Contact:
press@welcomehomewestchester.org
914-273-0730
www.welcomehomewestchester.org
@WHWestchester

Campaign Statement

Multi-Family Housing Development Impacts in Westchester County Part One: School District Enrollment

Executive Summary

Opponents of multifamily housing projects often cite a potential increase in school-aged children and a predicted drain on local school resources as a reason to oppose building badly needed multifamily housing, especially affordable workforce housing pegged to middle-class incomes.

On the surface, this concern makes sense. Families who move to middle- to upper-income suburban communities in Westchester and across the country have typically done so because of the superb return on investment, which more than offsets paying for such high housing prices. That ROI comes in two forms: first, ever-increasing property values, and second, well above-average school districts. Any potential threats to decrease or slow the growth of property values or to undermine the quality of the school district therefore strike at the heart of what makes these communities desirable in the first place.

Although neighborhood defenders cite these concerns routinely in opposition to new proposed multifamily housing developments, statistical analyses have shown neither one to be well-founded.

The Welcome Home Westchester campaign's first report, *The Economic Benefits of Building the Housing We Need*, examined the question of property values, finding, "The vast majority of academic studies over decades have found that affordable housing does not depress neighboring property values and may even raise them in some cases."

To answer the question on schools, The Building & Realty Institute of Westchester and the Mid-Hudson Region and the Welcome Home Westchester campaign retained the firm 4ward Planning Inc. to conduct an analysis of what happened within Westchester County suburban school districts both in terms of enrollments and in terms of school taxes and school budgets when large multifamily developments opened.

To address these concerns more directly, the study looked at multifamily developments of 100 units or more that were built in Westchester County towns and villages within the past ten years. The cities of Westchester County – Yonkers, New Rochelle, Mount Vernon, White Plains, and

80 Business Park Drive, Suite 309
Armonk, NY 10504

Peekskill – were not included in the study to specifically zero in on a purely suburban school district analysis.

The study demonstrated conclusively that these recent housing developments **did not have a major impact on school enrollment.**

- In none of the multifamily residential projects with at least 100 units examined did children associated with the project and enrolled in the local school district **equal or exceed one percent** of the school's total enrollment.
- In all but two projects studied, enrolled students associated with the multifamily projects analyzed represented only a small percentage of the school districts' enrollment increase.
    - In the case of Avalon at Somers, **school enrollment declined** after residents moved into the multifamily development.
    - In the case of Rivertowns Square, the development accounted for 16 of 22 new students enrolled in the Ardsley UFSD, but that figure is still only 0.7% of the district's total enrollment that year. Moreover, the ratio of school children to units in the development was **less than 1 child for every 10 units**.

The analysis also compared estimated annual public student costs associated with the multifamily development projects in the study with the reported ad valorem tax and PILOT revenues paid by these projects. **In all cases, the projects generated a net positive financial benefit to the school taxes**, even after taking into account the costs of educating enrolled school children living in the multifamily housing.

- Estimated one-year financial benefits ranged from a low of $333,000 to a high of $1.2 million.
    - Ardsley UFSD, which had the largest ratio of new students enrolled coming from one multifamily project to increased student enrollment in the district, was <u>also</u> the school district which saw the highest one-year financial benefit of $1.2 million, even after taking into account the estimated costs of educating those children.
- The median financial benefit for one year for these Westchester school districts where 100 units of new multifamily housing were built was $465,544.
- In all cases, the percentage of school tax revenue from each housing project going to surplus instead of the estimated costs of educating the children associated with that new housing was sky high, **with the median surplus as a percentage of school tax revenue at 85.4%**

In conclusion, there is no data from recent large multifamily developments in suburban Westchester communities to substantiate the fears of a surge in student enrollment. Indeed, these projects have not merely done no harm to the districts, they have brought with them eye-popping financial surpluses which have been to the benefit of existing students and existing residents.

Multi-Family Housing Development Impacts in Westchester County

Part One: School District Enrollment

ECONOMIC AND REAL ESTATE ANALYSIS FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND USE OUTCOMES ™

4WARD PLANNING™

Background

Over the past 15 years, a number of communities, regionally and nationally, have experienced economic revitalization which has, principally, been led by multi-family development (whether rental or owner-occupied). The economic benefit to a local area from added households is obvious – more discretionary income to be spent in local retail and dining establishments and, as a result, an increase in the value of nearby commercial properties and job creation.

