

### **3.9 Fiscal Analysis Comments and Responses**

**Comment 3.9-1 (Public Hearing, February 9, 2010 - Michael Guere, Representative of the Painter and Allied Trades Union and Resident):** Will it have the Apprentice Law attached that Yonkers City Council has passed? Will it allow the opportunity for residents of the community of Yonkers work on this project? And what role will organized labor play in this project....?

***Response 3.9-1:** The Applicant will abide by all laws in effect and applicable to the project. Corporation Counsel has not advised as to any applicable law that the commenter may be referencing. The Yonkers Workforce Investment Board indicated to the applicant that it is not familiar with such a law although there have been programs sponsored by the City and other organizations that encourage apprenticeship. The applicant has not yet determined what role union or non-union labor will play in the project.*

**Comment 3.9-2 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council):** Fiscal Analysis (Page 1-24) - Property Revenues - If the County and City go forward with a Countywide Reassessment, how will this affect the proposed revenue for this project?

***Response 3.9-2:** It would be speculative to forecast what change in tax revenues, if any, would result from a reassessment. It can only be determined what the revenues would be if the project were completed today, based on the current equalization rate. While a reassessment is intended to get assessed values in line with market values, it is unknown how a reassessment of all properties in the City will affect the proportionate share that each property pays of total value and applicable tax burden.*

**Comment 3.9-3 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council):** Fiscal Analysis (Page 1-25) - Please explain and clarify the topic as it pertains to Paragraph 1. What is the time period for the Brownfields Clean-up for this project? What are the requirements to assure that the developers stay within compliance of the application?

***Response 3.9-3:** Paragraph 1 explains that the Brownfields Cleanup program provides tax credits. These credits can only be applied against income taxes for an individual or a corporation who owns and develops the Brownfield. The amount of the tax credit, is based upon the real property taxes paid and the number of jobs created as a result of development of the Brownfield among other factors. Income tax credits are also available if the property is in an Empire Zone, which this property is. However, only one set of credits can be applied against the income taxes due and the selection must be made once and is irrevocable.*

*A detailed construction management plan is provided in Appendix K of the DEIS. Demolition, excavation and site preparation, during which time the remediation would occur, would take approximately 1.5 months to complete. Since the site is designated as a Brownfields site by the NYSDEC, its development for residential use is contingent upon its clean-up to the standards and requirements of the NYSDEC. Development cannot occur without the clean-up. The completion of the SEQRA process will result in the issuance of a Findings Statement adopted by the Planning Board which will set forth the mitigations and conditions which will be imposed to ensure compliance with the clean-up requirements for this project.*

**Comment 3.9-4 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council):** Fiscal Analysis (Page 1-25) - Employment Paragraph 6 & 7 - I would have like to a

larger volume of permanent employment. Out of 26 jobs that will be created out of the garden, concierge, full time leasing agent, office management & building maintenance, I am hoping that the developers will employ as many people from within the community as possible. Job Fair/Job Search should be created to assure that the people within the community to be trained properly and every opportunity given to them.

***Response 3.9-4:*** *As stated in Section 3.9 of the DEIS, the Applicant has stated that the Yonkers Employment Center will be contacted and employment opportunities posted with the agency.*

**Comment 3.9-5 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council):** Fiscal Analysis (Page I-26) - 20% of the project will be affordable housing: how many percentages of affordable housing units were put aside for 66 Main Street? If is not the same number, please explain why?

***Response 3.9-5:*** *Of the 170 dwelling units in 66 Main, 35 dwelling units, or 21 percent, were set aside as affordable units. The percentage of affordable unit set asides is comparable.*

**Comment 3.9-6 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** The impacts of application for tax credits relative to the hydroponic garden need to be explained further either here or in the fiscal impact section.

***Response 3.9-6:*** *The hydroponic garden is not seeking tax credits.*

**Comment 3.9-7 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** It should be stated here or in the fiscal section how many of the 5-10 jobs are likely to go to Yonkers residents.

