

Town of Colonial Beach Planning Commission Minutes

Date: May 06, 2010 – Town Center, 22 Washington Avenue

Time: 5:30 P.M.

Present: Ed Grant - Chairman
David H. Coombes
Margaret McMullen
Maureen Holt
Desiree Urquhart
Cynthia Misicka

Absent: Kent Rodeheaver

Also Present: Val Foulds, Town Manager
Gary Mitchell, Director of Building and Zoning
Andrea Erard, Town Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Grant called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. Mr. Rodeheaver was absent from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grant asked for approval of the minutes from the April 01, 2010 meeting. Ms. McMullen moved to approve the minutes and Ms. Urquhart 2nd the motion. Ms. McMullen asked that that the documents that the Commission votes on be included in the minutes. Staff agreed to do so.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS

Mr. Grant asked for any comment on Planning Commission matters. There was no comment from the public.

DISCUSSION ON LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS AND POLICIES FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they had in their packets this document to review. Mr. Mitchell stated that the first page was the introduction to this document and then on page two it talked about the goals and policies.

Mr. Mitchell stated the real first section for discussion was on page 4. which was the Transportation section. Mr. Mitchell stated that this section is agreed to by VDOT in terms of the level of services and the different types of studies that have to be done, road improvements. He stated that if a road improvement is required by VDOT then a developer cannot get credit for it as a proffer. He stated this is pretty consistent by most localities in Virginia.

Ms. Urquhart asked for an explanation of the first two sentences in paragraph three. She asked what the difference is.

There are 1.9 miles of roadways which are paper or undeveloped streets. There are 2.6 miles of roads that are under developed (non-paved).

Ms. Erard stated that you cannot drive on a paper road. Mr. Mitchell stated that a paper road is platted but it looks like woods or a field.

Mr. Mitchell goes on to explain the definitions and the level of service standards for transportation, giving examples of what each letter represents.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he would not be going over every paragraph that they could review them and discuss when necessary.

Mr. Coombes stated that on page 6 the numbers jumped from 2.19 to 2.25.

Mr. Coombes asked if this was just a preliminary. Mr. Mitchell explained that it is just a draft.

Mr. Coombes stated that in various parts there are sentences that are not sentences and grammatical errors. He stated that the document needed to be reviewed for errors.

Mr. Mitchell stated that on page 8 is the Storm Water Facilities page. He stated this has been reviewed with DCR (department of conservation and recreation). He stated they have no problems with the document and are in agreement with the concept.

Ms. Erard stated that Gary was proposing this as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan then when they do cash proffers they are required to say what they are doing with the money. In order to do cash proffers they need to know what they are going to build and how much it is going to cost. She stated that the level of service document is beneficial in arriving at cash proffers.

Mr. Mitchell stated that on page 12. He had received the public safety information from Chief Hawkins and his staff. He stated it included information like the number of officers they have and what their response times are and number of calls.

Mr. Mitchell stated that one of their goals was to have one sworn deputy devoted to law enforcement duties to the population ratio of one officer to 300 people.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he thought they were pretty close to being at that point.

Mr. Mitchell stated that below this was Fire and Rescue Services.

He stated that he worked with Mary Frances Bowen on this information since she is with the Fire Department.

Mr. Coombes asked Mr. Mitchell to rework all of this because a lot of this information is inaccurate.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he got this from the Fire Department.

Mr. Coombes pointed out that the Rescue department information is wrong. He stated that the hours in which rescue staff works is wrong. He stated they have two stations in Town one for Fire and one for rescue. He stated the demographics are in error. He stated he could not address the call information.

Ms. McMullen pointed out that on page 13 it referenced the sheriff's department and should read the police department.

Mr. Coombes asked Mr. Mitchell to speak to the rescue squad about the stats.

Mr. Mitchell stated that on page 14 it listed the goals for the Fire and Rescue. He stated that one goal was to establish a joint county-town fire rescue commission as an advisory body. He stated this was an advisory committee to provide for another sounding board.

Ms. Urquhart asked who would take the lead on establishing a joint committee.

Mr. Mitchell stated that if they adopted this language then probably the Town would get in touch with the County to work out an agreement.

Mr. Coombes stated that the county is responsible for all emergency services. The people that are paid here in Town during the day are county employees. He stated that when they say take the lead then the county is responsible if the town is unable to provide fire and rescue. He said this is by state statute.

