FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
Proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin Development
Upper Dublin Township, Montgomery County

March 16, 2016

Prepared for:
BET Investments
200 Witmer Road, Suite 200
Horsham, PA 19044

Prepared by:
David C. Babbitt, AICP
David C. Babbitt & Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 922
Frazer, PA 19355-0922
Phone 610-651-5717
Fax 610-651-5718
www.babbittplanning.com
david@babbittplanning.com

Fiscal Impact Analysis

Proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin Development
Upper Dublin Township
Montgomery County

March 16, 2016

This report examines the annual fiscal impact to Upper Dublin Township, the Upper Dublin School District (UDSD), and Montgomery County of the Promenade at Upper Dublin development project proposed by BET Investments for the Prudential Site. The report examines the fiscal impact to the Township, School District and County during any given year after the completion of the proposed project and full occupancy, based on 2016 levels of revenue, expenditures, and taxation.

The proposed mixed use project consists of the following elements:

- 173 one bedroom apartment units, to be rented for an average of approximately $2,000 per month.
- 260 two bedroom apartment units, to be rented for an average of approximately $2,200 per month.
- 7,700 square feet of retail commercial development, in two pad sites along Dreshertown Road.
- 122,300 square feet of retail commercial development, on the ground floor of the apartment buildings.
- 513 structured parking spaces. The remainder of the parking will be surface parking.

In all, the proposed development includes 433 multifamily apartment units, 130,000 square feet of retail development, and a 513 car parking garage. This proposed development scenario will be measured against the approved plan for a by right office building of 262,500 square feet with surface parking.

The table below shows the annual net fiscal impact (revenue minus expenditures) to the Township, School District and County of each proposed use and dwelling type. Below the table are sections on assessments and demographics, Township expenditures and revenue, School District expenditures and revenue, and County expenditures and revenue. At the end of this report are the spreadsheets for the Township, School District and County impact, which show the major expenditure and revenue categories for each entity. All cell addresses in the text refer to these spreadsheets.

Proposed Use	Number of Units/SF/ Spaces	Annual Net Township Impact	Annual Net School District Impact	Annual Net County Impact	**Annual Net Combined Impact**	Annual Net Combined Impact per Unit/1K SF/Space
1 BR Apartments	173	$58,630	$473,575	$38,376	**$570,581**	$3,298
2 BR Apartments	260	$56,158	$620,289	$51,842	**$728,288**	$2,801
Retail Pad Sites	7,700	$10,424	$50,584	$5,336	**$66,344**	$8,616
In-Line Retail	122,300	$93,807	$595,844	$61,898	**$751,549**	$6,145
Struct. Parking	513	$27,193	$153,185	$16,954	**$197,332**	$385
Total Proposed	**433 / 130,000 / 513**	**$246,212**	**$1,893,476**	**$174,406**	**$2,314,094**	--
By Right Office	**262,500**	**$238,979**	**$750,836**	**$80,927**	**$1,070,742**	**$4,079**

The annual net fiscal impact of the proposed project is projected to be favorable for the Township, School District and County, creating annual surpluses for each entity. **The annual net combined fiscal impact for the proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin development is projected to total positive (or surplus) $2,314,094.** The annual combined revenue is projected to exceed the annual combined expenditures by 221.6 percent. The annual net combined fiscal impact for the by right office building is projected to total positive $1,070,742. By comparison, the existing site is assessed at $2,415,000, which generates $13,439 in annual real estate tax revenue to the Township, $75,855 in annual real estate tax revenue to the School District, and $8,353 in annual real estate tax to the County, for a total of $97,648.

There are three important reasons for the positive annual net fiscal impacts projected here:

- First, the proposed development is comprised of smaller apartment units, which house fewer persons and fewer school age children than four bedroom single family detached dwellings, the predominant dwelling type in the Township. The lower number of persons and school age children result in lower expenditures for the Township, School District and County, which lead to annual surpluses for each entity.
- Second, the proposed apartments are high end, which generates higher revenue in the real estate tax and earned income tax categories.
- Third, the proposed pad sites, in-line retail commercial development and structured parking create considerable assessed value and therefore real estate tax revenue, but generate limited Township and County expenditures and no School District expenditures at all, resulting in surpluses for each entity.

The proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin development results in an annual net Township surplus ($246,212) roughly equal to that of the by right office building ($238,979). For the School District, the proposed development results in an annual net surplus that is more than $1.1 million greater than that of the by right office building, despite the fact that the proposed development generates some School District expenditures while the by right office building does not.

However, this is a false choice between these two development scenarios. The proposed mixed use development is a legitimate option, put forward by the owner of the property. The by right office building has been approved for many years, but has not been built because the market has determined that the subject site is not appropriate for a large scale office development. When the Township considered a different alternative proposal in 2006-2008 involving age restricted development, it was widely assumed that the office building would be completed within a few years; obviously this has not happened. Therefore, to view the by right office building as a reasonable alternative is unrealistic.

Projected Assessments

The projected assessed value of the proposed rental apartments is based on comparable high end apartment complexes recently constructed in eastern and central Montgomery County, shown in the table below, with data from the County Board of Assessment database.

Name	Municipality	Built	Units	Assessment	Per Unit
Regatta	Plymouth	2004	32	$3,106,220	$97,069
Avenel	Montgomery	2004	256	$28,213,000	$110,207
Station Square	Upper Gwynedd	2005	346	$35,504,000	$102,613
Glen at Lafayette Hill	Whitemarsh	1999	139	$13,631,000	$98,065
Amberley at Blue Bell	Whitpain	2006	120	$7,693,680	$64,114
Londonbury	Conshohocken	2010	309	$24,715,640	$79,986

Name	Municipality	Built	Units	Assessment	Per Unit
Riverwalk	Conshohocken	2005	375	$43,125,000	$115,000
Bridgeview	Towamencin	2013	180	$20,700,000	$115,000
TOTAL			**1,757**	**$176,688,540**	**$100,563**

Please note that the Regatta Apartments shown in this table are the units in Plymouth Township only (the units in Norristown Borough are assessed separately). The projected assessed values for the apartment units in the proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin development are $3,000 below the average for the one bedroom units (or $97,563, cell C6), and $3,000 above the average for the two bedroom units (or $103,563, cell C7).

The assessed value of the proposed retail pad sites is projected to be $209 per square foot (cell C8), which is the same as the assessment per square foot for the Bank of America across Welsh Road in Horsham Township, and the Starbucks on Easton Road in Upper Moreland Township. Both are recently constructed (2009 and 2003, respectively), and are comparable to the proposed pad sites. The assessed value of the proposed in-line retail development is projected to be $155 per square foot (cell C9), which is the same as the assessment per square foot of the Horsham Gate shopping center across Welsh Road in Horsham Township, constructed in 2009 (totaling $10,080,600 of assessed value in 64,805 square feet).