***Response 3.9-7:*** *There is a high probability that the 5-10 jobs would go to Yonkers residents, as the Applicant is committed to working with the Yonkers Employment Center to have these positions filled by Yonkers residents.*

**Comment 3.9-8 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** Page 3.9-3 The comment that there is no significant demand for services created by the development may not be the case once final analysis by all City Departments is complete.

***Response 3.9-8:*** *The comments of the community service providers are provided in Appendix B of the FEIS. The City's fire and police personnel have indicated that the project will not result in significant demand for services. The fire department did note that there will be cumulative demand placed on the agency as a result of the total number of projects recently approved or planned in the City.*

**Comment 3.9-9 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** The \$257,779 revenue to the City is total revenue and when existing revenue of \$42,277 is subtracted, it represents a net new revenue to the city of \$215,502. Additionally, the \$696,797 revenue to the school district minus the existing revenue of \$114,278 represents \$582, 519 net new revenue. The school impact section indicated that total cost to the school district would be for 56 students based on taxes to be raised by property taxes as \$8,572 per

student for a total cost of \$480,032, with additional revenue of \$102,487 available to the school district.

The school section page 3.8-15 indicated that the project would generate \$614,158 in taxes to the school district. When the \$480,032 is subtracted, \$134,126 was to be available as supplementary funds to the district. The fiscal section indicated the district would receive \$696,797 annually based on all project components. There is no allowance for numbers of school children that may already be generated from the Trolley Barn or from east side parcels, so the additional revenue to the school district could even be less. The FEIS should account for these other children and their costs to the district.

***Response 3.9-9:*** *The 56 students from the new apartment building would generate an annual cost of \$480,032. The new apartment building alone will generate tax revenues of \$614,158 annually. The current school district tax revenues generated by the properties on which the apartment building would be located (not including the Trolley Barn or the three residential buildings on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue) is \$11,705 annually. The net increase in school district tax revenues, \$602,453 will cover the cost of the anticipated increase in school age children.*

*There would be no change in revenues/costs associated with the Trolley Barn since that building already exists and no changes in occupancy are anticipated. The project calls for the demolition of two existing residential buildings on the west side of Buena Vista Avenue and the renovation of three residential buildings on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue. Presently there are a total of nine (9) apartments and 20 single room occupancy dwellings located in the existing five (5) on-site buildings. A breakdown of the existing units and current public school children generated from the apartments are provided in Table 3.9-1, below.*

Table 3.9-1 Buena Vista Teutonia PUR Multi-Family Residence School Age Children				
Street Address/ Tax Section/Lot	Present Land Use	Public School age Children Multiplier <sup>1</sup>	Student Population	Proposed Land Use
<b>Buena Vista Avenue - West</b>				
61 Buena Vista Ave./ Block 512, Lot 23	Three 1 BR Apts.	0.07	0.21	To be demolished
65 Buena Vista Ave./ Block 512, Lot 23	One 3 BR Apt.	0.67	0.67	
	4 SRO Rooms	0	0	
		<i>West Side Total</i>	0.88	
<b>Buena Vista Avenue - East</b>				
66 Buena Vista Ave./ Section 511, Section 27	Boardinghouse - 8 SRO Rooms	0	0	Two -2 bedroom apts.
68 Buena Vista Ave./ Section 511, Lot 25 -Multifamily Bldg.	8 SRO Rooms	0	0	Three - 2 bedroom apts.
	One 1 BR Apt.	0.07	0.07	
	One 2 BR Apt.	0.16	0.16	
72 Buena Vista Ave./ Section 511, Lot 24 Multi-family Bldg.	One 3 BR Apt.	0.67	0.67	Three - 2 bedroom apts.
		One 1 BR Apt.	0.07	
	One 2 BR Apt.	0.16	0.16	
		<i>East Side Total</i>	1.13	
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>2.01</b>	
Source of Residential Use: Teutonia Buena Vista, LLC, 2010. Notes: SRO - Single Room Occupancy dwelling 1 - Multiplier Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, Residential Demographic Multipliers, June 2006.				

