Fiscal Impact Analysis
Sudbury Village 40B
Peters Way
Sudbury, Massachusetts

January 23, 2016

1.0 Preface

Sudbury Station LLC is proposing to construct a residential development consistent with the regulations of Massachusetts General Laws (MGL) Chapter 40B at Peters Way and Peters Way Extension in Sudbury Massachusetts. The proposed development will provide 250 units of rental housing of which 63 units (25%) will be offered as affordable housing consistent with MGL 40B (the Proposal).

This report is intended to identify the key fiscal characteristics of the Proposal and estimate its long term fiscal profile. To address this objective the report will generate a cost-to- revenue ratio at project stabilization and an estimate of the annual fiscal benefit or loss (annual revenue minus annual service cost) expressed in current dollars. The fiscal findings are designed to provide the Town of Sudbury with an understanding of how the Proposal will impact the local tax base over the long term.

The departmental costs assigned in this report are intended as an estimate the annual financial impact on affected municipal departments. The cost estimates are not intended as budget recommendations for an individual department. This report recognizes that the application of current and future municipal revenues and levels of service is the purview of the local officials. Further, the specific values used to generate the various municipal cost estimates should be considered as the current average annual costs; meaning that the estimated fiscal profile and individual cost/ revenue or components may fluctuate annually depending on future local, regional, or national economic background conditions.

Projected public school student enrollments and associated costs are a major component of any fiscal review of residential development. Unfortunately, Sudbury has no comparable developments in Town. Therefore, this report generates an estimated student generation rate based on a review of comparable development in comparable communities in the region. The associated education cost is based on a projection of additional school age children and the current cost per pupil provided by the Massachusetts Department of Education. Similar to non-school cost estimates, education costs are not designed as budgetary or policy recommendations. Rather, the enrollment and cost projections should be considered as information to be used in conjunction with other town and school department studies, plans and policies designed to meet anticipated educational objectives and needs.

The education cost estimate used in this report is intended to provide an estimate of the long-term cost per student. In the near term, school costs, approximately one to three years after

project approval, are most likely to be lower. However, this report takes the position that the measurement of education costs, like the Proposal in general, should be estimated over the long term and allocates school costs to the present time frame on the basis of estimated annual cost per student at stabilization.

Table 1 below provides a summary review of the proposed unit mix.

Table 1. Residential Unit Mix

Sudbury Village	Unit Count	Percent of Total (rounded)
1 bedroom market rate	87	34.8 %
1 bedroom affordable	29	11.6 %
2 bedroom market rate	82	32.8 %
2 bedroom affordable	27	11.2 %
3 bedroom market rate	19	7.6 %
3 bedroom affordable	6	2.4 %
Total	**250**	**100 %**

As shown in Table 1 above, the proposed unit mix is oriented towards non-family housing, given that 90%, one, and two-bedroom designs, with approximately 46% of the total being one bedroom units which do not generate any measurable or sustainable level of school aged children. Accordingly, units only 134 of the total of 250 units will generate school aged children based on the unit type i.e. two or three bedroom units.

2.0 Summary of Methodology

Municipal service costs are divided, for the purpose of this report, into two broad categories: general service costs (i.e. all non-education costs) and education costs. The departmental cost estimates discussed in this report were based on current fiscal year operating budgets and operational data provided by the Sudbury Police and Fire Departments for the four most recent complete calendar years. As discussed in the body of the report, the measurable general service costs will be generated from public safety-related i.e. police and fire services).

For the Proposal, education costs represent the large majority of the total estimated service costs. Education costs have been applied based on an estimate of new students anticipated at project stabilization. Given that monthly rental rates play a significant role in school age children (SAC) generation rates, the annual student generation rate has been estimated by examining similar rent comparable multi-family developments in nearby demographically similar communities.

Education cost estimates presented in this report are driven by an estimate of net additional school-aged children to be enrolled in the Sudbury Public School System. The basic formula for determining the portion of education cost needed to be supported by the local tax base is Annual

Net Spending per Student (ANSS) as reported by the Massachusetts Department of Education minus state chapter 70 aid; which is a non-local revenue source.

2.2 General Service Cost Estimates

For all other municipal service costs i.e. general service costs, the report employs the Town's FY2016 operating budget and includes those service categories that will most likely exhibit a measurable additional cost due to the Proposal. In this case, the Police Department and Fire Department will be impacted. The report combines the individual estimated departmental costs to generate a total general service cost estimate.

