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Observations

- Most local governments do not know the true cost of development decisions
- Most local governments do not know if the current land use plan is fiscally sustainable
- Fiscal analysis is rarely required
- Lack of formal standards
- Considerable variation in methodologies employed
Observations (continued)

- Costs can change over time
- Does not address infrastructure replacement
- Seldom reflect geographic differences
Questions that Can be Answered

- What is the relationship between development densities and infrastructure costs?
- What is the relationship between municipal property tax and the density per acre?
- What is the return on municipal investment at various densities?
- What is the optimum mix of land uses?
- What is the relationship between the geographic location of new development and the cost?
- Are we living off tomorrow’s growth?
Incorporating Market Analysis

- Lends sense of “reality” to analysis
- Without market study analysis of multiple scenarios is imperative
  - Fiscal model can be invaluable in this effort
- Seeing an increasing trend of requiring market analysis as part of submittals
  - Particularly for TIF
Provides Context to Fiscal Analysis

- What are the region’s competitive advantages?
- Where will employment growth likely locate?
- Is there a transitioning of the area’s economy
  - E.g., transition from manufacturing focus to office/services
- Are jobs shifting from urban areas to suburbs or vice versa?
- What impact will changing demographics and lifestyle choices have on the jurisdiction’s economy and government services?
Fiscal Impact Analysis

- Cash flow to the public sector
  - Are the revenues generated by new growth enough to cover the resulting service and facility demands?
- Reflects operating expenses and capital costs (debt service and pay-go)
- All revenues
- Revenue minus expenditures = net surplus/deficit
Economic Impact Analysis

- Reflects overall economy of the community
- **Residential**
  - Primary factors are the construction phase and consumer spending
- **Nonresidential**
  - Primary factors are job creation and real disposable income
- Doesn’t follow jurisdictional lines
  - Large portion of economic output flows out of jurisdiction and possibly State
- Resident spending for mortgages, car payments, insurance probably are not sources of sales tax for local government
Municipal budgeting is primarily “revenue driven”
- Revenue forecast is used to establish spending target

Fiscal impact analysis is not revenue constrained
- Forecast expenses needed to maintain current LOS
Fiscal Impact Analysis in Practice

- Majority of fiscal analyses are prepared for specific development proposals
  - Project-level analyses are typically reviewed in a vacuum
- An increasing number of local governments are requiring fiscal impact analyses
  - Net neutrality
- Most comprehensive plans do not directly address fiscal sustainability
- Lack of formal standards
  - Considerable variation in methodologies employed
Methodologies

- Proportional valuation
  - Typically used for evaluating impacts of nonresidential development
  - Assumes assessed property values are directly related to public service costs

- Comparable city
  - Typically relies on data from U.S. Census of Governments

- Cost of community services
  - Developed by American Farmland Trust
  - Typically include residential, commercial/industrial, farmland/open space
Methodologies

- Case study-marginal approach
  - Reflects fiscal reality
  - Dependent on local levels of service
  - Available capacity triggers the staging of facilities
  - Reflects geographic differences

- Average cost approach
  - Focuses on per capita/employee
  - Doesn’t consider available capacities
  - Masks timing
  - Uses average (current) costs
  - Budget in equilibrium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Context</th>
<th>Per Capita Multiplier Method Likely Appropriate</th>
<th>Case Study-Marginal Method Likely Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is constrained</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise and resources are limited</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget is limited#</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection capacity is limited</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most services are at capacity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant unused or overused capacity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development will create unique service demands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New population likely to resemble the current population</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services likely to continue at current level#</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development requires significant new infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/countywide analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area/corridor plans</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large mixed-use/planned-unit developments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/medium scale developments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land uses studies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill/redevelopment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of alternative development patterns</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of service changes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term fiscal planning</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Edwards and Huddleston, 2010
*Bise, 2010
Elements of the Fiscal Equation

General perceptions

- Residential development doesn’t pay for itself
- Nonresidential development generates surpluses
Influencing Factors

- Revenue structure
  - Sources
  - Distribution formulas
- Levels of service
- Infrastructure lifecycle
  - Existing capacities
- Characteristics of new development
  - Demographic
  - Socioeconomic
Factors that Influence Costs

- Geographic location
- Timing/phasing of new development
- Density
- All of the above influence
  - Physical development pattern
  - Road network (curvilinear vs. grid)
  - Transportation choices
  - Intervention strategies
Case Examples