Less understood, is what impact such development has on a locality's public school district and parking system. For example, do smaller units (e.g., studios, one- and two-bedroom apartments) place an increased burden on local school districts, in terms of added personnel and building space? If a new multi-family residential development is built near mass transit (such as a commuter or light rail line), does it require the same amount of parking as a similar development located in a more suburban location absent mass transit?

As multi-family rental development is likely to lead the way in the post pandemic economic recovery, many municipal governments and school districts will want clarity on the above issues, in advance of extending support for such projects.

Consequently, The Building and Realty Institute (BRI) of Westchester and the Mid-Hudson Region and the Welcome Home Westchester campaign retained 4ward Planning Inc. to conduct an analysis - with *school district enrollment impacts covered here, in Part One*, and parking impacts covered in the forthcoming Part Two - which reviews the experience of several Westchester municipalities and their associated school districts, having had multi-family development completed within their jurisdictions over the past 10 years.

Key Findings: School District Enrollments

Less than one percent

In none of the multi-family residential projects with at least 100 units examined did children associated with the project and enrolled in the local school district equal or exceed one percent of the school district's total student enrollment.

Generally, study projects were not the drivers of increased enrollment.

The analysis demonstrates, with one exception, that the enrolled students associated with the multi-family projects analyzed were not significant drivers of the school districts' increased enrollment. In the case of the Ardsley UFSD, it is estimated that the Rivertowns Square development accounted for 16 of 22 new students enrolled in the year after opening, but only 0.7 percent of the district's total enrollment in that same year.

Multi-family development project revenue exceeds student costs.

An analysis of estimated annual public student costs associated with the multi-family development projects under study, along with reported ad valorem tax and PILOT revenues paid by these projects shows, in all cases, that the projects generate a net positive financial benefit to the school district (assuming the school portion of the revenues are shared with the school district). The range in the estimated positive financial benefit to the school district is $332,922 to $1,205,652, with $465,544 representing the median financial benefit for the one-year examined. Further, the median surplus as a percentage of total school tax revenue is 85.4 percent.

Selected Communities

In consultation with the BRI and Welcome Home Westchester, 4ward Planning performed a screening analysis of cities, towns, and villages within Westchester County seeking to identify communities where at least one multi-family rental project having at least 100 units was developed and occupied since 2012. While several such projects were identified in Westchester County cities, a relative few were found in the towns and villages. Recognizing that such multi-family development would likely increase in Westchester's towns and villages over the coming years, a mutual decision was made to focus on the impacts occurring in towns and villages – offering important insights to stakeholders in these communities.

This study's emphasis on multi-family development's impact on suburban school districts (as opposed to urban area school districts (e.g., Yonkers, White Plains, New Rochelle, etc.)) is meant to address objections from skeptics of multifamily housing impact analysis, as it relates to suburban school districts – specifically, that suburban municipalities are so distinct from cities as to make the application of school district impact findings from urban school district studies irrelevant to suburban school districts. While there are many characteristics which distinguish suburban communities and their school districts from cities and their school districts, recent fiscal impact studies examining the number of public-school children generated by multi-family development projects in suburban school districts (e.g., from villages and towns) show, in general, commonalities with the number of public-school children generated by multi-family properties in urban school districts.

However, it is recognized that in certain cases (e.g., a school district having an exceptional reputation relative to all other area school districts) the number of public-school children produced by a multi-family residential project may be higher than what would otherwise be expected; these situations are rare, however.

Selected Communities

The below table exhibits the development projects selected and the host village or town, and school district.

Development	*Units*	*Year Opened*	*Village or Town*	*School District*
Avalon at Ossining	168	2014	Village of Ossining	Ossining UFSD
Quarry Place	106	2015	Tuckahoe	Tuckahoe UFSD
Harbor Square	188	2016	Village of Ossining	Ossining UFSD
Danforth Apartments at Rivertowns Square	202	2016	Dobbs Ferry	Ardsley UFSD
Avalon at Somers	153	2018	Somers	Somers Central SD

Source: Apartmenst.com; Rent.com; 4ward Planning, 2021.