Ms. Urquhart stated that she was speaking in regards to establishing this joint body.

Mr. Coombes stated that he did not know. It could start here as far as he is concerned.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the next section was regarding community facilities. He stated it talks a little bit about the library system and that we meet those goals.

Mr. Mitchell stated that after library it talks about parks and recreation. He said in regards to the goals of 10 acres per 1,000 people they would need about 30 acres and they currently have 5 acres. He stated as a developer when they come in they could proffer park space.

Mr. Mitchell stated with the school system they had Dr. Power review this and edit it.

Ms. Holt stated she had a comment about this section 8.2

8.2 Expand permanent seat capacity at existing schools as the first response to student growth rather than construct new schools.

Ms. Holt stated that she thought they were planning on building a new elementary school. She stated that this needs to be looked at carefully.

Mr. Mitchell stated that this was what was presented back to him.

Ms. Holt said this is a huge issue.

Mr. Mitchell said he would look in to this.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the next section was public works. He said he worked with Mr. Murphy on this section.

He stated that this deals with solid waste, water and sewer. He stated that they were pretty much in good shape with the solid waste, water and sewer with the treatment plant.

Ms. McMullen commented on the recycling bin that the Town had. She believes that recycling is managed by the County.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the next section talked about the municipal administration. He stated that one of the goals was to develop a new municipal center. He stated this could possibly be done at 700 Colonial Avenue or somewhere else in Town. He said they would need to find a unified central location for Town administration offices. He stated that it talks about using the CIP to do this.

Mr. Mitchell stated that if the Commissioners had any additional comments or questions then he would like them to get them back to him so he can work on a final draft.

Mr. Mitchell stated this document would be a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Coombes asked where the standards and measurements that Mr. Mitchell used in the document came from.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they came from other localities in the area.

Mr. Mitchell proceeded with the proffer policy documents.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the meat and potato's of this document was in the spread sheet in the back of the packet.

Ms. Misicka asked what happens when a particular department in the level of service policy plan is not meeting their standards. She stated he had mentioned this with parks and recreation. She asked if this affects their ability to get anything done.

Mr. Mitchell stated that what they wind up doing is out of the process they end up updating the Capital Improvements program. He stated that from this document it helps them to set up a new CIP. He stated they will put items in there that need to be addressed.

Ms. Misicka asked if there was any danger in having a level of service that they are not meeting.

Mr. Mitchell stated no. Other than the fact that they recognize it and if a rezoning comes in and you are behind on something then you can look at the rezoning and see how much further it is going to put you behind. Then they can offset the pressure that the new development is going to have.

Ms. Erard stated that they could also use this information as a basis to deny a rezoning.

Ms. Misicka asked that with the parks and recreation is it possible that they can ever meet the goal.

Mr. Mitchell stated maybe with the 600 acres at Potomac crossings they can address some of this when they come back to amend their rezoning.

Ms. Holt stated that on page 4. which reads:

Cash proffers not used for the purpose specified in the proffer and/or this Policy will be returned to the payer thereof twenty (20) years after receipt of the proffer or as otherwise specified in the proffer statement.

She stated she felt this should be removed.

Ms. Erard stated that it is state code. Ms. Erard stated that when you have cash proffers there is an annual report that must be filed on how you spend the money.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the money cannot be used to run general deficits.

Mr. Mitchell explained the calculations on the back of the document and stated that he met with Mr. Fink in Westmoreland County and talked to a few people in Spotsylvania County and talked to Caroline County.

Mr. Mitchell went over the line items and described how he came up with the calculations and where he received these numbers.

(see chart attached in which Mr. Mitchell reads the numbers from)

Ms. Misicka stated that she recalled in the level of service policies that only 8 officers take calls.

Mr. Mitchell stated that this is divided by the total number of officers in the department.

Mr. Coombes said that Mr. Mitchell just had officers here and what about dispatchers or secretary.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they are not factored in here because they do not provide police protection. He said they could be added in.

Mr. Coombes stated that the dispatcher is there 24 hours a day.

Mr. Mitchell stated that you really can't use the dispatcher because you can't pay their salaries and that you can only pay for the equipment.

Mr. Coombes said okay he understood. He stated that there are more employees in the police department than what is listed here.

