resources or suggestions for publicizing our educational materials through the Internet. Thank you!


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The 5-year MACRS depreciation percentages are: $20 \%, 32 \%, 19.2 \%, 11.2 \%, 11.2 \%$, and $5.76 \%$.

[^1]:    - Sales grow at a $15 \%$ annual rate
    - COGS is $69 \%$ of sales - $\$ 11,198$ materials savings, $\$ 4,406$ water savings, $\$ 1,448$ electricity savings
    - Selling expense is $19 \%$ of sales - $\$ 3,411$ permitting expense -
    $\$ 3,349$ maintenance expense
    - Interest expense is $10 \%$ of previous
    (Notes Payable + Current LTD + LTD)
    - non-operating expense is $1 \%$ of sales
    - marginal tax rate is $33 \%$
    - depreciation is $15 \%$ of previous gross PPE
    - no preferred dividends, extraordinary items or discontinued operations