Selected Communities: Demographic Context

Profile data for each of the host communities is exhibited below. The majority of the communities examined are affluent, and it is generally the case that new residential development (whether single- or multi-family housing) will have price points and rental rates reflective of high household incomes.

Municipality	*Total Est. Pop. (2021)*	*Est. Pop. Density (2021)*	*Est. Households (2021)*	*Est. Household Density (2021)*	*Est. Median Household Income (2021)*
Ossining Village	25,995	8,235/sq. mile	8,542	2,706/sq. mile	$75,380
Tuckahoe Village	6,841	11,449/sq. mile	3,005	5,029/sq. mile	$94,224
Dobbs Ferry Village	11,316	4,658/sq. mile	4,098	1,687/sq. mile	$156,819
Somers Town	21,651	730/sq. mile	7,956	268/sq. mile	$141,928

Source: Esri, 2021; U.S. Census, 2021.

School District Enrollment Trends

Total numbers of enrolled students were collected from the subject school districts and the New York State Education Department statistics database* for all five school districts representing the period 2012-2022 (enrollment data was obtained for the year prior to the opening of a given development project and, thus, enrollment data is not displayed for all years for three of the four school districts). Numbers in red indicate years when selected multi-family developments opened in that district.

School District	*Students Enrolled, 2012-13*	*Students Enrolled, 2013-14*	*Students Enrolled, 2014-15*	*Students Enrolled, 2015-16*	*Students Enrolled, 2016-17*	*Students Enrolled, 2017-18*	*Students Enrolled, 2018-19*	*Students Enrolled, 2019-20*	*Students Enrolled, 2020-21*	*Students Enrolled, 2021-22*
Ossining UFSD	4,416	4,467	4,614	4,693	4,773	4,817	4,795	4,774	4,859	4,979
Tuckahoe UFSD	NA	1,060	1,057	1,099	1,164	1,172	1,156	1,184	1,138	1,148
Ardsley UFSD	NA	NA	2,077	2,081	2,097	2,216	2,276	2,325	2,311	2,336
Somers Central SD	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,076	2,982	2,948	2,862	2,788	2,718

*https://data.nysed.gov/

Methodology: Fiscal Impact Analysis

Ideally, an analysis of the number of public school-age children generated by new multi-family residential development would rely on student enrollment figures provided by the host school districts. That is, the local school district would be able to identify students by address (associated with a particular multi-family building).

Accordingly, between early January to mid-February 2022, 4ward Planning emailed the school district business administrators previously contacted for total enrollment and budget data for each of the four studied districts. Where no responses were received, another round of email requests were submitted and follow up telephone calls made, where necessary. The Somers Central School District never responded; the Ardsley school district responded that residential development-specific enrollment data is not customarily collected, and the Tuckahoe and Ossining districts instructed that we fill out FOIL requests.

The Tuckahoe district responded to our FOIL request by stating that residential development-specific data is not customarily collected. Only the Ossining school district, after having filed a FOIL request, furnished a detailed accounting of residential development-specific district enrollment data for the subject multi-family development projects: Avalon at Ossining and Harbor Square. The enrollment data for these two projects are utilized in this analysis.

Consequently, 4ward Planning utilized third-party research findings for the three school districts for which enrollment data was not obtained, in order to derive enrollment estimates.

Methodology: Fiscal Impact Analysis (continued)

To estimate the number of public school-age children likely to occupy any of the subject rental projects located in the Ardsley, Tuckahoe or Somers school districts, 4ward Planning used research findings from a 2019 report produced by The Real Estate Institute at Stony Brook University (REI). REI, in collaboration with Cushman and Wakefield, and Rampart Insurance Services, examined "the enrollment effect that new residential developments on Long Island might have on local school districts."

