

**3.8 Economic and Demographic**

This section of the DEIS addresses demographics and an analysis of fiscal impacts associated with the proposed project. As shown in the Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan, the BT Holdings parcel has been designated as an area which should be developed with medium to high density multifamily housing to meet the following goals as outlined in the Plan;

- To channel future residential growth into suburban areas where central water and sewer services can be expanded efficiently to accommodate growth.
- To coordinate planning with the surrounding communities and the county, but most importantly with the Village of Chester and the Town of Monroe.
- To provide for a mixture of housing types that will help to promote a diverse population base.

It is the applicant's intent to annex his parcels into the Village of Chester in order to be entitled to municipal water service by virtue of annexation, and to pay, to the Village, the taxes due for the services provided.

**3.8.1 Demographics**

Existing Conditions

In the most recent US Census, for the year 2000, the populations of Orange County, the Town of Chester (includes the Village of Chester) and the Village of Chester were 341,367 persons, 12,140 persons and 3,445 persons, respectively. Orange County's population increased by 9.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and is estimated to have increased by 9.5 percent between the years 2000 and 2007. The Town of Chester's population grew by 25 percent between 1990 and 2000, and is estimated to have increased by 9.4 percent between 2000 and 2007. The population associated with the Village of Chester increased by 5.1 percent from the years 1990 to 2000 and is estimated to have increased 3.6 percent from 2000 to 2007. Table 3.8-1 compares recent population trends for the Village and Town of Chester and for Orange County.

<b>Table 3.8-1 Population in the Town of Chester and Orange County, 1990-2007</b>					
<b>Area</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>% Change</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>Village of Chester</b>	3,270	3,445	5.1%	3,575	3.6%
<b>Town of Chester</b>	9,138	12,140	25%	13,402	9.4%
<b>Orange County</b>	307,647	341,367	9.9%	377,169	9.5%
<i>Source: US Census, 2007 population estimates, Census 2000, 1990 Census</i>					

*Population Characteristics of the Village and Town of Chester*

As noted above, the 2000 Census reported that the Village's total population was 3,445 persons in the year 2000 and of these 48.0 percent were males and 52.0 percent were females. Approximately, 23.5 percent of the 2000 population was under the age of 18 years and 10.9 percent were seniors above the age of 65 years. Of the Village's 2000 population, 65.6 percent was between the ages of 18 to 64 years old.

The 2000 Census reported that of the Town’s total population, 52.8 percent were males and 47.2 percent were females. Approximately 27.3 percent of this population was under the age of 18 years, 65.0 percent was between the ages of 18 to 64 years and 7.7 percent were seniors above the age of 65 years old.

Table 3.8-2 shows the population distribution by sex and age in the Village and Town of Chester and includes actual population count by sex and age as reported by the US Census.

<b>Table 3.8-2 Sex and Age of Population in the Village and Town of Chester, 2000</b>							
<b>Total Population of Village of Chester</b>		<b>Under 18 years</b>		<b>18 to 64 years</b>		<b>65 years and Over (Senior)</b>	
<b>3,445</b>		<b>23.5% (808 )</b>		<b>65.6% (2,260)</b>		<b>10.9% (377)</b>	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1,654	1,791	412	396	1,099	1,161	143	234
<b>Total Population of Town of Chester</b>		<b>Under 18 years</b>		<b>18 to 64 years</b>		<b>65 years and Over (Senior)</b>	
<b>12,140</b>		<b>27.3 % (3,321)</b>		<b>65.0 % (7,889)</b>		<b>7.7 % (930)</b>	
6,409	5,731	1,749	1,572	4,270	3,619	390	549
<i>Source: 2000 US Census</i>							

As shown in Table 3.8-2, the sex and age distribution of the populations associated with the Village and Town of Chester are similar. The median ages of the Village’s and Town’s population were 35.5 and 37.3 years, respectively, in 2000. In comparison, the median age in Orange County was 34.7 years in 2000, which falls slightly below the Village’s and Town’s median ages.

*Household Size and Composition*

The Village of Chester consisted of 1,455 total housing units, according to the 2000 US Census. One thousand three hundred and ninety six (1,396 or 95.9 percent) of these Village homes were occupied and 59 units (4.1 percent) were vacant in 2000. Approximately 57.5 percent (803 units) of the occupied units located within the Village of Chester were owner-occupied whereas 42.5 percent (593 units) were renter-occupied.<sup>1</sup>

As noted, the US Census information reported for the Town of Chester includes the Village within its total. The 2000 US Census reported that the Town contained 3,984 homes in the year 2000 and of these 3,848 (or 96.6 percent) were occupied and 136 (or 3.4 percent) were listed as vacant.<sup>2</sup> Differing from the Village of Chester, approximately 79.3 percent of the Town’s occupied housing was owner-occupied whereas approximately 20.7 percent of the Town’s occupied households were renter-occupied.