The assessed value of the structured parking is projected to be $9,500 per space (cell C10), which is slightly higher than the $9,231 per space assessment of the existing structured parking garage in Norristown built in 2008 and owned by SEPTA.

The assessed value of the by right office building is projected to be $91 per square foot, based on the following comparable office buildings in central Montgomery County. All of these buildings are recently constructed, are multistory, and have surface parking only (structured parking increases the overall assessed value, but decreases the assessed value per square foot).

Name	Address	Municipality	Built	SF	Assessment	Per SF
GI Realty Trust	101 Tournament Drive	Horsham	1998	368,495	$38,720,780	$105
Liberty	5 Walnut Grove Drive	Horsham	2000	102,474	$8,078,400	$79
Liberty	4 Walnut Grove Drive	Horsham	1998	114,300	$9,076,000	$79
URS	335 Commerce Drive	Upper Dublin	2004	75,370	$5,873,200	$78
Blue Bell Exec.	470 Norristown Road	Whitpain	1999	153,544	$13,970,000	$91
Hillcrest	721-751 Arbor Way	Whitpain	2012	476,392	$39,870,260	$84
Metro Plex	4000 Chemical Road	Plymouth	2007	120,501	$12,585,770	$104
TOTALS				**1,411,076**	**$128,174,410**	**$91**

The total projected assessed value of the entire proposed project is determined by multiplying the number of units, square feet and parking spaces (cells B6-B12) by the assessment per unit, square foot or space (cells C6-C12). The assessed value of the proposed development at buildout is projected to total $69,243,919 (cells D6-D11 and D47-D52). This $69,243,919 in projected assessed value represents 2.8 percent of the entire assessed value of Upper Dublin Township ($2,443,744,658). The assessed value of the by right office building is projected to total $23,887,500 (cells D12 and D53). Please note that the Montgomery County Board of Assessment Appeals will determine the actual assessments only when the proposed development is constructed and inspected.

Demographics

The number of persons per unit is projected to be 1.36 for all one bedroom units and 1.75 for all two bedroom units (cells E6-E7). These figures are from *Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing*, by Robert W. Burchell, David Listokin, and William Dolphin of the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR), published in June, 2006 (available at http://www.dataplace.org, under "data available"). These multipliers are based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Sample, and are specific to this dwelling type, size, rent and state. The Rutgers CUPR examined housing built between 1990 and 2000 specifically in Pennsylvania, and determined the demographic multipliers for a variety of dwelling types (detached, attached, multifamily, etc.), size (in number of bedrooms), and value or monthly rent.

The number of persons projected to reside in the proposed development is determined by multiplying the number of units (cells B6-B7) by the number of persons per unit for each dwelling type (cells E6-E7). The number of persons projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy totals 690 (cells F6-F7).

The number of workers per thousand square feet to be generated by the proposed nonresidential development is projected to be 4.00 for the pad sites, 2.00 for the in-line retail, and 3.25 for the by right office building (cells E8-E12). These figures are based on *Who Lives in New Jersey Housing? New Jersey Demographic Multipliers*, by the CUPR, published in November, 2006 (available at http://www.njmeadowlands.gov/eg/housing/intro.html). In addition to the residential demographic multipliers specific to New Jersey (which were not used in this analysis – see above for the source of the Pennsylvania multipliers used in this analysis), this document also includes nonresidential multipliers from nationwide studies. No workers are projected for the proposed parking garage.

The number of workers projected to work in the nonresidential uses is determined by multiplying the number of square feet (cells B8-B12) by the number of workers per thousand square feet (cells E8-E12). The number of workers projected to work in the proposed retail commercial development at buildout and full occupancy totals 275 (cells F8-F10). The number of workers projected to work in the by right office building at buildout and full occupancy totals 853 (cell F12). Please note that these figures represent the number of full time equivalent positions, not the number of employees. Given part time positions and turnover within positions, the number of employees for each use is likely to be higher.

The number of school age children per unit is projected to be 0.05 for all one bedroom units and 0.09 for all two bedroom units (cells E47-E48 of the School District spreadsheet). These multipliers are also from the same document by the CUPR that contains the multipliers for number of persons per unit in Pennsylvania housing, referenced above. The number of public school children is determined by multiplying the number of units (cells B47-B48) by the number of school age children per unit for each dwelling type (cells E47-E48), and by 82.6 percent (cell D77), to account for those children who will attend private schools or be schooled at home. The figure of 82.6 percent is from the 2013 American Community Survey, a function of the U.S. Census, specifically for Upper Dublin Township, which reported 4,157 public school students out of 5,034 school age children (ages 5-18). The number of UDSD students projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy totals 26 (cells F47-F48). The 26 UDSD students are projected to be distributed evenly throughout all 13 grades in the public school system. No public school students are projected to be generated by the proposed retail commercial development or structured parking, or the by right office building (cells F49-F53).

Please note that the residential demographic multipliers in the CUPR study are comparable to a similar study prepared by the Montgomery County Planning Commission, called *Characteristics of the Population in New and Existing Housing Units* (January, 2012). The MCPC study examined the 28,000 units built in the County between 2000 and 2010, and differentiated by dwelling type only (and not number of bedrooms, tenure or value). The demographic multipliers for new multifamily housing were 1.67 persons per unit and 0.04 school age children per unit. Using these multipliers, the number of residents of the proposed development is projected to total 723, the number of school age children is projected to total 17, and the number of public school students is projected to total 14. This fiscal impact analysis uses the CUPR demographic multipliers because they differentiate not only by dwelling type (like the MCPC study), but also by dwelling size, tenure and value or rent. In particular, please note that the MCPC figures include multifamily dwellings with three or more bedrooms, while the proposed development has only one and two bedroom units.

Also, please note that the number of public school students in the 2012-2013 school year generated by the 375 apartment units at the Riverwalk development in Conshohocken Borough (a comparable, high end multifamily development) was only three, for a multiplier of 0.008 public school students per unit.

Annual Upper Dublin Township Expenditures

The Upper Dublin Township budget includes the following funds, shown in the table below with their respective 2016 expenditure totals:

Fund	Budgeted Expenditure
General Fund	$17,684,203
Parks and Recreation Fund	$2,119,429
Library Fund	$1,164,735
Internal Services Fund	$2,085,263
Debt Service Fund	$2,808,897
Fire Protection Fund	$522,344
Non-Expendable Trust Fund	$5,800
Capital Projects Fund	$1,137,309
Open Space Projects Fund	$83,200
Fire Capital Fund	$1,947,550
Stormwater Management Fund	$430,000
Economic Development Fund	$1,770,000
TOTAL 2016 EXPENDITURES	**$31,758,730**

The total Township budgeted expenditures in 2016 are $31,758,730, which includes all twelve Township funds. In order to find a more accurate measure of the average annual expenditures for the proposed development, this analysis focuses on the regular, ongoing operating expenditures of the Township. Such operations are quantified in the following five funds, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the 2016 budget.