REI, utilizing CoStar's proprietary real estate database, randomly selected 14 multi-family apartment complexes (five within Nassau County and nine within Suffolk County) which were developed and occupied since 2003. Each apartment complex had a minimum of 200 units, and a total of 10 public school districts were associated with the 14 complexes (*see Market Rate Apartment School Aged Children Study, REI at Stony Brook University College of Business, April 2019*).

It should be noted that the authors of the above study were able to receive enrollment figures by property, after having filed a FOIL request with each school district.

While the REI study's subject multi-family properties and school districts are in nearby Nassau and Suffolk Counties, the character and scale of development, as well as the suburban nature of the communities and school districts in which the multi-family projects were developed, make the study's findings relevant to the Westchester multi-family housing impact analysis. Indeed, some of the multi-family residential projects identified in the Long Island study were developed by the same developer of projects in Westchester (AvalonBay Communities).

Methodology: Fiscal Impact Analysis (continued)

Below is a listing of the 14 complexes included in the REI study, along with the associated number of units per complex, year built, and municipal and the school district jurisdictions:

Apartment Complex	Units	Year Built	Municipal Jurisdiction	School District
Avalon at Glen Cove	367	2004	Glen Cove	Glen Cove
Avalon Westbury	396	2004	Westbury	Uniondale
Fairfield Knolls at Port Jefferson	291	2004	Port Jefferson Station	Brookhaven-Comsewogue
The Point at Pine Ridge	450	2006	Coram	Longwood
Medford Pond	200	2007	Medford	Patchogue-Medford
Enclave at Charles Pond	200	2009	Coram	Longwood
Avalon Garden City	204	2012	Garden City	Uniondale
Avalon Huntington	303	2014	Huntington Station	Huntington
New Village at Patchoge	291	2014	Patchogue	Patchogue-Medford
The Allure Mineola	275	2015	Mineola	Mineola
The Jefferson at Farmingdale	154	2015	Farmingdale	Farmingdale
The Reserve at the Boulevard	240	2016	Yaphank	Longwood
One Third Avenue	315	2016	Mineola	Mineola
The Cornerstone at Farmingdale	42	2016	Farmingdale	Farmingdale

Source: Market Rate Apartment School Aged Children Study; REI at Stony Brook University College of Business, 2019.

Methodology: Fiscal Impact Analysis (continued)

The below table presents the highest number of school-age children that any one complex reported over the period of time since opened, along with the ratio of these students to total units of the subject property:

Apartment Complex	Units	Highest Number of Students	Student/unit Ratio	School District
Avalon at Glen Cove	367	32	.09	Glen Cove
Avalon Westbury	396	46	.12	Uniondale
Fairfield Knolls at Port Jefferson	291	2	.01	Brookhaven-Comsewogue
The Point at Pine Ridge	450	71	.16	Longwood
Medford Pond	200	53	.27	Patchogue-Medford
Enclave at Charles Pond	200	33	.17	Longwood
Avalon Garden City	204	13	.06	Uniondale
Avalon Huntington	303	56	.18	Huntington
New Village at Patchoge	291	20	.07	Patchogue-Medford
The Allure Mineola	275	7	.03	Mineola
The Jefferson at Farmingdale	154	6	.04	Farmingdale
The Reserve at the Boulevard	240	25	.10	Longwood
One Third Avenue	315	15	.05	Mineola
The Cornerstone at Farmingdale	42	3	.07	Farmingdale
Mean[1]	**266**	**27**	**.10**	
Median[1]	**283**	**23**	**.08**	

[1] Values are rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Source: *Market Rate Apartment School Aged Children Study*; REI at Stony Brook University College of Business, 2019.

Methodology: Fiscal Impact Analysis (continued)

As exhibited on the preceding page, the reported number of school-age children per every 100 units of multi-family rental housing is relatively low. Based on the metrics presented, the mean number of school-age children per 100 units is approximately 10; the median is slightly lower, at eight per 100 units.

This relatively low ratio of school-age children per 100 multi-family housing units has important implications, insofar as school service costs are concerned. Specifically, arguments are often made (with little factual support) that multi-family development complexes will significantly impact a local school district (e.g., create overcrowding and substantially increase the district's operating and capital costs). While there are certainly instances where a new multi-family development complex may have contributed to a significant increase in a local school district's operating and capital budgets, over the past 15 years, it is more the exception than the rule, based on 4ward Planning's considerable analysis of a variety of urban and suburban school district enrollment trends within the northeastern U.S.

