



Community Opportunities Group, Inc.
129 Kingston Street, Third Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

November 26, 2007

Colleen A. Corona, Chair
Board of Selectmen
Town of Easton
136 Elm Street
North Easton, MA 02356

Reference: Queset Commons Chapter 40R District

Dear Ms. Corona and Members of the Board:

At the request of Attorney Mark Bobrowski, Community Opportunities Group, Inc., has reviewed the proposed Queset Commons development for its potential fiscal impact on the Town of Easton. Attached please find a draft of our report. We emphasize that this is a draft, first because we are still verifying some assumptions and second, we have not had sufficient time to prepare all of the appendix tables that need to be added to the document. However, we do not expect any substantive changes to our conclusions about this project. In our opinion, Queset Commons will have a beneficial fiscal impact on the Town regardless of Chapter 40R incentive payments.

We would like to thank Mr. David Colton and the Town's professional staff for their assistance during this review. In addition, we appreciate the cooperation we received from Mr. Douglas King.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (781) 834-7324.

COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITIES GROUP, INC.

Judith A. Barrett
Director of Planning

SUMMARY

In our opinion, Queset Commons will have a favorable fiscal impact on the Town of Easton. Table 1 provides a summary of our fiscal impact analysis. Since Queset Commons will be built in phases, Table 1 presents the net present value of Easton’s cumulative revenue and expenditures for this development over a 10-year period. The ratio of municipal and school service costs to revenue is 0.60, which means that for every \$1.00 of revenue generated by the project, the Town will spend approximately 60 cents to serve the residents and businesses at Queset Commons. Although a net present value analysis is the appropriate way to describe the fiscal impact of a phased development, many people find it easier to understand the concept of fiscal impact when dollars are expressed as the revenue and expenditures that would occur in a single year for a fully built and occupied project. Accordingly, Table 1 includes a one-year estimate of revenue and expenditures for Queset Commons following completion of the fourth phase of the project, *unadjusted for inflation*. Depicted this way, the project’s cost-revenue ratio is 0.64.

Table 1. Estimated Fiscal Impact of Queset Commons

Fiscal Impact Component	10-Year Cumulative (Adjusted for Phasing)	One-Year Snapshot (FY 2007 Dollars)
Total Expenditures	\$2,765,900	\$485,900
Municipal	\$1,591,300	\$285,900
School	\$1,174,600	\$200,000
Gross Revenue	\$4,610,200	\$763,600
Net Revenue	\$1,844,300	\$277,700
Cost-Revenue Ratio	0.60	0.64

We estimate that at full buildout, Queset Commons will have approximately 380 residents and 32 school-age children, or an average of 0.16 students per unit, *excluding* the assisted living facility. The number of students could vary 8-12% in any given year. Although a working average of 0.16 may seem low, the proposed project’s location, use mix and density make it unattractive to families with older children. Massachusetts has relatively little experience with new mixed-use developments, but in other parts of the country that have attracted this type of project, the number of families with school-age children is conspicuously small. If Queset Commons were located in a different setting or did not include an assisted living residence, or if the project included a larger percentage of three-bedroom units, the assumptions used to forecast school-age children would be different. Given the types of housing that Queset Commons will offer, we believe that most of the school-age children will be elementary students. Our experience is that 60-70% of the students from multi-family condominium and rental developments enroll in grades K-5.

Regardless of whether the fiscal impact of Queset Commons is described as the net present value of a phased project or a one-year buildout condition, it is important to point out that a cost-revenue ratio of 0.60 – 0.64 is a positive impact. It means that Queset Commons will generate more revenue than the Town’s cost to serve the development. Revenue ratios

express a relationship between costs and revenue that usually fluctuates from year to year, but a fundamentally positive relationship remains positive just as a fundamentally negative relationship rarely improves to a noticeable degree. Based on our reviews of completed and occupied projects in other communities, we would not be surprised if the actual balance of costs and revenue for Queset Commons ranged from 0.60 to a high of 0.67 or a low of 0.56.

