

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

The DEVELOPMENT PLAN describes various proposals and recommendations needed to provide the residents of Rochester with adequate municipal facilities. These proposals entail the expenditure of sums of money. The Plan is essentially a long range plan and, therefore, the cost of financing the various improvements will have to be spread over a time period consistent with the financial status of the Town. In addition to the costs there are also the considerations of timing and priority scheduling--deciding the order in which the proposals should be accomplished.

The process by which proposals for new facilities and improvements are placed in a priority sequence--and a financial program established for providing funds over a specific period of time--is known as "Capital Improvements Programming."* This is essentially a process of balancing monies available, or reasonably expected to become available, against the volume of needed public facilities and improvements, and assigning a priority so that the most needed items will be provided for in the early part of the program period. The period usually chosen is six years--the current fiscal year plus five consecutive years. Each year the program is reviewed and a new year added to replace the previous year. At each review the situation of the Town will be re-examined, its current ability to pay determined, the proposed projects re-evaluated in terms of changing conditions, and new required improvements added.

Those items included in the capital improvements program are known as capital projects, which are defined as:

- (a) any physical betterment or improvement, including furnishings, machinery, apparatus or equipment,
- (b) any preliminary studies and surveys relating to any physical betterment or improvement,
- (c) land or rights in land,
- (d) any combination of the above.

* State enabling legislation for municipalities to undertake capital programming was passed in 1962. (General Municipal Law, Section 99-g)

The annual operating budget of the Town will include operating costs, plus appropriations for those capital projects to be begun that year which are to be financed wholly or partially by current revenues. If the capital project is scheduled to take longer than one year, only that portion of the cost expected to be spent during the first year should be included in the annual budget. Projects that will be financed outside the annual budget will not appear in the budget. The capital improvements program is generally developed by the Planning Board. Each municipal official, when preparing his annual budget request, should prepare a list of capital projects, including general cost estimates and priorities. The Planning Board, after reviewing all proposed capital projects, should develop the capital improvements program for the next six year period. The first year of the capital program is then submitted to the Town Board for approval, in the same manner as the budget is approved. The Town Board may amend the capital program prior to passage.

The Capital Improvements Program is in two parts, a fiscal analysis, and the first six year Capital Improvements Program.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of the fiscal analysis is to provide a basis for making recommendations for a capital improvements program for the development of the municipality. It is not a fiscal study for the purpose of making budget or tax recommendations, but rather to examine the base upon which the recommended capital improvements program shall rest. In many instances 1966 fiscal data is the most recent published data available. This report focuses on the Town of Rochester and though there are special districts in Town such as school and fire which are an integral part of the Town, they shall, because of their unique nature, be treated separately in this report.

The Tax Base

The tax base of a community consists of the value of all fully taxable property within the Town limits. The value of property for taxing purposes is referred to as "assessed value". Assessed value generally does not reflect market value. The relationship between assessed value and full value (100% value) is expressed as a percentage. Thus on the following table assessed value was 20% of full value (100%) in 1956 and 28% in 1966. Tax rates and property tax levies in the Town are based upon assessed value.

The amount listed on the following table as "Fully taxable" is that portion of the assessed valuations which is taxable for town purposes. Property purchased with the proceeds of a pension, bonus or insurance granted by the U. S. or New York State for military or naval services is exempt from general taxation but is taxable for school purposes and is also subject to assessment on the basis of benefit. The exemption is limited to \$5,000 of assessed value per taxpayer. "Taxable for Schools" is the assessed valuation of property taxable for Town purposes plus pension-exempt property. "Wholly Exempt from Taxation" includes the valuation of all property both public and private, which is not subject to ad valorem taxes for any purpose. Some properties which are wholly exempt from ad valorem taxes may be assessed on the basis of benefit for certain services.

In order to insure an equitable sharing of the tax burden among communities, the New York State Board of Equalization establishes the relationship between assessed value and full value of real property. Ulster County also establishes a ratio of assessed value to full value.

In summary, the tax base is that portion of real property which is subject to taxation by the municipality for municipal purposes. It is expressed in terms of assessed valuation which represents a percentage of full value. The following shows the tax base of the Town of Rochester during the period 1956 to 1966.

