

Connery Associates

June 7, 2017

Dear City Councilors,

In recent correspondence from a resident of Newton, I have been asked to address a few questions relating to the methodology used in preparing the net fiscal impact calculation for Washington Place. Below are my responses, which I am more than happy to discuss in further detail if appropriate.

Question: Why are 1+ bedroom units not treated as 2-bedroom units and 2+ bedroom units treated as 3-bedroom units for purposed of calculating school aged children (SAC)?

The additional room in a “plus” unit has a very different characteristic than a conventional bedroom. For starters, the size of the additional room in a plus unit is typically smaller in overall square footage. At Washington Place, the additional room in the plus units are approximately 75 SF in size compared to a typical bedroom at 140 SF. In addition, unlike a true bedroom, the additional room in a plus unit is not required by code to provide either natural light or closet space, and therefore does not allow the apartment to be marketed as having an additional bedroom.

Given these distinguishing characteristics, I have not seen plus units treated as having an additional bedroom for calculation of the net fiscal impact, nor do I know of any data that supports that these units are drivers of school aged children in residential buildings. Therefore, consistent with the Austin Street Fiscal Impact Report, I have not assumed the additional room in a plus unit to constitute a bedroom.


Question: If we apply the same formula used by the Planning Department for Austin Street (Appendix F of the NPS Enrollment Analysis Report) the number of school-age children jumps from 24 to 32 children. Author’s Note: I believe the question is meant to reference Appendix G in the 2013 NPS Enrollment Analysis Report, not Appendix F.

I have reviewed the formulas in “Appendix G” of the 2013 NPS Enrollment Analysis Report and I would like to make the following points. First, footnote #3 states that only the physical addresses of the SAC are known and NOT the types of units (e.g., 2BR or 3BR units), so these allocations are estimates. As a matter of policy, the School Department does not disseminate information on SAC by unit type or by grade.

Second, in my many years of preparing Fiscal Impact Reports, I have never seen the ratio of school aged children for 3 BR Affordable units this high, i.e., 2.579, 2.548, and 3.25 for the three comparable projects. Based on my experience, I am more accustomed to seeing a ratio of 1.40 for 3BR Affordable Units, as noted in my revised report. That said, if I adjust the 3 BR ratios based on Appendix G, my projection of **28 SAC increases to 31 SAC**. This increase in the number of SAC would reduce my currently projected net fiscal benefit from **\$133,598 down to \$87,608**.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Regards,



John Connery