Indeed, often, flat or declining enrollments over the past 10 to 15 years has meant there is existing slack (in terms of school building space and professional personnel) in many of these school systems, such that the addition of a few new students (spread over grade levels and years of enrollment) has relatively little impact on a school system's budget.

Based on the estimated public school-age children multiplier median of eight students per 100 units, the number of estimated students associated with the four multi-family residential projects in those school districts since the opening of the Westchester County based properties is presented on the following page.

School District Enrollment Trends

The table below shows the change in total student enrollment for each school district related project from the year prior to the project's opening to a year after opening, along with number of enrolled students from each project and associated percentage of total enrollment. Actual enrollment figures associated with the multi-family development projects are shown for the Ossining school district and estimated enrollment numbers associated with multi-family development for the Tuckahoe, Ardsley and Somers school districts are derived by multiplying total residential units by the earlier identified 0.08 (eight students per 100 units) and rounding up.

School District	*Enrollment Numbers as of the **Year Prior** to Residential Occupancy*	*Enrollment Numbers as of the **Year After** Residential Occupancy*	*Difference in Enrollment between Year Prior and Year After*	*Enrolled Students Associated with Residential Project (year after)*	*Project Related Students as a Pct. of Total Enrollment (year after)*
Ossining UFSD (Avalon at Ossining -168 Units)	4,416 (2012-13)	4,614 (2014-15)	+198	23[a]	0.4%
Tuckahoe UFSD (Quarry Place – 106 Units)	1,060 (2013-14)	1,099 (2015-16)	+39	9[b]	0.8%
Ossining UFSD (Harbor Square – 188 Units)	4,614 (2014-15)	4,773 (2016-17)	+159	0[a]	0.0%
Ardsley UFSD (Rivertowns Square – 202 Units)	2,077 (2014-15)	2,097 (2016-17)	+22	16[b]	0.8%
Somers Central SD (Avalon at Somers – 153 Units)	3,076 (2016-17)	2,948 (2018-19)	-128	12[b]	0.4%

The table shows that in the year after opening, both actual enrollment related to multi-family projects and estimated enrollment figures were below one-percent of total enrollment in the year after project opening.

[a]Source: Ossining UFSD, Office of the Superintendent; [b]Estimate based on multiplying total residential units by 0.08

School District Enrollment Trends

The table below exhibits the total enrollment figures for the Ossining UFSD from the 2014-15 through 2021-22 academic year, along with actual student enrollment associated with the subject multi-family project since opening and the percentage of total enrollment (in parentheses). As shown, student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment has averaged 0.6- and 0.3-percent for Avalon at Ossining and Harbor Square, respectively.

School Year	Ossining UFSD Total Enrollment	Avalon at Ossining	Harbor Square
2014-15	4,614	23 (0.4%)	-
2015-16	4,693	31 (0.6%)	-
2016-17	4,773	32 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
2017-18	4,817	21 (0.4%)	17 (0.3%
2018-19	4,795	21 (0.4%)	17 (0.4%)
2019-20	4,774	26 (0.5%)	20 (0.4%)
2020-21	4,859	27 (0.6%)	16 (0.3%)
2021-22	4,979	35 (0.7%)	11 (0.2%)
Average	4,788	27 (0.6%)	14 (0.3%)

In no year shown does the combined enrollment figures equal one-percent of the total school district enrollment.

Finally, the student enrollment figures shown represent students spread out across K-12 grade levels and unless any of the students had special needs requiring additional personnel or special capital improvements, it is unlikely that the school district would have realized any significant expenditures associated with the students from these apartment complexes.

Source: Ossining Union Free School District, 2022

School District Budget Trends

Lastly, to ascertain the impact new student enrollment has had on public education expenditures, the annual adopted budgets of districts that realized **an increase**[1] in total student enrollment for each year since the occupancy of selected developments were analyzed.