It should be noted that there are municipal operational budget categories that are properly not included in general service costs for purposes of determining the fiscal impact, such as existing debt payments, municipal services paid by enterprise accounts, water and sewer fees or similar accounts. For example, it should be noted that the Proposal will operate its own sewer treatment plant, this incur all associated annual costs of operation.

Further, building department reviews and inspections which are paid for directly by fees charged to the developer are not included. In addition Public Works' responsibilities such as road maintenance and plowing of existing public roadways abutting the Proposal area will not change as a result of the Proposal, so no marginal costs are included. In short, the measurable additional general service costs will be associated with police and fire services.

2.3 Revenue Projection

Service costs represent only one part of the fiscal equation. In order to appropriately estimate the annual fiscal impact of the Proposal, the estimated annual revenue stream (total tax revenues) accruing to the Town also needs to be determined. Based on conversations with the Town's assessing consultant, this report has employed the stabilized income method consistent with current practices related to similar residential multi-family development in the region to estimate the annual property taxes. Vehicular Excise Tax estimates are added to the estimated property tax to generate an estimated annual revenue stream. No other fees are fines are pro-rated and added to the revenue estimate.

2.4 Fiscal Profile

The report compares the estimated total municipal service costs (both general service costs and education costs) to estimated total annual revenue to arrive at an estimated annual cost-to-revenue ratio, or annual fiscal profile. The fiscal finding is also expressed in terms of current dollars gained or lost annually, commencing at estimated project stabilization.

Since the objective of the report is to provide Sudbury with an understanding of the long-term fiscal implications of the Proposal, the most important finding presented is the estimated cost-to-revenue ratio at stabilization since this finding reflects the Proposal's long term fiscal profile. While the cost-to-revenue ratio will likely vary slightly from year to year due to background regional or national economic trends, the cost to revenue is the best measure of the long-term projected fiscal performance of the Proposal.

3.0 Summary of Findings

- Sudbury Station will have an estimated annual revenue stream of $989,000 and an estimated annual service cost of $700,000. Accordingly, it will generate a positive long - term annual cost-to-revenue ratio of approximately 0.71.

- In current dollar terms Sudbury Station will generate an annual fiscal benefit of $289,000 at project stabilization.

- One-time building permit and associated plumbing and electric review fees are estimated to be approximately $500,000 to $600,000 payable at receipt of building permits and associated infrastructure inspections.

- The estimated annual average number of school-aged children is estimated at 43-students; with a long term operational range of 35 to 50 students. The full enrollment level is likely to be attained by the 2020/21 school year. Of the annual average estimate of 43 students approximately 65% or 28 students will be enrolled in the various grades Kindergarten through the eighth grade. The range of anticipated new enrollments will not exceed the enrollment decline of 250 students over the past decade.

- Sudbury Station will permit the Town of Sudbury to address its affordable housing needs in a fiscally prudent manner.

4.0. General Service Costs

This report uses the Town's FY2016 operating budget to estimate annual departmental costs associated with the Proposal and information provided by the Town's police and fire departments in October 2015.

Residential Service Costs – Police Department
Without the benefit of local comparables to estimate the anticipated number of police service call this report employs total local police call data and town population data to address the issue from a per dwelling unit and a per person approach.

It is important to note that the majority of calls for police service in the region are not directly related to a residential address. Office, retail, and industrial uses plus public facilities, institutional uses, schools, recreation uses, town wide traffic management, and inter community co-operation create significant public safety demands and calls for service. Based on our experience in the region, police service calls to residential addresses are, depending on the nature of the community, 20% to 40% of all service calls in suburban communities. Since in this instance we cannot discern the exact ratio and given the Town's strong residential character we have applied the high end i.e. 40% of all calls emanating from residential properties. This ratio will be applied to the call per dwelling unit analysis below.

The current annual police budget is approximately $3,454,000. As noted, if we assume 40% of all service calls are residentially generated, then 40% of the police budget generates a residential service cost estimate of approximately $1,382,000. Based on our review Sudbury has approximately 5,600 dwelling units, accordingly, Sudbury generates an *average* police service cost of approximately $247 per dwelling unit.

To generate a per dwelling unit estimate for the Proposal we examined the number of annual police calls in Sudbury as provided by the Police department in October of 2015. Table 2 below illustrates total police call data from 2011 to 2014.

