

3.15 SOCIOECONOMICS - FISCAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment 3.15-1 (Letter 12, Donna Genova, May 22, 2005; Letter 11, Pearl Seigler, May 21, 2005; Letter 18, Marie and Richard Panella, May 22, 2005): My taxes will rise because of an increased number of residents. Yorktown taxes are high enough! Tax increases will make it hard for senior citizens to continue to live in Yorktown.

Response 3.15-1: *The DEIS indicates that the project would increase the Town's population by some 0.34 percent over the 2000 recorded population. A revised estimate of school age children is described in Response 3.11-1 using higher multipliers that were endorsed by the District School Superintendent. Using higher rates of school age children per household based on the rate published in The New Practitioner's Guide to Fiscal Impact Assessment, and accounting for children attending private and parochial schools, results in an estimate of 26 school age students residing at Yorktown Farms that will attend public schools in a development of 22 new homes.*

The total budget for Lakeland School District 2007-2008 school year (listed in the NYS Education Department's Property Tax Report Card) is \$133,004,710, with a total enrollment of 6,300 students.¹ Approximately 28 percent of the District's total budget is funded through State Aid revenues, the balance being the local tax levy: \$95,514,969. Approximately nine percent of the District's budget is spent on administrative and general support expenditures that would not be expected to increase as a result of the additional public school children. Dividing the total budget, less administrative and general support expenditures, by the enrollment, per pupil cost of the Lakeland School District is approximately \$19,212.

Total annual costs of educating the estimated 26 new public school students from the project would be approximately \$499,507. Assuming that the District will fund 72 percent of this cost, with the remainder funded through State Aid, costs to the Lakeland Central School District are estimated to total \$358,712.

With regard to overall tax revenues, the 2004 DEIS based its fiscal impact analysis on an estimated sales price for the 34 proposed new homes of \$650,000 each, for a projected total market value of \$22,100,000. A residential assessment ratio (RAR) of 2.34 percent was applied to the total estimated market value for Yorktown Farms to obtain a projected total assessed or taxable value of \$517,140. According to the Town Assessor's office, the RAR as of March 2007 is 1.90 percent. With an updated estimated sales price of \$850,000 for each of the 22 proposed homes in the Revised Plan -- considering price increases since 2004 and the higher value of larger-lot homes in a subdivision with only 22 residential lots -- the total projected assessed or taxable value of the revised layout is \$355,300.

The following table compares existing versus anticipated post-development tax revenues from the Yorktown Farms site for the currently proposed project with 22 lots, based on updated tax rates and the revised estimated house prices for the 22 proposed homes described above. Annual property and school taxes from the revised layout with

¹ NYSED EMSC "2007 Property Tax Report Card Data", all data for 2007-2008.

22 lots are expected to total \$434,658, versus the total from the 34-Lot layout of \$564,539.

Table 3.15-1						
Existing and Projected Tax Revenues Before and After Site Development						
Yorktown Farms 22-Lot Layout						
March 2007	Assessed Value and Taxes Generated					
Taxing Jurisdiction	Current AV*	Rate (per \$1,000 AV)	Current Taxes	Projected AV**	Projected Taxes***	Difference
Westchester County	\$14,850	\$134.326	\$1,995	\$355,300	\$47,726	\$45,731
Town of Yorktown	\$14,850	\$117.564	\$1,746	\$355,300	\$41,770	\$40,024
Lake Mohegan Fire District	\$14,850	\$48.170	\$715	\$355,300	\$17,115	\$16,400
Westchester County Refuse	\$14,850	\$15.571	\$231	\$355,300	\$5,532	\$5,301
Westchester County Peekskill Sanitary	\$14,850	\$34.645	\$514	\$355,300	\$12,309	\$11,795
Advanced Life Support District	\$14,850	\$3.221	\$48	\$355,300	\$1,144	\$1,096
Yorktown Consolidated	\$14,850	\$33.991	\$505	\$355,300	\$12,077	\$11,572
Lakeland Central Schools	\$14,850	\$835.870	\$12,413	\$355,300	\$296,985	\$284,572
Average Property Tax per DU					\$19,757	
TOTAL		\$1,223.358	\$18,197		\$434,658	\$416,491
Source: Town of Yorktown Tax Receiver's and Tax Assessor's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc.						
*Assessed or Taxable Value						
**Based on Total Market Value (\$18,700,000) x Residential Ratio (0.019 or 1.90%)						
***Based on 2007 tax rates for all jurisdictions						

