# Table 1.

### Net Revenue (Cost) of Development for all Tax Supported Services by Type and Location

Geographic Area	New Development compared to Existing Development				New Development compared to City-Wide Average for New Development				
	Low Density		High Density		Low Density		High Density		
	Per hsld (\$)	Per Cap (\$)	Per hsld (\$)	Per Cap (\$)	Per hsld (\$)	Per Cap (\$)	Per hsld (\$)	Per Cap (\$)	
Urban	\$1952	\$561	\$1510	\$983	\$626	\$181	\$21	\$153	
Suburban	\$466	\$46	\$1568	\$1020	(\$682)	(\$273)	(\$102)	(\$76)	
Rural	\$95	(\$90)	N/A	N/A	(\$945)	(\$372)	N/A	N/A	

Sources: Tables 34 and 38, Comparative Fiscal Impact Analysis of Growth Study

1

#### Table 2.

### Net Revenue (Cost) of Development for Water Rate Supported Service by Type and Location

	Existir	ng Developme	nt	New Development			
Service Area	(cost/reve	nue variance p	per unit)	(marginal cost/variance per unit)			
	Low Density	Condo	Multi-Unit	Cost/Low Density Unit (\$)	Cost/Condo Unit (\$)	Cost/Multi- Re Unit (\$)	
Urban	(\$40)	(\$51)	(\$30)	\$81	\$90	\$49	
Suburban	(\$119)		(\$56)	(\$48)		(\$13)	

Sources: Table 40, Comparative Fiscal Impact Analysis of Growth Study

## Table 3.

### Net Revenue (Cost) of Development for WasteWater Rate Supported Service by Type and Location

	Existir	ng Developme	nt	New Development			
Service Area	(cost/reve	nue variance p	per unit)	(marginal cost/variance per unit)			
	Low Density	Condo	Multi-Unit	Cost/Low Density Unit (\$)	Cost/Condo Unit (\$)	Cost/Multi- Re Unit (\$)	
Urban	(\$95)	(\$178)	(\$108)	\$95	\$120	\$35	
Suburban	(\$169)		(\$125)	\$35		(\$23)	

Sources: Table 41, Comparative Fiscal Impact Analysis of Growth Study