Operating Fund	Budgeted Expenditure
General Fund	$17,684,203
Parks and Recreation Fund	$2,119,429
Library Fund	$1,164,735
Debt Service Fund	$2,808,897

Operating Fund	Budgeted Expenditure
Fire Protection Fund	$522,344
TOTAL 2016 EXPENDITURES	**$24,299,608**

The five operating funds total $24,299,608 in expenditures for 2016 (cell D36). These five funds cover nearly all Township expenditures, including administration and finance, tax collection, police protection, code enforcement, sanitation, engineering, road maintenance, emergency services, parks and recreation, library, fire protection, and debt service.

The following funds, shown below with their respective sums in the 2016 budget, are excluded because they are capital funds which fluctuate significantly year to year, represent transfers between funds (and therefore double counting), and/or are not associated with ongoing operations:

- Internal Services Fund ($2,085,263), which includes charges to other departments to pay for vehicle operations, maintenance and replacement. The charges for vehicle operations and maintenance are counted in the five operating funds.

- Non-Expendable Trust Fund ($5,800), which is a fund used to track the five trusts maintained by the Township.

- Capital Projects Fund ($1,137,309), which is a capital fund using the annual liquid fuels grant from Harrisburg (which is a pure pass-through fund) as well as other sources.

- Open Space Projects Fund ($83,200), which is also a capital fund using revenue generated by the Township's fee in lieu of open space and grant revenue.

- Fire Capital Fund ($1,947,550), which is also a capital fund using excess revenue from the Fire Protection Fund (the Fire Protection Fund operating expenditures are included in the analysis) plus a bond issue, in order to fund capital expenditures such as apparatus purchases and fire house renovations.

- Storm Water Management Reserve Fund ($430,000), which is also a capital fund using revenue from various bond issues (the debt service for which is included in this analysis), to pay for stormwater management projects.

- Economic Development Fund ($1,770,000), which is a capital fund using revenue from a bond issue, state grants, and a dedicated millage (0.096 mills), to pay for improvements to the Fort Washington Office Park and not Township-wide.

In order to find a more accurate measure of the average annual expenditures for future residents of the proposed development, four categories of funds are subtracted from the total 2016 operating expenditures of $24,299,608 (cell D36):

1. Pass-Through Funds. Pass-through funds are excluded because the proposed development will have no net impact on these funds, since revenue always equals expenditures. Pass-through funds that are excluded are as follows, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the Township's 2016 budget.

Source	Fund	Budgeted Amount
Rent from NHCC	General	$18,500

Source	Fund	Budgeted Amount
Other Rent	General	$175,000
Public Utility Realty Tax	General	$25,000
State/Federal Grants	General	$110,000
Beverage License Tax	General	$4,200
Casualty Insurance Premium Tax	General	$520,984
Fire Insurance Premium Tax	General	$252,881
Fire Marshal Reports	General	$13,500
Special Police Services	General	$40,000
Crossing Guard Services	General	$72,500
Finance Department Services	General	$1,000
Police Report Fees	General	$45,000
Contracted Snow Removal	General	$147,000
Cart Fees	General	$2,500
Benefit Contributions	General	$71,000
State Grants	Parks & Recreation	$56,541
Employee Contributions	Parks & Recreation	$7,750
General Trips	Parks & Recreation	$36,775
Park Rental	Parks & Recreation	$36,600
Donations	Parks & Recreation	$34,194
North Hills Summer Camp	Parks & Recreation	$3,000
Summer Programs	Parks & Recreation	$267,401
Other Programs	Parks & Recreation	$81,353
Special Events	Parks & Recreation	$11,360
Pool Rental	Parks & Recreation	$26,750
State Grants	Library	$82,526
Fines	Library	$32,000
Book Charges	Library	$2,750
Employee Contributions	Library	$6,750
Copy/Printing	Library	$1,300
TOTAL		**$2,186,115**

2. Development Related Funds. The other pass-through category is charges related to the processing and administration of proposed subdivisions and land developments in the Township, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the Township's 2016 budget (all are in the General Fund). Such charges for services and departmental earnings are excluded because they are in essence one-time pass-through funds for specific functions normally associated with new development. For example, the Township is budgeted to receive $452,000 in building permit fees, which will be expended on the building inspections and the administration of those permits while a development is under construction, not on other functions associated with the time after a development is completed. Once a

development is completed, the revenue and expenditures for such permits and application fees decreases significantly, but not completely.

Source	Budgeted Amount
Zoning/Development Fees	$9,000
Zoning Hearing Board Fees	$25,000
Sale of Maps and Documents	$1,500
Street Opening Permits	$52,000
Building Permits	$452,000
Electrical Permits	$94,500
Plumbing Permits	$98,000
Sewage Permits	$500
TOTAL	**$732,500**

Ninety percent of the development related pass-through funds of $732,500 (or $659,250) is excluded from the total expenditures. Only 90 percent of the development related funds is excluded from the expenditure analysis, in acknowledgment that there will still be some expenditures on subdivisions and land developments once they are complete, for things like building renovations and inspections for violations. Please note that in the revenue analysis, below, only 10 percent of the revenue from development related funds (or $73,250) is included in the category of miscellaneous revenue.

3. Sanitation Expenditures. Sanitation and leaf collection expenditures are excluded, since the proposed development will not require any such Township services. The 2016 Township expenditures of $2,419,899 for sanitation and $147,150 are excluded. Please note that the revenue from sanitation services ($25,000) and recycling ($5,000) are two pass through funds which have not been subtracted above, since their associated expenditures have been excluded here.

4. Transfers. Certain transfers are excluded, in order to avoid double counting the same funds, and in order to exclude payments to capital funds for future capital expenditures. Transfers include $542,000 from the Fire Protection Fund to the Fire Capital Fund (a capital fund), and $306,859 from the Fire Protection Fund to the Debt Service Fund (already counted as Debt Service Fund expenditures), for a total of $848,859. Please note that the transfers from the General Fund and the Parks and Recreation Fund to the Pension Fund (which total $1,332,297) have not been excluded since they are required annual payments to fiduciary funds to pay for future retirement, medical, or insurance expenses.

The excluded pass-through, development related, sanitation, and transfer funds total $6,261,273 (cell D37). The 2016 net Township operating expenditures (minus pass-through, development related, sanitation expenditures and transfer funds) are $18,038,335 (cell D38). Please note that just as the expenditures for the above funds are not included in the expenditure calculations of this section, the revenue from these sources is also not included in the revenue analysis, below.