The 2007 Town of Yorktown Budget, according to the Town's E-Newsletter (Volume 1, Issue 2, December 2006) is \$48,108,249. Based on the same portion of the budget that may be assigned to residential land uses as was assumed in the DEIS (65 percent), per capita Town Budget Expenditures total \$861 (compared to \$850 from the DEIS). The following table indicates that there will be minor net fiscal deficits for the Town and School District resulting from the Yorktown Farms Subdivision revised layout with 22 homes. These calculations do not account for the fact that the project sponsor proposes to provide a significant community benefit entailing area-wide sewer improvements that will save local taxpayers approximately \$1 million in infrastructure expenses. Therefore, no significant adverse effects on the Town's tax base are anticipated as a result of the Revised Plan.

Table 3.15-2			
Yorktown Farms Subdivision: Cost-Revenue Analysis			
Jurisdiction	Projected Annual Revenue	Projected Annual Cost	Surplus/Deficit
Town of Yorktown	\$41,770	(\$68,880)	(\$27,110)
Lakeland Central Schools	\$296,985	(\$358,712)	(\$61,727)
Source: Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2007.			

Comment 3.15-2 (Letter 15, Ann B. De Felice, May 22, 2005): While a soccer field is a wonderful asset, who will be assessed for the cost of insurance?

Response 3.15-2: *The soccer field proposed in the DEIS plan has been replaced with payment by the applicant in lieu of parkland as a condition of the Town Board's rezoning of the project site.*

Comment 3.15-3 (Letter 18, Marie and Richard Panella, May 22, 2005): The value of homes in this area would depreciate as a result of the proposed project.

Response 3.15-3: *The introduction of market rate housing that is likely to be priced at equal or higher levels than homes that currently exist in the area would not be expected to drive down home prices in the area. Increases in traffic or other effects of the project are not expected to alter quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood such that home values would decrease, as the commentor has suggested. The project will allow area residents to tie into municipal sewers and end their reliance on septic systems, which would be expected to increase the value of those existing homes.*

Comment 3.15-4 (Letter 19, Daniel Kiely, May 22, 2005): The DEIS employs the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook* from 1994, based on data from 1987, to support its conclusion that there will be only 30 school-aged children out of a population of 123 in this subdivision. The degree of precession to the 1/10,000 that the DEIS ascribes to the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook* is quite amazing. One would expect to see a range in the number of possible school aged children. According to the DEIS section 3.14, the average household size in Yorktown in 1990 was 2.6 and 2.8 in 2000. If this percent increase in household size was applied to the factor that the DEIS used to come up with the 30 school-aged children, there would be 32 such children. Using the DEIS's numbers the fiscal surplus of \$982 would turn into a fiscal deficit of \$23,094.

Response 3.15-4: *See Response 3.15-1.*

Comment 3.15-5 (Letter 19, Daniel Kiely, May 22, 2005): As further described under comments for section 3.15.2, the numbers contained in the DEIS again do not confirm the statement that the increased costs to the Lakeland School District will be offset by the increased tax revenue. The increased costs are estimated at \$17,473 per student or \$524,190 and the revenue from the project at \$12,070 or \$362,122. The difference is expected to come from other sources. As noted previously, the fiscal impact to the Lakeland School District is incorrect. Even accepting the numbers noted in this section, Lakeland had net income (revenue less expenses) of \$10,399 without the project and \$982 from the project. If a reduction of net income of \$9,417 is considered to be a fiscal benefit to the project sponsor, perhaps a reduction in homes from 34 to 20 will also be considered to be a fiscal benefit to the sponsor.

Response 3.15-5: *See Response 3.15-1.*