Mr. Mitchell stated they would be looking at the cost to provide police protection in terms of the capital cost.

Mr. Mitchell talks about the mathematics and how he came up with the figures for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Mitchell discusses the figures for Fire and Rescue. Mr. Mitchell stated that he got these figures from Mr. Anderson at the fire house.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the public works came from a similar process. Mr. Mitchell goes over how he arrived at the numbers for public works. He stated that he worked with Rob Murphy on these numbers.

Mr. Coombes asked Mr. Mitchell what a Leed Silver Certification was.

Mr. Mitchell explained that a Leed Silver Certification is when it meets a green building code. He stated that it uses less energy and is more sustainable. He stated that this is deserving of a credit and that is what the \$4,900 represents.

Mr. Coombes stated that Mr. Mitchell would need to tell them as the professional what the right number is for the Leed Silver Certification.

Ms. Erard stated that some of the features for this are more expensive for the builder to construct. She said the idea is that if a community would like to provide an incentive for green development.

Mr. Mitchell said they can do some more research on this to come up with a number. He said he came up with this number so that they had something to look at.

Mr. Mitchell stated that as the chart shows the suggested proffer amount he came up per unit \$19,669.52

Mr. Coombes stated that he would like to draw this distinction for the record and for the commission. He stated this is phenomenal and the reason he was pushing this proffer thing for 5 years is that the property out on the Wilkerson Farm (532 acres) which has now stalled. He stated that when this came through 5, 6, 7 or maybe 10 years ago the amount for proffers that was offered by the Ben Bell corporation was \$300 per residence. He stated the town accepted that.

Mr. Coombes said that now you can see that it is almost \$20,000 per resident. He stated that this development is to include homes, condos and townhomes spread over 10-15 years. He stated that they were talking about millions of dollars. He stated this is why this is so important.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that if that development had caught fire and built out like so many things in northern Virginia. You could have a thousand houses sitting there right now. If you just figure a 1/3 of a child that would be another 160 or 170 kids in school that you would have to educate for 12 years.

Mr. Coombes asked what the proffer was per dwelling unit in Spotsylvania.

Mr. Mitchell said it was like \$29,000. Mr. Mitchell said Stafford was like \$32,000. He stated that Caroline is in the \$17,500 range.

Mr. Coombes stated that they were not out of line with \$19,000.

Mr. Grant stated that their goal was to refine this and get it on the books. He stated that it should not be played around with for 6 months.

Mr. Coombes stated that he had discussions with Lennar homes and they are ready to move in about 6 months. He stated this needs to go to Council soon.

Mr. Grant asked if they can improve this enough by the next meeting to move forward.

Mr. Mitchell asked the Town Attorney if a public hearing would need to be done.

Ms. Erard stated they do at both the Planning Commission and Town Council levels.

Mr. Mitchell said he would try and polish this up and get it to them by June.

Mr. Mitchell said he can try and get the Commission a copy by the middle of the month and if he hears nothing from them then they will move forward with a public hearing in June.

Ms. Misicka stated that she does not have much knowledge on this type of thing and would be heavily relying on Staff. Ms. Misicka stated that she would be willing to have the public hearing in June to make this happen.

Mr. Coombes stated that they could have a special meeting if need be to get this done.

Mr. Coombes stated that he would sooner move with dispatch then hold it up 30, 60 or 90 days.

Ms. Urquhart asked Mr. Mitchell if the footnotes on his spreadsheet have all the assumptions, so they may refer to them if need be.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he can show formulas.

Ms. Urquhart stated that it is critical to also see the assumptions.

Ms. Holt stated that she would like to move forward with a public hearing.

Ms. McMullen moved to have a public hearing. Ms. Misicka seconded the motion.

Mr. Grant asked if everybody agreed. There was general agreement to hold the public hearing. Nobody objected.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Commissioners had a copy of the old CIP in front of them. He stated it was from 2006 and projected up to 2011. He stated it has not been updated since 2006.

Mr. Mitchell said they could look through this and get some ideas.

Ms. McMullen stated that when this CIP was done it was done quickly because somebody was energized and wanted it done. She stated yes they needed a CIP but this was simply based off of budgets. Ms.