Then, the Township expenditures associated with existing nonresidential development are subtracted from the net expenditures using the "proportional valuation method" of *The New Practitioner's Guide to Fiscal Impact Analysis*. First, a portion of the total Township expenditures is assigned to existing nonresidential development, based on the average value of property. According to the Montgomery County Board of Assessment as of December, 2015, the total assessed value of the 9,637 properties in Upper Dublin Township was $2,443,744,658, yielding an average assessed value of $253,579. Of those properties, 439 were nonresidential (commercial, industrial, institutional, utility, etc., whether taxable or exempt), with a total assessed value of $613,383,563 (representing 25.1 percent of the Township total), and an average assessed value of $1,397,229. The proportion of average nonresidential assessed value to average Township assessed value (residential and nonresidential combined) is 5.51, which is then used to determine the refinement coefficient of 1.07 from a graph in the *New Practitioner's Guide*. The refinement coefficient is based on empirical research by the Rutgers University CUPR, and is necessary to adjust the costs of existing nonresidential development in communities without extensive nonresidential development of very high average assessed value, such as Upper Dublin Township. By comparison, in communities where the ratio between the average nonresidential assessment and the average overall assessment is above 6, an economy of scale reduces the nonresidential expenditures on a per square foot basis, and the refinement coefficient is below 1.00.

The proportion of Township assessed value in nonresidential uses (25.1 percent) is then multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 1.07, and by the 2016 net Township operating expenditures of $18,038,335 (cell D38). The result of this calculation is that $4,844,584 of the net Township operating expenditures (representing 26.9 percent) is attributable to existing nonresidential development (cell D39). This sum is subtracted from the 2016 net Township operating expenditures $18,038,335 (cell D38), and the remainder ($13,193,751 in expenditures attributable to existing residential development) is divided by the estimated number of Township residents in 2016, which is 26,279 (cell I36). The estimated number of Township residents is determined by taking the U.S. Census estimate for 2014 (the most recent estimate available) of 26,042, and adding two year's worth of the average annual increase between 2010 and 2014 (473 over those four years, or 118.25 additional residents per year and 237 over two years, as a result of rounding) to find the current estimate of 26,279.

The per capita Township operating expenditures attributable to existing residential development are $502.07 (cell D40). This figure is then applied to the projected number of residents of the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy (totaling 690, cells F6-F7) to find the annual projected Township operating expenditures for the proposed apartments totaling $346,572 (cells G6-G7).

The Township expenditures associated with the proposed nonresidential development (including the retail pad sites, in-line retail, and structured parking garage) are also determined using the proportional valuation method. The proposed nonresidential development has a projected assessed value totaling $25,439,300 (cells D8-D10) which is 4.1 percent of the assessed value of all 439 existing nonresidential properties in the Township (which is $613,383,563). The ratio of the projected assessed value of the proposed nonresidential development ($25,439,300) to the average assessed value of existing nonresidential properties in the Township ($1,397,229) is 18.2, which is used to determine a refinement coefficient of 0.27 from the same graph in the *Guide*. Then, the proportion of proposed assessed value to existing nonresidential assessed value (4.1 percent) is multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 0.27 and by the 2016 Township operating expenditures attributable to existing nonresidential development ($4,844,584, cell D39). The result of this calculation is that the proposed nonresidential development is projected to generate $54,249 in Township expenditures each year (cells G8-G10). This annual expenditure is apportioned among the pad sites and in-line retail development according to their respective square foot totals, with $3,213 attributed to the pad sites (5.9 percent) and $51,036 to the in-line retail (94.1 percent). The proposed structured parking garage is projected to generate no Township expenditures directly; instead, the Township expenditures are attributed to the primary uses associated with the parking (either the apartments or the retail commercial development).

The annual Township expenditures for the by right office building are also determined using the proportional valuation method. The by right office building has a projected assessed value of $23,887,500 (cell D12) which is 3.9 percent of the assessed value of all existing nonresidential properties in the Township ($613,383,563). The ratio of the projected assessed value of the proposed nonresidential development ($23,887,500) to the average assessed value of existing nonresidential properties in the Township ($1,397,229) is 17.1, which is used to determine a refinement coefficient of 0.28 from the same graph in the *Guide*. Then, the proportion of proposed assessed value to existing nonresidential assessed value (3.9 percent) is multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 0.28 and by the 2016 Township operating expenditures attributable to existing nonresidential development ($4,844,584, cell D39). The result of this calculation is that the by right office building is projected to generate $52,827 in Township expenditures each year (cell G12).

The annual Township expenditures for the entire proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin development are projected to total $400,821 (cells G6-G11). Annual Township expenditures per unit are projected to be $683 for the proposed one bedroom units and $879 for the proposed two bedroom units (cells H6-H7). Annual Township expenditures are projected to be $417 per 1,000 square feet of the proposed nonresidential development (cells H8-H9), and $201 per 1,000 square feet of the by right office building (cell H12).

Annual Upper Dublin Township Revenue

The annual Township revenue is determined by adding the following sources:

- Real estate tax revenue, based on the Township tax rate of 5.565 mills (cell I37) applied to the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D6-D11) and the projected assessed value of the by right office building ($23,887,500, cell D12). The 2016 millage rates of the five operating funds are shown below.

Fund	Millage Rates
General Fund	2.762
Parks and Recreation Fund	0.713
Library Fund	0.479
Debt Service Fund	1.000
Fire Protection Fund	0.611
TOTAL	**5.565**

  The annual real estate tax revenue is projected to total $385,342 for the proposed development (cells B17-B22) and $132,934 for the by right office building (cell B23). Please note that for the proposed development, the projected real estate tax revenue very nearly offsets the annual Township expenditures ($400,821, cells G6-G11). For the by right office building, the projected real estate tax revenue is two and one-half times the annual Township expenditures ($52,827, cell G12).

- Earned income tax revenue, determined in two ways. The earned income tax revenue for the apartment units is based on the tax rate of 0.5 percent applied to the household income of residents. Household income is calculated by multiplying the monthly rent for each dwelling type (averaging $2,000 for the one bedroom units and $2,200 for the two bedroom units, see the introduction, above) by twelve months and dividing by 25 percent, which is the industry standard for maximum percentage of household income used for rent for prospective tenants of a proposed multifamily development. The minimum annual household income for each unit is projected to be $96,000 for the one bedroom units and $105,600 for the two bedroom units. These minimum annual income levels are then multiplied by the number of units in each category (cells B6-B7) and by the tax rate of 0.5 percent, to determine the tax revenue. The revenue is then reduced by 17.6 percent to account for those residents who will work in the City of Philadelphia, and therefore pay the City's wage tax instead of Upper Dublin Township's earned income tax. The 2014 American Community Survey of the U. S. Census Bureau reports 2,285 resident workers living in the Township and working in the City out of a total of 13,002 resident workers, or 17.6 percent.

