



# FISCAL RESEARCH CENTER

**Feasibility Study for the  
Proposed City of Tucker**

**Fiscal Research Center  
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, GA**

**December 2013**



**ANDREW YOUNG SCHOOL**  
OF POLICY STUDIES

**FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE  
PROPOSED CITY OF TUCKER**

**Fiscal Research Center  
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, GA**

**December 2013**

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Economic and Demographic Characteristics .....	2
Revenue Analysis.....	4
Property Taxes .....	4
Personal Property Taxes .....	6
Franchise Fees.....	8
Parks and Recreation Fee Revenue.....	9
Life, Property, and Casualty Insurance.....	10
Hotel-Motel Tax.....	10
Mixed Drink Tax.....	11
Business License.....	11
Bank Share Tax.....	11
Building, Development, Zoning Fees .....	11
HOST .....	12
CDBG .....	13
Qualifying Fees.....	13
Revenue Sources That Are Not Applicable to Tucker.....	14
Revenue Summary .....	15
Expenditure Analysis .....	16
Comparison Cities.....	16
Governance .....	16
City Administration .....	17
Parks and Recreation.....	19
Tourism.....	20
Code Enforcement and Comprehensive Planning and Zoning.....	20
Facility Leasing and Management .....	21
Startup Expenses.....	21
Contingency .....	22
Conclusion .....	23
About the Fiscal Research Center.....	24

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Executive Summary

The Fiscal Research Center (FRC), Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University was contacted by State Representative Bill Mitchell and then contracted by Tucker Together, Inc. to develop an analysis of the fiscal feasibility of a newly incorporated city of Tucker. This study provides a detailed analysis of the expected revenue and expenses of the proposed city using generally accepted methodologies that the FRC has used for similar studies. The main purpose of the analysis is to estimate the ability of a city of Tucker to meet its expenditures with available revenue sources. Based on this analysis, the city of Tucker should expect annual revenue of approximately \$16.6 million and annual expenses of approximately \$13.3 million (the conservative, “high” estimate, see Table EX-1). This analysis suggests that the city would generate a surplus of approximately \$3.3 million, which may be used to provide additional contingency funds, reduce the millage rate, or expand the level of expenditures. *Based on these estimates and given the assumptions that are detailed in this report, we find that the city of Tucker is financially feasible.*

The revenue from the various sources depends on the tax rate or fee structure. For some of the revenue sources the city of Tucker would have no say as to what the rates are. For the other taxes and fees it is assumed that the rates will be the same as those that DeKalb County is currently imposing. To the extent that the city of Tucker was to adopt different tax rates or fee structures, the revenues would differ from the estimated revenue. To produce the estimates of expenditures for the proposed city of Tucker, we relied on Tucker Together to list the expenditures the proposed city of Tucker would provide. We also relied heavily on the budgets of several other cities in Georgia with a similar population, including Smyrna, Marietta, Alpharetta, Dunwoody, and Brookhaven. In both the revenue and expenditure analysis we have taken a conservative approach to the estimation, as detailed in the report. The analysis provides the best estimate given available data and information from Tucker Together regarding their expenditures, and assumes no “shocks” such as unanticipated capital expenses or a major economic downturn.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

**TABLE EX-1. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

Revenue Category	Amount	Expenditure Category	Amount (High Est.)
Property Tax	\$1,212,397	Mayor/City Council	\$282,727
Franchise Fees	4,634,922	Other Administration	5,380,204
		Parks and Recreation (includes Purchase of Park Facilities and Land)	2,274,797
Parks and Recreation	151,709	Code Enforcement/Planning and Zoning	2,162,601
Life and Property and Casualty Insurance	2,514,729	Tourism	543,673
Hotel/Motel Tax	543,673	Facility Leasing	600,000
Mixed Drink Tax	48,048	Startup Expenses	1,057,000
Business Licenses	4,490,529	Contingency	990,138
Bank Share Tax	260,198		
Building, Development and Zoning Fees	804,116		
HOST	1,540,120		
CDBG	341,398		
Qualifying Fees	8,640		
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$16,550,479</i>	<i>Total Expenses</i>	<i>\$13,291,140</i>
<i>Revenue in Excess of Expense</i>	<i>\$3,259,339</i>		

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Introduction

The Fiscal Research Center (FRC), Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University was contacted by State Representative Bill Mitchell and then contracted by Tucker Together, Inc. to develop an analysis of the fiscal feasibility of a newly incorporated city of Tucker. This study provides a detailed analysis of the expected revenue and expenses of the proposed city using generally accepted methodologies that the FRC has used for similar studies. The main purpose of the analysis is to estimate the ability of a city of Tucker to meet its expenditures with available revenue sources. Based on this analysis, the city of Tucker should expect annual revenue of approximately \$16.6 million and annual expenses of approximately \$13.3 million (conservative, “high” estimate). This analysis suggests that the city would generate a surplus of approximately \$3.3 million, which may be used to provide additional contingency funds, reduce the millage rate, or expand the level of expenditures. *Based on these estimates and given the assumptions that are detailed in this report, we find that the city of Tucker is financially feasible.*

The purpose of the study is to provide in as much detail as possible, an estimate of the revenues and expenditures of the proposed city. Tucker Together provided a list of services that they envision the city undertaking; other services and activities as required were included in the analysis. The proposed city has a limited prescribed set of revenues that are analyzed in this report. Where there is discretion regarding an item or an important limitation regarding data or assumptions made to develop the estimate, those are noted in the text.

This report proceeds as follows. The first section provides a summary of economic and demographic characteristics of the proposed city of Tucker and a selected group of existing comparison cities with populations about the same as the proposed city of Tucker in the metro area. The second section provides detail regarding the revenue analysis while the third section provides the expenditure analysis. A fourth section concludes.

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

## Economic and Demographic Characteristics

The proposed city of Tucker analyzed in this report is comprised of land area in DeKalb County. The land area (just over 25 square miles) is similar to that of Marietta, Alpharetta, and Peachtree City. Based on data from the U.S. Census and other governmental agencies, the population of the proposed city of Tucker is 55,713. This is on par with cities including Marietta, Alpharetta, and Smyrna—making it one of the larger cities in the metro area.

The socio-economic characteristics of the proposed city of Tucker and comparison cities are summarized in Table 1. In general, the population of proposed city of Tucker is older than the average of the comparison cities. The percent of population under age 18 (21.1 percent) is six percentage points smaller than the average of the comparison cities (which combine for a simple average of 27.14). Tucker is however similar in this demographic to Marietta, Sandy Springs, and Smyrna. The concentration of population over age 65 in Tucker is 11.54 percent—larger than the comparison group (8.9) and similar to Sandy Springs, Peachtree City, and Dunwoody. Tucker’s racial diversity is on par with the simple average of these cities.

**TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS  
PROPOSED CITY OF TUCKER AND SELECTED COMPARISON CITIES**

	<b>Tucker</b>	<b>Marietta</b>	<b>Alpharetta</b>	<b>Dunwoody</b>	<b>Smyrna</b>
Population	55,713	57,204	56,316	45,490	50,882
Land Area (sq. miles)	25.14	23.08	26.91	12.94	15.35
% of Population 65 or older	11.54	9.7	7.15	12.55	7.90
% HS degree	44.25	41.21	47.34	43.98	49.58
# of Households	23,089	23,565	21,126	18,973	22,934
Per Capita Income	\$31,479	\$27,488	\$45,190	\$44,137	\$37,260
Median House Value	\$239,100	\$221,300	\$326,400	\$376,600	\$221,600
% of Population receiving SNAP benefits	21.90	29.46	5.87	6.55	17.88
# of Businesses	2,976	3,218	3,899	2,402	1,530

Sources: U.S. Census 2010 (micro data) and the American Community Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce (2011), SNAP Georgia Department of Human Resources/FRC, # Businesses Georgia Department of Labor/FRC.

While Tucker’s labor force is larger than the average of these cities, the employment rate is the same as the average of the 28 cities (90.9 percent). Tucker’s median household income is \$54,427, which is 87 percent of the average—but in line

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

with other cities, including Smyrna, Duluth, and Stockbridge. The housing stock is older—21.6 percent of homes were built after 1989 compared to a simple average of 53 percent. Overall, these characteristics attest to a city of Tucker that is a bit older than cities of similar size in terms of population age and housing stock, slightly lower median household income than the comparison cities, and holds a racial diversity that mirrors other cities in the metro area with populations of 15,000 or more. In Tucker, 21.9 percent of the population received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits—similar to the average of all of the comparison cities (22 percent). There are 2,976 employment establishments in Tucker, compared to a simple average of 1,480 in this set of cities. Sandy Springs leads this group of cities in number of establishments at 5,612.

In terms of size and population Tucker looks like the cities of Marietta, Alpharetta, Smyrna, and Peachtree City, while the socio-economic characteristics including age and household income looks more like Sandy Springs, Marietta, and Smyrna. These comparisons are helpful for understanding the landscape of Tucker and for developing reasonable estimates of the expenditure side of Tucker's expected budget.



# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Revenue Analysis

This section presents the revenue estimates for the proposed city of Tucker. Table 4 contains the revenue estimates by source. The section also contains a discussion of how each of the revenue estimates was developed.

The revenue from the various sources depend on the tax rate or fee structure. For some of the revenue sources the city of Tucker would have no say as to what the rates are. For the other taxes and fees we assumed the rates will be the same as those that DeKalb County is currently imposing. To the extent that the city of Tucker was to adopt different tax rates or fee structures, the revenues would differ from the estimated revenue.

For the property tax we assume a millage rate of 0.71 mills. This is the current property tax rate that DeKalb County imposes on the unincorporated area for the services that are proposed to be offered by the city of Tucker.

## Property Taxes

To estimate property tax revenue we estimated the revenue for individual components of the property tax base. For real property taxes we used the property tax base data for the proposed city of Tucker provided by DeKalb County. For the other components we allocated a portion of the property tax base for the unincorporated area to the proposed city of Tucker. In all cases we assumed a millage rate of 0.71 mills. We assumed a collection rate of 92 percent; a large percentage of the delinquent property tax liability that is not collected in the first year will be collected in subsequent years.

### *Real Property Tax Revenue*

The real property tax base for 2013 for the proposed city of Tucker has been estimated for the property area defined by Tucker Together. An ArcView digital tax parcel map and related database was provided by the DeKalb County Geographic Information System Department. The related data contained tax parcel IDs for all parcels contained in the map. All parcel IDs and IDs associated with the sub-areas identified in the map, were submitted to the DeKalb County Tax Commissioner who returned consolidated real property tax base data for the total area and each subarea. These data include the taxable values for residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and conservation properties. Because of the

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

state of the Commissioner’s program, data for personal property, automobiles, and utility property were not included in the data provided by the Tax Commissioner. The revenue from these sources had to be estimated separately.

Table 2 shows the assessed values by major property class for the total area as well as the net taxable value after exemptions, while Table 3 shows the estimated revenue production for the proposed city of Tucker from the real property tax base at 1) the total operating millage levied by DeKalb County—19.29 mills—in the Tucker area for county general operations, hospital, fire, police, and unincorporated area service, and 2) the levy for only unincorporated area services for which the millage rate is 0.71 mills. The last column shows the revenue that a levy of 0.71 mills would produce at a 92 percent collection rate. The estimated real property tax revenue is \$961,272.

**TABLE 2. PROPOSED CITY OF TUCKER REAL PROPERTY TAXABLE VALUE**

	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Industrial</b>	<b>Agriculture Conservation</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>M&amp;O Exemptions</b>	<b>Net Taxable</b>
Total	\$948,719,211	\$443,989,448	\$230,637,230	315,000	\$1,623,660,889	\$152,026,386	\$1,471,634,503

**TABLE 3. PROPOSED CITY OF TUCKER MILLAGE AND LEVIES**

	<b>Net Taxable</b>	<b>Current Tax Rate</b>	<b>Current Total Levy</b>	<b>Current Uninc Tax Rate</b>	<b>Current Uninc Levy</b>	<b>Return at 92%</b>
Total	\$1,471,634,503		\$28,387,830		\$1,044,860	\$961,272

### *Utility Property Taxes*

The property tax records obtained from DeKalb County did not contain information on utility property. We first estimated the utility tax base for the proposed city of Tucker by allocating a share of the utility property for the unincorporated area, using the consolidation sheet from the Georgia Department of Revenue (DOR), by the population share. We then multiplied the estimated utility tax base by the proposed millage rate for the proposed city of Tucker of 0.71 mills and a collection rate of 92 percent.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

### **Personal Property Taxes**

The property tax records obtained from DeKalb County did not contain information on personal property. Most (99.6 percent) of the personal property tax base for the unincorporated area is in the commercial and industrial property categories. We calculated the share of personal property of the total property for the commercial and industrial categories. We used these shares and the value of commercial real property and industrial real property for the proposed city of Tucker to estimate the personal property tax base for the proposed city of Tucker. We multiplied this base by the proposed millage rate for the proposed city of Tucker and the assumed collection rate.

### *Mobile Home Property Taxes*

The property tax records obtained from DeKalb County did not contain information on mobile home property. Using Census data we calculated the share of mobile homes in the unincorporated area that are in the proposed city of Tucker. We multiplied the mobile home property tax base for the unincorporated area by this share to estimate the mobile home tax base in the proposed city of Tucker. We multiplied this amount by the proposed millage rate for the proposed city of Tucker and the assumed collection rate.