The likelihood that revenue and service costs will fluctuate somewhat argues for interpreting revenue ratios as an approximation of a development's fiscal impact. This is especially true for fiscal impact studies prepared in response to a concept plan because there are many unknowns during the predevelopment stages of a large project. For example, the revenue generated by the commercial component could differ from the amounts we have estimated depending on vacancy rates, the actual mix of tenants and their leases. In addition, the size and composition of the resident households will vary from year to year, so the Town's expenditures for public schools could be somewhat higher or lower over time. Furthermore, we have made fairly high-range assumptions about the potential operating impacts on Easton's public safety departments because in our experience, rental housing and retail stores tend to impose more demands on police, fire and emergency medical services than other residential or commercial uses.

The estimates in Table 1 do not include any one-time, non-recurring revenue that Easton would receive as a direct result of this development. Aside from building permit fees, if the project is constructed in an overlay district approved pursuant to M.G.L. c.40R ("Chapter 40R"), Easton will be eligible for certain one-time payments from the state. We have treated these kinds of revenue sources separately in our report because one-time revenue should not be represented as an offset to annually recurring costs. In addition, our analysis does not account for the value of any mitigation provided by the proponent. The cost of mitigation is a developer's responsibility and it should not be represented as revenue to a city or town. Finally, we have not attributed any general fund debt service to this development. Improvements required to serve the project are also the developer's responsibility. For large developments that will house many families with school-age children, we often include a pro-rated share of the cost of debt service for school facilities if the community has or is anticipated to have school space shortages. It appears that Easton has sufficient capacity to absorb three to four students per grade at the elementary level, and one or two students per grade at the intermediate and high school levels. If this is not the case, we will revise our analysis at the Town's request.

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Queset Commons is a planned mixed-use development to be located at the intersection of Washington Street (Route 138) and Belmont Street (Route 123). The proponent, Douglas A. King Builders, wants to develop the following residential and commercial uses as depicted on a conceptual site plan for this project:

Residential Component

60 condominiums
80 assisted living units
140 rental units

Commercial Component

60,000 sq. ft. retail space
15,000 sq. ft. conference center
15,000 sq. ft. food store
11,000 sq. ft. office building

The site consists of 37.5± acres in several parcels under the proponent’s control. The surrounding land uses include single-family residences and municipal property, and Stonehill College is located to the north on the opposite side of Washington Street.

The proponent expects to construct the project in four phases. The first phase would include 40 apartments, the 80-unit assisted living residence, and 22,000 sq. ft. of floor area for retail stores and services. Phase II calls for an additional 50 apartments, 18,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and an 11,000 sq. ft. office building. The third phase is entirely residential and involves construction of the 60-unit condominium component. During the last phase, the proponent intends to build 50 units of rental housing, 35,000 sq. ft. of retail/commercial space, and a 16,000 sq. ft. conference center. For all of these uses combined, the proponent estimates that Queset Commons will generate \$703,400 per year in property tax revenue. Our estimate is higher because even though we used more conservative assumptions about the assessed value of the commercial space and the multi-family condominiums, we included revenue from motor vehicle excises taxes in our analysis.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A fiscal impact analysis measures the relationship between the amount of revenue generated by various land uses and their associated service costs. Most fiscal impact studies are designed to evaluate the impacts of a specific project, such as Queset Commons. The question for any fiscal impact study is whether a development will generate enough revenue to cover the cost of services used by its residents or businesses. To a fiscal impact analyst, a project is “revenue positive” if it generates more revenue than the cost of services used by its residents or businesses. For example, a project with a cost-revenue ratio of 0.67 has a positive fiscal impact because for every dollar of revenue it generates, the community would spend 67 cents to serve the development’s residents. A “revenue-neutral” land use represents the break-even point, and a revenue-negative land use costs more to serve than the amount of revenue it produces, i.e., a cost-revenue ratio of >1.00.