The annual earned income tax revenue from the proposed apartments is projected to total $181,600 (cells C17-C18). The earned income tax revenue for the nonresident workers at the proposed pad sites and in-line retail commercial development is determined by multiplying the number of workers (totaling 275, cells F8-F9) by the average annual wage per retail job of $45,460 (cell I38) and by the nonresident worker tax rate of 0.1 percent. This figure is then reduced by 80 percent to account for those workers who live in municipalities that charge the earned income tax. Upper Dublin Township is projected to retain only 20 percent of the earned income tax revenue it collects from the nonresident workers, and the remaining 80 percent is forwarded to the municipalities where these nonresident workers live. The annual earned income tax revenue from the proposed pad sites and in-line retail commercial development is projected to total $25,039 (cells C19-C20). No earned income tax revenue is projected from the proposed parking garages. The annual earned income tax revenue from the proposed development is projected to total $206,640 (cells C17-C22). The annual earned income tax revenue for the nonresident workers at the by right office building is determined by multiplying the number of workers (totaling 853, cell F12) by the average annual wage per office job of $61,655 (cell I39) and by the nonresident worker tax rate of 0.1 percent. This figure is then reduced by 80 percent to account for those workers who live in municipalities that charge the earned income tax. The annual earned income tax revenue from the by right office building is projected to total $105,199 (cell C23). The source for these average annual earnings is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, average mean labor wages for the Philadelphia Metropolitan Statistical Area, May, 2014 (the most recent data available).

- Local services tax revenue, determined by applying the tax rate of $52 per worker per year to the projected number of workers in the proposed development (totaling 275, cells F8-F9) and the by right office building (totaling 853, cell F12). The annual local services tax revenue is projected to total $14,321 for the proposed development (cells D17-D22) and $44,363 for the by right office building (cell D23). No local services tax revenue is projected from the proposed apartments or parking garage.

- Annual housing permit fee revenue, determined by applying the fee ($25 every two years, or $12.50 per year) to the number of units in the proposed development (totaling 433, cells B6-B7), and adding the $50 per apartment building per year (assuming two buildings). The annual housing permit fee revenue is projected to total $5,513 (cells E17-E22). No housing permit fee revenue is projected from the proposed nonresidential development, parking garage or by right office building.

- Franchise fees and miscellaneous revenue, based on the Township's budgeted revenue from these sources ($688,250 comprised of $615,000 in franchise fee revenue and $73,250 in development related revenue, representing 10 percent of the total revenue in this category associated with existing and not new development, which is $732,500; see the expenditure analysis, above) divided by the estimated number of units in the Township (9,877, cell I40), and that per unit revenue of $69.68 is applied to the units in the proposed development (totaling 433, cells B6-B7). The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue for the proposed apartment units is projected to total $30,172 (cells F17-F18). The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue from the proposed retail commercial development is determined by multiplying the same per unit revenue of $69.68 to the number square feet of proposed retail development divided by 2,000. In other words, each 2,000 square feet of retail commercial development is projected to generate the same franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue as one home. The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue from the proposed retail commercial development is projected to total $4,529 (cells F19-F20). The proposed parking garage is projected to generate only miscellaneous revenue, and no franchise fee revenue. The annual miscellaneous revenue is determined by dividing the annual Township revenue from this source ($73,250) by the estimated number of housing units in the Township (9,877, cell I40) and multiplying that per unit revenue of $7.42 by the number of parking spaces in the proposed garages divided by 100. In other words, each 100 structured parking spaces are projected to generate the same miscellaneous revenue as one home. The annual miscellaneous revenue for the proposed parking garages is projected to total $38 (cell F21). The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue for the proposed development is projected to total $34,740 (cells F17-F22). The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue for the by right office building is determined by multiplying the per unit revenue of $69.68 by the number square feet of the by right office building, divided by 2,000. Annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue for the by right office building is projected to total $9,146 (cell F23). The estimated number of 9,877 units in the Township (cell I40) is from the Montgomery County Planning Commission estimate of 2014, based on the 2010 Census total of 9,649 plus 228 units built since 2010.

- Interest earnings, based on the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D6-D11) divided by the Township's total assessed value ($2,443,744,658, according to the Board of Assessment as of December, 2015), and multiplying by the Township's projected revenue from interest earnings in the 2016 budget, totaling $16,850 and shown in the table below:

Fund	Interest Earnings
General Fund	$12,000
Parks and Recreation Fund	$1,100
Library Fund	$500
Debt Service Fund	$2,500
Fire Protection Fund	$750
TOTAL	**$16,850**

The annual interest earnings are projected to total $477 for the proposed development (cells G17-G22) and $165 for the by right office building (cell G23).

The annual Township revenue from all sources is projected to total $647,033 for the proposed development (cells H17-H22) and $291,806 for the by right office building (cell H23). The annual Township revenue is projected to be $1,022 for each one bedroom unit, $1,095 for each two bedroom unit, $1,771 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, $1,184 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, $53 per structured parking space, and $1,112 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells I17-I23).

The annual net Township impact (revenue minus expenditures) is projected to total positive $246,212 for the proposed development (cells B27-B32) and $238,979 for the by right office building (cell B33). The annual net Township revenue is projected to be $339 for each one bedroom unit, $216 for each two bedroom unit, $1,354 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, $767 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, $53 per structured parking space, and $910 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells C27-C33).

Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 49.6 percent for the one bedroom units, 24.6 percent for the two bedroom units, 324.4 percent for the retail pad sites, 183.8 percent for the in-line retail commercial development, and 61.4 percent overall (cells D27-D32). Since the structured parking garage has no Township expenditures associated directly with it, all $27,193 of annual revenue becomes surplus. Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 452.4 percent for the by right office building (cell D33).

Annual Upper Dublin School District Expenditures

The number of units, square feet of nonresidential development, and parking spaces, as well as the projected assessment per unit/square foot/space and the total projected assessment are the same as for the Township impact, above.

The Upper Dublin School District General Fund budgeted expenditures total $90,925,485 for the 2015-2016 year (cell D78 of the School District spreadsheet). The following pass-through funds are subtracted from this total:

Pass-Through Fund	Budgeted Amount
Revenue from Intermediary Sources	$501,500
Rentals	$90,000
Tuition from Patrons	$890,000
Revenue from District Activities	$112,500
Services Provided by Other LEA's	$35,000
Revenue from Community Service Activities	$275,000
TOTAL	**$1,904,000**

In addition, the budgetary reserve of $250,000 is subtracted, representing funds not projected to be expended during the school year. The pass-through funds and budgetary reserve total $2,154,000 (cell D79), with the remaining net School District expenditures totaling $88,771,485 (cell D80). This figure is then divided by the current 2015-2016 District-wide enrollment of 4,187 students (cell I78) to find the 2015-2016 UDSD net expenditure of $21,202 per student (cell I77). This per student expenditure is applied to the 26 students from the proposed development projected to attend public schools (cells F47-F52) to determine the annual projected School District expenditures of $561,132 (cells G47-G52). The annual School District expenditure per unit is projected to be $875 for the one bedroom units and $1,576 for the two bedroom units (cells H47-H48). The proposed pad sites, in-line retail commercial development and parking garage, as well as the by right office building, are projected to generate no school district students and therefore no annual school district expenditures (cells H49-H53).