### *Motor Vehicles Property Taxes*

The property tax records obtained from DeKalb County did not contain information on motor vehicle property. Motor vehicles can be either commercial or non-commercial. The Census provides an estimate of the number of non-commercial vehicles in the unincorporated area. Dividing this number by the number of vehicles as reported on the property tax consolidation sheet from the DOR gives us an estimate of the percentage of vehicles in the unincorporated area that are non-commercial. We multiplied the vehicle property value as reported on the consolidation sheet by this percentage to obtain the non-commercial vehicle property tax base for the unincorporated area. We allocated a share of the non-commercial vehicle property tax base to the proposed city of Tucker using Census data to estimate the share of vehicles owned by residents of the unincorporated area that are in the proposed city of Tucker. We then allocated the commercial vehicle property tax value using the ratio of commercial and industrial

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

property in the proposed city of Tucker to that for the unincorporated area. We summed these two amounts and then multiplied the sum by the proposed millage rate for the proposed city of Tucker and the assumed collection rate.

Beginning this year, the state of Georgia changed how motor vehicles are taxed. When a motor vehicle is sold the buyer will pay a Title Ad Valorem Tax Fee when the vehicle is registered. The revenue from this fee will be allocated to local jurisdictions that were in existence on January 1, 2013. Thus, the city of Tucker should not expect any revenue from this new fee. Furthermore, under this new law, new vehicles will not become part of the property tax base, and when a used motor vehicle is sold it will cease to be part of the property tax base. Thus, over time, the value of the motor vehicle property tax base will decline.

### *Intangible Property Taxes*

There are two intangible taxes. A tax is levied on the value of real estate when it is transferred and a tax is levied on the value of real estate mortgages. Revenue from these taxes are divided among all taxing jurisdictions according to the proportion that the millage rate levied by jurisdiction bears to the total millage rate levied on that property. To estimate the intangible tax revenue for the proposed city of Tucker we allocated the intangible tax revenue reported for the unincorporated area. There were two steps to this allocation. First, we divided the reported revenue from the unincorporated area to the area associated with the proposed city of Tucker and the rest of the current unincorporated area. This allocation was based on the ratio of the sum of the residential plus commercial property tax base for the proposed city of Tucker to that for the unincorporated area. This revenue amount equals the total intangible tax levied times the ratio of the current unincorporated area tax rate to the total property tax rate applied to the unincorporated area. For the second step, note that the percentage of this allocated revenue that would be allocated to the proposed city of Tucker would equal the ratio of the millage rate for the proposed city of Tucker to the millage rate for the unincorporated area.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

### Franchise Fees

Municipalities are allowed to impose fees on utilities for the use of the municipality's right-of-way and related costs. Other than for cable, county governments do not collect franchise fees. The fee is some percentage of the receipts for specified services collected by the utility within the municipality. Franchise fees are collected from cable operators, natural gas providers, electricity companies, and telephone companies. We estimated the revenue that the city of Tucker might expect for each of these franchise fees.

For electricity, which generates the largest amount of the franchise fee revenue, we used data provided by Georgia Power. For the other franchise fees we used franchise fee revenues for various cities adjusting for differences in population and employment. The following provides some details of the estimating procedures for each franchise fee.

#### *Electricity*

We provided Georgia Power with a map of the proposed city of Tucker. Georgia Power used that map to determine which of their meters were likely to be located in the proposed city of Tucker. Georgia Power then calculated the franchise fee revenue that would be generated from these meters assuming a 4 percent fee rate. This process produces an estimate, but not a completely accurate one, of the likely franchise fee revenue of \$3.30 million. There are several reasons why the estimate may not be accurate. For example, meters near the border of the proposed city of Tucker could be incorrectly assigned or not assigned to the proposed city of Tucker using the map and geocoding of the locations of meters. It would require a much closer inspection of the boundaries and location of the electrical consumer to develop an accurate measure of franchise fee revenue. In addition, revenues vary from year to year. For example, revenues for the past year are probably lower than normal given the cooler summer we had. In addition, the opening and closing of large businesses will affect the revenue.

#### *Cable*

For cable franchise revenue we started with the revenues for Alpharetta, Dunwoody, Marietta, Smyrna, and unincorporated DeKalb. The revenue per capita differs a little across these five areas. The average for the area is \$14.40 per capita. Cable franchise fee revenue

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

per capita for Smyrna is \$12.20 per capita. Since Smyrna has a population, a median income, and a poverty rate that are close to those for the proposed city of Tucker we used Smyrna's revenue per capita to estimate cable franchise fee revenue for the proposed city of Tucker. The estimate is \$681,322.

### *Natural Gas*

For natural gas we started with franchise fee revenue for Alpharetta, Athens, Augusta, Columbus, Dunwoody, Johns Creek, Macon, Marietta, Smyrna, and Valdosta. Using the revenue per capita for the total of these cities generates an estimate for the proposed city of Tucker of \$337,850. Using the revenue per capita for Smyrna generates an estimate of \$358,590. Since natural gas is also used by businesses, we divided franchise fee revenue by a weighted population and employment for the cities of Alpharetta, Dunwoody, Johns Creek, Marietta, and Smyrna. We selected the weights to minimize the differences across the cities in the weighted average. Using the resulting weighted average of population and employment yields estimated revenue for the proposed city of Tucker of \$367,906. To be conservative, we used the revenue estimate based on Smyrna.

### *Telephone*

Since franchise fee revenue for telephone services depends on both population and employment, we divided the franchise fee revenue for Alpharetta, Dunwoody, Johns Creek, Marietta, and Smyrna by a weighted average of employment and population. Again we selected the weights to minimize the differences in revenue per weighted population and employment. It makes little difference if we use the weighted average for the five metro cities or for Smyrna. We report the estimate based on Smyrna average, namely \$295,010.

### **Parks and Recreation Fee Revenue**

Revenue is generated from fees charged for the use of recreation facilities and organized activities. We allocated a share of the current revenue of the unincorporated service district for parks and recreation using a variety of allocation factors. These revenue data were provided by the DeKalb County Department of Revenue. The basis for the

## **Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker**

---

allocation depends on the specific nature of the revenue source. For park rental and summer program revenues we used the share of the unincorporated park acreage that is in the proposal city of Tucker. For swimming fees we used the share of swimming pools in the unincorporated area that is in the proposed city of Tucker. There are no tennis centers or golf courses in the proposed city of Tucker, so none of that revenue was allocated. Revenue associated with the Tucker Recreation Center was allocated 100 percent to the proposed city of Tucker. The revenue from adult softball was allocated based on the number of ball fields in the proposed city of Tucker relative to the number in the unincorporated area. Youth sports revenue was allocated using the share of 5-17 year olds in the unincorporated area that are in the proposed city of Tucker. Allocation of the revenue from the Therapeutic programs was based on the population 18 years of age and over, while the senior program revenue was allocated based on population over 64 years of age.