McMullen stated that it is her feeling that they may want to use this with a grain of salt. She stated that she would prefer using what Mr. Mitchell presented tonight and chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Erard stated that the CIP needs to be updated. She said the CIP dictates how the money gets spent that you collect from cash proffers. She stated that the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment they are looking at and the CIP go together hand and glove. She said they are essential to the cash proffer policy. She said if you want to have a public hearing on all of this on June 3rd then the ad and all of these things need to be complete by Monday, May 17th.

Ms. McMullen stated that it was her understanding that they didn't have to have the CIP....

Ms. Erard stated they have to have the CIP because everything is based on the CIP.

Ms. McMullen stated that this was the way it should be and the format here is fine but the substance is not valid.

Ms. Erard stated that was what she was saying it needed to be corrected.

Ms. McMullen stated they needed to do it right this time, however long it takes.

Ms. Erard asked if Mr. Mitchell would be able to get this done by the 17th of May.

Mr. Mitchell responded probably not by the 17th of May.

Ms. Erard stated all the paperwork must be available when the ad is run.

Mr. Coombes asked what must be available by the 17th.

Ms. Erard said everything.

Ms. McMullen stated that the CIP is supposed to be updated every single year. Therefore she stated that she hoped they would not put into the Comprehensive Plan the specifics that are shown here. She said they can refer to it from the Comprehensive Plan and that they are going to update it constantly. She stated in her opinion this would be the smarter way to go. She stated it would also give them the opportunity for public input. She said the amendment would reference the current CIP. She said they could print this without the numbers because they would constantly be changing.

Ms. Erard said the numbers needed to be printed in the CIP.

Ms. McMullen encouraged them to move on with what Mr. Mitchell had proposed and then take the time to do the CIP correctly.

Mr. Coombes stated that it was his understanding that if they were going to advertise for the proffer program they had to have everything including the CIP completed.

Ms. McMullen stated that she disagrees.

Ms. Erard stated that the reason you have to have the CIP is if you say we are going to build a school you have to know when based on your population projections when you are going to build the school that is what is in the CIP. The level of service dictates how many kids will go into a class room. You need the numbers that are in the CIP and then arguably the level of service. She stated not every community has the level of service policy but she liked what Gary has in there. She stated that it all fits together like pieces of a puzzle.

Ms. Urquhart asked Ms. McMullen how does she know the process that is presented is not correct.

Ms. McMullen stated she didn't say it was incorrect. She said they all voted to have a public hearing and they can do that. She said that when they get to the exact dollars on what he or she wants they can prioritize everything. She said it can be updated annually. She stated what they agreed to for the public hearing gives them the whole process and how to do things with calculations. She stated that the specific dollars and what year it can be spent could be referenced to rather than enclosed or published in here. She stated it will be published but she does not think they should have to have a public hearing every year to update this.

Ms. Urquhart stated she did not know who to believe.

Mr. Coombes stated that they have a staff and one of the things that hold's them up is the seven of them trying to deal with process. He stated that he thinks the process whether they agree or not needs to be left to the staff. He said he objects with trying to tell staff what the process is.

Ms. McMullen stated that the CIP is one of the most important things they do and the community should have input in this before it is going to final draft.

Ms. Erard stated that the state law requires you have a CIP in order to collect cash proffers. She said they have a CIP but being that it is almost 5 years old and looking at the cost to advertise this. She said it really makes sense to update it. She said it would be possible to use the existing CIP.

Ms. Misicka stated that the CIP as Margaret said should be lifted pretty easy out of what they had done here. She stated that there is a list of priorities in here. She said they are not starting from scratch.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they will work diligently towards getting this done but realizing that the 17th is when it needs to be done well they will report back to the Commission somewhere in the middle of May about where they are. At that point they may decide to do a special meeting at the end of June as opposed to the regular meeting. He said he can't promise them at the end of June because if it is so close to the July meeting they may just wait until then.

Ms. Erard said they may want to have a joint public hearing with Town Council in July.

Mr. Mitchell said he would let the Commission know where they are in a couple of weeks.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion on Zoning of Town Right of Ways-

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Town Attorney had drafted this ordinance. He said this addresses when the Town sells a Town Right of Way that the zoning on either side of that right of way becomes the zoning for that right of way.

Mr. Mitchell stated that this was basically because the Towns roads and right of ways are not zoned. So when you have a situation that makes sense to abandoned or sell a right of way then this will kick in.

Mr. Mitchell said it is a fix.

Mr. Coombes asked why it was made retroactive.