Gross Receipts Tax

General Fund Net Revenues - Per 1,000 Square Feet
City of Scottsdale

- Resort: $887
- Retail: $2,083
- Office: $75
- Industrial: $14
Case Examples

- Income Tax by Place of Employment

### Annual Net Results
City of Dublin Cost of Land Uses Fiscal Analysis
(Per Unit for Residential/Per 1,000 SF for Nonresidential)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Annual Net Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>($1,713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>($866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>($711)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Rental</td>
<td>($845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Condo</td>
<td>($869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Examples

- Results Can Vary by Fund

Scenario 1 - Net Annual Fiscal Results Residential Land Uses By Fund (per unit)

- General Fund
- Streets Fund
- Parks & Recreation Fund
- Police Fund
- State Highway Fund
- Urban Forestry Fund
- Capital Projects

Pickerington, OH
Case Examples

- Housing Characteristics

![Net Fiscal Results-Residential Prototypes](image-url)

Sarasota County Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis
(Per Unit)

- Bel-Air Estates: $1,494
- Greenfield: $178
- Summerwood: $(1,030)
- Summit Heron Apts.: $(274)
- Lazy River MHP: $(483)
- Total: $1,724

Legend:
- General Fund
- School District
- Total
Case Example

- Overlap of governmental entities

![Graph showing annual net impact of residential land uses in Hempstead, New York. The graph compares different land uses: SFDU, Condo, and Apt. with Village and School District impacts.]
Applications

- Land use policies and development patterns
- Demographic and economic change
- Economic development incentives
- Leveraging public dollars for economic growth
  - How to invest limited funds as to maximize return
- Rezonings and specific development projects
- Timing on impacts
- Annexation
- Infrastructure planning
Case Studies
Evaluating Land Use Policy

Champaign, IL

Three-phase fiscal impact study

• What is the fiscal impact of current land uses?
• What is the fiscal impact of future growth?

  • Scenario 1: Growth Within the Service Area—all growth occurs within the current sanitary sewer service area.
  • Scenario 2: Growth Beyond the Service Area—growth occurs both within and outside of the current sanitary sewer service area.

What are ways we can raise revenue without raising taxes?
Analysis Areas
Champaign, IL

Fiscal Impact Results-Citywide

Cumulative Net Fiscal Impacts from New Growth - Operating vs. Capital Scenario Comparisons
Champaign Fiscal Impact Analysis

Growth Within the Service Area
Growth Beyond the Service Area
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Operating Capital Combined

(X 1,000)
Champaign, IL

Fiscal Impact Results- By Subarea (FAZ)

Cumulative Net Fiscal Impacts from New Growth
FAZ Comparisons
Champaign Fiscal Impact Analysis

Scenario One: Growth Within Service Area
Scenario Two: Growth Beyond The Service Area
Champaign, IL Findings

- The difference in fiscal impact results of the two scenarios is driven mainly by much higher capital costs—$52.3 million higher—for the Growth Beyond the Service Area scenario
  - Acreage available for development is more than double that of the Growth Within the Service Area scenario
  - Larger area available leads to a more scattered and leapfrog approach to development which requires the expansion of fire service areas as well as the road network
  - The results show this is an inefficient development pattern
Champaign, IL Findings

- The City is severely constrained as to the amount of revenue available for support of capital improvements needed to serve new development
  - The City should consider alternative financing sources such as impact fees for growth-related infrastructure, particularly for road projects
  - The implementation of a tiered impact fee program, that charges more for development further out, could assist the City in directing development in a phased manner
Market and Fiscal Assessment: Orangeburg County, SC

- Fiscal impact analysis of combined direct and indirect employment impacts on the County
- Conducted as part of the County’s Sustainability Plan
- Industries studied are identified as Targeted Industries in the County
- Questions to be answered by the study:
  - What type of growth pays for itself?
  - What nonresidential land uses provided best economic and fiscal return? And therefore should be considered for incentives?
  - What are direct and indirect effects of those industries?
  - Are we losing jobs to neighboring counties?
## Nonresidential Prototypes

### NONRESIDENTIAL PROTOTYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and Storage</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$3.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$76.66</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$76.66</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Serv</td>
<td>$102.28</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$6.14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$67.21</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$4.03</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$41.08</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total Employment (Direct & Spinoff)

#### Total and Direct and Spinoff Jobs within the County per 1,000 Square Feet of Nonresidential Prototype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Prototype</th>
<th>Direct Employees per 1,000 sf</th>
<th>Spinoff Employees per 1,000 sf</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and Storage</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratio of Spinoff Jobs to Direct

Spinoff:Direct Employment Ratio per 1,000 Square Feet (Jobs w/in County)