According to the 2000 Census, “family households” constituted 74.6 percent of the occupied housing units (both owner and renter-occupied) in the Village of Chester and approximately 78.4 percent of the occupied homes in the Town.

<sup>1</sup> Source: US Census, Year 2000

<sup>2</sup> Source: US Census, Year 2000

The household sizes for the Village of Chester and Town of Chester were 2.45 and 2.92 persons, respectively. The average family size was 3.04 persons within the Village and 3.31 persons for the Town of Chester in the year 2000. Table 3.8-3 summarizes household information for the Village and Town.

<b>Table 3.8-3 Household Information</b>				
<i>Area</i>	<i>Average Household Size</i>	<i>Average Family Size</i>	<i>% Owner-occupied</i>	<i>% Renter-occupied</i>
<b>Village of Chester</b>	2.45 persons	3.04 persons	57.5%	42.5%
<b>Town of Chester</b>	2.92 persons	3.31 persons	79.3 %	20.7%
Source: 2000 Census				

*Income Characteristics*

The Village’s median household income and median family income was \$55,417 and \$65,321, respectively, in 2000. As shown in Table 3.8-4, approximately 5.2 percent of the Village population had a household income of less than \$10,000 and 1.5 percent of the population had a household income of more than \$200,000. Approximately 26.8 percent fell within the income bracket of \$40,000 to \$59,999 and slightly over 30 percent (30.2) of the Village’s household incomes were between \$60,000 and \$99,999 in 2000.

The Town’s median household and median family incomes were higher than those of the Village’s, resulting in incomes of \$69,280 and \$75,222, respectively, in 2000. As shown in Table 3.8-4, around 3.2 percent of the Town population had a household income of less than \$10,000 and 3.8 percent of the population had an income of more than \$200,000. About 20 percent (20.8%) of households fell within the income bracket of \$40,000 to \$59,999, while 33.8 percent were within the income bracket of \$60,000 to \$99,999.

<b>Table 3.8-4 Village and Town of Chester Household Income, 2000</b>				
	<i>Village of Chester</i>		<i>Town of Chester</i>	
<b>Total Households</b>	<b>1,432</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>3,861</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than \$10,000	75	5.2	123	3.2
\$10,000 to \$24,999	159	11.1	281	7.3
\$25,000 to \$39,999	177	12.4	345	8.9
\$40,000 to \$59,999	384	26.8	804	20.8
\$60,000 to \$99,999	433	30.2	1,304	33.8
\$100,000 to \$199,999	182	12.7	858	22.2
\$200,000 or more	22	1.5	146	3.8
Median Household Income (dollars)	<b>\$55,417</b>		<b>\$69,280</b>	
Source: 2000 US Census				

*Housing Characteristics*

Tables 3.8-5a and 3.8-5b show the housing types for the Village and Town of Chester in the year 2000, respectively.

<b>Table 3.8-5A Housing Type in the Village of Chester, 2000*</b>				
	<b>Owner Occupied Housing</b>		<b>Renter Occupied Housing</b>	
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>%</b>
1-unit, detached (single family)	442	53.8	78	13.1
1-unit, attached	231	28.1	144	24.1
2 units	24	2.9	58	9.7
3 or 4 units	--	--	66	11.1
5 to 9 units	100	12.2	138	23.1
10 to 19 units	-	-	36	6.0
20 to 49 units	-	-	60	10.1
50 or more	-	-	11	1.8
Mobile home	18	2.2	6	1.0
Other	7	0.9	0	0.0

*Source: 2000 US Census, \*There are minor discrepancies between the Census' Fact sheet pertaining to the Village's housing type and the housing counts in the Housing, Physical Characteristics portion of the US Census but these discrepancies are not significant.*

<b>Table 3.8-5B Housing Type in the Town of Chester, 2000*</b>				
	<b>Owner Occupied Housing</b>		<b>Renter Occupied Housing</b>	
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	<b>3,052</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>%</b>
1-unit, detached (single family)	2,398	78.6	208	26.1
1-unit, attached	410	13.4	174	21.9
2 units	36	1.2	65	8.2
3 or 4 units	8	0.3	73	9.2
5 to 9 units	168	5.5	157	19.7
10 to 19 units	-	-	42	5.3
20 to 49 units	-	-	60	7.5
50 or more	-	-	11	1.4
Mobile home	25	0.8	6	0.8
Other	7	0.2	0	0