Table 2. Total Police Calls for Service 2011-2014

Call for Service	Calls 2011	Calls 2012	Calls 2013	Calls 2014
Sudbury	15,140	15,497	16,051	16,467

As noted above, Sudbury's police service calls have been increasing on an annual basis, i.e. a rate of approximately 2.7% per year. Accordingly this report will assume that for the current year calls will increase at approximately the same rate i.e. 2.7%. Therefore, for the purposes of this report we assume that the 2015 call level will increase to approximately 16,910 calls for

service and that assigning 40% residential ratio discussed above we can estimate that approximately 6,765 calls are related to residential uses in some manner. Please note: that the very large majority of said calls are not related to criminal activities.

Further, in addition to the calls for service discussed above, the Sudbury Police Department responds to almost all EMS calls. Based on local data, for the current year we estimate that there will be approximately 1,200 calls for ambulance service from all sources (see fire department discussion in following section). However, to be conservative (high estimate) we have assigned all ambulance calls to residential land use. Accordingly, for this report we have increased the annual calls for police service calls to residential uses to 7,965 (6,765 police calls and 1,200 for EMS). This value equates to 1.42 calls per dwelling unit given 5,600 dwelling units. In our experience this is an extremely high ratio per unit in comparison to regional average, and likely for Sudbury. However, using said value we can estimate the 250 unit proposal would generate 355 calls. Using this approach, we could estimate a police service cost of $87,685 (355 calls x $247 per call).

In this instance due to the wide disparity of population per unit between the typical residence in Sudbury and the Proposal and the lack of comparables, an examination of police service cost per person is also warranted in order to generate a more credible police service cost. Specifically, the Town has a relatively high population per dwelling unit ratio of approximately 3.25 persons per unit. We estimate, based on the proposed unit mix which is 90% one and two bedroom that there will be 1.6 people per unit (400 people), or a per unit ratio of slightly less than half of the Town's population per unit.

Given 18,500 residents and a residential assignment of $1,382,000 to residential uses, we can derive a $75 per person cost for police services associated with residential calls for service. Applying the per capita cost of $75 to the anticipated 400 new residents generates a cost estimate of $30,000 per year.

Further, applying the estimated 7,965 residentially related service calls for 2015 to the approximately 18,500 residents, generates estimate a 0.43 calls per person. When applied to the estimated population of 400 for the proposal this ratio produces an estimate of 172 police service calls (all types).

The estimate of 172 calls per unit generates call rate of 0.69 per dwelling unit (172 calls divided by 250 proposed units.). This rate is about half the police service call rate estimated using total town wide service calls to generate a dwelling unit per call rate i.e. 0.69 vs. 1.42 (see per dwelling unit discussion above).

In 2015 we prepared fiscal studies for Winchester, Needham and Burlington and found a police service call per dwelling unit rate for large multi-family developments (based on actual call data from multi-family developments in each community) ranged from 0.12 to 0.42 calls per unit. While we instinctively believe the rate of 0.69 is still high it does represent the call rate per unit derived from a per capita approach and local data for Sudbury.

However, given the lack of comparable local data, the methods discussed above most likely represent the range of possibilities relative to the number of additional service calls and associated police costs, particularly given the wide disparity in population per unit characteristics of the Town and the Proposal. Therefore, *for the purposes of this report we will employ the average of the two methods for cost police cost estimating purposes i.e. $59,000.*

Residential Service Cost –Fire Department

In October of 2015 the Sudbury Fire Department provided data illustrating the total number fire service runs and emergency medical service runs for the four most complete calendar years.

The report recognizes the fact that all fire service calls are not generated by residential land use, but our experience has indicated that it can be as much as 75% in any given year depending on the land use nature of the community. Unfortunately there are no comparable developments in Sudbury from which to generate a fire service demand by specific land use type. Therefore, to reflect the strong residential land use character of Sudbury and to take a conservative (high cost approach) this report will assign 75% of fire service calls (all types) to residential land uses.

Table 3 illustrates the total *non –emergency* service fire runs for the past four years and generates an annual 4 year average. Non-emergency service fire runs varied from 48% of the total service runs in 2011 to 43% in 2014. Total runs varied from 2,332 in 2011 to 2,025 in 2014.

Table 3. Fire Service Calls (Non-EMS)

Sudbury Fire Department Service Calls	75% of Total Runs 2011-2014	Average/Year . @ 75% Residential	Average per unit per year (1)
Residential Demand	2,986	747	0.133

(1) 747 annual runs per year for the past 4 years, divided by 5,600 dwelling units.

