

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the potential socioeconomic effects of the Proposed Project. The chapter identifies whether the Proposed Project would have direct or indirect adverse effects on the area's population characteristics, residential markets, or commercial markets. In addition, the chapter evaluates the Proposed Project's effects on property tax revenues generated by the Project Sites, and estimates the economic and fiscal benefits generated by operation of the Proposed Project. Economic benefits related to construction of the project are described in Chapter 15, "Construction Impacts."

This chapter of the DEIS includes the following sections:

Section B: Methodology.

Section C: Existing Conditions.

Section D: The Future Without the Proposed Project.

Section E: Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project.

The analysis presented in this chapter concludes that overall, the Proposed Project is not expected to affect the Town of Haverstraw's demographic characteristics or business environment. The Proposed Project is expected to generate a substantial increase in property tax revenues for the Town, Rockland County, and other affected jurisdictions as a result of improvements made to the Project Sites. Contributing to this is the collection of taxes from the currently tax-exempt Town-owned site on which the water treatment plant would be constructed. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse socioeconomic impacts. The Proposed Project is, however, expected to have a net positive effect on the local and regional economies of Rockland County and New York State.

B. METHODOLOGY

The following sections describe the methodologies for the various analyses contained in this chapter.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, BUSINESS ACTIVITY, AND GROWTH

The purpose of this section is to examine the Proposed Project in its demographic setting and consider the potential effects it could have on residents and businesses in the surrounding area. In general, significant adverse impacts could result when a proposed action would directly or indirectly displace residents or businesses as a result of changing population characteristics, housing stock, or economic activities in an area.

Direct displacement occurs when a proposed project results in the involuntary displacement of residents, businesses, or institutions from the actual site of (or sites directly affected by) a proposed project. Examples include proposed redevelopment of a currently occupied site for

Haverstraw Water Supply Project DEIS

new uses or structures, or a proposed easement or right-of-way that would take a portion of a site and thus render it unfit for its current use.

Indirect displacement is defined as the involuntary displacement of residents, businesses, or employees in an area adjacent or close to a Project Site that results from changes in socioeconomic conditions created by a proposed action. Examples include rising rents in an area that result from a new concentration of higher-income housing introduced by a proposed action, which ultimately forces out lower-income residents; a similar turnover of industrial to higher-rent commercial tenancies induced by the introduction of a successful office project in an area; or the flight from a neighborhood that can occur if a proposed action creates a condition that breaks down the community (e.g., a highway dividing the area).

Residential Analysis

The Project Sites do not currently contain any residential uses, and subsequently there is no potential for direct residential displacement. An analysis of the potential for significant adverse impacts due to direct displacement is therefore not warranted.

The residential analysis describes the population and housing characteristics of Rockland County and the Town of Haverstraw (the study area), presents trend data since 1990, and compares study area characteristics to New York State as a whole. Information used in this section was gathered from demographic and housing data from the US Census Bureau's 1990 and 2000 Census, as well as the US Census Bureau's 2006 Population Estimates and American Community Survey.

Business Analysis

The Proposed Project would not introduce any new commercial uses to the study area, and therefore would not create any new economic activities that could result in the indirect displacement of area businesses. Therefore, an analysis of indirect effects on area businesses is not warranted. The section below does not present data on existing businesses or economic activity in the area around the Project Sites.

However, the Proposed Project would result in the development of sites that are currently occupied or used by existing businesses. Therefore, the analysis presents information on the existing business users of the Project Sites, and considers the potential for significant adverse impacts due to direct displacement.

TAXATION AND FINANCES

Assessed values and property tax revenue data for tax parcels that comprise the Intake Site and the Water Treatment Plant Site were provided by the Town of Haverstraw Assessor's Office and the Town's Receiver of Taxes to the Albert Valuation Group, Inc. in July 2008.