*Source: 2000 US Census, \*There are minor discrepancies between the Census' Fact sheet pertaining to the Town's housing type and the housing counts in the Housing, Physical Characteristics portion of the US Census but these discrepancies are not significant.*

According to the 2000 Census' statistics, there were a total (owner- and renter-occupied) of 1,419 units in the Village of Chester.<sup>3</sup> Of these, 36.6 percent (or 520 units) were one-unit, detached homes, 26.4 percent (or 375 units) were one-unit attached units and 16.8 (238 units) percent were housing structures that consisted of 5 to 9 units.

The Town of Chester included a total (owner- and renter-occupied) of 3,848 units. Of these 67.7 percent (or 2,606 units) of the total units were one-unit, detached homes and 15.2 percent (or 584 units) were one-unit, attached units in 2000. Approximately 8.4 percent (or 325 units) of the total occupied units in the Town of Chester, included housing with 5 to 9 units in 2000.

**3.8.2 Economics**

Existing Conditions

*Project Assessed Value*

The subject property consists of four tax parcels. The lot in the Town of Chester (to be annexed to the Village) has a Section-Block-Lot number of 2-1-39 and is 60.6 acres. The two existing tax lots in the Village are 107-3-4 and 108-1-1 and total 4.0 acres. An approximately 3.9 acre portion of Village lot 120-1-1 is under contract to the Applicant and would be subdivided from the parent lot as part of the proposed action.

The project site lies within the following jurisdictions: Orange County, Town of Chester, Village of Chester, Chester Union Free School District, and the Chester Fire District. The Village parcels are located in the Village of Chester Sewer District - Unit C and the Town parcel is located in the Town Sewer Benefit District Number 1. Within these jurisdictions, miscellaneous budget categories and separate tax and fee rates have been established for certain services to pay for associated costs. The tax rates applicable to the project site are listed in Table 3.8-7.

The project site has a 2008 assessed value (AV) of \$331,600. The assessed value of the project site is based on its present land use status as vacant land. The assessed value of each parcel is provided in Table 3.8-6. A 3.9-acre portion of Village Lot 120-1-1, which is fallow land and is to be subdivided as part of the proposed action, is currently under contract and is not included in the 2008 assessed value of the project site.<sup>4</sup> The existing calculated assessed value is, therefore, slightly conservative.

<b>Table 3.8-6 Tax Lots and 2008 Assessed Value</b>		
	Section-Block-Lot	Assessed Value
Town of Chester	2-1-39	\$303,000
Village of Chester	107-3-4	\$17,500
	108-1-1	\$11,100
<b>Total Assessed Value</b>		<b>\$331,600</b>
Source: Town of Chester, Assessor, Tax Receiver. Table prepared by Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009.		

<sup>3</sup> Source: 2000 US Census, \*There are minor discrepancies between the Census' Fact sheet pertaining to the Town's housing type and the housing counts in the Housing, Physical Characteristics portion of the US Census but these discrepancies are not significant.

<sup>4</sup> Source; Village of Chester Tax Assessor: Village of Chester lot 120-1-1 is 19.10 acres and has a 2008 assessed value of \$286,500.

*Existing Tax and Revenue Structure*

Table 3.8-7 provides a summary of the property taxes and fees paid in 2009 to the various taxing jurisdictions. According to tax bill records, the project site currently generates \$17,765.26 annually in taxes and fees. Note that the "Part Town" tax rate applies to properties within the unincorporated Town area only and pays for services that are provided strictly to residents of the Town. The "Part Town Highway" tax also only applies to properties in the unincorporated portion of the Town. The "Town" tax rate applies to both Town and Village parcels so all of the parcels, both Town and Village, pay the "Town" tax. Town parcels do not pay the "Village" tax however. Sewer-related fees go into the respective sewer funds for the Village and Town.