As shown above, we can derive a call rate of 0.13 fire dept runs per unit per year for the period 2011-2104. Therefore, given the Proposal's 250 units, we an estimate an additional 33 service runs. As noted, residential fires represent a very small percentage of total runs for any modern day fire department.

Given that there are approximately 5,600 dwelling units in Sudbury, and a FY16 Fire Department budget of $3,517,000 and assigning 75% to residential service calls ($2,637,750), the average residential unit service cost is approximately $467 per unit per year. Therefore, an estimated fire service cost of $15,411 ($467 X 33 service calls) can be derived.

However, as noted earlier in this section, the number of fire service calls fluctuates each year and while a four year average is useful to derive a base estimate of cost, our experience and the

experience of Sudbury indicates that in any given year the number of service calls and types of calls can increase or decrease, see discussion above. To address the volatility in annual non-emergency calls this report increases the annual estimated cost increase of $15,411 by 25% to $19,500.

However, it is important to note that the above estimate does not take into account Fire Department Emergency Service (EMS) calls. Data provided by the fire department indicates that EMS calls (transport and emergency) have average approximately 1,250 calls for service or a rate of 0.22 calls per dwelling unit (assuming the conservative position that all calls are residentially generated). Applying the 0.22 call per unit ratio we can estimate that the proposed 250 units will generate 55 additional calls for ambulance service per year. This estimate is likely on the high end of the probable outcomes since it does not take into account the disparity of population per unit, as discussed above.

Sudbury like most communities in Eastern Massachusetts receives insurance reimbursements for ambulance service runs based on advanced or basic life care service provided. While there can be wide variation year to year, insurance reimbursements cover most ambulance costs but not all. In a community with Sudbury's economic characteristics and in a state like Massachusetts which has the highest health insurance coverage in the nation (95% to 96%) almost all the anticipated new residents are likely have health insurance coverage that includes ambulance service. However, our experience in the region also suggests that the insurance coverage may not cover 100% of costs for service runs. As noted, there can be wide variations from year to year but we have found that up to $100-$150 per run may not be covered. Accordingly, this report will assign a $150 non-coverage insurance cost to the 55 anticipated additional runs and assign a cost of $8,250.

Combining the fire and EMS projected service costs ($19,500 and $8,250) this report will assign a total estimated fire service cost of $27,750 ($28,000).

The Fire Department will also be required to inspect the proposed development on an annual basis but associated inspection fees are designed to address said costs.

Other General Service Costs

The Proposal will pay the annual water usage fees assigned by the Town and sewage will be addressed by an on-site private system and any use of the transfer station will be addressed by the transfer station fee system. Similarly, building department construction review and monitoring costs will be covered by the required permit fees. The additional population should not generate additional staffing requirements for general government services such as Town Clerk, Treasurer, selectman and various municipal boards or services such as libraries,. Recreation costs will be minimal if any, and the Proposal will be subject to the town pool and recreation maintenance enterprise fees.

Further, budget items like current municipal debt are not applicable since they pre-date the Proposal. Accordingly, the municipal departments that will experience measurable additional

costs are Police, Fire and Departments. Table 4 below summarizes the total estimated annual general service costs (current dollars) associated with the Proposal.

Table 4. Total General Service Costs

Department	Annual Cost
Police	$ 59,000
Fire	$ 28,000
Total	**$ 87,000**

5.0 Education Costs

5.1 Student Projections

The student generation analysis is based on the school aged children (SAC) rate based on similar 40B development in a nearby community, i.e. Concord Mews. Concord Mews was judged to be the most appropriate comparable given project size, unit mix, community demographics, quality of school system, and rent levels. Two other comparables were examined but not included.

It is important to note that this analysis does not employ gross school aged children (SAC) per development as the basis for its projection. The reason being is that one bedroom units do not generate school aged children in either a market or the affordable format in any measurable or sustainable amount. Therefore, if a development has a high percentage of one bedroom units using total units to generate a student per unit ratio is likely to mask the student generation rate of the two and three bedroom units, i.e. the unit types that account for all the additional students. Therefore, one bedroom units are removed from the comparable SAC analysis and the total number of students is applied to only the two and three bedroom units. The resulting higher adjusted SAC ratio per unit is then applied to the two and three bedroom unit count of the Proposal. In this manner the differences in the percentage of one bedroom units can be accommodated from development to development and therefore generate a more accurate SAC estimates.

Table 5 illustrates the aggregate two and three bedroom school aged children (SAC) generation for Concord Mews.