Based on current assessment and taxation information and an assessment of historical tax and equalization rate trends, the Albert Valuation Group, Inc. prepared a "Projected Assessments and Taxes Study" to provide a conservative estimate of future prospective taxes due to the improvements of the parcels comprising the Project Sites resulting from construction of the proposed facilities. Total property tax revenues were projected for the Intake Site and Water Treatment Plant Site in the Town of Haverstraw. Tax revenues were projected for the target tax year of 2015/2016, the point when the Proposed Project is expected to be completed.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL BENEFITS

The economic benefits analysis—performed using the IMPLAN (IMpact analysis for PLANning) input-output modeling system—estimates the number of direct and indirect jobs, tax revenues, and economic output generated by the construction and operations of the development expected to result from the Proposed Project. The analysis includes a description of taxes generated during the construction period.

Overview of the IMPLAN Economic Model

The principal economic model used to estimate the effect on the Rockland County's economy of constructing and operating the Proposed Project was IMPLAN, which was originally developed by the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service in 1979 and was subsequently privatized by the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG). The model uses the most recent economic data from sources such as the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the U.S. Census Bureau to predict effects on the local economy from direct changes in spending. The model contains data for Rockland County on more than 500 economic sectors, showing how each sector affects every other sector as a result of a change in the quantity of its product or service. A similar IMPLAN model for New York State was used to trace the effects on the State economy. Using these models and the specific characteristics of the projected development, the total effect has been projected for Rockland County and New York State.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, BUSINESS ACTIVITY, AND GROWTH

The population characteristics of New York State, Rockland County and the areas within the Town of Haverstraw that are not incorporated into villages are described below.

POPULATION

The population of Rockland County increased 2.9 percent from April 2000 to June 2006, to an estimated 2006 population of 294,965 (U.S. Census Bureau 2006 Population Estimates). As shown in Table 6-1, the estimated overall New York State population growth from 2000 to 2006 was 1.7 percent (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts). Population growth in Rockland County has been slightly higher than New York State growth. Of the estimated 294,965 individuals in Rockland County during 2006, 145,411 were male, and 149,554 were female (U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey).

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the Town of Haverstraw had a population of 33,811 residents in the year 2000; 48.4 percent male and 51.6 percent female. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the Town of Haverstraw's population increased by 3.8 percent from 2000 to 2006.

Table 6-1
Population Characteristics (2000 to 2006)

Population Characteristic	New York State	Rockland County	Town of Haverstraw
2006 Population	19,306,183	294,965	35,104
Population Growth/Decline (2000 to 2006)	1.7%	2.9%	3.8%
Percent of Population Male (2000)	48.5%	49.2%	48.4%
Number of Households (2000)	7,056,860	84,874	11,255
Number of Housing Units (2000)	7,679,307	94,973	11,553
Median Home Value (2000)	\$190,078	\$242,500	\$187,600
Median Age (2000)	35.9	36.2	35.3
Percent of Population 25+ highest level of education is:			
High School Diploma (2000)	27.80%	22.50%	27.6%
Bachelors Degree (2000)	15.60%	21.20%	13.5%
Masters or higher (2000)	11.80%	13.10%	9.1%
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey			

RACE

Rockland County's population is predominantly Caucasian at 77.6 percent, while 11.3 percent of the population is African American, 14.8 percent of the population is Hispanic, and 6.2 percent of the population is of Asian decent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).

In 2000, the Town of Haverstraw's population was: 66.2 percent Caucasian, 10.3 percent African American, 3.2 percent Asian, 0.4 percent American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.1 percent Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and 15.7 percent Some Other Race. Of the total Town population, 31.7 percent of the population was Hispanic or Latino (of any race).

HOUSEHOLDS

There were 92,675 households in Rockland County, an increase of 9.2 percent from 1990. This includes a significant increase of family households, which grew by 6.5 percent in the same decade. The average household size in 2000 was 3.01 people.