Since local governments rely on property taxes to finance most of their municipal and school services, fiscal impact studies have become a popular tool for development review. However, fiscal impact analysis is not confined to a single “tool” because practitioners have more than one model from which to choose. Nearly all of the long-standing models share at least one feature: they embrace the theory that a proportional relationship exists between the assessed value of a given land use and its share of a community’s service costs. The

prevailing models have been field-tested and reviewed by peers, and from time to time new field tests result in changes to the assumptions embedded in each model. It is important to apply the models with care, but practitioners have to use professional judgment because not all models have been designed to account for the unique conditions that may exist in a given city or town. Municipalities in Massachusetts are somewhat more dependent on property tax revenue than is the case for sub-state units of government in other parts of the country, and this is one of the conditions that fiscal impact analysts have to consider.

None of the prevailing fiscal impact models accounts very well for financial or capacity weaknesses that may already exist in a town today, yet these conditions partially determine the real impacts of new growth. Further, all models rely on today's service cost and revenue patterns to forecast the fiscal outcome of a future development event, yet over time, many factors can affect a project's fiscal position: changes in local aid policies, the state of the economy, population cycles, and the expectations that residents place on local government. Also, local government costs have increased significantly in some communities despite very low rates of population growth or an absolute population decline. Not all costs are population-sensitive, and this makes it important to separate growth-related impacts from other issues affecting a community's cost of services.

To overcome the risk of errors in using a single year of financial data to predict future conditions, we typically construct a long-term fiscal and demographic trends model. The financial portion of the model is based on a community's actual revenue and expenditure experience, drawing from sources such as Schedule A and the Tax Rate Recapitulation Sheet, which we received from Easton, and historic summaries of these sources prepared by the Department of Revenue. The demographic portion is based on a variety of sources: decennial and intercensal data from the Bureau of the Census, proprietary data from Claritas, information from the Department of Revenue and, where appropriate, from the Department of Education. By converting several years of financial data to constant dollars, calculating rates of real appreciation per capita and drawing average trends from the community's financial history, we have a statistical basis for estimating how future costs might change in relation to household population growth. After applying this method in several fiscal impact studies and reviewing the outcomes of projects once they were built and occupied, we are convinced that the effort required to construct the model is worthwhile because the actual results have been strikingly close to the original estimates.

CHAPTER 40R

M.G.L. c.40R ("Chapter 40R") offers financial incentives to communities that adopt a state-approved overlay district. The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) administers Chapter 40R and has jurisdiction to approve or disapprove a proposed Chapter 40R district. In general, an overlay district will qualify under Chapter 40R if it complies with a series of location, area, density and permitting requirements outlined in the statute and meets other state policy objectives. Further, at least 20 percent of the housing

units built in a Chapter 40R overlay district must be affordable as defined by the DHCD's Local Initiative Program (LIP). In exchange for adopting the overlay district, the community becomes eligible for two types of one-time, non-recurring payments from DHCD:

- ♦ A "zoning incentive" payment, which the state will issue after town meeting adopts the district, and
- ♦ A "bonus unit" payment, i.e., a per-unit payment for each housing unit built in the district over and above any units that could have been built without the overlay.

If Queset Commons proceeds as proposed by the developer, Easton will be eligible for a \$350,000 zoning incentive payment and up to \$840,000 in "bonus unit" payments.¹ Both payments are based on statutory formulas. The zoning payment formula is a sliding scale relative to the number of units that can be built in the overlay district. The bonus unit formula is simply \$3,000 per unit, payable upon issuance of a building permit.