<b>Table 3.8-7 2009 Property Tax Revenues</b>					
<b>Taxing Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Rate per \$1,000 AV*</b>	<b>2-1-39</b>	<b>107-3-4</b>	<b>108-1-1</b>	<b>Property Tax Revenues</b>
Village of Chester**	\$12.0000	---	\$210.00	\$133.20	\$343.20
Town of Chester	\$4.6069	\$1,395.89	\$80.62	\$51.14	\$1,527.65
Chester UFSD	\$33.0587	\$10,016.80	\$578.53	\$366.95	\$10,962.28
Part Town Highway	\$0.6338	\$192.04	---	---	\$192.04
Part Town	\$2.3998	\$727.14	---	---	\$727.14
Chester Fire District	\$1.3865	\$420.11	\$24.26	\$15.39	\$459.76
Orange County	\$5.9243	\$1,795.06	\$103.68	\$65.76	\$1,964.50
Consolidated Sewer District	\$2.3320	\$1,413.19	---	---	\$1,413.19
Village of Chester Sewer District - Unit C**	\$13.5000	---	\$162.00***	\$13.50****	\$175.50
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$15,960.23</b>	<b>\$1,159.09</b>	<b>\$645.94</b>	<b>\$17,765.26</b>
<small>Source: Town of Chester, Tax Receiver's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009.            * AV = Assessed Value; **For Fiscal Year 6.1.2008 to 5.31.2009; *** Calculation - based on 12 units;            ****Calculation-Based on one (1) unit;</small>					

**3.8.3 Potential Impacts**

Potential Population Impacts

This project consists of a combination of single family, attached, for-sale townhomes (herein referred to as "townhomes") and age-restricted multifamily rental units.

The proposed project would introduce 76 two-bedroom townhomes, 282 three-bedroom townhomes, and 100 age-restricted rental apartment units (75 one-bedroom units and 25 two-bedroom units). Refer to Table 3.8-8 for the breakdown of proposed unit and project population. The anticipated selling price is projected to be \$333,333 and \$455,455 for the two- and three-bedroom townhouse units, respectively.

Residential demographic multipliers are used by community planners to project population and school-age child generation. The expected number of people and school children generated in any residential development is primarily affected by two principal variables: 1) Housing type and 2) Market price. Detached, single-family homes are geared towards families and accordingly generate an expected higher number of people and school-age children per unit. Smaller, attached townhome and multi-family housing units are primarily targeted towards empty-nesters and young professionals and, as such, generate fewer people and school-age children. Additionally, the lower the market price for any unit, the greater the expected number of people

and school children generated while the higher-priced units generate fewer people and school children.

Knowing this, the project sponsor specifically conceived of a residential development intended to have a relatively low impact on the school district. Rather than propose detached single-family homes, the applicant proposed attached townhome and multi-family units to be built at a higher price range thereby limiting school child generation. For instance, 'Master Down' townhouses—units with the master bedroom on the first floor—were specifically conceived of and included in the proposal in order to appeal more directly to senior and empty nesters. Additionally, the senior rental aspect of the project is expected to generate no children at all.

In order to insure the proposed senior housing would be restricted to seniors, A covenant will be placed on the property in a form satisfactory to the Village attorney that restricts the property for age-restricted use in accordance with Federal and State requirements.

As a result of the proposed action, the Village of Chester is expected to grow by 1,137 persons over the expected five-year build period. This expected increase in population from the proposed development would include 121 school age children. In order to be conservative, this analysis assumes that all 121 school age children could potentially attend the Chester UFSD. The senior rental community alone would be expected to generate 180 senior citizens. The townhouse community would also be expected to produce a substantial amount of additional seniors, particularly in consideration of the availability of Master Down units.

<b>Table 3.8-8 Unit Type, Bedroom Count, Population Projections</b>					
<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Number of Units</b>	<b>Population Multiplier</b>	<b>Population Estimate</b>	<b>School-age Multiplier</b>	<b>School-age Children Estimate</b>
1-bedroom Senior Apartments	75	1.80	135	0	0
2-bedroom Senior Apartments	25	1.80	45	0	0
2-bedroom Townhouses	76	2.09	159	0.14	11
3-bedroom Townhouses	282	2.83	798	0.39	110
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>458</b>				
<b>TOTAL UNITS</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>TOTAL POPULATION</b>	<b>1,137 (includes 180 seniors)</b>	<b>TOTAL SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN</b>	<b>121</b>

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, Residential Demographic Multipliers (June 2006); Senior housing multipliers from Tim Miller Associates from various senior housing studies conducted in Putnam and Rockland Counties, New York.



As mentioned previously, the Village's population is estimated to be 3,575 persons in 2007. The 1,137 persons expected to reside at the proposed development would represent a 32 percent increase in the Village of Chester's 2007 estimated population. However, in the context of the Town of Chester 2007 population of 13,402, which includes the Village, the 1,137 new residents would represent an 8 percent increase.