*The applicant proposes to convert three dwellings on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue into eight (8) two-bedroom apartments. Based upon the multipliers for two bedroom apartments, (8 apartments X 0.16 students per apartment), 8 renovated apartments on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue will generate approximately 1.28 students. The number of school children generated from this portion of the project is not likely to increase above existing conditions.*

**Comment 3.9-10 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** Page 3.9-6 Since the apartment site already generates \$11,926 in tax revenue to the city, the net new revenue from the apartment building would be \$199,109; \$211,535 is the total revenue generated from the building.

**Response 3.9-10:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3.9-11 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):** Page 3.9-8 - Provide greater detail on the affordable housing program based on input from the City of Yonkers. Identify proposed length of affordability, anticipated selection

process and overseer of the program, including mechanisms to assure the units remain affordable.

***Response 3.9-11:*** *The Applicant has indicated a willingness to voluntarily set aside 20 percent of the proposed dwelling units as affordable - the unit types have been identified in the DEIS and FEIS. Establishment of an affordable housing program will not result in any significant SEQRA impact. The specific parameters of the program will be determined in consultation with the City Council at the time the special use permit is approved.*

**Comment 3.9-12 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):**

Page 3.9-6 Educational impacts. DEIS notes that the Yonkers schools operate at a 95-96% capacity but that this is considered as able to allow the system to handle added students. Is this in fact a capacity that will allow the inflow of new students or, like apartment buildings, is a 95% capacity considered full up?

***Response 3.9-12:*** *John Carr, the Executive Director of the Yonkers City School District School Facilities Management department provided a building capacity review study prepared by Kaeyer, Garment & Davidson Architects & Engineers, P.C., in 2010. The review calculated the capacity of each school building using three different methods: SED capacity, functional capacity, and unadjusted maximum capacity. The SED capacity used class sizes and room use rates based on NY State Education Department standards. The functional capacity used target class sizes and full programs as desired by the school district, and the unadjusted maximum capacity used maximum class sizes and more full utilization of all spaces. The following are the districtwide results of the study:*

<u>Enrollment as Percent of Capacity</u>		
2010 Enrollment:	25,121	----
SED Capacity :	26,119	97 percent
Functional Capacity:	21,396	118 percent
Maximum Capacity:	29,313	86 percent

*The study notes that space is most problematic for grades K-8. Of the 56 students to be generated by the project, 43 would be in grades K through 8. According to the study, the capacity review will be further refined as the next phase of the study effort is advanced.*

*According to Mr. Carr<sup>1</sup>, the district is in the process of increasing the functional capacity of the district and has recently leased a local school building, which was a Catholic School no longer in use. This building is located within close proximity to the Buena Vista site.*

*In 2000, there were 35,665 children who were enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade. Of the total 35,665 students, 27,781 were in public school. The increase of 56 students represents less than two tenths of a percent increase to the total student population.*

**Comment 3.9-13 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):**

Page 3.9-7 State the wage ranges of the "highly skilled positions in greenhouse maintenance

<sup>1</sup> Phone Conversation with John Carr, Executive Director of the Yonkers City School District School Facilities Management. August 23, 2011.

and operations". Will these be all of the positions or will there be lower paid pickers, packers and farmers?

***Response 3.9-13:*** *As the DEIS and FEIS are analyzing a PUR concept development plan, the specific wages of employees who would work at the hydroponic garden is not yet known. The wages will depend on the operator who will be contracted with to operate the greenhouse. Positions will range from minimum wage earners to personnel that earn approximately \$125,000 annually (aquaponist). According to the US Department of Labor, wages for farm workers and laborers in crops, nurseries and greenhouses range from a starting salary of \$17,540 to \$24,340 for an experienced worker. Salaries for supervisors of these positions ranges from an entry level of \$33,340 to \$51,670 for an experienced supervisor. Truck drivers needed to transport the produce can expect to make between \$20,910 and \$ 51,670. It is anticipated that most jobs will be a full time 40 hour work week, with some part time seasonal jobs.*