School District	*Total Adopted Budget, 2014-15*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2015-16*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2016-17*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2017-18*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2018-19*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2019-20*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2020-21*	*Total Adopted Budget, 2021-22*
Ossining UFSD	$114.5MM	$117.2MM	$125.2MM	$125.7MM	$128.7MM	$134.0MM	$137.0MM	$139.8MM
Tuckahoe UFSD		$32.0MM	$31.9MM	$32.5MM	$34.0MM	$35.5MM	$36.4MM	$36.9MM
Ardsley CSD				$67.2MM	$70.0MM	$72.3MM	$73.0MM	$74.7MM

Districts across the selected communities, including the Somers Central district (not shown here), that experienced falling enrollment, have seen their budgets consistently grow throughout the time period observed. This makes drawing a relationship between changes in spending and student count unfeasible, based on this data alone.

[1]4ward Planning is showing budgets for districts having realized an increase in enrollment, only, to better show a relationship between budget increases and multi-family project related enrollment.)

Methodology: Adjusting School District Budgets

The most widely used technique for performing fiscal impact analyses (the per capita approach) has, with few exceptions, included all line-item expenditures within municipal and school district annual budgets. Ostensibly, this approach makes sense, as, if the objective is to derive a per capita budget expenditure cost, the sum total of all expenditure line items should be included when dividing by the current jurisdiction's population or households. However, this approach grossly overestimates the likely per capita/per household cost due to the inclusion of salaries, wages and fringe benefit costs of municipal and school district personnel, as well as the inclusion of capital outlays, fund transfers and debt service payments by municipal government and school districts.

The underlying theory of the per capita approach is that a pro rata share of goods and services are exhausted (worn out) by each resident's (or household's) consumption of said goods, services, and natural resources over some period of time (whether a month, a year or five years). For, example, a municipality has a certain number of housing units, each of which will receive notices over the course of the year from the municipality (e.g., tax notices, water and/or sewer bill notices, health department notices, etc.). These notices are mailed and, thus, consume paper, ink and postage, in addition to the labor involved in processing said notices. Separating out labor cost, for the moment, there is a known total cost for producing these notices and, via a simple calculation, the cost per household (recognizing that regardless of the number of household members, there is, with few exceptions, only one notice sent per household). Consequently, should additional households form within that municipality, the increase in total costs associated with sending public notices should, ostensibly, be known in advance, as the additional cost is simply a function of the per household cost multiplied by the number of new households.

Methodology: Adjusting School District Budgets (continued)

Similarly, a school district will purchase a certain number of textbooks based on the student enrollment within its district. If there is an influx of new residents and the number of students is projected to increase over the current student enrollment figure, than more textbooks will be purchased and a known additional cost can be derived (note: where the school district has a sufficient number of textbooks prior to new students arriving, either due to an unexpected decrease in enrollment in prior years or its having purchased more text books than necessary, no incremental textbook cost should be attributed to each new student, as the textbook costs are already amortized over the existing student body in place, prior to the arrival of the new students). Additionally, the same logic would apply to other supplies, such as paper, pens and pencils, notebooks, chalk, staples, markers, etc.) that a school district would purchase.

While a case is easily made for the consumption of municipal and school district supplies and materials associated with residents, households and students, the consumption or wearing out of personnel (whether municipal or school district associated) cannot be calculated in a similar manner. Specifically, the addition of residents and households to a municipality doesn't diminish the physical capacities of the town clerk, public works director or health department director, or their staffs; as while they may have to spend a marginal amount of additional time in providing service to additional residents, each of these workers will continue to work an eight hour shift and earn the same wage or salary, regardless of whether the municipality experienced an increase in 100 households or a decrease 100 households (this is an economies of scale effect). The same can be said of school district personnel – an increase or decrease in enrollment, generally, will have little practical impact on the capacity and cost of the district employee.

Methodology: Adjusting School District Budgets (continued)

However, while municipal and school district personnel are not "consumed" in the same way as office supplies, there comes a point at which additional residents (in the case of a municipal employee) or additional students (in the case of a school district employee) necessitates greater capacity than can be provided by existing personnel (most municipal and school district employees are full-time salaried personnel and, thus, for all intents and purposes, their service delivery per day, week, month and year remains relatively fixed, regardless of the change in population (municipal) or student enrollment (school district)). It is in these situations that additional personnel are, generally, hired and an attendant increase in personnel cost incurred by the municipality and/or school district.