TABLE 1: ASSESSED VALUE, EQUALIZED VALUE AND EQUALIZATION RATE IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER 1956-1966

Year	Assessed Value (\$ million)			Equalization Rate		Equalized Value (\$ million)*		
	Fully Taxable	School Purposes	Wholly Exempt	State	County	Fully Taxable	School Purposes	Wholly Exempt
1956	2.08	2.19	0.04	19	18	10.95	11.53	0.21
1957	2.17	2.27	0.04	20	18	10.85	11.35	0.20
1958	2.18	2.27	0.035	20	20	10.90	11.35	0.175
1959	2.19	2.29	0.035	20	20	10.95	11.45	0.175
1960	2.16	2.26	0.035	16	20	13.50	14.13	0.22
1961	2.21	2.37	0.04	14	16	15.79	16.93	0.29
1962	2.23	2.42	0.05	14	14	15.93	17.29	0.36
1963	4.52	4.74	0.05	27	27	16.74	17.56	0.19
1964	4.61	4.82	0.05	28	27	16.46	17.21	0.18
1965	4.67	4.88	0.05	28	28	16.68	17.43	0.18
1966	4.82	5.07	0.04	28	28	17.21	18.11	0.14

* based on State Equalization Rate 1956 through 1966

Source: New York State Comptroller, "Special Report on Municipal Affairs, 1956-1966"

The column of equalized value of fully taxable property and property taxable for school purposes reflects the growth of the tax base in the Town. Equalized value of fully taxable property has increased by 57% between 1956 and 1966. The equalized value of taxable property for school purposes shows a similar increase. The equalized value of wholly exempt property decreased by 33% between 1956 and 1966.

The Tax Rate

The tax rate is the amount per \$1,000 of taxable assessed valuation which is required to raise funds needed in the operation of the Town. The tax rate times the fully taxable assessed value yields the amount to be raised by property taxation. Overlapping jurisdictions make tax rates difficult to compare; for example, the Town is served by several special districts, (2 fire, 3 light and 2 school districts). The following tables show the tax rates for the Town of Rochester excluding special districts and tax rate comparisons between the Town of Rochester and the Towns of Hurley, Marbletown, Wawarsing and Rosendale.

TABLE 2: TAX RATES (Town & County) PER \$1,000 OF ASSESSED VALUE AND PER \$1,000 FULL VALUE 1961 for 1962 THROUGH 1967 for 1968 - TOWN OF ROCHESTER

<u>Year</u>	<u>Tax Rate Per \$1,000 of Assessed Value</u>	<u>Equal-ization Rate</u>	<u>Tax Rate Per \$1,000 of Full Value</u>
1961 for 1962	85.695	14%	11.997
1962 for 1963	43.208	27	11.666
1963 for 1964	47.106	27	12.719
1964 for 1965	52.044	28	14.572
1965 for 1966	50.466	28	14.131
1955 for 1967	52.319	28	14.649
1967 for 1968	63.442	28	17.764

Source: General Tax Table for Ulster County 1961 for 1962 through 1967 for 1968.

The above table includes the tax rate to raise taxes for County and Town purposes. The 1966 for 1967 tax rate of 52.319 per \$1,000 of assessed value was composed of 26.284 or 50% for County purposes and 26.035 or 50% for Town purposes.

TABLE 3: TAX RATE PER \$1,000 OF FULL VALUE TOWN OF ROCHESTER
 Compared to Towns of Hurley, Marbletown, Rosendale, and Wawarsing 1961 for 1962 and 1967 for 1968

Tax Rates (County & Town) Per \$1,000 of Full Value

	<u>1961 for 1962</u>	<u>1967 for 1968</u>
Town of Rochester	11.997	17.764
Town of Hurley	8.422	14.143
Town of Marbletown	10.097	15.233
Town of Rosendale	7.883	13.357
Town of Wawarsing	9.280	15.046

Source: General Tax Table for Ulster County 1961 for 1962 and 1967 for 1968

The above table indicates that the tax rate for the Town of Rochester based upon full value was higher than the Towns of Hurley, Marbletown, Rosendale and Wawarsing in both periods.