Cost of Land Use Fiscal Impact Analysis

- Chemical Manufacturing: 3.25
- Beverage Manufacturing: 0.62
- Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing: 0.34
- Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing: 0.34
- Truck Transportation: 0.30
- Machinery Manufacturing: 0.28
- Health Care and Social Assistance: 0.26
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services: 0.24
- Wholesale Trade: 0.24
- Finance and Insurance: 0.23
- Warehousing and Storage: 0.19
- Retail Trade: 0.08
“Lost” Spinoff Jobs

Spinoff Jobs per 1,000 Square Feet "Lost" to Neighboring Counties
Cost of Land Use Fiscal Impact Analysis

- Chemical Manufacturing
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
- Finance and Insurance
- Beverage Manufacturing
- Health Care and Social Assistance
- Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing
- Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing
- Machinery Manufacturing
- Truck Transportation
- Retail Trade
- Wholesale Trade
- Warehousing and Storage

Berkeley
Charleston
Dorchester
# Direct and Spinoff Fiscal Results

## Direct Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Prototype</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Fiscal Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>$596</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>$712</td>
<td>$508</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>$586</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>$599</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and Storage</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>$543</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td>$742</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$849</td>
<td>$(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>$954</td>
<td>$657</td>
<td>$298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$3,685</td>
<td>$921</td>
<td>$2,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Spinoff Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Prototype</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Fiscal Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>$597</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>$9,684</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td>$6,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and Storage</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$801</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>$279</td>
<td>$634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Combined Fiscal Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Prototype</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Fiscal Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries and Tortilla Manufacturing</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td>$498</td>
<td>$695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage Manufacturing</td>
<td>$1,192</td>
<td>$358</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>$10,396</td>
<td>$3,524</td>
<td>$6,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>$796</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td>$574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>$608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and Storage</td>
<td>$405</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>$746</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$1,692</td>
<td>$1,129</td>
<td>$564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>$1,705</td>
<td>$907</td>
<td>$798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$3,876</td>
<td>$979</td>
<td>$2,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$493</td>
<td>$211</td>
<td>$282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another Way of Evaluating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototype Category</th>
<th>5 Highest Real Disposable Income</th>
<th>5 Highest Direct and Spinoff Jobs</th>
<th>Net Revenues to County General Fund</th>
<th>Net Revenues to School District</th>
<th>Net Revenues to School District Exceeds Deficit to County General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruments/Related Products</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Equipment, except Computers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Engineering, Management and Miscellaneous Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One Size Fits All?

State of Florida Department of Community Affairs

- Task force assembled by Governor Bush in 2001 to examine whether growth pays

  - Is it possible to develop a sophisticated fiscal impact model that is relatively easy to use, update and maintain?
  
  - If a model could be developed, how and under what circumstances could or should it be used?
The Florida Model

- Uses average cost approach
- Evaluates one scenario at a time
- Field tested in seven pilot communities
- Capable of evaluating communitywide scenarios or specific projects
- Relatively easy to use
- Not sophisticated
Hillsborough County Case Study

- TischlerBise retained for a two-phase study intended to:
  - Determine fiscal sustainability of the County’s current growth trend (macro-level analysis)
  - Develop a fiscal model for evaluating specific development proposals within the County (micro-level analysis)
County is Large and Diverse

Fiscal Analysis Zones

[Map showing fiscal analysis zones with numbered regions including 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6TT, 6TA, 6PC, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.]
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County is Large and Diverse

School Choice Zones
## Comparison of Model Results

### TischlerBise vs. State of Florida Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>20-Year Cumulative Impacts</th>
<th>HCCCPC</th>
<th>State Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1: Small Lot Subdivision</td>
<td>($2,624,747)</td>
<td>($11,509,011)</td>
<td>($14,133,758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2: Medium Lot Subdivision</td>
<td>$2,812,405</td>
<td>($4,473,703)</td>
<td>($1,661,298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 3: Infill Apartments</td>
<td>($2,285,472)</td>
<td>($4,530,932)</td>
<td>($6,816,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential 1: Shopping Center</td>
<td>$740,892</td>
<td>$1,183,326</td>
<td>$1,924,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In order to facilitate a true comparison of results, the per capita inflation factors in FIAM are zeroed out to reflect constant dollars, which is why the fiscal results for FIAM do not mirror the results from the County's report.
The Realities

- Fiscal impact analysis is both a science and an art
- A “one size fits all” approach leads to generalizations
  - Each jurisdiction is unique
  - Results can indicate the opposite of reality
- Fiscal impacts are only one part of the equation
- Goal should be to educate
- Seek the right balance!!!!