Annual Upper Dublin School District Revenue

The annual School District revenue is determined by adding the following sources:

- Real estate tax revenue, based on the School District's tax rate of 31.4099 mills (cell I79) applied to the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D47-D52) and by right office building ($23,887,500, cell D53). The annual real estate tax revenue is projected to total $2,174,945 for the proposed development (cells B58-B63), and $750,304 for the by right office building (cell B64). Please note that this one revenue source is nearly four times greater than the projected annual School District expenditures of $561,132 for the proposed development (cells G47-G52).

- Earned income tax revenue, determined using the same method as was used for the Township impact, above, except that the proposed pad sites, in-line retail commercial development, parking garage and by right office building are projected to generate no earned income tax revenue for the School District. The annual earned income tax revenue is projected to total $181,600 (cells C58-C63).

- State and Federal revenue, based on the 2015-2016 UDSD budgeted revenue from those sources totaling

$15,269,554 divided by the current UDSD enrollment of 4,187 (cell I78), or $3,647 per public school student (cell I80), applied to the projected number of students from the proposed development (totaling 26, cells F47-F52). The annual state and federal revenue is projected to total $96,520 (cells D58-D63). No state and federal revenue is projected from the proposed pad sites, in-line retail commercial development, structured parking garage, or by right office building.

- Interest on investments, based on the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D47-D52) and the by right office building ($23,887,500, cell D53) divided by the School District's total assessed value ($2,243,121,348, according to the 2015-2016 UDSD budget), and multiplying by the School District's projected revenue from interest on investments in the budget ($50,000). The annual interest on investments is projected to total $1,543 for the proposed development (cells E58-E63) and $532 for the by right office building (cell E64).

The annual School District revenue from all sources is projected to total $2,454,609 for the proposed development (cells F58-F63) and $750,836 for the by right office building (cell F64). The annual School District revenue is projected to be $3,613 for each one bedroom unit, $3,961 for each two bedroom unit, $6,569 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, $4,872 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, $299 per structured parking space, and $2,860 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells G58-G64).

The annual net School District impact (revenue minus expenditures) is projected to total positive $1,893,476 for the proposed development (cells B68-B73) and positive $750,836 for the by right office building (cell B74). The annual net School District revenue is projected to be positive $2,737 for each one bedroom unit, positive $2,386 for each two bedroom unit, positive $6,569 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, positive $4,872 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, positive $299 per structured parking space, and positive $2,860 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells C68-C74).

Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 312.7 percent for the one bedroom units, 151.4 percent for the two bedroom units, and 337.4 percent overall (cells D68-D73). Since the retail pad sites, in-line retail commercial development, structured parking garage, and by right office building have no School District expenditures associated with them, every dollar of annual revenue becomes surplus.

Annual Montgomery County Expenditures

The proposed number of units, square feet of retail commercial development, structured parking spaces, as well as the average assessment per unit/square foot/space, total assessment, persons per unit, and number of persons, are the same as for the Township impact, above. Also similar to the Township impact, the annual County expenditures attributable to the proposed development are determined using the per capita multiplier method for the proposed residential development, and the proportional valuation method for the proposed nonresidential development, as follows:

The Montgomery County General Fund includes most ongoing, annual expenditures, such as administration (commissioners, assets and infrastructure, assessment appeals, controller, human resources, information technology, planning commission, public defender, purchasing, recorder of deeds, tax collection, treasurer and voter services), judicial (clerk of courts, coroner, courts, district attorney, district justices, domestic relations, jury board, law library, prothonotary, register of wills, sheriff and central processing), corrections (adult probation, juvenile probation, child care delinquent, correction facility, and youth detention center), general welfare (drug and alcohol programs, behavioral health programs, health department and community connections), adult welfare (aging and adult services, Parkhouse Center and assisted living), child welfare (youth center, children and youth administration, child care dependent and day care), public safety, and other expenditures (veterans affairs, insurance, debt service, tax refunds, professional fees, etc.).

The total expenditures in the 2016 budget are $389,722,974 (cell D117). Subtracted from this total are pass-through grant revenue funds of $136,439,383 and recoverable expenditures of $1,500,000, for a total of $137,939,383 (cell D118). Also subtracted are several expenditures that former Montgomery County Finance Director Jon B. Ganser believed are largely unrelated to new development. In this category are 95 percent of the following expenditures: district attorney, courts, clerk of courts, prison, sheriff, prothonotary, central processing, juvenile probation, adult probation, youth detention, Parkhouse and human services center; 90 percent of the district justice office expenditures; and 80 percent of the expenditures for children and youth administration, child care dependent, and health department. These excluded expenditures (minus any pass-through grant revenue already subtracted) total $103,466,097 in the 2016 budget (cell D119), and are also subtracted from the total expenditures to determine the net 2016 County expenditures of $148,317,494 (cell D120).

Then, the County expenditures associated with existing nonresidential development are determined using the proportional valuation method of *The New Practitioner's Guide*. According to the Montgomery County Board of Assessment computer records as of December, 2015, the total assessed value of the 299,676 properties in the County is $66,708,106,101, yielding an average assessed value of $222,601. Of those properties, 22,546 are nonresidential (commercial, industrial, institutional, utility, etc., regardless of whether they are taxable or exempt), with a total assessed value of $20,149,233,890 (representing 30.2 percent of the County total), and an average assessed value of $893,694.

The proportion of average nonresidential assessed value to average County assessed value (residential and nonresidential combined) is 4.01, which is then used to determine the refinement coefficient of 1.27 from a graph in the *New Practitioner's Guide*. Again, the refinement coefficient is based on empirical research by the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, and is necessary to adjust the expenditures of existing nonresidential development in communities without extensive nonresidential development of very high average assessed value, such as Montgomery County. The ratio of nonresidential assessed value to total County assessed value (30.2 percent) is then multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 1.27, and by the 2016 net County general fund expenditures ($148,317,494, cell D120). The result of this calculation is that $56,895,252 of the net County expenditures (representing 38.4 percent) is attributable to existing nonresidential development (cell D121). This figure is subtracted from the 2016 net County general fund expenditures ($148,317,494, cell D120) and the remainder (expenditures attributable to existing residential development) is divided by the estimated number of County residents in 2016, which is 825,349 (cell I117). The estimated number of County residents is determined by taking the U.S. Census estimate for July, 2014 of 816,857, and adding two year's worth of the increase between 2010 and 2014 (16,983 additional residents over those four years, or 4,246 per year) to find the 2016 estimate of 825,349 (cell I117).

The 2016 per capita County General Fund expenditures attributable to existing residential development are $110.77 (cell I118). This figure is then applied to the projected number of residents of the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy (totaling 690, cells F87-F88) to find the annual projected County expenditures of $76,461 (cells G87-G88). Annual County expenditures per unit are projected to be $151 for the one bedroom units and $194 for the two bedroom units (cells H87-H88).