Revenues

The revenues for the Town for municipal purposes have been separated into three categories: Real Estate Taxes for Town Purposes, State Aid and Other Revenue. The real estate tax for Town purposes is obtained by applying the tax rate to the fully taxable assessed valuation. State aid includes per capita aid and support for specific special programs as provided by the State of New York. Other revenue includes interest and penalties on taxes, licenses, permits, fines and other miscellaneous items. Such items as bonds and notes are not included as revenues.

TABLE 4: REVENUES IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER
(in thousands of dollars)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Real Estate Tax for Town Purposes</u>	<u>State Aid</u>	<u>Other Revenue</u>	<u>Total</u>
1956	92.2	28.8	8.5*	129.5
1957	114.3	48.7	6.8	169.8
1958	110.5	37.0	14.6	162.0
1959	98.3	43.8	14.5	156.6
1960	95.7	27.6	7.5	130.9
1961	95.8	40.2	10.0	146.0
1962	106.3	40.8	9.0	156.0
1963	105.1	37.3	10.1	152.6
1964	122.4	37.6	9.6	169.6
1965	126.1	43.9	11.2	181.2
1966	120.5	49.8	9.7	180.1

* includes \$2,074.75 in Federal Aid

Note: Totals may not add because of rounding

Source: New York State Comptroller, Special Report on Municipal Affairs 1956-1966

Total revenues increased by 39% between 1956 and 1966. In 1956 real estate taxes for town purposes were 71.2% of the total revenues but decreased to 66.9% in 1966. State aid has shown considerable fluctuation between 1956 and 1966. In 1956 State aid was 22.2% of total revenues and increased to 27.7% in 1966. The category of Other Revenue also showed considerable fluctuation between 1956 and 1966; however, when comparing the year 1956 to 1966 the category of Other Revenue was 6.6% of total revenues in 1956 and 5.4% in 1966.

Expenditures

Expenditures in the Town of Rochester have been divided into three categories: current operations, capital outlay and debt service. Current operations include normal operations and maintenance of the Town. Capital outlay includes disbursements for the construction, improvement or acquisition of fixed assets. Debt service reflects the costs of redemption of long and short term obligations, both principal and interest.

TABLE 5: EXPENDITURES IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER 1956-1966
(in thousands of dollars)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Current Operations</u>	<u>Capital Outlay</u>	<u>Debt Service</u>		<u>Total Expenditures</u>
			<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	
1956	106.3	25.8	16.0	1.1	149.2
1957	115.5	35.8	16.8	1.1	169.1
1958	85.8	24.0	10.8	0.7	121.2
1959	126.5	21.1	7.8	0.4	155.9
1960	165.6	7.6	5.8	0.2	179.2
1961	126.0	27.1	8.2	1.0	162.3
1962	126.6	26.4	6.6	1.0	160.6
1963	136.1	23.7	6.6	0.8	167.2
1964	144.7	27.7	9.6	0.8	182.9
1965	133.3	29.9	16.3	1.0	180.5
1966	164.7	6.2	11.4	1.0	183.3

Note: Total may not add because of rounding

Source: New York State Comptroller, Special Report on Municipal Affairs 1956-1966

Total expenditures in the Town of Rochester increased by 23% between 1956 and 1966. Current operations constituted the predominant expenditure between 1956 and 1966. With the exception of 1960 and 1966 capital outlay has been more than \$20,000 per year. Debt service expenditures have decreased between 1956 and 1963 but increased significantly in 1965.

Debt Position

The amount of debt which a town in New York State may incur for general town purposes is limited by State law to 7% of the average full valuation of real property taxable for town purposes as shown on the last 5 completed assessment roles for which equalization rates were established as of the close of the fiscal year. Thus the town's capacity to incur debt is closely tied to its tax base and increases as the tax base increases. With the consent of the State Comptroller, certain self-sustaining improvements and services may have their indebtedness excluded when computing the outstanding debt which is subject to the 7% limitation. The debt margin or available borrowing capacity is the difference between the constitutional debt limit and the outstanding debt.