### **Life, Property, and Casualty Insurance**

Insurance premium tax revenue collected in the state is required by law to be allocated on a per capita basis. Thus, a share of the revenue from the insurance premium taxes, as reported by the DeKalb County Department of Finance, for the unincorporated area was allocated to the proposed city of Tucker based on its share of the population of the unincorporated area.

### **Hotel-Motel Tax**

The hotel-motel tax is a five percent tax on receipts of hotel-motel establishments. At least 40 percent of the hotel/motel tax revenue must be earmarked for tourism purposes. The other 60 percent could be used to fund the general operations of the city. We allocated a share of the hotel/motel tax revenue, as reported by the DeKalb County Department of Finance, for the unincorporated area to the proposed city of Tucker using the proposed city of Tucker's share of employment in hotels, motels, and inns in the unincorporated area.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

### **Mixed Drink Tax**

We allocated the current mixed drink tax revenue, as reported by the DeKalb County Department of Finance, for the unincorporated area using the proposed city of Tucker's share of the commercial property tax base for the unincorporated area.

### **Business License**

There are several categories of business licenses, which we combined into two categories: general business licenses (sometimes called the occupation tax) and licenses for liquor. The later includes licenses for package liquor stores, stores that sell beer and wine, establishments that sell liquor by the drink, and adult entertainment establishments. DeKalb County provided a list of addresses for holders of general business licenses and liquor licenses, along with the fee charged. We were able to geo-code most of the addresses. Using the addresses we were able to geo-code, we calculated the business license revenue collected from businesses located in the proposed city of Tucker as share of the revenue collected in the entire unincorporated area. The business license revenue reported in the financial data file provided by the county is much larger than the sum of the fees for file of business licenses. To be conservative, we took the total fee revenue from the business license file and allocated a share to the proposed city of Tucker based on its share of revenue using the geo-coded data. The resulting revenue estimate is \$4,490,529. If we had used the revenue reported on the financial report estimated business license revenue would have been \$5,704,390.

### **Bank Share Tax**

Bank share tax is imposed on banks based on the gross receipts of banks, including savings and loan offices. We allocated a share of the unincorporated revenue, as reported by the DeKalb Department of Finance, from this tax to the proposed city of Tucker based on the relative employment in the banking industry.

### **Building, Development, Zoning Fees**

Building, development and zoning fee revenue comes from registration, permits, and inspection fees associated with construction and renovations, including installation of



## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

plumbing, electrical, and HAVC systems. The revenue also includes sign permits, zoning variance permits and certificates of occupancy. A share of the revenues from these activities, as reported by the DeKalb Department of Finance, was allocated to the proposed city of Tucker based on its share of the unincorporated area's residential, commercial, and industrial property tax base.

### HOST

The proposed city of Tucker will be eligible to receive part of the Homestead Option Sales Tax (HOST) revenue. The allocation is determined through a formula set out in Georgia code. The HOST allocation is determined by OCGA 48-8-104 and each year is calculated by the Georgia Department of Revenue using data provided by the county (the appendix contains that information). There are two calculations. The following are the steps for the first calculation:

1. The county sets the capital factor, which is the share of HOST revenue that can be used for capital expenditures. This has been set at 20 percent each year and is expected to be set at 20 percent in the future.
2. The homestead factor is the result of multiplying the HOST revenue by one minus the capital factor, and then dividing by the amount of taxes levied for county purposes. For the most recent 12 month period, HOST tax revenue was \$105.1 million. Taxes levied for county purposes on qualified homestead exemptions are \$140.6 million; this will decrease some with the incorporation of Tucker. The resulting homestead factor is 0.598.
3. Next the county millage rate applicable to the proposed city of Tucker, which we estimate will be 18.58 mills is subtracted from the unincorporated county millage rate of 19.29 mills. This result is then multiplied by the homestead factor. The result is 0.425 mills.
4. Multiply this millage rate by the net homestead digest for the proposed city of Tucker, which we have calculated to be \$481,678,716. This results in an equalization allocation to the proposed city of Tucker of \$234,114.

The following is the second calculation. Since the sum of the estimated equalization allocations to all jurisdictions including Tucker, that is, \$11,693,826, is less than the product of the capital factor (0.20) and HOST revenue (\$105.1 million), namely, \$21.0 million, municipalities will receive an additional allocation. To calculate this second allocation first subtract the equalization allocations to all jurisdiction from the product of the capital factor

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

and the HOST revenue. Second, divide the net homestead digest for the proposed city of Tucker's by the total net homestead digest for all municipalities.<sup>1</sup> The result is 0.1311. Third, multiply the results of the two steps to get the allocation, which is \$1,306,006.

Thus, the total HOST allocation to the proposed city of Tucker will be \$1,540,120.

### **CDBG**

The proposed city of Tucker will be eligible for a federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). The size of the grant is determined by a formula, but to use the formula it is necessary to determine the value of the variables in the formula for all eligible cities in the U.S. Instead, to estimate the revenue we used the amount of CDBG revenue that cities in Georgia received, as reported by the U.S. Department of Urban Development. We first ran a regression using the log of the grant as the dependent variable and the logs of the city's population and the number of poor as explanatory variables. We used the coefficients from this regression and the population and number of poor in the proposed city of Tucker. The resulting revenue estimate is \$367,750. The city of Smyrna received a grant of \$322,629, but Smyrna has a slightly smaller population than the proposed city of Tucker. Using the per capita grant for Smyrna, yields a revenue estimate for the proposed city of Tucker \$341,398. To be conservative we use the revenue estimate for \$341,398.

### **Qualifying Fees**

Qualifying fees are imposed on each person qualifying to run for an elected office. The rate is 3 percent of position's salary. We assume that there will be a mayor and five city council members, with salaries of \$16,000 for each position. We assume that there will be three people qualifying for each position.

---

<sup>1</sup> There appears to be some confusion regarding the calculation of this ratio. Some people believe the ratio should be based on the total net homestead digest for the county, including the unincorporated area. However, the state code says to use the total homestead digest for municipalities, and was confirmed by an official at the Georgia Department of Revenue. Using the total homestead digest for the county produces a revenue estimate that is \$669,000 smaller.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

### **Revenue Sources That Are Not Applicable to Tucker**

There are several potential revenue sources that we assume are not applicable to the proposed city of Tucker.

#### *Investment Income*

Investment income represents income on reserves and non-cash asset balances. We assume that there will be no such revenue in the first year of operation.