After Chapter 40R was passed, the legislature enacted a related law, Chapter 40S, which pledges supplemental local aid to Chapter 40R communities if they receive less revenue from a Chapter 40R development than the cost to provide a public education to children living in the development. Unlike Chapter 40R incentive payments, Chapter 40S is a recurring source of revenue (subject to appropriation). However, communities do not become eligible for it unless they have a revenue shortfall as determined by another statutory formula. In effect, the formula means that at least some of the Chapter 40R housing must be occupied for a year before the state can determine whether a revenue gap exists. Until the units begin to house families with school-age children, there is no basis to determine whether a Chapter 40R project will provide enough revenue to offset the cost of educating its students. Since Chapter 40S requires an annual commitment from the legislature and the funding is not guaranteed, we maintain that communities should not count on receiving both Chapter 40R incentive payments and supplemental school aid (via the Chapter 70 program) under Chapter 40S. In Easton's case, we believe Chapter 40S is irrelevant because viewed in its entirety, Queset Commons will generate far more revenue than the cost of services used by its residents and businesses.

Chapter 40B Implications

The percentage of affordable units at Queset Commons has been designed to make a significant contribution to Easton's Subsidized Housing Inventory. The 140-unit apartment component will include 35 units affordable to moderate-income tenants, thereby enabling all 140 to qualify for the Subsidized Housing Inventory under current state policy. In addition,

¹ Author's Note: The bonus unit payment needs to be verified. By law, it consists of a \$3,000 per unit payment for each unit over and above the number of housing units that could be built in the underlying zoning district without the Chapter 40R overlay. For purposes of this report, we have estimated the dollar value of bonus unit payments at 280 units x \$3,000, but our assumption may be in error.

the proponent has stated that 12 of the 80 assisted living units will be reserved for low- or moderate-income seniors. Finally, the 60 condominiums will include nine to be sold at prices affordable for moderate-income first-time homebuyers. In short, Queset Commons will create 56 affordable housing units and a total of 161 units eligible for the Subsidized Housing Inventory.

Easton has a DHCD-approved Chapter 40B Production Plan. Regulations of the Housing Appeals Committee (HAC) currently provide for a one-year certification when communities produce new low- or moderate-income housing equal to 0.75% of their total year-round housing inventory in any 12-month period, based on the most recent federal census; or a two-year certification for production equal to 1.5% of the total year-round housing inventory in any 12-month period. For Easton, this means 57 or 114 units respectively. It appears that the proposed phasing plan for Queset Commons does not meet these targets. To complicate matters, HAC's regulations create a differential system for counting affordable units in comprehensive permit and non-comprehensive developments. While comprehensive permit units are added to the Subsidized Housing Inventory once the Zoning Board of Appeals issues a comprehensive permit and the appeal period expires, affordable units created through other means are not added until the developer obtains a building permit. If all of the units at Queset Commons were approved through a development review process conducted under Chapter 40R, DHCD would not "count" the units on the Subsidized Housing Inventory immediately.

However, HAC recently published a proposed set of Chapter 40B regulations that include some significant changes to the existing rules. For example, the proposed regulations call for reducing the annual production threshold to 0.50% and 1.0% (for Easton, 38 and 76 units). In addition, they would allow affordable units in non-comprehensive permit developments (such as Chapter 40R projects) to be added to the Subsidized Housing Inventory as soon as the project is approved by the Planning Board. If these regulations are implemented, Easton should be eligible for at least a one-year certification once the Planning Board issues a site plan approval decision.

Chapter 40S

Most of the municipal and school costs associated with Queset Commons will be generated by the 140 rental units. Rental developments rarely cover all of their associated service costs because compared to multi-family homeownership developments, rental housing generates much less revenue per unit. Queset Commons has sufficient capacity to subsidize the rental component's cost of services due to the inclusion of higher-value uses, i.e., the condominiums, assisted living residence and commercial space. If the town decides to pursue a Chapter 40R overlay district, the anticipated one-time, non-recurring incentive payments would provide an additional financial benefit. However, these payments are not required to make the project fiscally sustainable. Since Queset Commons is unquestionably "revenue positive," our fiscal impact analysis excludes any consideration of Chapter 40S revenue.