Mr. Mitchell stated to deal with some situations in the past.

Mr. Coombes asked what is the problem.

Mr. Mitchell said that there was a piece of property that the Town recently sold which was a right of way and they needed to zone it. He stated that if the right of ways are not zoned than anything can happen within those boundaries. Mr. Mitchell stated that not that the current person of this right of way would do anything but somebody else could.

Mr. Coombes stated that this would be a fix then and also fixes everything else.

Mr. Mitchell stated that yes it is a fix for anything in the future.

Ms. McMullen stated that she thought she knew what property this was occurring on and she felt they should stick with what it is now and just do this for the future.

Mr. Mitchell stated that right now this property is not zoned.

Ms. McMullen stated that this would be the case with the alleyway that runs near her house.

Mr. Mitchell stated that alleyways and right of ways are just that until they are abandoned or sold then they need to be zoned.

Ms. McMullen stated that she did not want to make it retroactive. She stated that she thought they should just make this for the future.

Ms. McMullen stated this is a rezoning issue and she felt they should come before the commission if there is an issue.

Ms. McMullen stated she felt uncomfortable with this.

Ms. Urquhart stated that she felt uncomfortable with this being retroactive.

Mr. Mitchell stated it applies to the future as well.

Ms. Urquhart stated that she felt uncomfortable with this retroactive to over a year ago.

Mr. Coombes stated they get themselves into a great deal of difficulty because the town over looks some things for whatever reason. He stated it is clear to him without Gary or Val saying anything that this was overlooked. He stated a piece of property was sold and right of ways are undeveloped property. He stated if you go to Bluff point you have right of ways going down the cliffs from the roads. He stated it is just an extension of the roads. He stated in this case it happens to be a commercial development and the zoning has been overlooked. He said he certainly thinks we should go back and pick that one up as well as the future. He stated they would be doing the Town and the property owner a disservice if we didn't do it.

Ms. Misicka agreed.

Ms. McMullen stated that this was an approved right of way that was to be a town easement. The owner has built a fence that obstructs this area. The documents of sale did not include it as a public right of way, as recommended by the Planning Commission. She said that she believes this may be an issue. Ms. McMullen moved that they adopt this but not retroactive.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they needed to have a public hearing first.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Mitchell if Andrea had okayed this.

Mr. Mitchell stated that yes she wrote it.

Ms. Misicka stated that she was going to trust in the staff that it is legal to do this and she stated that it is certainly not in the best public interest to have any piece of land in this town un-zoned. That would mean that the sky is the limit and there are no restrictions to what could happen on un-zoned land. Ms. Misicka stated that they were not asking it to be zoned something foreign to what is there they are asking it to be zoned to what is right next to it.

Ms. McMullen said to not assume that she is saying this is illegal but she does think it is a mistake.

Mr. Coombes stated that they should go to public hearing with this.

Mr. Grant agreed.

Ms. Misicka asked if there is a reason why they can't talk about where this property is.

Mr. Coombes said that this is immaterial. He stated it is a problem and a commercial establishment and we can all figure out where it is and it is whether or not the nature of this thing is correct. He stated he was sorry he brought this up but he did want to know about the retroactive part.

Mr. Coombes stated that it is just something that was overlooked and triggers something.

Ms. Foulds stated she wished not to identify this property.

Mr. Coombes asked if we were going to public hearing with this in June.

Mr. Grant asked for a motion.

Mr. Coombes stated that he would make a motion to take the zoning ordinances as presented (section 3-4) to public hearing.

Ms. Holt seconded the motion.

Mr. Grant asked if all were in favor. All members of the Commission were in favor with Ms. McMullen stating she was opposed.

Mr. Grant stated the motion passes.

Discussion on the joint public hearing with the Town Council.

Mr. Mitchell handed out the Staff report that he would be presenting to them in regards to the public hearing they would be holding jointly with Town Council on May 13th. He stated that the public hearing was for a conditional use permit for a proposed Bed and Breakfast at 100 Dennison Street.

Mr. Coombes stated that the Planning Commission would be the first to make a decision on this then it would go to the Town Council.

Ms. Misicka stated that she could not make the meeting but she generally supported this.

Mr. Coombes asked if Mr. Mitchell had recommended conditions for this permit.

Mr. Mitchell stated yes they are on the back.