There were 11,255 households in the Town of Haverstraw in 2000. Approximately 74 percent of the households were comprised of families. There were 4,195 households (or 37.3 percent) with children under the age of 18. Over half (54.4 percent) were married-couple families.

AGE CHARACTERISTICS

The median age of Rockland County residents in 2000 was 36.2 years old, which was slightly older than the total New York population as a whole (35.9 years of age). The largest age group in Rockland in 2000 was the 40-49 year olds, comprising 15 percent of the population. The smallest age group in 2000, 1.5 percent of the population, was the 85-year-old and older category. From 1990 to 2000, the 70-79-year-old age group increased more than all other age groups, growing from 11,160 to 15,111 persons, an increase of 3.5 percent. The group that decreased the most in that period was the 20-29 year olds, dropping from 39,274 to 31,207 individuals.

The median age for the Town of Haverstraw in 2000, 35.3 years old, was slightly lower than that of Rockland County. The most populated age group for the Town of Haverstraw is 35-44-year-old category, with a population of 5,624 or 16.6 percent. The age group with the least population in the Town of Haverstraw is those people 85 years old and older (436 people or 1.3 percent of the town's total population).

EDUCATION

Of the 184,012 residents in Rockland County 25 years old or older, 22.5 percent of the population had a high school diploma. Out of the Rockland County population, 21.2 percent earned a bachelor's degree, 13.1 percent earned a master's degree, 3.3 percent earned a degree from a professional school and 1.5 percent earned a doctorate.

Over three-quarters of the Town of Haverstraw's population 25 years old and older (22,097 people or 76.6 percent) hold a high school diploma, 22.6 percent (4,991 individuals) hold a bachelor's degree, and 9.1 percent (2,012 people) hold a graduate or professional degree.

HOUSING

Rockland County had 94,973 housing units in 2000, of which 2.4 percent were vacant. In 2000, 71.7 percent of the housing units were owner-occupied and 28.3 percent of the housing units were renter-occupied. The mean home value was \$242,500, which is higher than the New York State mean home value of \$190,078. The average household income in Rockland County in 1999 was \$85,236, which, like the home value, is significantly higher than the New York State average, which was \$61,856.

In 2006, there were an estimated 97,021 housing units in Rockland County, of these, 67,952 housing units were owner-occupied and 24,163 housing units were renter-occupied. Of the estimated number of housing units, 4,906 (5 percent) were vacant. An estimated 38,511 of the households in Rockland County had 2 vehicles available, while 8,528 households had no vehicle available. Of the estimated number of housing units, 81,803 were heated with utility gas, 4,767 were heated with electricity, and 4,154 were heated with bottled, tank or LP gas.

In 2000, there were 11,553 housing units in the Town of Haverstraw. The median number of rooms per unit was 5.1, 10.6 percent of the units had 9 or more rooms, 2.5 percent had 1 room. The largest percentage of units (17.7 percent) had 4 rooms. Approximately 37.3 percent of the housing units had 2 vehicles available, while 11.9 percent had no vehicles. Of the housing units, 84.5 percent were heated by utility gas and 10.8 percent used electricity. Ninety percent of these units had 1.00 or less people per room, 4.4 percent had 1.51 or more people per room.

Of the 7,134 owner-occupied units in the Town of Haverstraw, 31.7 percent were valued between \$200,000 and \$299,999, 29 percent were valued between \$150,000 and \$199,999, 23.5 percent were valued between \$100,000 and \$149,999, 11.3 percent were valued between \$300,000 and \$499,999, and 3.6 percent were valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The median value for housing units in the Town of Haverstraw was \$187,600. The median monthly mortgage in the Town of Haverstraw was \$1,576, while the median rent was \$859. There were 4,121 renter-occupied housing units in 2000, from these, 5.1 percent of the gross rent paid was less than \$200, 43.4 percent was between \$750 and \$999 dollars, and while 1.9 percent was \$1,500 or more. The greatest percentage of households (35.1 percent of the total) paid 35 percent or more of the total household income to rent, while only 12 percent of the households paid less than 15 percent of the total income toward rent.