Conducting interviews with school district superintendents (the Case Study approach) for purposes of understanding existing service delivery capacities and how these capacities might be over-burdened with an increase of public-school students is a superior approach to identifying the prospective school district personnel impact (staffing and associated costs) than using the per capita method which automatically assumes each new student will require additional personnel and associated costs.

For example, two or three new students who are assigned to a classroom which has four or five available desks, extra textbooks, and a teacher already present are not likely to cause the school district to increase personnel or associated costs; that is, sufficient capacity to accommodate these students is evident.

Methodology: Adjusting School District Budgets (continued)

The exclusion of capital outlays, fund transfers, contractual expenditures, debt service payments, and certain other non-personnel related costs from budget expenditures, in advance of performing a fiscal impact analysis is only logical, as these expenditures, while real, are not influenced by the increase or decrease in the number of enrolled students in a given jurisdiction. For example, the amount of debt payments will not fluctuate if 40 new students arrive or 40 new students leave.

Consequently, to include these budget expenditures in the analysis is to overestimate service costs associated with new students.

Estimated Per Pupil Annual Expenditure: Ossining UFSD

Total 2021-22 Budget Expenditures	**139,817,795**
Less	
Salaries	*$70,406,043*
Employee Benefits	*$31,900,407*
Debt Service	*$5,540,000*
Capital Projects & Transfers	*$6,950,000*
Adjusted Expenditures	$25,021,345
2021-22 Enrollment	4,979
Adjusted Budget Expenditures/Student	$5,025
New Students Associated with Project	35
Estimated One-Year Total Cost	$175,888

Estimated Per Pupil Annual Expenditure: Ossining UFSD

FY 2021-22 School District Expenditures -Ossining UFSD

Development: Harbor Square

Total 2021-22 Budget Expenditures	**139,817,795**
Less	
Salaries	*$70,406,043*
Employee Benefits	*$31,900,407*
Debt Service	*$5,540,000*
Capital Projects & Transfers	*$6,950,000*
Adjusted Expenditures	$25,021,345
2021-22 Enrollment	4,979
Adjusted Budget Expenditures/Student	$5,025
New Students Associated with Project	11
Estimated One-Year Total Cost	$55,279

Estimated Per Pupil Annual Expenditure: Tuckahoe UFSD

FY 2021-22 School District Expenditures - Tuckahoe UFSD

Development: Quarry Place

Total 2020-21 Budget Expenditures	**36,926,600**
Less	
Salaries	*$19,189,719*
Employee Benefits	*$7,890,983*
Debt Service	*$1,892,140*
Capital Projects & Transfers	*$315,000*
Adjusted Expenditures	$7,638,758
2021-22 Enrollment	1,148
Adjusted Budget Expenditures/Student	$6,654
New Students Associated with Project	9
Estimated One-Year Total Cost	$59,886

Estimated Per Pupil Annual Expenditure: Ardsley UFSD

FY 2021-22 School District Expenditures - Ardsley UFSD

Development: Rivertowns Square

Total 2021-22 Budget Expenditures	**74,680,461**
Less	
Salaries	*$39,936,883*
Employee Benefits	*$16,835,442*
Debt Service	*$0*
Capital Projects & Transfers	*$4,822,808*
Adjusted Expenditures	$13,085,328
2021-22 Enrollment	2,336
Adjusted Budget Expenditures/Student	$5,602
New Students Associated with Project	16
Estimated One-Year Total Cost	$89,626

Estimating Annual Real Property Revenue

4ward Planning utilized address information to identify real property tax data for each of the four multi-family properties where school district enrollments increased since the opening of the properties. Further, tax equalization rate data was obtained from the Westchester County Tax Assessor's website.

As the Harbor Square development (located in the village of Ossining) is the only project which is subject to a payment in-lieu-of tax (PILOT)[1] incentive, the County of Westchester Industrial Development Agency (IDA) 2020 annual report was obtained to identify the portion of the PILOT payment made to the Ossining UFSD (Note: 2020 is the latest year for which an annual financial statement is available from the county IDA).