Mr. Grant complemented Mr. Mitchell on the pictures.

Mr. Mitchell stated the reason for the joint hearing was that this was an economic development project for the Town and they were trying to get them open for the season.

Ms. Foulds stated that in regards to the proffers the reason they hesitated to commit to the May 17th date to be able to advertise was because they are currently working feverishly on the grant for the downtown. Ms. Foulds stated from a staff perspective they are down three people at Town Hall.

Mr. Grant asked if there is any further discussion on this matter.

Ms. Urquhart inquired about whether there is adequate parking for the Bed and Breakfast. Mr. Mitchell replied yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Grant adjourned the meeting at 6:45PM.

Mr. Ed Grant, Chairman

COLONIAL BEACH PROFFER GUIDELINES

Schools

Total Number of Housing Units (2009)	2,026	
School Enrollment (2008-09)	585	
Students per dwelling unit		0.29
Statewide Average Construction Costs for Schools (DOE) (2008-09)	Per Student	Per Square Foot
Elementary	\$20,649.00	\$179.41
Middle	\$38,701.00	\$195.35
High	\$26,276.00	\$176.91
Average	\$28,542.00	\$183.89
Average Per dwelling unit/student	\$8,241.40	

Cash Proffer for Schools **\$8,241.40**

Police

Number of Officers required by LOS	12.4	
Current Number of Officers per capita	0.0029	(11)
Police Officer Deficit	(1.40)	
Total Population (2009)	3,712	
Total Calls for Service	4,498	
Calls per capita	0.83	
Calls per Officer	409	
Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit	1.83	
Cost to equip 1 patrolman (car and required equipment)	\$40,000	
Cost per capita	\$10.76	
Cost per dwelling unit	\$19.74	

Cash Proffer for Police **\$19.74**

Parks/Recreation

Land

Amount of Park Land required by LOS	37.16
Amount of Existing Park Land	11.4
Parkland Deficit	(25.76)
Existing Park land per capita	0.003
Average Assessment of Existing Town Land (per acre)	\$228,000
Cost of Parkland Acquisition per LOS Standard	\$5,873,280
Assessment per capita	\$1,581
Average Persons per Dwelling Unit	1.83
Cost per Dwelling Unit	\$2,898.95

Equipment

Playground equipment	\$ 25,000.00
Athletic Equipment	\$ 20,000.00

Per Capita Cost	\$	12.11
Cost per Dwelling Unit	\$	22.21

Cash Proffer for Park/Recreation

\$2,921.16

Fire/Rescue

	Fire		
Building Square Footage		10,000	
Square Feet per capita		2.69	
Assessment	\$	645,100.00	
Assessment per capita	\$	173.60	
Costs per Dwelling Unit	\$	318.41	
	Rescue		
Building Square Footage		7,800	
Square Feet per capita		2.10	
Assessment	\$	292,600.00	
Assessment per capita	\$	78.74	
Cost per Dwelling Unit	\$	144.42	
Equipment Costs			\$ 950,000.00
	Fire	\$	750,000.00
	Rescue	\$	200,000.00
Equipment Costs per Capita	\$	255.65	
Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit		1.83	
Cost per Dwelling Unit	\$	468.90	

Cash Proffer for Fire/Rescue

\$ 931.74

Public Works/ General Services

	Building		
Number of Employees		26	
Number of Employees per Capita		0.007	
Building Square Footage		10,000	
Square Feet per Capita		2.69	
Assessment	\$	6,757,400.00	
Assessment per Capita	\$	1,818.46	
Costs Per Dwelling Unit	\$	3,335.34	
	Equipment		\$ 550,000.00
Jet Truck	\$	300,000.00	
Trash Truck	\$	250,000.00	
Equipment Costs per Capita	\$	148.01	
Costs Per Dwelling Unit	\$	271.47	

\$ 3,606.81

Administrative Facilities

New Administration Building	\$	8,000,000.00
-----------------------------	----	--------------

Costs Per Capita	\$	2,152.85	
Costs Per Dwelling Unit	\$	3,948.67	
		Cash Proffer for Administrative Facilities	\$ 3,948.67
		Total Cash Proffer Per Dwelling Unit	\$19,669.52
		Credits	
Dwelling Units Constructed with a LEED Silver Certification			\$4,900
		Net Suggested Proffer	\$14,769.52