LABOR FORCE

In 2000, 65.5 percent or 140,516 people 16 and older were in the Rockland County labor force. The civilian labor force was comprised of 140,476 individuals. Approximately 96.3 percent of these individuals were employed. There were 74,153 individuals (34.5 percent of the population) not in the labor force.

The estimated median household income for 2006 in Rockland County was \$76,710, while the median family income was \$91,169. Seven percent of all families were estimated to be below the poverty line, 12.0 percent of families with children under 18 were estimated to be below the poverty line, and 9.8 percent of families with children under 5 were estimated to be below the poverty line.

The majority of the population in the Town of Haverstraw 16 years and over was in the labor force in 2000 (64.3 percent). Of the 16,578 individuals 16 years of age and over in the civilian labor force, 3 percent were unemployed, 27.3 percent worked in sales and office occupations, 30.6 percent were in management, professional, and related occupations, 20.2 percent were in service occupations, 12.2 percent were in production, transportation and material moving occupations, and 9.6 percent were in construction, extraction and maintenance occupations.

The median household income in the Town of Haverstraw was \$53,850. Of the 8,356 families earning incomes within the town, 5.3 percent made less than \$10,000 and 2.2 percent made more than \$200,000; the median family income was \$61,119.

In Rockland County, 132,302 residents were workers that commuted to work. Of these workers, 54.4 percent worked in Rockland County, 20.2 percent worked in New York City, 10.2 percent worked in another Hudson Valley county (8.3 percent in Westchester), and 13.3 percent worked in New Jersey. In the Town of Haverstraw, 15,382 people commuted to work: 11,961 people drove alone, 1,670 carpooled, 1,056 took public transportation (including taxi cabs), 291 walked, 316 worked from home, and 88 via other means.

ADJACENT BUSINESS ACTIVITY

A portion of the Intake Site is used for off-season boat storage by the adjacent Haverstraw Marina, which is located to its immediate south. The Intake Site is bounded to the south by the US Gypsum (USG) conveyor belt and pier that periodically receives deliveries of materials from barges in the Hudson River. A small private boathouse is located immediately adjacent to the USG conveyor, to the south of the site. The remaining Project Sites do not contain any active commercial uses. The Water Treatment Plant Site is sited on a portion of the closed Haverstraw Landfill. The sites of the raw water treatment line and the potable water main route are beneath public streets, and the route of the water intake is beneath the Hudson River.

FISCAL CONDITIONS

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," the Proposed Project would occupy two primary sites: the Water Treatment Plant Site and the Intake Site. The Water Treatment Plant Site consists of portions of four tax parcels: 20.16-2-1, 20.16-2-2.1; 20.16-2-2.2; and 20.16-2-5. The Intake Site consists of a portion of one tax parcel, 21.09-2-1.

According to data provided by the Town of Haverstraw Assessor's Office and PropertyShark.com, the total assessed value for the Proposed Project sites is approximately \$4.0 million (see Table 6-2).

Table 6-2
Assessed Values of Project Sites, 2008

Property Address	Section, Block, & Lot	Owner	Total Assessed Value
Beach Road	20.16-2-1	Town of Haverstraw	\$589,800
555-571 Beach Road	20.16-2-2.1	Town of Haverstraw	\$1,125,300
Off Grassy Point Road	20.16-2-2.2	US Gypsum Co.	\$863,300
555-571 Beach Road ¹	20.16-2-5	Town of Haverstraw	\$101,300
710 Beach Road	21.09-2-1	US Gypsum Co.	\$1,284,300
Total			\$3,969,000
Notes: Data for Tax Parcel 20.16-2-5 is from FY 2006, and was obtained from Propertyshark.com by HDR, Inc. Source: Town of Haverstraw Tax Payment Receipts, Telephone conversation with Town of Haverstraw Assessor's Office, May 13, 2008, and Albert Valuation Group, Inc., July 2008.			