Table 5. Comparable Aggregate SAC Rates

Residential Comparable	Total Units	Total Students (1)	2 and 3 Bedrooms	SAC Rate
Concord Mews	350	70	218	0.321

(1) Concord School Department October 20, 2015.

Appling the average SAC rate of 0.321 as shown in Table 5 above to the 134 two and three bedroom units of the Proposal generates an average of 43 students per year. In operational terms it is likely that the total number of new students will vary between 35 and 50 students in any given year after project stabilization by approximately 2020.

The Proposal will likely reflect SAC enrollment patterns consistent with almost all new multi-family developments in the region. Specifically, it will likely take one to two years after project stabilization (attainment of initial 95% occupancy rate) for the anticipated number of new students to enroll. However, to be prudent the Sudbury School Department should consider that the full complement of students will be in place by the 2020/2021 school year.

It should be noted that there will be very few if any students from the estimated operational range of 35 to 50 students per year that will attend the vocational school. If one or two of the estimated number of students do enroll from time to time, they will not generate any marginal cost increase for said school system.

5.2 Estimated Annual School Cost

Based on information received from the Massachusetts Department of Education, Actual Net Spending per Student (ANSS) for FY 2015 was $13,271 for Sudbury with State aid representing $1,615 of the total expenditure. Based on our review of recent annual education cost increases in Sudbury, we have increased the FY15 ANSS by 5% to attain a FY16 estimate of $14,000. After deducting state aid (a revenue source) a cost of $12,385 per student remains to be addressed by local revenue sources.

Assigning the above the annual local cost estimate of $12,385 per student to the annual average estimate of 43 students generates an average annual school cost of $533,555(current dollars) that will need to be generated by local revenue sources. However, cognizant of the variations that occur year to year in student enrollments from multi-family developments, and the fact that the development will be a first of its type in Sudbury, this report will carry a 15% contingency factor relative to annual average school costs and employ a higher school cost estimate of $613,000.

5.3 Enrollment Context and Distribution

Based on current Massachusetts Department of Education data overall enrollment levels in Sudbury (K-8 and High School combined) has experienced a decline of approximately 250 students over the past decade; a decline of approximately 9%. Since 2005 this trend has been experienced in many suburban public school systems in Eastern Massachusetts. Further, based on a report prepared by the Sudbury School Department's enrollment consultant (NESDEC December 2012) enrollment is projected to continue to decline system wide by an additional 204

students from 2015 to 2025. Accordingly, by 2025 the enrolment in the Sudbury school system will have declined by 450 students since 2009 or by more than 15%.

This report finds that the anticipated 43 additional school aged students (range of 35 to 50 per year) will not result in enrollment levels close to the 2005 total enrollments. Therefore, the new enrollments associated with the Proposal will not generate a physical capacity issue or related physical plant costs. Further, the new students will not add to operational or maintenance costs since the Physical plant and associated facilities are already in place, and we can find no evidence that related to enrollment declines of the past decade that operational and maintenance costs have decreased. Accordingly, we find that the Proposal school costs ae related to additional staffing costs and that said costs are accounted for by this report (See section 5.2 above).

Estimated Enrollment Patterns

Based on our experience with regional enrollment patterns in Eastern Massachusetts for multi-family developments, Sudbury can anticipate 65% of the projected 4annaul average 43 new students to be enrolled in the various grades K-8 i.e. 28 students; and the balance of 15 students to be enrolled in various grade levels of 9-12.

6.0 Total Service Cost

Table 6 below summarizes the estimated total service cost associated with the Proposal

Table 6. Total Estimated Service Cost

Department	Estimated Service Cost
Police	$ 59,000
Fire	$ 28,000
Schools	$ 613,000
Total	**$ 700,000**

7.0 Revenue Projection

The Town of Sudbury has no appropriate comparable development consistent with the characteristics of the Proposal and use of non-Sudbury comparables was deemed inappropriate for assessed value purposes. Therefore, to generate a viable revenue estimate, this report employs an estimated stabilized income method metrics based on discussions with the Town of Sudbury's assessing consultant. It should be noted that the assessed value estimate developed in this report is not a Town estimate but a Connery Associates estimate.

This report will employs the rent data from an internal market analysis prepared for Sudbury Station LLC and applies said rents to assessing metrics noted below.