Exhibited in the below table are the values used to derive the 2021 real property tax levy for those properties not subject to a PILOT agreement:

School District	*Estimated Full Market Value - 2021*[2]	*2021 Equalization Rate*[3]	*2021 Estimated Taxable Value*	*2021 School Tax Rate/$1,000*[4]	*2021 Estimated Property Tax Levy*
Avalon-at-Ossining Ossining UFSD	**$31,701,500**	**1.0000**	**$31,701,500**	**24.286195**	**$769,909**
Quarry Place Tuckahoe UFSD	**$19,966,942**	**0.0121**	**$241,600**	**1,642.961200**	**$396,939**
Rivertowns Square Ardsley UFSD	**$57,046,900**	**1.0000**	**$57,046,900**	**22.7055**	**$1,295,278**

[1] See the BRI and Welcome Home Westchester "What Is a PILOT?" video at https://youtu.be/k7o7cf8oKs0;
[2] Local tax assessor websites16;
[3] Westchester County Tax Commission website;
[4] Westchester County Tax Commission website.

Estimated Annual School Costs vs. Annual Real Property Revenue

The table below exhibits the estimated adjusted per pupil annual cost (based on the preceding methodology), estimated number of public-school students associated with the subject multi-family residential project and calculated total annual school district service costs. These values are then compared against the real property revenue (whether ad valorem or PILOT) generated by the project to determine one-year annual impact. As exhibited in the table, each of the projects is estimated to generate a net surplus, with the median net surplus estimated at $465,544 and 85.4 percent representing the median surplus as percentage of total tax revenues.

School District	*Est. Annual Cost per Student[1] (2022)*	*Est. Avg. Number of Students[2]*	*Est. Total Annual Cost (2022)*	*School Tax Revenue from Multi-family Development Project (2020-21)[3]*	*Estimated Net Surplus*	*Surplus as a Pct. of Total School Tax Revenue*
Ossining UFSD Avalon-at-Ossining	**$5,025**	**35**	**$175,875**	**$769,909**	**$594,034**	**77.2%**
Ossining UFSD Harbor Square	**$5,025**	**11**	**$55,275**	**$388,197**	**$332,922**	**85.8%**
Tuckahoe UFSD Quarry Place	**$6,654**	**9**	**$59,886**	**$396,939**	**$337,053**	**84.9%**
Ardsley UFSD Rivertowns Square	**$5602**	**16**	**$89,626**	**$1,295,278**	**$1,205,652**	**93.1%**

[1]Derived per the adjusted school budget methodology described on pages 16 through 19;
[2]Per earlier identified methodology;
[3]Ad valorem tax and PILOT revenue data is the most complete for the years 2021 and 2020, respectively. It is assumed that 2022 ad valorem tax and PILOT revenue for each of the projects would be greater and, therefore, result in a larger positive financial impact for the school district.

Findings Summary

As exhibited in the previous table, reported 2021 annual real property tax and 2020 PILOT revenue for all projects examined exceeds the estimated aggregate school 2021 costs associated with the public-school children produced by these properties (2021 is the latest year for which complete ad valorem tax revenue data is published for all properties examined and 2020 is the latest year for which PILOT data was obtained; it is assumed that if 2022 ad valorem tax and PILOT data were available for these properties, the positive difference between revenues and estimated school district costs would be much greater).

For the single year examined, the median net positive impact per district is $465,544. The greatest impact is $1,205,652 for the Ardsley UFSD (Rivertowns Square), and the smallest impact is $332,922 for the Ossining UFSD (Harbor Square).

While 4ward Planning is unaware of any additional personnel having to be hired as a result of the additional public-school students associated with the subject multi-family projects, it is reasonably assumed that the relatively large net surpluses generated by each of the projects would adequately cover associated personnel costs if additional school personnel were required.

The preceding analysis demonstrates that annual multi-family project real property tax revenue, generally, more than covers the annual costs associated with the public-school children associated with the project.

For more information, please contact:

Todd Poole
646.383.3611 x1
tpoole@landuseimpacts.com