APPENDIX TABLES

A. PROPORTIONAL VALUATION ANALYSIS (FY07 ACTUAL): EXISTING CONDITIONS		
FY07 General Fund Expenditures	\$52,390,870	
Estimated Municipal Expenditures ²	\$16,113,655	
Non-Residential Real Property Assessed Value	\$349,448,521	
Total Real Property Assessed Value	\$3,300,706,950	
Ratio	0.11	
Non-Residential Parcels	385	
Total Parcels	8,189	
Average Value: Non-Residential Parcel	\$907,658	
Average Value: All Parcels	\$403,066	
Ratio	2.25	
Refinement Coefficient	1.40	
Nonresidential Expenditures	\$2,388,352	
Residential Expenditures	\$50,002,518	
Nonresidential %	4.6%	
Assumed Distribution of Expenditures	Nonresidential	Residential
<i>General Government</i>	\$11,942	\$1,896,544
<i>Public Safety</i>	\$1,194,176	\$5,020,067
<i>Education</i>	\$0	\$27,482,633
<i>Public Works</i>	\$573,204	\$1,808,476
<i>Health & Human Services</i>	\$35,825	\$601,628
<i>Culture & Recreation</i>	\$0	\$444,985
<i>Debt Service</i>	\$334,369	\$3,385,935
<i>Fixed Costs</i>	\$238,835	\$8,604,549
<i>Other</i>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$757,702</u>
<i>General Fund Total</i>	\$2,388,352	\$50,002,518

² Excludes direct school expenditures, and assumes 70% of the Town's debt service and 65% of its employee benefit costs are attributable to the schools.

B. PROPORTIONAL VALUATION: PROPOSED COMMERCIAL SPACE³

New Project Cost Assumptions	Retail	Office	Food Store	Conference Center	Total
Floor Space (Sq. Ft.)	60,000	11,000	15,000	16,000	102,000
Value/Sq. Ft.	\$150	\$140	\$150	\$140	
Total Value	\$9,000,000	\$1,540,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,240,000	\$15,030,000
Proportion to FY07 Total Real Property Valuation	0.026	0.004	0.006	0.006	
Proportion to FY07 Average Nonresidential Parcel Value	9.916	1.697	2.479	2.468	
Refinement Coefficient	0.71	0.55	0.80	0.83	
Current Nonresidential Expenditures (Table A)	\$2,388,352	\$2,388,352	\$2,388,352	\$2,388,352	
Cost of New Services	\$43,700	\$5,800	\$12,300	\$12,700	\$74,500
New Commercial Revenue	\$97,400	\$16,700	\$24,300	\$24,200	\$162,600
Cost/Foot	\$0.75	\$0.55	\$0.85	\$0.82	

Note: numbers may not total due to rounding.

³ We have adopted more conservative assumptions than the proponent's for the assessed value per foot for commercial space at Queset Commons. We think the average assumption of \$155/sq. ft. is somewhat high, though it is not unreasonable. If we accepted the proponent's assumptions, the total assessed value of the commercial space would be \$15,810,000 and the tax revenue would be \$171,000.

C. MARGINAL COST MULTIPLIERS FOR RESIDENTIAL COMPONENTS

Service Category	Adjustments to Base (FY07) Service Costs				Notes
	Decelerate	Average*	Accelerate	Use-or Scale-Sensitive	
General Government	0.50	0.96	1.09		
Public Safety	0.88	1.00	1.05	1.15	<i>Multi-family rental, senior housing</i>
Education	0.92	1.04	1.04	1.06	<i>Single-family homes</i>
Public Works	0.79	1.09	1.06		
Health & Human Services	0.78	1.12	1.22	1.25	<i>Multi-family rental, restaurants</i>
Culture & Recreation	0.81	0.97	1.09	1.14	<i>Single-family homes</i>
Debt Service	0.00	1.29	0.00		<i>Excluded from this review</i>
Fixed Costs	0.40	1.09	1.08		
Other	0.70	1.08	1.01		
General Fund Total	0.82	1.05	1.07		

*See Appendix Table E.