#### *Recorders Court*

Revenue from the operation of the Recorders Court is largely from traffic fines. Since traffic fine revenue is associated with police services, which will remain with the unincorporated area, we assume there will be no revenue from traffic fines. We assume that there is a small amount of revenue associated with violation of municipal ordinances. Other than revenue from housing and building code violations, the enforcement of municipal ordinances will largely be handled by the police and thus will not be revenue for the proposed city of Tucker. Thus, what revenue might be generated from enforcement of municipal ordinances is likely to be very small. We assume no revenue will be generated for the proposed city of Tucker.

#### *Storm Water Fees*

Currently, DeKalb County imposes a storm water utility fee to cover the cost of handling storm water. We assume that the proposed city of Tucker will not be responsible for handling storm water and thus will not impose this fee. Since this would be an enterprise fund, if the proposed city of Tucker was to be responsible for storm water, this revenue would be earmarked for this activity.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

### Revenue Summary

Table 4 contains the estimates for all of the revenue items listed above. Based on the estimates, the estimated revenue for the city of Tucker is \$16,550,479.

**TABLE 4. REVENUE ESTIMATES**

Revenue Category	Tucker Revenue	Revenue Category	Tucker Revenue
Property Tax:		Life & Property & Casualty Insurance	\$2,514,729
Real Property	\$961,272	Mixed Drink Tax	\$48,048
Utilities	\$18,774	Hotel-Motel	543,673
Personal Property	\$134,518	Business Licenses	
Motor Vehicles	\$97,302	Business License -General	\$3,800,743
Mobile Homes	\$8	Business License- Liquor	\$689,786
Intangible Recording	\$523	Bank Share Tax	\$260,198
Franchise Fees		Building, Development, & Zoning Fees	\$804,116
Electricity	\$3,300,000	HOST	\$1,540,120
Cable	\$681,322	CDBG	\$341,398
Natural Gas	\$358,590	Qualifying Fees	8,640
Telephone	\$295,010	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$16,550,479</i>
Parks and Recreation:			
Park-Rental	\$3,657		
Summer Program	\$10,311		
Swimming Pool Admissions	\$35,437		
Tucker Rec Center	\$74,807		
Swim Lessons	\$3,477		
Adult Softball	\$4,481		
Youth Sports	\$11,100		
Therapeutic Programs	\$8,348		
Senior Programs	\$91		

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Expenditure Analysis

### Comparison Cities

To produce the estimates of expenditures for the proposed city of Tucker, we relied heavily on the budgets of several other cities in Georgia with a similar population. These include Smyrna and Marietta in Cobb county, Alpharetta in Fulton county, and Dunwoody and Brookhaven in DeKalb county. While the population of the proposed city of Tucker is expected to be more in line with that of Marietta and Alpharetta, these are older and more established municipal governments which offer a larger array of government services than is initially expected of the proposed city of Tucker. As an alternative we also include the cities of Smyrna, Brookhaven and Dunwoody which have a slightly lower population but are leaner with respect to the provision of governmental services. Although it is important to note that all of the comparison cities offer police and road and storm water management services which will not be offered, at least initially, by the proposed city of Tucker.<sup>2</sup>

Table 1 (above) lists the prominent financial and demographic characteristics of the proposed city of Tucker and our comparison cities. The information for Brookhaven is not available. It is included as a comparison city because it is newly established and its current expenditures provide useful information for other newly formed cities.

### Governance

The governance of the city includes the position of mayor and members of the city council. Average council sizes of the comparison cities ranged from four members in Brookhaven to seven members in Marietta and Smyrna. We assumed a city council of between five and seven members. Based on the 2012 Department of Community Affairs Local Government Wage and Salary survey (DCA WSS), compensation for council members in our comparison cities ranged between \$17,100 in Smyrna and \$12,000 in Dunwoody. Compensation for the position of mayor ranged between \$30,000 in Alpharetta and \$16,000 in Dunwoody. In addition, Marietta and Smyrna each had one staff position within this department to serve as staff to the mayor and council members.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is assumed that DeKalb will continue to collect and appropriate storm water fees on behalf of Tucker.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

Expenditures for the mayor and city council department range from \$178,000 in Dunwoody to \$327,000 in Smyrna. Based on budget data from 2012, we computed the per-capita expenses associated with this department for each of the comparison cities. From these per-capita figures shown in Table 5, we computed the average ratio for the cities of Smyrna, Dunwoody, and Brookhaven (S-D-B) and the average for Marietta and Alpharetta (M-A). Based on these two average ratios, we estimated an expenditure for governance for the incorporated area of Tucker of between \$267,047 and \$282,727.

**TABLE 5. GOVERNANCE ESTIMATE**

	Per-Capita Average		Tucker Expenditure	
	-----Expenditure-----		-----Estimate-----	
	S-D-B	M-A	S-D-B	M-A
Mayor/City Council	\$4.79	\$5.07	\$267,047	\$282,727

### City Administration

For the purposes of this analysis city administration is defined to include the departments of city manager, finance, general administration, legal and city clerk. Total administrative expenses for 2012 for our comparison cities ranged from a low \$3.4 million in Dunwoody to a high of \$7 million in Alpharetta.

Determining the expenses associated with each department is challenging because each city allocates the responsibilities of city management amongst the administrative departments in different ways. Therefore, comparing the expenditures of finance departments across two different cities may not provide an apples-to-apples comparison. This is particularly problematic in the case of administrative services. To the extent possible, we reallocated expenses between departments to construct departments with similar responsibilities across our comparison cities. For instance, the finance departments of Dunwoody and Marietta are responsible for the administration of business licenses. In Alpharetta and Smyrna, business licenses are handled through their departments of Community Development. For the purposes of the analysis, we reallocated the expenses associated with business licenses to the Dunwoody Department of Community Development and the Marietta Department of Development Services so that these departments could be more properly compared to the other cities used in the analysis. Thus, the estimated expenses

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

for the finance department shown below do not include expenditures associated with the function of administering business licenses.<sup>3</sup>

The expenditures associated with the finance department were constructed to include expenses associated with a director, accounting, budgeting, cash and debt management, purchasing, and internal audit. Expenditures associated with the general administration were constructed to include human resources, risk management, IT and GIS services. Because Dunwoody and Brookhaven contract out many of their financial and city administrative services, they operate with a combined finance/city administration department and it is not possible to allocate their expenses to individual finance and administration departments. To be consistent, we also combined the city administration expenses and finance expenses of Smyrna. Marietta and Alpharetta have separate departments for these services. It is likely that the proposed city of Tucker would follow the Dunwoody-Brookhaven model of a combined financial administration department due to its initially limited governmental scope.

The offices of city clerk and city manager were fairly consistently defined over our comparison cities. The city of Smyrna is an exception in that the expenditures associated specifically with the city manager's office is captured in the general administrative expenses of the city. As an estimate for the expenses from Smyrna we used the average of the salaries for the city manager and an assistant from the DCA WSS report for 2012, allocated a portion for benefits and estimated an allocation to account for supplies and small capital expenses associated with this department. A separate breakdown of legal fees was not available for Smyrna. As a result, the legal expenses were estimated using all the comparison cities with the exception of Smyrna.