As shown above, the proposed development is projected to introduce 121 new school-age children to the Chester Union Free School District (Chester UFSD) when fully occupied. This translates to an expected rate of 0.26 per unit for all units (including the seniors) and 0.34 per unit for the townhouse units only (both two- bedroom and three-bedroom combined). A portion of those children would be expected to attend private schools. However, to provide a conservative estimate, this analysis includes all 121 children that could attend the Chester UFSD.

Local comparable residential developments have also been surveyed to examine local trends for schoolchild generation. The Meadow Glen townhouse development in the Town of Monroe, located several miles to the east near the junction of Route 17 and Route 87, is a residential development built approximately five years ago consisting of 198 three-bedroom attached townhouses. The townhouse component of the BT Holdings project was largely modeled on this development. The units are priced at the same approximate price range, are at comparable densities and offer similar amenities. Using the demographic multipliers above, Meadow Glen would be expected to generate 77 school-age children. Instead a total of 68 school-age children were generated, which translates to a rate of 0.34 for all school-age children generated per unit. This rate is **less than** the 0.39 rate used above to project school-age children for the BT Holdings project.

For comparison purposes, and at the specific request of the Village Board, the Whispering Hills complex was reviewed with regard to student multipliers. Whispering Hills is a condominium community located in the Village of Chester consisting of 690 units, split evenly between two-bedroom and three-bedroom units (345 each). The 25+-year-old community was built at a density of approximately 12 units per acre, about double that of the proposed BT Holdings project. Importantly, the condominiums are priced at a substantially lower price range relative to the proposed BT Holdings townhouses and show an expected increase in school-child generation as a result. Using the appropriate demographic multipliers, a rate of 0.39 school-age children per unit would be expected. Discussions with officials at the Chester UFSD have indicated that approximately 360 school-children are produced by Whispering Hills, or 0.52 per unit.

The school children population multiplier for Whispering Hills was expected to be and is indeed higher than the expected school children multiplier for the proposed BT Holdings project because of the significantly lower market price of the Whispering Hills units. When formulating the BT Holdings project concept, the applicant was well aware of the community concerns with respect to the number of students generated by the Whispering Hills development. As a result, the applicant deliberately proposed Townhouse housing types and mix that would be expected to generate far fewer school children, similar to the Meadow Glen Development. In addition, the applicant further proposed an age-restricted component which would generate no students at all.



The analysis of school-age child generation above is a deliberately conservative estimate given that it measures *all* school-age children that will be generated by this project, not just *public* school-age children. If the expected public school-age children multiplier was used, only 87 public school-age children would be expected from the project, nearly 30% fewer than the 121 total. The demographic analysis provides a conservative assessment in that it is based on 100% of the school-age population attending the public schools.

The introduction of these students into various grade levels over a multi-year period due to project phasing would ameliorate the effect of the increase in school district enrollment associated with this project. The phased construction period of this project provides time to allow the Chester UFSD to implement measures for the introduction of new students from this and other area projects.

It is the Applicant's intent to build the senior housing as proposed as part of this project. At the request of the Village's planning consultants, a discussion of the impact of removing the age restriction is provided. If the rental units were to be made available to the general population instead of restricted to a senior population, the demographics would be slightly different. Based upon the population multipliers used to calculate the BT Holdings population, the total population may increase by up to 30 persons and the total population may include up to 35 additional students. Prior to the restriction on senior citizens being removed from the property covenant, the Applicant or subsequent owner would need to come before the Village Board for approval. Additional information as to the impacts of this action would be most appropriately discussed at that time in the context of a SEQR review, specific to that action, to determine if removing the age-restriction resulted in a potential adverse environmental impact.

#### Potential Fiscal Impacts

##### *Projected Assessed Value*

In order to project the property tax revenues that would be generated by the proposed project, the market value and the assessed value for the proposed development must be estimated.

Consistent with fiscal impact methodology<sup>5</sup>, property tax revenues are determined by considering the amount of property tax revenues would be generated if the development were completed and occupied today. This approach recognizes that development often requires several years to be completed and that inflation will increase costs and revenues over time.

The proposed project would convert vacant land to a residential development that would include 358 (two- and three-bedroom) townhomes and 100 (one- and two-bedroom) age-restricted apartment type units. All units proposed would be in condominium ownership. Refer to Table 3.8-8 for the breakdown of proposed unit and project population.