Although the total taxable value of all five development properties is \$3.97 million, a large portion of the parcels are currently owned by the Town of Haverstraw and are therefore non-taxable. Fully-taxable properties are those properties comprising the Intake Site, and are currently owned by the US Gypsum Company, which account for about \$2.15 million of the assessed value. As shown in Table 6-3, these fully-taxable properties generate approximately \$100,000 in taxes. In addition to the fully taxable parcels, the non-taxable town properties generate approximately \$500 in solid waste and sewer taxes.

Table 6-3
Total Tax Generation of Project Sites, 2008

Total Taxable / Assessable Market Value	\$2,153,600
NYS Equalization Rate, Town of Haverstraw	100%
Indicated Total Assessment (3 Taxable Parcels, Town of Haverstraw)	\$2,153,600
Current Total Tax Rate, Town/County (JAN 08 & School SEP 07, per \$1000 AV)	44.34
Effective Total Taxes Estimate as of SEP 07 / JAN 08	\$95,490
Sources: <i>Projected Assessment and Tax Study for United Water of New York, Inc.</i> , Albert Valuation Group, Inc., July 23, 2008. See Appendix 6.1 for full report.	

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL BENEFITS

As discussed above, the Project Sites generated approximately \$98,420 in property taxes. The Project Sites do not generate any other economic and fiscal benefits.

D. THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As discussed in Chapter 1, "Purpose and Need," over the next 20 years, population in Rockland County is projected to continue to grow and the demand for water to increase.

In the future without the Proposed Project, it is assumed that the Project Sites would remain unchanged. The water treatment plant, intake facilities, and the raw water transmission line would not be constructed. The property taxes generated by the Project Sites would also remain unchanged (and the increased values expected as a result of the Proposed Project, described

below, would not occur). In the future without the Proposed Project, it is assumed that the Project Sites would remain unimproved and therefore property taxes would continue to be generated by the land portion of the individual parcels. Any development or growth that occurs in the immediate area would do so independent of the Proposed Project.

E. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, BUSINESS ACTIVITY, AND GROWTH

RESIDENTIAL ANALYSIS

As noted above, the Project Sites do not contain any residential uses, and subsequently there would be no direct residential displacement. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct residential displacement.

As discussed above, over the next 20 years, population in Rockland County is projected to continue to grow. The Proposed Project would be executed in stages to keep pace with projected growth. Therefore, the new water supply infrastructure would serve the population growth that is expected to occur in the existing service area irrespective of the Proposed Project; it is not intended to accommodate additional growth beyond what is already forecast for the area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not induce new residential growth. In addition, the Project would not result in any adverse land use effects that would affect growth patterns in the surrounding area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement. At the same time, however, the Proposed Project would provide a tax benefit (described below) for the area's schools without adding new school students, as would a residential project.

BUSINESS ANALYSIS

As noted above, the Proposed Project would not introduce any new commercial uses to the study area, and therefore would not result any new economic activities that could result in the indirect displacement of area businesses. In addition, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse effects on land use that could serve as a disincentive to nearby businesses, and would also not be expected to induce new growth in the surrounding area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in no significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement.

In the future with the Proposed Project, it is expected that the Intake Site would no longer be available to the Haverstraw Marina for off-season boat storage. The displacement of the boat storage facility is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact because it is anticipated that replacement areas suitable for boat storage are available in the vicinity of the existing storage area.

In addition, the Proposed Project would operate near the USG conveyor and pier. As noted above, barges periodically make deliveries of materials to this pier. The Proposed Project would be designed to not interfere with the operation of the conveyor belt and pier, and a marked buoy would be placed near the intake structure in the Hudson River to alert barges and ships of its presence. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to USG's operations.