TABLE 6: DEBT POSITION OF THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER
1956-1966

Year	Constitutional Debt Limit	Outstanding Debt Subject to CDL*		Not Sub- ject to Limit	Debt Margin
		Amount	% of Debt		
1956	649,424	44,350	6.8%		605,074
1957	706,994	27,580	3.9		679,414
1958	764,671	16,810	2.2		747,861
1959	764,671	9,040	1.2		755,631
1960	799,813	27,870	3.5		771,943
1961	867,252	28,246	3.3		839,006
1962	938,490	21,613	2.3		916,877
1963	1,020,510	29,863	2.9		990,647
1964	1,097,763	49,319	4.5		1,048,444
1965	1,141,791	33,035	2.9		1,108,756
1966	1,162,318	21,670	1.9	6,340	1,140,648

*Constitutional Debt Limit

Source: New York State Comptroller, Special Report on Municipal Affairs 1956-1966

The outstanding debt was 6.9% of the constitutional debt limit in 1956 and has declined to 1.9% in 1966. The decline is attributable to both a smaller outstanding debt and a larger constitutional debt limit. In 1966 the Town had a debt margin or available borrowing capacity of approximately 1.14 million dollars.

Special Town Districts

Within the Town of Rochester there is one fire district and one fire protection district and 3 light districts. One of the fire districts (Kerhonkson) services a very small part of the Town. Data on revenues and expenditures are not available for the Town of Rochester portion of the Kerhonkson Fire District and therefore this district is not included in the following table.

TABLE 7: SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER*
1956-1966
(in thousands of dollars)

Year	<u>REVENUES</u>			<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					Out- stand- ing Debt
	Real Pro- perty Taxes & Asses- ments	Other Revenues	Total	Bor- row- ings	Cur- rent	Capital Outlay	Debt Serv- ice	Total	
1956	5.8	1.4	7.2	-	3.0	1.6	2.5	7.1	21.0
1957	5.9	0.7	6.6	-	2.4	-	2.4	4.8	19.0
1958	6.4	1.9	8.3	-	4.9	-	2.4	7.3	17.0
1959	6.4	8.4	14.8	6.0	4.3	18.5	2.4	25.2	21.0
1960	6.5	0.8	7.3	-	3.9	-	2.5	6.4	19.0
1961	7.1	0.3	7.4	-	3.3	0.5	2.5	6.3	17.0
1962	7.9	0.3	8.2	-	3.8	2.1	2.4	8.3	15.0
1963	9.0	0.5	9.5	-	5.1	1.0	2.4	8.5	13.0
1964	9.1	0.3	9.4	-	5.8	0.8	2.3	9.0	11.0
1965	13.4	0.6	14.0	-	4.1	0.3	2.2	6.6	9.0
1966	13.4	2.5	15.9	-	6.5	3.1	1.2	10.7	8.0

*does not include Kerhonkson Fire District
Note: Totals may not add because of rounding

Source: New York State Comptroller, Special Report on Municipal Affairs,
1956-1966

The Kerhonkson fire district raised by assessment \$13.82 in 1964, \$26.93 in 1965 and \$27.36 in 1966 in the Town of Rochester. The tax rates in

1965 for 1966 and 1967 for 1968 were \$2.514 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation in the Town for the Accord fire district, \$3.151 and \$3.478 for the Accord Light District, \$2.637 and \$2.835 for the Kerhonkson Light No. 2 District, \$5.182 and \$4.450 for the Berme Road Light District and \$6.001 and \$11.280 for the Kerhonkson Fire District. The latter district is an equalized district and the tax rates reflect only the Town of Rochester portion of the district.

TABLE 8: KERHONKSON FIRE DISTRICT 1956-1966
(in thousands of dollars)