In New York State, condominium units are assessed differently than fee simple units. According to the New York State Office of Real Property Services (NYRPS), Section 339-y of the Condominium Act requires that each condominium unit, together with its common interest, be assessed as one parcel.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Fiscal Impact Handbook, Robert Burchell and David Listokin, 1978.

Condominium dwellings are assessed using a rental-income approach. The assessment analysis for the proposed project assumes the following rental fees for the proposed dwellings:

- One-bedroom Senior Apartment - \$750 per month;
- Two-bedroom Senior Apartment - \$900 per month;
- Two-bedroom Townhouse - \$1,800 per month; and
- Three-bedroom Townhouse - \$2,300 per month.

After discussion of the appropriate methodology and upon the specific recommendation of Andrea Nilon, Village Tax assessor, operating expenses for the proposed project are projected to be 25 percent of gross income and the capitalization rate is projected to be 8 percent. In order to calculate the assessed value of the proposed project, the market value of the project (\$97,216,875) was multiplied by the Village's 50 percent equalization rate as identified on the Tax Bills for the parcel, resulting in an assessed value of \$48,608,438. These calculations are detailed in the Fiscal Analysis Worksheets included in Appendix N.

*Projected Property Tax Revenues and Other Fees*

<b>Table 3.8-9 Projected Property Tax Revenues and Fees</b>			
<b>Taxing Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Tax Rate (per \$1,000 AV*)</b>	<b>Total Assessed Value</b>	<b>Property Tax Revenues</b>
Village of Chester	\$12.0000	\$48,608,438	\$583,301
Town of Chester	\$4.6069	\$48,608,438	\$223,934
Chester UFSD	\$33.0587	\$48,608,438	\$1,606,933
Chester Fire District	\$1.3865	\$48,608,438	\$67,396
Orange County	\$5.9243	\$48,608,438	\$287,971
Village of Chester Sewer Fees	\$325 per unit	458 units	\$148,850
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$2,918,385</b>

Source: Village of Chester Assessor's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009. Property tax revenues rounded to the nearest dollar. Discrepancies between the total and individual line items due to rounding.

As shown in the Table 3.8-9, total project-generated tax revenues are estimated to be \$2,769,535 annually. By far the largest portion of the total, 55 percent would accrue to the Chester Union Free School District (Chester UFSD), which would receive \$1,606,933 annually. The Village would gain \$583,301 annually. Even though the proposed development would reside entirely in the Village due to annexation, the Town would receive significant Town tax revenue (\$223,934 annually). It should be noted that the Town Tax Revenue would go entirely to the Town General Fund under Annexation, whereas without annexation, tax revenue to the Town would be divided between the Town, Part Town and Part Town Highway funds. Orange County would receive approximately \$287,971 annually and the Chester Fire District would receive approximately \$67,396 annually. Additionally, as proposed, the project would generate annual fees to the Village of Chester Sewer District of \$148,850 (\$325 per unit).

Associated Costs

Table 3.8-10 shows the municipal costs and anticipated tax revenue in the Village, the Town and the Chester School District for the proposed BT Holdings Project. The methodologies used to derive these numbers are described in the text below.

<b>Table 3.8-10 Summary of Revenue and Cost Analysis BT Holdings Multifamily Proposal</b>			
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Tax Revenue</b>	<b>Service Cost</b>	<b>Net Benefit / (Deficit)</b>
Town of Chester	\$223,934	\$166,002	\$57,932
Village of Chester	\$583,301	\$249,003	\$334,298
Chester UFSD	\$1,606,933	\$1,599,620	\$7,313
Chester Fire District	\$67,396	\$49,580	\$17,816
Source: TMA 2009			

*Village of Chester*

Since the proposed development would include the annexation of land from the Town into the Village, increased costs would be expected to be incurred by the Village. The Per Capita Multiplier Method of estimating future municipal costs as defined by noted practitioners in the field, Robert Burchell, David Listokin and William R. Dolphin<sup>6</sup> was utilized to determine these costs.

The Per Capita Multiplier Method estimates the average cost per person of operating expenses to project an annual cost assignable to a population change. The technique begins by refining local costs to include those related to residential assessed valuation. Then it expresses all municipal costs per person. These per capita costs are multiplied by the estimated project population and are the incremental costs attributable to the project.

The total 2009 operating budget for the Village of Chester was \$4,170,621 and the total tax levy is estimated to be \$2,879,021<sup>7</sup>. The per capita cost is determined by dividing the population into the total residentially induced cost. As detailed in the Fiscal Analysis Worksheets included in Appendix N, the estimated per capita municipal cost is \$219. In other words, for each additional person, the Village can be expected to incur \$219 in additional expense to be raised by residential tax revenue.