Estimated Aggregate Rents per Unit Type

87 One bedroom market rate@ $2,050
29 One bedroom affordable rate @ $1,307
82 Two bedroom market rate @ $2,600
27 Two bedroom Affordable Rate 1,568
19 Three bedroom market rate@ 3,200
6 Three bedroom market rate@ 1,812

Income Method Metrics

- 5% vacancy deduction,
- 30% operation and maintenance deduction
- Cap rate of 8.00%

Accordingly, at stabilization, it is estimated that the assessed value of the Proposal will have an assessed value of approximately $53,950,000 (current dollars) or an average per unit value of $215,770. *Applying the current residential tax rate of $17.60 yields an estimated annual property tax of $949,000 (current dollars).*

Additionally, the Proposal will likely generate approximately 400 registered vehicles that will be subject to automobile excise taxes. The Town's average excise tax is estimated at $100 per vehicle. Assuming 400 registered vehicles (1.6 per unit), the Proposal will produce approximately $40,000 in annual excise tax revenue.

Adding excise taxes to the estimated property taxes yields an annual revenue stream of $989,000 (current dollars).

8.0 Fiscal Profile

Table 7 provides an overview of the Proposal's long term fiscal profile.

Table 7. Summary of Fiscal Profile

Proposal	Annual Revenue	Annual Cost	Cost to Revenue Ratio	Annual Benefit (loss)
250 Apartments	$989,000	$700,000	0.71	$289,000

(1) Annual revenue stream is property taxes and excise taxes.

The report finds that the Proposal generates a moderately positive fiscal profile. The key factor in generating the positive fiscal profile is the proposed unit mix with 46% of the total units being one bedroom units. Therefore, only 134 units will be generating education costs, which is by far the most significant cost factor. Further, the relatively high residential tax rate of $17.60 generates a considerable annual revenue stream approaching one million dollars given the total assessed valuation estimate. The resulting average annual cost to revenue estimate of 0.71 will generate an annual fiscal benefit of approximately $289,000.

This report finds that the Proposal will permit the Town of Sudbury to address its affordable housing needs in a fiscally responsible fashion.

9.0 One Time Fees

Building Permits and Related Fees.
Given the current building permit fee permit fee of $15 per $1,000 of construction value plus ancillary plumbing and electrical inspection fees, our initial estimate of one time building fees is approximately $500,000 to $600,000. As the project moves through the permitting process towards construction there is likely to be additional fees that may double what is shown above but at this point the fiscal analysis is listing only the building permit and related fee estimates.

Summary Vitae **Phone: 617 835 3956** **E- Mail: johnconnery@Comcast.net**

John W. Connery
Connery Associates
Principal

Education: Master of City Planning
Ohio State University 1971

Bachelor of Arts. American Studies
Boston University 1969

Experience:
Mr. Connery has 44 years of community planning experience. He has worked in Bloomington Illinois and for the past 43 years in New England. As founding principal of Connery Associates he has had approximately 300 municipal and private clients. Mr. Connery has developed an expertise in municipal zoning, fiscal impact analysis, and project permitting. His professional assignments have included comprehensive zoning studies, downtown redevelopment plans, community master plans, and fiscal impact studies for residential and commercial development for both public and private clients.

In recent years Mr. Connery prepared the Zoning Plan for East Cambridge. His comprehensive/community wide zoning efforts include communities such as Waltham, Watertown, North Andover, Revere, Shrewsbury, Amesbury, and Walpole. Additionally, in recent years he prepared the Commerce Way Overlay District in Woburn, the Smart Growth Overlay in Melrose, the Zoning Plan for the Needham Industrial Park; and area wide zoning plans for Lynn, Malden, Winchester, and Wellesley Massachusetts among others.

His more recent private sector projects include fiscal impact studies in Massachusetts for the Lexington Technology Park, Cubist Laboratories in Lexington, Hancock Village in Brookline, Stonegate Apartments in Melrose, Legacy Place in Dedham, and regional shopping centers in Lynnfield, Burlington, and Westwood Massachusetts (University Station). Recently he has prepared fiscal analyses for senior living facilities in Lynnfield, Braintree, Sharon, Dedham, and Lincoln Massachusetts. Currently he is preparing fiscal studies for residential developments in Newton, Walpole, Malden and Westwood.

Mr. Connery has taught one-semester courses in urban planning at the University of Massachusetts at Boston and at Boston University. He has been a guest lecturer at Harvard, MIT, and Tufts Graduate Schools on a number of occasions.

Mr. Connery has been employed as an expert land use and zoning witness before the Land Court, Housing Appeals Committee and Superior Court for both public and private clients. He is currently involved in a Superior Court case in Haverhill. He is a past President of the Massachusetts Consulting Planners Association.