Year	REVENUES			Bor- row- ings	EXPENDITURES			Out- stand- ing Debt	
	Real Pro- perty Tax	Other Revenues	Total		Cur- rent Opera- tions	Capital Outlay	Debt Service		Total
1956	3.0	2.6	5.6	-	3.5	0.1	1.2	4.9	4.4
1957	3.1	3.2	6.3	-	4.6	0.2	1.2	6.0	3.3
1958	1.9	3.8	5.7	-	3.0	0.3	1.2	4.5	2.2
1959	1.6	3.5	5.1	-	3.8	1.0	1.2	5.9	1.1
1960	1.6	4.2	5.8	-	3.5	2.2	1.1	6.8	-
1961	1.5	4.2	5.7	-	5.2	-	-	5.2	-
1962	1.5	3.7	5.2	-	4.6	0.7	-	5.3	-
1963	1.5	3.2	4.7	-	4.3	0.3	-	4.5	-
1964	1.5	3.1	4.6	-	5.1	0.7	-	5.8	-
1965	3.2	3.9	7.1	-	4.5	0.2	-	4.7	-
1966	3.2	3.8	7.0	-	4.5	1.3	-	5.8	-

Note: Totals may not add because of rounding

Source: New York State Comptroller, "Special Reports on Municipal Affairs,"
1956-1966

TABLE 9: RONDOUT VALLEY CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCES
FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1966

Enrollments	2,604	
Assessed Value	\$11,538,446	
Full Value	52,367,261	
Revenue		
Real Property Taxes	802,624	
Real Property Taxes Per Pupil		\$308
State Aid	1,513,764	
State Aid Per Pupil		\$581
Federal Aid	90,762	
Other Revenue	118,538	
Total Revenue	2,525,688	
Total Revenue Per Pupil		\$970
Expenditures		
Current Operations	2,207,074	
Capital Outlay	283,813	
Debt Service		
Principal	169,000	
Interest	90,761	
Total Expenditures	2,750,648	
Outstanding Debt		
Bonds	2,710,000	
Notes	294,723	
Tax Rate per \$1,000 of Assessed Valuation	<u>1965 for 1966</u>	<u>1967 for 1968</u>
Rochester District W1	\$56.52	96.69
Rochester District W3	56.10	96.69
Rochester District #2	47.46	98.04
Rochester	54.52	95.35

Source: New York State Comptroller, "Special Report on Municipal Affairs, 1966 - 1966 Ulster County Data Book Special District Tax Rates 1967 for 1968."

TABLE 10: ELLENVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
 SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCES
 FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1966

Enrollments	2,304	
Assessed Value	\$16,573,639	
Full Value	93,847,964	
Revenue		
Real Property Taxes	1,348,264	\$585
Real Property Taxes Per Pupil		
State Aid	727,500	\$316
State Aid Per Pupil		
Federal Aid	46,344	
Other Revenues	72,210	
Total Revenue	2,194,317	\$952
Total Revenue Per Pupil		
Expenditures		
Current Operations	1,966,293	
Capital Outlay	52,349	
Debt Service		
Principal	125,000	
Interest	51,875	
Total Expenditures	2,195,517	
Outstanding Debt		
Bonds	1,950,000	
Notes	-	
Tax Rate Per \$1,000 of Assessed Valuations	1965 for 1966	\$51.46
	1967 for 1968	\$57.87

Source: New York State Comptroller, "Special Report on Municipal Affairs"
 1966 - 1966 and 1968 Ulster County Data Book.

Summary

The tax base of the Town has been consistently improving. Revenues have been increasing but so have expenditures and the Town tax rate for 1966 was higher than the adjacent Towns of Hurley, Marbletown, Rosendale and Wawarsing. With the expansion of the tax base, the available debt margin has increased to the point where over \$1.1 million dollars of borrowing capacity is available.

RECOMMENDED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Capital projects as recommended in the Development Plan are as follows:

1) Acquisition and Development of Park and Recreation Facilities

The Development Plan recommends that 45 acres of land be developed for park and recreation purposes. Federal and State grants to aid in acquisition of property is available. In addition it is possible that land may be donated or land can be acquired through cluster development. At the present time the Town has \$2,700 in a special fund which is earmarked for park and recreation purposes.

2) Street Improvements

The recommended street improvements basically involve State and County action and funds. Other street proposals and extensions are proposed to be effectuated as a result of subdivision activity.

3) Town Hall

The Town presently owns property on which a Town Hall is proposed to be built. Necessary capital expenditures are for construction of the building.

4) Utilities

The Development Plan recommends following the Ulster County Water Supply study recommendations. This involves formation of an inter-municipal water district which would supply water to the medium density residential areas. Costs involved in this proposed central water supply may involve Town wide and special district costs but can not be determined until plans are further advanced. An engineering study has been made for water supply to the Pataukunk area of the Town as discussed in the Utilities and Services Plan section of this report. Costs involved in this proposal are special district costs.