D. HOUSEHOLD SIZE & COMPOSITION ASSUMPTIONS⁴

Housing Type	Household Size		School-Age Children		Affordable
	Average	High	Average	High	
Apartments					
1-BR	1.80	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
2-BR	2.20	2.56	0.05	0.14	0.60
3-BR	2.42	2.90	0.18	0.55	1.30
Assisted Living	1.07				
Multi-Family Condominiums					
1-BR	1.72	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
2-BR	2.19	2.25	0.08	0.18	0.32
3-BR	2.35	2.49	0.17	0.29	1.20

⁴ Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey 2006, Public User Microdata Sample (PUMS), Balance of Bristol County (Non-Urban Public User Microdata Areas); Census 2000, Summary File 3, Tables H32, H33, H39, HCT9: Easton, Massachusetts; and Community Opportunities Group, Inc. Household sizes represent the average of similar unit types built in the past eight years, sorted by price band.

Queset Commons Fiscal Impact Review

E. HISTORIC TRENDS ANALYSIS: TOTAL AND PER CAPITA GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES

SUMMARY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Notes
<i>General Government</i>	\$2,088,255	\$1,879,768	\$1,757,788	\$1,736,783	\$1,741,378	\$1,684,693	\$1,709,214	\$1,908,486	
<i>Public Safety</i>	\$5,113,461	\$5,298,724	\$5,433,551	\$5,314,416	\$5,495,877	\$5,511,510	\$5,786,096	\$6,214,243	
<i>Education</i>	\$16,795,995	\$20,825,600	\$21,893,208	\$22,601,342	\$22,650,202	\$23,815,985	\$25,046,935	\$27,482,633	
<i>Public Works</i>	\$1,324,780	\$2,526,074	\$2,096,424	\$2,138,659	\$2,025,643	\$2,347,828	\$2,206,214	\$2,381,680	
<i>Health & Human Services</i>	\$261,442	\$397,741	\$454,064	\$478,686	\$519,805	\$575,451	\$511,878	\$637,453	
<i>Culture & Recreation</i>	\$452,168	\$438,971	\$423,690	\$475,389	\$474,326	\$473,151	\$401,092	\$444,985	
<i>Debt Service</i>	\$969,244	\$3,029,005	\$3,092,328	\$2,975,206	\$3,010,105	\$3,355,192	\$3,496,158	\$3,720,304	
<i>Fixed Costs</i>	\$3,907,617	\$4,566,721	\$5,067,788	\$5,933,774	\$6,478,130	\$7,445,174	\$8,028,149	\$8,843,384	
<i>Other</i>	<u>\$364,861</u>	<u>\$406,334</u>	<u>\$448,787</u>	<u>\$471,555</u>	<u>\$654,718</u>	<u>\$709,518</u>	<u>\$751,813</u>	<u>\$757,702</u>	
<i>General Fund Total</i>	\$31,277,823	\$39,368,938	\$40,667,628	\$42,125,810	\$43,050,184	\$45,918,502	\$47,937,549	\$52,390,870	
<i>Estimated School Costs</i>	\$20,062,879	\$26,065,722	\$27,506,516	\$28,689,700	\$29,118,565	\$31,171,742	\$32,887,350	\$35,835,045	
<i>Estimated Municipal Costs</i>	\$11,214,944	\$13,303,216	\$13,161,112	\$13,436,110	\$13,931,619	\$14,746,760	\$15,050,199	\$16,113,655	
<i>School %</i>	64.1%	66.2%	67.6%	68.1%	67.6%	67.9%	68.6%	69.2%	
Conversion	0.855	0.879	0.893	0.913	0.937	0.969	1.000	1.021	
<i>General Government</i>	\$2,442,404	\$2,138,530	\$1,968,408	\$1,902,281	\$1,858,461	\$1,738,589	\$1,709,214	\$1,869,232	
<i>Public Safety</i>	\$5,980,656	\$6,028,127	\$6,084,604	\$5,820,828	\$5,865,397	\$5,687,833	\$5,786,096	\$6,086,428	
<i>Education</i>	\$19,644,439	\$23,692,378	\$24,516,470	\$24,755,030	\$24,173,108	\$24,577,900	\$25,046,935	\$26,917,368	
<i>Public Works</i>	\$1,549,450	\$2,873,804	\$2,347,619	\$2,342,452	\$2,161,839	\$2,422,939	\$2,206,214	\$2,332,693	
<i>Health & Human Services</i>	\$305,780	\$452,493	\$508,470	\$524,300	\$554,755	\$593,861	\$511,878	\$624,342	
<i>Culture & Recreation</i>	\$528,851	\$499,398	\$474,457	\$520,689	\$506,218	\$488,288	\$401,092	\$435,833	
<i>Debt Service</i>	\$1,133,619	\$3,445,967	\$3,462,853	\$3,258,714	\$3,212,492	\$3,462,530	\$3,496,158	\$3,643,785	
<i>Fixed Costs</i>	\$4,570,312	\$5,195,359	\$5,675,015	\$6,499,205	\$6,913,693	\$7,683,358	\$8,028,149	\$8,661,493	
<i>Other</i>	<u>\$426,738</u>	<u>\$462,268</u>	<u>\$502,561</u>	<u>\$516,490</u>	<u>\$698,739</u>	<u>\$732,217</u>	<u>\$751,813</u>	<u>\$742,118</u>	
<i>General Fund Total</i>	\$36,582,249	\$44,788,325	\$45,540,457	\$46,139,989	\$45,944,700	\$47,387,515	\$47,937,549	\$51,313,291	