The proposed development is projected to increase the Village's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services is \$219. Using this as a basis for projections, additional costs are projected to total \$249,003 annually.

<sup>6</sup> The New Guide to Fiscal Impact Analysis, Robert Burchelle and David Listokin, 1986

<sup>7</sup> Based upon an analysis of residential assessed valuation by Andrea Nilon, August 2009.

As shown in Table 3.8-9, overall revenues from the proposed development for general municipal services associated with the Village are projected to be \$583,301. Therefore, after covering the anticipated municipal cost to the Village of \$249,003, a net benefit in the amount of \$334,298 would be projected to the Village of Chester as a result of the proposed project.

The project as proposed includes private roads and self-contained recreational facilities which were intended to reduce the demand for public services to be provided by the Village. As has been shown in the fiscal analysis, the self-sufficient nature of the proposed community results in a development that is anticipated to more than cover its costs.

The Village of Chester has created separate budgets for Water and Sewer Funds. Refer to Section 3.10 Utilities for a discussion pertaining to the proposed project and its potential impacts in the area's water and sewer facilities including potential costs.

#### Town of Chester

Upon annexation, the residents of the BT Holdings project would be entitled to services provided by both the Village and the Town of Chester. Utilizing the Per Capita Multiplier methodology discussed above, The total 2009 General Fund including Town-wide Highway for the Town of Chester was \$4,638,382 and the total amount to be raised by tax levy for these expenses is estimated to be \$3,569,867.

As shown in the fiscal Analysis Worksheets in Appendix N, Dividing the 2009 residential induced costs by the 2007 estimated population of the Town of 13,402, would result in an estimated per capita municipal cost to the Town of \$146. In other words, for each additional Village resident, the Town can be expected to incur \$146 in additional expense to be raised by tax revenue.

The proposed development is projected to increase the Town's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services to the Town of a Village resident is \$146. Based upon the Per Capita Multiplier Method costs are projected to total \$166,002 annually.

As shown in Table 3.8-9, overall tax revenues from the proposed development to the Town of Chester are projected to be \$223,934. Therefore, after covering the anticipated total municipal cost to the Town of \$166,002, an annual net benefit in the amount of \$57,932 would be projected to the Town of Chester as a result of the proposed project. This represents a 38 fold increase compared to existing tax revenue to the Town.

*Chester Union Free School District*

The Chester UFSD 2008-2009 School Tax Levy was \$13,682,558 with a total school enrollment of 1,035 children. As a result, the cost assumed to be raised through the property tax for the proposed development in 2009 would be \$13,220 per student.<sup>8</sup> Since 121 school age children are expected to reside at the proposed development, as shown in Table 3.8-8, this would result in an overall annual cost to the school district of \$1,599,620, annually. These costs would include the increase in transportation services of approximately two buses as bus service is a contractual operating expense for the Chester UFSD.

Upon full build-out expected in 2014, the proposed development would generate annual property tax revenues of \$1,606,933 directly to the Chester UFSD as shown in Table 3.8-9.

This would result in a nominal net benefit to the school district of \$7,313. Once again, based upon the data provided in the fiscal analysis, the nature of the proposed project, which includes upscale multifamily units and provisions for senior housing, resulting in a low-impact community with regard to school children, results in a development that is expected to cover its costs.

The \$1,606,933 in annual revenues for the Chester UFSD could be used to cover the expense of the increased school population, as necessary.

The proposed development is expected to be completed by 2014. As such, the population of school age children (121) would be added to the Chester UFSD over a five-year period, as homes are built, marketed, sold and occupied, resulting in an annual school age population increase of approximately 25 new children.

*Chester Fire District*

The residents of the BT Holdings project would be entitled to Fire protection services provided by the Chester Fire Department. Utilizing the Per Capita Multiplier methodology discussed above, and as shown in the fiscal Analysis Worksheets in Appendix N, the estimated per capita cost to the Fire District is \$44. In other words, for each additional resident, the Fire District can be expected to incur \$44 in additional expense to be raised by tax revenue.

The proposed development is projected to increase the Town's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for fire protection services is up to \$44. Based upon the Per Capita Multiplier Method costs are projected to total \$49,580 annually.

As shown in Table 3.8-9, overall tax revenues from the proposed development to the Chester Fire District are projected to be \$67,396. an annual net benefit in the amount of \$17,816 would be projected to the Chester Fire District as a result of the proposed project.