The Proposed Project would provide the economic benefit of re-using a portion of the closed Haverstraw Landfill for use as the Water Treatment Plant Site. This site is otherwise expected to remain undeveloped in the foreseeable future.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL BENEFITS

This section estimates the economic and fiscal benefits that would be generated by the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The analysis considers benefits to both Rockland County and the wider New York State economy.

METHODOLOGY

Using IMPLAN terminology, economic impacts are broken into three components: direct, indirect, and induced effects:

- *Direct effects* represent the initial benefits to the economy of new investment; e.g., a construction project, changes in employment, changes in employee compensation.
- *Indirect effects* represent the benefits generated by industries purchasing from other industries as a result of the direct investment; e.g., indirect employment resulting from construction expenditures would include jobs in industries that provide goods and services to the contractors. A direct investment triggers changes in other industries as businesses alter their production to meet the needs of the industry in which the direct impact has occurred. These businesses in turn purchase goods and services from other businesses, causing a ripple effect through the economy. The ripple effect continues until leakages from the region (caused, for example, by imported goods) stop the cycle. The sum of these iterative inter-industry purchases is called the indirect effect.
- *Induced effects* represent the impacts caused by increased income in a region. Direct and indirect effects generate more worker income by increasing employment and/or salaries in certain industries. Households spend some of this additional income on local goods and services, such as food and drink, recreation, and medical services. Benefits generated by these household expenditures are quantified as induced effects.

These effects were assessed for construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Construction assumptions used in the estimation of economic benefits from construction of the Proposed Project are described in Chapter 15, “Construction Impacts.” Once completed, the Proposed Project is expected to have fewer than 10 employees.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL BENEFITS FROM PROPOSED PROJECT

The employees who would work at the new water treatment plant would be anticipated to commute from their existing residences, and would not be expected to relocate from their current home communities.

PROPERTY TAX BENEFITS

As discussed above, in July 2008, the Albert Valuation Group, Inc. prepared a report titled “Projected Assessments and Taxes Study” for United Water New York, in connection with this DEIS. This report is found in Appendix 6.1. The purpose of the study was to provide a conservative estimate of future property taxes due to the new facilities. Taxes were projected for the Intake Site and the Water Treatment Plant Site, both in the Town of Haverstraw, as well as

for improvements to private properties resulting from the installation of the raw water transmission lines running through easements across those properties. Tax revenues were projected for the target tax year of 2015/2016, when the project is expected to be completed.

Methodology

Future tax revenue projections are based on current year tax estimates, which then were escalated at an annual rate to reflect probable future tax revenues in the phase years 2016, 2021, and 2030. To account for tax revenues from improvements (i.e., construction of the water treatment plant and the intake pumping station), the analysis assumed the hypothetical condition that the construction of the facilities would be completed and fully taxed in the base year of 2008. Future taxes from improvements are then calculated by escalating current, hypothetical tax revenues.

To calculate a market value for the proposed facilities in Haverstraw, the “cost approach” was applied, which is indicative for the assessment of “specialty properties.” In accordance with the New York State Real Property Tax Law, the estimated construction cost was used to estimate the total market value of the improvements. Land values for the project parcels owned by United Water were previously valued by the Albert Valuation Group, Inc. for property acquisition purposes. Combined, the improvements and land associated with the water treatment plant and intake pumping station were valued at \$65,550,000. For Phase 1 land and improvements were valued at \$47,050,000. The development of Phase 2 would contribute \$6,400,000 to the value, and Phase 3 improvements would increase the cumulative valuation by another \$12,100,000. It is noted that elements of the Proposed Project (i.e., subsurface piping) that are located within publicly owned right-of-ways, are not assessable.

Assessed values of improvements and land were derived from market values using the New York State Equalization Rate. The current applicable New York State Equalization Rate for Haverstraw is 118 percent. However, in accordance with the assessing standards of New York State, the maximum applicable rate may not exceed 100 percent. Therefore, an equalization rate of 100 percent was applied to current market value estimates.