The installation of sewage disposal systems is also possible during the range of the Development Plan. No costs are presently available but these again would be special district costs.

FIRST SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

The adoption of a capital improvements program in communities which are experiencing population growth or demand for new and improved public facilities is a vital step toward the optimum organization of available resources to meet required improvements. Such program enables the officials and citizens to take an overall view with respect to specific needs, place improvements in their proper priority scale and establish a continuous financial management tool which can achieve financial efficiency and tax stability.

The expenditures of financially independent agencies--such as the school district--are not included in the municipal capital improvements program.

Since the matter of available financing and the loads placed on the community are very often a determining and limiting factor in the effectuation of physical improvements, it is important to note that at the present time the State and Federal governments participate in the financing of many types of community improvements. In most cases, Federal or State participation must be requested by the municipality, and, in return for financial aid, the Federal or State agencies require certain activities by the community. This usually involves the existence of a comprehensive planning program and the use of the capital improvements programming technique.

Such prerequisites apply to park and recreation development and utilities to name a few. In other cases, such as highway programs, local direct participation is not necessary to bring the State agencies into action.

Several of the improvements recommended in the Development Plan qualify for financial assistance by the Federal and State governments--park and recreation facilities and utilities. Other sources of financing may also be available: the donation of land by owners, or the construction of improvements by citizens, fraternal, social, business or other groups. Such expenditures would not, of course, be included in the capital program, but they would help to relieve pressure for public improvements.

It is the recommendation of this report that improvements be made with the financial participation of other governmental units whenever possible. The assistance provided will almost surely outweigh any other factors or imposed restrictions. The presently available sources of aid from the Federal and State governments are included with the description of each recommended project.

Each six-year capital improvement program schedules those capital expenditures deemed most likely to be needed during that period. The Planning Board reviews an Individual Project Estimate for each project, prepared by department heads. Each of these estimates should include sufficient data to permit the Board to analyze the project. A sample follows this page. The Board evaluates the project estimates and prepares the six-year capital program. Consideration is also given to projects already scheduled in the previous year's capital program. The Board must also analyze the progress made under the previous six-year program, and any changing requirements brought about by unexpected circumstances. For example, early equipment failure or changes in traffic patterns may require unexpected and unprogrammed expenditures for equipment replacement or street improvement. This would require modification of the next annual six-year capital improvement program.

Town of Rochester
Municipality

Exhibit A
Project No. _____
Priority No. _____

SIX-YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM
INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ESTIMATE

1. Department _____ 2. Division _____
3. Project Title _____
4. Location _____
5. Description _____

6. Purpose and Justification _____

7. Status of Plans: (check)
____ Plans not needed ____ Survey completed ____ Sketch plans completed
____ Nothing done on plans ____ Work on plans scheduled ____ Detail plans in preparation
____ Preliminary est. rec'd. ____ Sketch plans in preparation ____ Detail plans completed.

8. Estimated Cost
Engineering \$ _____
Site Acquisition _____
Construction _____
Other() _____
Total _____

11. Proposed Method of Financing
Obligations \$ _____
Current Revenues _____
Assessments _____
Service Charge _____
St. & Fed. Aid _____
Reserves _____
Other _____
Total _____

9. Proposed Method of Construction:

10. Estimated Project Expenditures
by Years:
19 _____ \$ _____
19 _____
19 _____
19 _____
19 _____
19 _____
Later _____
Total _____

12. If Obligations are to be issued, state:
Type _____
Period of Years from _____ to _____

13. Effects the Project will have on Operating & Maintenance Expenses for first 3 Years of Operation: (±)
19 (±) \$ _____
19 (±) \$ _____
19 (±) \$ _____

Submitted by _____ Date _____
Planning Board Action _____ Date _____
Governing Action _____ Date _____

Note: Furnish as much of the information requested, as is available at the time of preparation. Attached maps and other supporting data that will aid in evaluating the project.