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: "Property Tax Report Card Data - Part 1 - Budget, Levy, and Enrollment." Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education (EMSC). 2008 . New York State Education Department (NYSED). 13, February 2009 <<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov>>; Notes and Calculations: Chester UFSD 2008/2009 budget: \$21,874,089; Chester UFSD 2008-2009 School Tax Levy: \$13,682,558; Chester 2008-2009 School Enrollment: 1035; Per-student cost: (\$13,682,558/1,035)=\$13,220.

*Employment Opportunities - Short Term - Construction Employment*

In the applicant's opinion, it can be expected that the majority of construction-related workers at the project site would come from Orange County and the immediately surrounding areas. These workers would be expected to have a positive fiscal benefit on existing local businesses, purchasing food and gasoline, convenience shopping, etc. In addition to direct construction employment, fiscal benefits to total construction employment (direct and indirect/secondary) resulting from construction expenditures on this project would include the creation of jobs in business establishments providing goods and services to project contractors (indirect/secondary).

*Direct Construction Employment*

Based on labor hour estimates included in the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook* published in 1994 by the Urban Land Institute, and the estimated 2009 construction value of the project, adjusted to be consistent with the 1994 Producer Price Index the proposed project would be expected to generate approximately 316 person-years of direct construction employment.<sup>9</sup>

*Indirect Construction Employment*

The construction of the BT Holdings development would include the indirect construction category of 'new multifamily housing structures, non-farm units' in order to calculate the secondary impacts to construction employment from the proposed development. The secondary effect multipliers for 'new residential multifamily housing structures, non-farm' is 1.43.<sup>10</sup> As noted above, the proposed project would be expected to generate 316 person-years of construction employment. Adding the indirect job creation figures brings the total of directly and indirectly generated construction jobs generated by the construction of the proposed development to a total of approximately 452 person-years of employment<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Source of multipliers for direct employment: The Urban Land Institute's Development Impact Assessment Handbook (1994) Direct employment breakdown: 439 labor hours (direct employees);

<sup>10</sup>Source: Secondary effect multiplier - 2004 IMPLAN (Impact Analysis for Planning) data, Putnam County, New York.

<sup>11</sup>Total indirect construction employment: 189 indirect employees;

### 3.8.4 Mitigation Measures

#### Population and School Age Children

The implications of increasing the Village 's population by 1,137 persons over a five-year period would result in an increased demand for community services and facilities that would be provided to the project site. To the extent that impacts to any of these services are identified, mitigation measures are described in Section 3.9, Community Services, according to community service provider.

The Chester UFSD must produce a budget on a year-by-year basis that covers its projected costs to educate the district's school population. Since the estimated taxes to be generated are so close to the estimated costs, it is expected that the fiscal impacts will be *de minimus* and do not require mitigation.

#### Provision of plans for senior housing, recreational and pedestrian amenities

An extensive sidewalk and walking trail network runs through the development connecting the senior apartments with the townhouse and condominium neighborhood areas and the clubhouse and other recreation amenities. The trails traverse internal open spaces, follow the edge of stormwater ponds and the central wetland and converge with sidewalks following the private road system. Picnic areas, outdoor play areas and gazebos are located on the sidewalk and trail system. Sidewalks follow the boulevard that provides the primary access to the development allowing future residents safe pedestrian access to NYS route 17M. A potential sidewalk from the BT Holdings primary access to the Chester Mall is also being studied. The emergency only access in the eastern end of the site would provide pedestrian access to the adjoining neighborhood. Additionally, the internal private roads provide a safe network for biking.

As shown in Figure 2-4, immediately following Section 2.0 of this DEIS, the central recreational facilities, which are located along the entry boulevard on the western side of the site, include a clubhouse, swimming pool, outdoor play area, and a picnic area with a gazebo. The one-story clubhouse is approximately 3,900 square feet. Four other play areas are located along the site roads throughout the development; two in the central and northern area within the loop created by Roads B and C; another near the intersection of Road C with A and one in the eastern end within the loop created by Road A. Gazebos are located near the clubhouse, the senior apartments and in the eastern end to the south of the Road A loop.

The future Homeowner's Association may wish to designate portions of common open areas for dog run areas. These would have to be properly fenced and appropriate rules established for use by homeowners and their dogs, pet waste removal and maintenance of these areas.

Common land and facilities would be owned by a Homeowners Association that would be responsible for the maintenance of common space, the recreational complex, and utilities.