Table 6 shows the per-capita expenditures for each of the comparison cities for their combined administrative expenditures. Table 7 provides the per-capita estimates and estimated expenditure totals for the proposed city of Tucker.

**TABLE 6. ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES PER-CAPITA**

	<b>Smyrna</b>	<b>Dunwoody</b>	<b>Brookhaven</b>	<b>Marietta</b>	<b>Alpharetta</b>
All Admin	\$85.82	\$74.04	\$68.74	\$68.00	\$125.14

---

<sup>3</sup> The expenses associated with the Tucker administration of business licenses is reflected in the estimated expenditures for Planning and Zoning.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

**TABLE 7. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATE**

Departments	Per-Capita Average		Tucker Expenditure	
	-----Expenditure-----		-----Estimate-----	
	S-D-B	M-A	S-D-B	M-A
City Manager	\$6.88	\$20.84	\$383,545	\$1,160,896
Finance		\$39.80		\$2,217,199
General Administration		\$23.19		\$1,292,242
Financial Administration	\$69.57		\$3,876,023	
Legal*	\$10.50	\$8.26	\$585,032	\$460,150
City Clerk	\$3.98	\$4.48	\$221,498	\$249,716
Total—All Admin	\$90.93	\$96.57	\$5,066,098	\$5,380,204

\*Estimate does not include amounts for Smyrna.

### Parks and Recreation

To estimate the expenditures associated with operating the existing parks and recreation programs in the proposed city of Tucker, we relied on the expenditure experience of the comparison cities of Marietta, Dunwoody, Alpharetta, and Smyrna and the DeKalb county special service district. The table below lists the parks that were included in the analysis.

Unlike the administrative expenses, the park and recreation expenditures did not fall into two distinct groups of Marietta/Alpharetta and Dunwoody/Smyrna. Of the comparison cities, Alpharetta had the most acreage of parkland at 755 acres, including an equestrian center and two hockey rinks. Dunwoody had the smallest acreage of parkland at 160 acres, most of which consists of passive parks. Parks and recreation budgets of the comparison cities ranged from \$6.7 million in Alpharetta to \$1.9 million in Smyrna for 2012. We constructed an average high and low per acre estimate. The proposed city of Tucker is expected to have 285 acres of parkland. Table 8 provides a list of all existing park facilities that are located in the proposed incorporation area. By law the cost of parkland is \$100 per acre. The cost of purchasing the parkland and park facilities is determined by multiplying the 285 acres by \$100 per acre which includes the acquisition of the Tucker recreation center, a structure at Henderson Park, and the swimming pool at the Kelley C. Cofer park (totals Table 9).



## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

**TABLE 8. LIST OF PROPOSED CITY OF TUCKER PARK FACILITIES**

<b>Park</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>List of Facilities</b>
Kelley C. Cofer	Community Park	20	ball fields, swimming pool, trail
Henderson Park	Community Park	120.7	ball fields, playground, recreation center
John's Homestead	Undeveloped	54.9	lake and 1828 farmhouse
Lake Ivanhoe	Undeveloped	1	lake
Montreal Park	Neighborhood Park	9	nature preserve
Peters	Neighborhood Park	4	multi use field, basketball court, playground
Pleasantdale Park	Community Park	24	ball fields, multi-use court, picnic shelter, playground, nature trail
Smoke Rise (formerly Hugh Howell)	Undeveloped	18.3	
Smoke Rise II	Linear Park and Greenway	5.69	
Tucker Park	Future Neighborhood Park	15	
Tucker Recreation Center	Community Park	12	basketball court, multi-use court, playground, recreation center
<i>Total</i>		<i>284.59</i>	

**TABLE 9. PARKS AND RECREATION ESTIMATE**

<b>Departments</b>	<b>Average Expenditure Per Acre</b>		<b>Tucker Expenditure Estimate</b>	
	<b>-----Low-----</b>	<b>-----High-----</b>	<b>-----Low-----</b>	<b>-----High-----</b>
Parks and Recreation	\$5,449	\$7,993	\$1,550,630	\$2,274,797

### Tourism

A minimum of forty percent of hotel-motel taxes have to be used for tourism. For this analysis, we assume that all hotel-motel taxes will be used for such purposes, although the proposed city of Tucker could decide differently.

### Code Enforcement and Comprehensive Planning and Zoning

The proposed city of Tucker will be responsible for developing a comprehensive strategic plan and for all zoning decisions. In addition, the estimate below includes the cost of administering business licenses and providing building inspections. While the expenses for Brookhaven were not explicitly used in this estimate, the Brookhaven budget for this department is similar to that of Dunwoody. It is important to note that the proposed city of Tucker will have to employ code enforcement officers to perform that task. That expense is included in the estimate. The estimated expenditures for code enforcement and planning and zoning are shown in Table 10.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

**TABLE 10. CODE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND ZONING ESTIMATE**

Departments	Per-Capita Average -----Expenditure-----		Tucker Expenditure -----Estimate-----	
	S-D	M-A	S-D	M-A
Code Enforcement/Planning & Zoning	\$35	\$39	\$1,973,863	\$2,162,601

### Facility Leasing and Management

To account for office space and equipment, we used information from Dunwoody and Brookhaven. Brookhaven has very limit administrative space at the time of this report. Dunwoody leases 24,000 square feet. Because commercial leasing rates for Dunwoody would not be representative of the proposed city of Tucker commercial leasing market, we used a range of advertised leasing rates for the Tucker area, of between \$18 and \$25 per square foot per year and assumed that the proposed city of Tucker would lease approximately 24,000 square feet of space. Expenses for utilities are already accounted for in the estimates for the various departments and are not included in this estimate for leasing expenses. The estimated expenses for facility leasing are shown in Table 11.

**TABLE 11. OTHER EXPENSES ESTIMATE**

	Tucker Expenditure -----Estimate-----
Facility Leasing	\$432,000—\$600,000
Startup Expenses	\$1,057,000
Contingency	\$870,460—\$990,138

### Startup Expenses

To account for the general startup expenses of furniture and office equipment, software, computer servers, communication equipment and GIS equipment, we assumed an amount of \$1,000,000 initially. This cost will vary if the city leases equipment instead of purchasing equipment and also depends on the number of employees initially hired. In addition, to cover the initial costs incurred before the first property tax collection, the city can offer a one year bond, called a Tax Anticipation Note (TAN). Assuming the city floats a 1 year bond for \$10,000,000 at the current LIBOR 1 year interest rate of 0.57%, interest on this note would be \$57,000 for the first year. Table 11 provides the estimates for interest expense associated with the TAN and other estimated startup expenses.

## Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

### Contingency

To account for unforeseen expenses and deviations from an original plan, we have included a contingency budget equal to one month of expenses, shown in Table 11. The adopted budget for FY2013 for Brookhaven included a \$4.3 million contingency amount against a \$16 million budget and the FY14 proposed budget includes a \$3 million contingency amount against a \$19 million budget. The FY2009 budget for Dunwoody included a \$500,000 contingency amount against a \$14 million budget.

Table 12 provides a summary of all the estimated expenditures associated with the proposed city of Tucker.

**TABLE 12. SUMMARY OF ALL EXPENSE ESTIMATES**

<b>Departments</b>	<b>S-D-B/Low</b>	<b>M-A/High</b>
Mayor/City Council	\$267,047	\$282,727
City Manager	\$383,545	\$1,160,896
Finance		\$2,217,199
General Administration		\$1,292,242
Financial Administration	\$3,876,023	
Legal	\$585,032	\$460,150
City Clerk	\$221,498	\$249,716
Sub Total Administration	\$5,066,098	\$5,380,204
Parks and Recreation (including purchase of park facilities and land)	\$1,550,630	\$2,274,797
Code Enforcement/Planning & Zoning	\$1,973,863	\$2,162,601
Tourism	\$543,673	\$543,673
Facility Leasing	\$432,000	\$600,000
Startup Expenses	\$1,057,000	\$1,057,000
Contingency	\$870,460	\$990,138
<b>Total – All Expenses</b>	<b>\$11,760,711</b>	<b>\$13,291,140</b>

# Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker

---

## Conclusion

Total estimated revenues and total estimated expenses for the proposed city of Tucker are shown in Table 13. As noted there, under the most conservative assumption (the “high” expenditure case), the City would anticipate \$3.3 million of revenue in excess of expenditure under the assumptions made in this report given the data we have been able to develop and the list of expenditures that Tucker Together anticipates undertaking.

**TABLE 13.**

	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>
Estimated Revenues	\$16,550,479	\$16,550,479
Estimated Expenditures	\$11,760,711	\$13,291,140

## **Feasibility Study for the Proposed City of Tucker**

---

### **About The Fiscal Research Center**

The Fiscal Research Center (FRC) provides nonpartisan research, technical assistance and education in the evaluation and design of state and local fiscal and economic policy. FRC Reports, Policy Briefs, and other publications maintain a position of neutrality on public policy issues in order to safeguard the academic freedom of the authors. Thus, interpretations or conclusion in FRC publications should be understood to be solely those of the author(s).

For more information on the Fiscal Research Center, call 404.413.0249 or visit our website at [www.aysps.gsu.edu/frc](http://www.aysps.gsu.edu/frc).



## Finance Department

Joel Gottlieb  
Chief Financial Officer

Interim Chief Executive  
Officer  
Lee May

### Board of Commissioners

District 1  
Elaine Boyer

District 2  
Jeff Rader

District 3  
Larry Johnson

District 4  
Sharon Barnes Sutton

District 5  
Lee May

District 6  
Kathie Gannon

District 7  
Stan Watson

July 25, 2013

Mr. Douglas J. MacGinnitie, Commissioner  
Georgia Department of Revenue  
1800 Century Center Blvd NE  
Atlanta, GA 30345-3205

Dear Mr. MacGinnitie:

In accordance with O. C. G. A. 48-8-104 (d) (2), I am certifying the following information:

- A. The adopted Capital Factor for 2013 is 20 percent, .200.
- B. There are no payments due under the Intergovernmental Agreements in accordance with the recent court ruling invalidating the agreements. The agreement with the City of Atlanta was terminated due to noncompliance with reporting requirements.
- C. The County millages in cities are contained in the attached.
- D. The net homestead digests for the cities as of July 24, 2013 is contained in the attached.
- E. The total net homestead digest for DeKalb County as of July 24, 2013 is contained in the attached.
- F. The unincorporated millage rate (O&M) is 19.29 mills.

Pursuant to O.C.G.A. 48-8-104 (e), the "taxes levied for county purposes on only that portion of the county tax digest that represents net assessments on qualified homestead property after all other homestead exemptions have been applied" is \$140,597,734.89

If you require any additional information, please contact me at 404-371-2741.

Sincerely,

  
Joel Gottlieb  
Chief Financial Officer

Cc: Lee May, Interim CEO  
Claudia Lawson, Tax Commissioner



# CLAUDIA G. LAWSON

Tax Commissioner  
DeKalb County, GA

Office of the Tax Commissioner

Robert Goodman, Assistant Tax Commissioner

July 24, 2013

Mr. Joel Gottlieb  
Chief Financial Officer  
DeKalb County Government  
1300 Commerce Drive  
Decatur, GA 30030

RE: Requested Digest Information

Dear Mr. Gottlieb:

The information below is being provided at your request and in accordance with O.C.G.A. § 48-8-104(d)(2).

The net M&O homestead digest for each municipality:

Avondale	\$97,179,344
Brookhaven	\$1,101,502,522
Chamblee	\$157,152,820
Clarkston	\$9,672,680
Doraville	\$33,929,112
Dunwoody	\$1,182,669,230
Lithonia	\$995,816
Atlanta	\$632,454,206
Pine Lake	\$4,246,856
Stone Mountain	\$10,460,935
Decatur	\$593,254,254

The net Total M&O homestead digest § 48-8-104(d)(2)(E): \$7,681,520,997

The net Bond homestead digest for each municipality:


Avondale	\$106,366,384
Brookhaven	\$1,189,889,630
Chamblee	\$176,612,260
Clarkston	\$13,936,380
Doraville	\$45,901,308
Dunwoody	\$1,273,459,230
Lithonia	\$2,154,028
Atlanta	\$716,778,938
Pine Lake	\$6,386,856
Stone Mountain	\$19,418,747
Decatur	\$642,544,254

The net Total Bond homestead digest § 48-8-104(d)(2)(E): \$8,976,141,391

The values above have been reduced by the appropriate exemption amounts including the "freeze" exemption. The Homestead Option Sales Tax (HOST) factor has not been applied since it is not an exemption but a tax credit to homesteaded properties. As of this date, municipality qualification has not been determined therefore all municipalities are provided at your request. Additionally, you requested the "taxes levied for county purposes on only that portion of the county tax digest that represents net assessments on qualified homestead property after all other homestead exemptions have been applied" which is \$140,597,734.89.

If you need additional information to complete the certification as required by O.C.G.A. § 48-8-104, please don't hesitate to contact me at (404) 298-3020.

Sincerely,

  
Robert Goodman  
Assistant Tax Commissioner





**COUNTY MILLAGE RATE CERTIFICATION FOR TAX YEAR 2013**

Please provide a copy of this form to your county's Clerk of Superior Court.