Recommended Six-Year Capital Improvements Program

It is recommended that during the first capital improvements program funds be allocated yearly for acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities and a Town Hall.

TABLE 11: TOWN OF ROCHESTER

Tentative Six-Year Capital Program															
Line No. of Project	Description	Annual Operating Costs	Estimated Total Cost	3	4	5	6	Recommended and Scheduled for 6 Year Period						Cost to Complete After 1975	
								7	8	9	10	11	12		13
1	Land Acquisition for Park & Recreation							500	500	500	500	500	500	500	**
2	Town Hall	\$2,000	\$50,000					50,000							
								a)							
			\$50,000					500	50,500	500	500	500	500	500	

* If the Town were the purchase all of the recommended park and recreation acreage, total costs would be approximately \$40-50,000. However, it is expected that considerable acreage will be obtained through use of subdivision and cluster development as well as State and Federal grants.

** Program to be continued until objectives of the Development Plan has been accomplished.

a) To be financed by general obligation bonds

TABLE 12: TOWN OF ROCHESTER

REGISTER OF CAPITAL PROJECTS

Pro- ject No.	Description of Project	De- partment	Total Esti- mated Cost	Year Scheduled	Year Com- pleted	Total Actual Cost	Remarks
1.	Park & Re- creation Facilities	General Town	\$500 per year	1970-1975			
2.	Town Hall	General Town	\$50,000	1971			

Effect upon the Tax Rate

In order to assist the Planning Board, an analysis was made of the effect of the proposed improvements on the tax base of the community. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the actual cost to the individual taxpayer of each improvement.

To accomplish this requirement an assumption must be made regarding the stability of the tax base. The tax base of the Town of Rochester showed a growth, from a \$2.08 million fully taxable assessed value in 1956 to a \$4.82 million fully taxable assessed value base by 1966. For the purposes of this analysis only, it shall be assumed that throughout the period of the proposed capital program, the fully taxable assessed value base will average \$5.20 million.

Items in the capital improvement program may be paid for out of current revenues in one year, or under a long-term general obligation bond, or a combination of both of these methods. The length of a bond may not be longer than the useful life of the improvement being financed.

To illustrate the effect of an improvement on the tax rate, a hypothetical example is used. An improvement, if projected at a cost of \$1,000 would result in an increase in the tax rate of \$0.192 per \$1,000 of assessed value for that year if paid from current expenditures, based on a \$5.20 million taxable assessed value base. The tax rate of \$63.442 would increase to \$63.634 per \$1,000 of assessed value for that year.

The \$500 per year allocated for park and recreation purposes is the same as the Town has been allocating in past years and does not represent an increased cost to the taxpayers over previous years. The expenditure for a Town Hall estimated at \$50,000 to be paid for by the issuance of general obligation bonds will cost approximately \$4,500 per year if issued for a period of 20 years at an interest rate of 4%.

The effect of \$4,500 per year of capital improvements plus an estimated \$2,000 per year in increased operating costs will increase the tax rate by \$1.25 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation over the 1967-1968 tax rate. This increased tax rate does not take into account any increase or decrease in the tax rate that may be due to other expenditures.

To provide a better illustration of the effect of the recommendations on the property owner, the increase in taxes to a property owner whose property is assessed at \$5,000 (approximately \$18,000 of true value) would be \$6.25 per year for the construction and operation of a Town Hall. If the Town Hall were built in 1971, this increase will be felt in 1972.

Operating Costs

The recreation facilities will cause increased operating expenditures for maintenance of property and equipment. It is estimated that maintenance costs will be a part of one man's yearly salary or \$2,000-\$3,000 per year when the suggested park and recreation facilities are in operation.

Increased operating cost as a result of a new Town Hall is \$2,000 per year and includes heat, light and general maintenance.

Public Improvements Program

The recommended capital improvements not included in the first capital improvements program constitute the public improvements program. There are:

- 1) Expenditures for Rochester's share of an intermunicipal water supply district as recommended by Ulster County Water Supply Study.
- 2) Sewage disposal systems for the medium density residential areas.

No cost estimates are available for the above projects.

In addition the Town should consider a continuing road improvement program. This can be handled by increases to the operating expenditures for the Highway Department or become part of the capital improvements program.