The annual County expenditures for the proposed nonresidential development are determined using the proportional valuation method, based on the projected assessed value of the development, including another refinement coefficient, and apportioned between the various uses according to the distribution of square feet of development. The proposed nonresidential development has a projected assessed value totaling $25,439,300 (cells D89-D91) which is 0.13 percent of the assessed value of all 22,546 existing nonresidential properties in the County (which is $20,149,233,890). The ratio of the projected assessed value of the proposed nonresidential development ($25,439,300) to the average assessed value of existing nonresidential properties in the County ($222,601) is 114.3, which is used to determine a refinement coefficient of 0.08 from the same graph in the *Guide*. Then, the proportion of proposed assessed value to existing nonresidential assessed value (0.13 percent) is multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 0.08 and by the 2016 County operating expenditures attributable to existing nonresidential development ($56,895,252, cell D121). The result of this calculation is that the proposed nonresidential development is projected to generate $5,747 in County expenditures each year (cells G8-G10). This annual expenditure is apportioned among the pad sites and in-line retail development according to their respective square foot totals, with $340 attributed to the pad sites (5.9 percent) and $5,406 to the in-line retail (94.1 percent). The proposed structured parking garage is projected to generate no County expenditures directly; instead, the County expenditures are attributed to the primary uses associated with the parking (either the apartments or the retail commercial development).

The annual County expenditures for the by right office building are also determined using the proportional valuation method. The by right office building has a projected assessed value of $23,887,500 (cell D93) which is 0.12 percent of the assessed value of all existing nonresidential properties in the County ($20,149,233,890). The ratio of the projected assessed value of the proposed nonresidential development ($23,887,500) to the average assessed value of existing nonresidential properties in the County ($222,601) is 107.3, which is used to determine a refinement coefficient of 0.08 from the same graph in the *Guide*. Then, the proportion of proposed assessed value to existing nonresidential assessed value (0.12 percent) is multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 0.08 and by the 2016 County operating expenditures attributable to existing nonresidential development ($56,895,252 cell D121). The result of this calculation is that the by right office building is projected to generate $5,396 in County expenditures each year (cell G93).

The annual County expenditures for the entire proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin development are projected to total $82,208 (cells G87-G92). Annual County expenditures per unit are projected to be $151 for the proposed one bedroom units and $194 for the proposed two bedroom units (cells H87-H88). Annual County expenditures are projected to be $44 per 1,000 square feet of the proposed nonresidential development (cells H89-H90), and $21 per 1,000 square feet of the by right office building (cell H93). The proposed structured parking is projected to generate no direct County expenditures.

Annual Montgomery County Revenue

The annual County revenue is determined by adding the following sources:

- Real estate tax revenue, based on the County millage rate of 3.459 (cell I119) applied to the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D87-D92) and by right office building ($23,887,500, cell D93). The annual real estate tax revenue is projected to total $239,515 for the proposed development (cells B98-B103), and $82,627 for the by right office building (cell B104). Please note that this one revenue source is nearly three times greater than the projected annual County expenditures of $82,208 for the proposed development (cells G87-G92).

- Departmental revenue, determined by dividing the County's budgeted revenue from charges for services ($49,352,389 minus $20,583,200 in departmental revenue from the excluded departments, above, for a total of $28,769,189, cell I120) by the estimated number of units in the County (337,309, cell I121), and applying that per unit revenue of $85.29 to the number of units as well as to the number of square feet of nonresidential development (excluding parking) divided by 2,500 (i.e., the revenue from 2,500 SF of nonresidential development equals the revenue from one home). The same per unit revenue of $85.29 is applied to the number of parking spaces divided by 200 (i.e., the revenue from 200 parking spaces equals the revenue from one home). The annual departmental revenue is projected to total $16,995 for the proposed development (cells C98-C103) and $3,660 for the by right office building (cell C104).

- Interest income, based on the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling $69,243,919, cells D87-D92) and the by right office building ($23,887,500, cell D93) divided by the County's total assessed value ($66,708,106,101, according to the Board of Assessment), and multiplying by the County's projected revenue from interest income in the 2016 budget ($100,000). The annual interest income is projected to total $104 for the proposed development (cells D98-D103) and $36 for the by right office building (cell D104).

The annual County revenue from all sources is projected to total $256,614 for the proposed development (cells E98-E103) and $86,323 for the by right office building (cell E104). The annual County revenue is projected to be $372 for each one bedroom unit, $393 for each two bedroom unit, $737 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, $550 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, $33 per structured parking space, and $329 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells F98-F104).

The annual net County impact (revenue minus expenditures) is projected to total positive $174,406 for the proposed development (cells B108-B113) and positive $80,927 for the by right office building (cell B114). The annual net County revenue is projected to be positive $222 for each one bedroom unit, positive $199 for each two bedroom unit, positive $693 per 1,000 square feet of retail pad sites, positive $506 per 1,000 square feet of in-line retail commercial development, positive $33 per structured parking space, and positive $308 per 1,000 square feet of by right office building (cells C108-C114).

Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 147.3 percent for the one bedroom units, 102.9 percent for the two bedroom units, 1,567.7 percent for the retail pad sites, 1,144.9 percent for the in-line retail commercial development, and 212.2 percent overall (cells D108-D113). Since the structured parking garage has no County expenditures associated directly with it, all $16,954 of annual revenue becomes surplus. Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 1,499.7 percent for the by right office building (cell D114).

ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL IMPACT TO UPPER DUBLIN TOWNSHIP

Of the Proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin Development

March 16, 2016

Proposed Use	Number of Units/GSF/Spaces	Assessment per Unit/GSF/Space	Total Assessed Value	Persons per Unit/ Workers per 1K GSF	Total Persons/ Workers	**Annual Township Expenditures**	Expenditures per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	173	$97,563	$16,878,335	1.36	235	**$118,128**	$683
2 BR Apartments	260	$103,563	$26,926,284	1.75	455	**$228,444**	$879
Retail Pad Sites	7,700	$209	$1,609,300	4.00	31	**$3,213**	$417
In-Line Retail	122,300	$155	$18,956,500	2.00	245	**$51,036**	$417
Structured Parking	513	$9,500	$4,873,500	0.00	0	**$0**	$0
Total Proposed	**433/130,000/513**		**$69,243,919**		**690 / 275**	**$400,821**	
By Right Office	262,500	$91	$23,887,500	3.25	853	**$52,827**	$201

Proposed Use	**Annual Township Revenue**							
	Real Estate Tax	Earned Income Tax	Local Services Tax	Annual Housing Permit Fee	Franchise Fee & Misc. Revenue	Interest Earnings	**Total Annual Revenue**	Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	$93,928	$68,446	$0	$2,213	$12,055	$116	**$176,758**	$1,022
2 BR Apartments	$149,845	$113,154	$0	$3,300	$18,117	$186	**$284,602**	$1,095
Retail Pad Sites	$8,956	$2,800	$1,602	$0	$268	$11	**$13,637**	$1,771
In-Line Retail	$105,493	$22,239	$12,719	$0	$4,261	$131	**$144,843**	$1,184
Structured Parking	$27,121	$0	$0	$0	$38	$34	**$27,193**	$53
Total Proposed	**$385,342**	**$206,640**	**$14,321**	**$5,513**	**$34,740**	**$477**	**$647,033**	
By Right Office	$132,934	$105,199	$44,363	$0	$9,146	$165	**$291,806**	$1,112