The 2008 tax rates were utilized to estimate tax revenues for the hypothetical scenario described above. For Haverstraw, the total 2008 tax rate is \$44.37 per \$1,000 of assessed value. To project probable future tax revenues from the proposed facilities, a trend factor based on an average CPI increase of 3.0 percent was developed for each phase. Applying the annual escalation rate to each phase results in a trend factor of 1.27 for Phase 1, 1.47 for Phase 2, and 1.92 for Phase 3.

Table 6-4, below, summarizes input variables discussed above and presents resulting estimated tax revenues for the Proposed Project. Table 6-4 illustrates total tax revenues generated by facilities in the various phase years. According to the tax projections, the Proposed Project would generate total real estate tax revenues of \$2,649,470 in year 2016, \$3,483,860 in year 2021, \$5,580,455 in year 2030.

This estimate of current-value total tax generation is a substantial increase over the existing tax revenue currently generated by the Project Sites of \$95,490, as shown in Table 6-3, above.

The 2007 municipal tax levy for the Town of Haverstraw is \$16,840,163, and the Town’s levy for Rockland County taxes is \$5,856,970,¹ for a combined Town/County levy of \$22,697,133. At the present value discounted level of \$3,039,346, the Proposed Project’s tax generation would

¹ <http://www.orps.state.ny.us/cfapps/MuniPro>, accessed August 25, 2008.

represent over 18 percent of the Town's entire 2007 property tax levy, and approximately 13 percent of the Town's County tax levy if the Proposed Project were in full operation at this point in time. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project would generate proportionately similar amounts at the time of its completion in the future.

Table 6-4
Assessment Findings for the Town of Haverstraw

Phase	Factor	Year		
		2016	2021	2030
Phase 1	Indicated Total Assessment	\$47,050,000	\$47,050,000	\$47,050,000
	Current Total Tax Rate (Sept.' 08, per \$1000 AV)	44.34	44.34	44.34
	Effective Total Taxes Estimate as of Sept. '08	\$2,086,197	\$2,086,197	\$2,086,197
	Years out	8	13	22
	CPI Trend	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Trend Factor	1.27	1.47	1.92
	Projected Taxes	\$2,649,470	\$3,066,710	\$4,005,498
Phase 2	Indicated Total Assessment		\$6,400,000	\$6,400,000
	Current Total Tax Rate (Sept.' 08, per \$1000 AV)		44.34	44.34
	Effective Total Taxes Estimate as of Sept. '08		\$283,776	\$283,776
	Years out		13	22
	CPI Trend		3.0%	3.0%
	Trend Factor		1.47	1.92
	Projected Taxes		\$417,151	\$544,850
Phase 2	Indicated Total Assessment			\$12,100,000
	Current Total Tax Rate (Sept.' 08, per \$1000 AV)			44.34
	Effective Total Taxes Estimate as of Sept. '08			\$536,514
	Years out			22
	CPI Trend			3.0%
	Trend Factor			1.92
	Projected Taxes			\$1,030,107
Total Projected Taxes by Year		\$2,649,470	\$3,483,860	\$5,580,455
Notes: Current total tax rate includes town and county taxes.				
Sources: Projected Assessment and Tax Study for United Water of New York, Inc.: Albert Valuation Group, September 23, 2008, page 8. See Appendix 6.1 for full report.				

CONCLUSIONS

The Proposed Project is not expected to affect the Town of Haverstraw's demographic characteristics or business environment. The Proposed Project is expected to generate a substantial increase in property tax revenues from the improvement of the Project Sites. This increase is partially due to the collection of taxes from the currently tax-exempt Town-owned site on which the water treatment plant would be constructed. As a result, the Proposed Project is expected to have a net positive effect on the local and regional economies of Rockland County and New York State.

*