Queset Commons Fiscal Impact Review

E. HISTORIC TRENDS ANALYSIS: TOTAL AND PER CAPITA GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES

SUMMARY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Notes
Per Capita	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
<i>General Government</i>	\$110	\$95	\$87	\$83	\$81	\$76	\$74	\$81	
<i>Public Safety</i>	\$268	\$269	\$268	\$254	\$255	\$247	\$251	\$264	
<i>Education</i>	\$881	\$1,057	\$1,080	\$1,079	\$1,051	\$1,069	\$1,088	\$1,169	
<i>Public Works</i>	\$69	\$128	\$103	\$102	\$94	\$105	\$96	\$101	
<i>Health & Human Services</i>	\$14	\$20	\$22	\$23	\$24	\$26	\$22	\$27	
<i>Culture & Recreation</i>	\$24	\$22	\$21	\$23	\$22	\$21	\$17	\$19	
<i>Debt Service</i>	\$51	\$154	\$153	\$142	\$140	\$151	\$152	\$158	
<i>Fixed Costs</i>	\$205	\$232	\$250	\$283	\$301	\$334	\$349	\$376	
<i>Other</i>	\$19	\$21	\$22	\$23	\$30	\$32	\$33	\$32	
<i>General Fund Total</i>	\$1,641	\$1,997	\$2,006	\$2,012	\$1,998	\$2,060	\$2,081	\$2,228	
Real Appreciation Per Capita	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Average
<i>General Government</i>		0.87	0.91	0.96	0.97	0.94	0.98	1.09	0.96
<i>Public Safety</i>		1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.97	1.02	1.05	1.00
<i>Education</i>		1.20	1.02	1.00	0.97	1.02	1.02	1.07	1.04
<i>Public Works</i>		1.84	0.81	0.99	0.92	1.12	0.91	1.06	1.09
<i>Health & Human Services</i>		1.47	1.11	1.02	1.05	1.07	0.86	1.22	1.12
<i>Culture & Recreation</i>		0.94	0.94	1.09	0.97	0.96	0.82	1.09	0.97
<i>Debt Service</i>		3.02	0.99	0.93	0.98	1.08	1.01	1.04	1.29
<i>Fixed Costs</i>		1.13	1.08	1.13	1.06	1.11	1.04	1.08	1.09
<i>Other</i>		1.08	1.07	1.02	1.35	1.05	1.03	0.99	1.08
<i>General Fund Total</i>		1.22	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.03	1.01	1.07	1.05