Proposed Use	**Annual Net Township Revenue**	Net Township Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space	Revenue > Expenditure
1 BR Apartments	**$58,630**	$339	49.6%
2 BR Apartments	**$56,158**	$216	24.6%
Retail Pad Sites	**$10,424**	$1,354	324.4%
In-Line Retail	**$93,807**	$767	183.8%
Structured Parking	**$27,193**	$53	–
Total Proposed	**$246,212**		**61.4%**
By Right Office	**$238,979**	$910	452.4%

Notes

2016 Township Operating Expenditures (5 funds)		$24,299,608	2016 Township Population Estimate	26,279
Minus 2016 Pass-Through and Excluded Expenditures		$6,261,273	2016 Township Real Estate Tax Millage (5 funds)	5.565
2016 Net Township Operating Expenditures		$18,038,335	Average Wage per Retail Job (BEA, 2011)	$45,460
2016 Township Non-Residential Expenditures	26.9%	$4,844,584	Average Wage per Office Job (BEA, 2011)	$61,655
2016 Township per Capita Expenditure		$502.07	2016 Township Housing Unit Estimate	9,877

ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL IMPACT TO THE UPPER DUBLIN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Of the Proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin Development

March 16, 2016

Proposed Use	Number of Units/GSF/Spaces	Assessment per Unit/GSF/Space	Total Assessment	School Age Children per Unit	Public School Students	**Annual School District Expenditures**	Expenditures per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	173	$97,563	$16,878,335	0.05	7	**$151,444**	$875
2 BR Apartments	260	$103,563	$26,926,284	0.09	19	**$409,688**	$1,576
Retail Pad Sites	7,700	$209	$1,609,300	0.00	0	**$0**	$0
In-Line Retail	122,300	$155	$18,956,500	0.00	0	**$0**	$0
Structured Parking	513	$9,500	$4,873,500	0.00	0	**$0**	$0
Total Proposed	**433/130,000/513**		**$69,243,919**		**26**	**$561,132**	
By Right Office	262,500	$91	$23,887,500	0.00	0	**$0**	$0

	Annual School District Revenue					
Proposed Use	Real Estate Tax	Earned Income Tax	State & Federal Revenue	Interest on Investments	**Total Annual Revenue**	Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	$530,147	$68,446	$26,050	$376	$625,019	$3,613
2 BR Apartments	$845,752	$113,154	$70,470	$600	$1,029,976	$3,961
Retail Pad Sites	$50,548	$0	$0	$36	$50,584	$6,569
In-Line Retail	$595,422	$0	$0	$423	$595,844	$4,872
Structured Parking	$153,076	$0	$0	$109	$153,185	$299
Total Proposed	**$2,174,945**	**$181,600**	**$96,520**	**$1,543**	**$2,454,609**	
By Right Office	$750,304	$0	$0	$532	$750,836	$2,860

Proposed Use	**Annual Net School District Revenue**	Net School Dist. Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space	Revenue > Expenditure
1 BR Apartments	**$473,575**	$2,737	312.7%
2 BR Apartments	**$620,289**	$2,386	151.4%
Retail Pad Sites	**$50,584**	$6,569	--
In-Line Retail	**$595,844**	$4,872	--
Structured Parking	**$153,185**	$299	--
Total Proposed	**$1,893,476**		**337.4%**
By Right Office	**$750,836**	$2,860	--

NOTES:

Percentage of School Age Children in Public Schools in Upper Dublin	82.6%	2015-2016 UDSD Net Expenditure per Student	$21,202
2015-2016 UDSD Total Expenditures	$90,925,485	2015-2016 UDSD Current Student Enrollment	4,187
Minus Pass-Through Expenditures & Budgetary Reserve	$2,154,000	2015-2016 UDSD Real Estate Tax Millage	31.4099
2015-2016 UDSD Net Expenditures	$88,771,485	2015-2016 UDSD State/Federal Revenue per Student	$3,647

ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL IMPACT TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Of the Proposed Promenade at Upper Dublin Development

March 16, 2016

Proposed Use	Number of Units/GSF/Spaces	Assessment per Unit/GSF/Space	Total Assessed Value	Persons per Unit/ Workers per 1K GSF	Total Persons/ Workers	**Annual County Expenditures**	Expenditures per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	173	$97,563	$16,878,335	1.36	235	**$26,062**	$151
2 BR Apartments	260	$103,563	$26,926,284	1.75	455	**$50,399**	$194
Retail Pad Sites	7,700	$209	$1,609,300	4.00	31	**$340**	$44
In-Line Retail	122,300	$155	$18,956,500	2.00	245	**$5,406**	$44
Structured Parking	513	$9,500	$4,873,500	0.00	0	**$0**	$0
Total Proposed	**433/130,000/513**		**$69,243,919**		**690 / 275**	**$82,208**	
By Right Office	262,500	$91	$23,887,500	3.25	853	**$5,396**	$21

	Annual County Revenue				
Proposed Use	Real Estate Tax	Departmental Revenue	Interest Income	**Total Annual Revenue**	Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space
1 BR Apartments	$58,382	$6,030	$25	**$64,438**	$372
2 BR Apartments	$93,138	$9,063	$40	**$102,241**	$393
Retail Pad Sites	$5,567	$107	$2	**$5,676**	$737
In-Line Retail	$65,571	$1,705	$28	**$67,304**	$550
Structured Parking	$16,857	$89	$7	**$16,954**	$33
Total Proposed	**$239,515**	**$16,995**	**$104**	**$256,614**	
By Right Office	$82,627	$3,660	$36	**$86,323**	$329

Proposed Use	**Annual Net County Revenue**	Annual Net County Revenue per Unit/1K GSF/Space	Revenue > Expenditures
1 BR Apartments	**$38,376**	$222	147.3%
2 BR Apartments	**$51,842**	$199	102.9%
Retail Pad Sites	**$5,336**	$693	1567.7%
In-Line Retail	**$61,898**	$506	1144.9%
Structured Parking	**$16,954**	$33	–
Total Proposed	**$174,406**	–	**212.2%**
By Right Office	**$80,927**	$308	1499.7%

NOTES:

2016 Total County General Fund Expenditures		$389,722,974	2016 County Population Estimate	825,349
Minus Grant Revenue, Recoverable Expenditures		$137,939,383	2016 County per Capita Expenditure	$110.77
Minus Excluded Expenditures		$103,466,097	2016 County General Fund Real Estate Tax Millage	3.459
2016 Net County General Fund Expenditures		$148,317,494	2016 County Net Departmental Revenue	$28,769,189
Existing County Non-Residential Expenditures	38.4%	$56,895,252	2016 County Housing Unit Estimate	337,309