<http://www.etax.dot.ga.gov/pfd/download/index.aspx>

COUNTY: DeKalb

Submit three (3) original signed copies with digest submission

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5	COLUMN 6	COLUMN 7	COLUMN 8	COLUMN 9	COLUMN 10	
District Number Must be Shown	District Name (Inc, Uninc, School, Special Districts, Etc.)	Mark X if District Falls In Unincorporated Area	Mark X if District Falls In Incorporated Area	Enter Gross Millage Rate Before Rollbacks	Sales Tax Rollback OCGA § 48-9-91	Insurance Premium Rollback OCGA § 33-8-8.3	Duplication of Services Pursuant to OCGA § 36-70-2	Net M&O Millage Rate Column 4 less Columns 5, 6 & 7	Enter Bond Millage Rate	Total Millage Rate Column 8 plus Column 9
61	Atlanta		X	11.510	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.510		11.510
14	Avondale Estates		X	17.680	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.680		17.680
20	Brookhaven		X	14.330	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.330	1.920	16.250
24	Chamblee		X	14.760	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.760		14.760
34	Clarkston		X	17.140	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.140		17.140
92	Decatur		X	12.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	12.030		12.030
44	Doraville		X	14.520	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.520		14.520
50	Dunwoody		X	14.330	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.330	1.920	16.250
54	Lithonia		X	17.400	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.400		17.400
74	Pine Lake		X	17.840	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.840		17.840
84	Stone Mountain		X	15.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.020		15.020
04	Unincorporated	X		19.290	0.000	0.000	0.000	19.290	1.920	21.210
S2/S3	Perimeter CiD		X	4.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.000		4.000
S4	Stone Mountain CiD	X		5.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.000		5.000
S5	Tucker	X		3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.000		3.000
SC	DeKalb Schools	X	X	23.980	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.980		23.980

I hereby certify that the rates listed above are the official rates for the Districts indicated for Tax Year 2013

7-16-2013 Date

Lee Mery  
Presiding Officer, Board of Commissioners

Estimated Homesteaded Taxes  
M&O Digest  
As Requested

07/23/2013

DISTRICT	DISTRICT NAME	GROSS DIGEST	EXEMPTION	NET DIGEST	MILLAGE	TAX BEFORE HOST	HOST FACTOR	TAX AFTER HOST	HOST CREDIT ISSUED (66%)
4	Unincorporated	5,017,529,034	1,161,746,452	3,855,782,582	0.01929	74,378,047.67	0.34	25,288,545.90	49,089,501.77
14	Avondale Estates	108,651,792	12,685,328	95,966,464	0.01768	1,696,687.30	0.34	576,873.77	1,119,813.53
20	Brookhaven	1,218,720,194	133,252,760	1,085,467,434	0.01433	15,554,748.98	0.34	5,288,614.68	10,266,134.30
24	Chamblee	98,464,275	15,292,629	83,171,646	0.01476	1,227,613.33	0.34	417,388.72	810,224.61
24A	Chamblee Annex	85,948,449	11,967,275	73,981,174	0.01476	1,091,962.34	0.34	371,267.28	720,695.06
34	Clarkston	15,059,012	5,386,332	9,672,680	0.01714	165,789.67	0.34	56,368.54	109,421.13
44	Doraville	47,289,232	14,092,616	33,196,616	0.01452	482,014.77	0.34	163,885.09	318,129.74
44A	Doraville Annex	1,661,936	929,440	732,496	0.01452	10,635.80	0.34	3,616.25	7,019.55
50	Dunwoody	1,316,796,837	134,127,607	1,182,669,230	0.01433	16,947,650.19	0.34	5,762,202.93	11,185,447.26
54	Lithonia	2,547,108	1,551,292	995,816	0.0174	17,327.17	0.34	5,891.29	11,435.88
61	Atlanta	736,888,281	105,641,155	631,247,126	0.01151	7,265,654.77	0.34	2,470,322.95	4,795,331.82
61A	Atlanta Annex	1,267,080	60,000	1,207,080	0.01151	13,893.48	0.34	4,723.77	9,169.71
74	Pine Lake	6,619,496	2,383,480	4,236,016	0.01784	75,570.47	0.34	25,693.97	49,876.50
74A	Pine Lake Annex	20,840	10,000	10,840	0.01784	193.39	0.34	65.75	127.64
84	Stone Mountain	20,525,315	10,461,260	10,064,055	0.01502	151,162.20	0.34	51,395.19	99,767.01
92	Decatur	663,083,112	71,833,698	591,249,414	0.01203	7,112,730.21	0.34	2,418,328.60	4,694,401.61
92A	Decatur Annex	2,238,840	234,000	2,004,840	0.01203	24,118.22	0.34	8,200.20	15,918.02
S1	Lenox Park (Brookhaven)	17,564,868	1,529,780	16,035,088	0.01433	229,782.82	0.34	78,126.16	151,656.66
T104	Tad #1 (Unincorporated)	4,206,176	2,518,616	1,687,560	0.01929	32,553.12	0.34	11,067.89	21,485.23
T114	Tad #2 (Unincorporated)	822,960	120,000	702,960	0.01768	12,428.33	0.34	4,225.65	8,202.68
T204	Tad #3 (Unincorporated)	674,360	211,720	462,640	0.01929	8,924.32	0.34	3,034.26	5,890.06
T304	TAD Avondale Estates	80,440	10,000	70,440	0.01929	1,358.79	0.34	461.99	896.80
TAV1	TAD Stone Mountain	624,480	114,560	509,920	0.01768	9,015.39	0.34	3,065.24	5,950
TSM1	TAD Stone Mountain	593,840	196,960	396,880	0.01502	5,961.13	0.34	2,026.79	3,934.34
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>9,367,877,957</b>	<b>1,686,356,960</b>	<b>7,681,520,997</b>		<b>126,515,823.86</b>		<b>43,015,392.80</b>	<b>83,500,431.06</b>

Estimated Homesteaded Taxes  
Bond Digest  
As Requested

07/23/2013

DISTRICT	DISTRICT NAME	GROSS DIGEST	EXEMPTION	NET DIGEST	MILLAGE	TAX BEFORE HOST	HOST FACTOR	TAX AFTER HOST	HOST CREDIT ISSUED (66%)
4	Unincorporated	5,017,529,034	239,437,954	4,778,091,080	0.00192	9,173,936.86	0	9,173,936.86	-
14	Avondale Estates	108,651,792	2,895,328	105,756,464	0	-	-	-	-
20	Brookhaven	1,218,720,194	45,835,652	1,172,884,542	0.00192	2,251,937.63	0	2,251,937.63	-
24	Chamblee	98,464,275	5,072,629	93,391,646	0	-	-	-	-
24A	Chamblee Annex	85,948,449	2,727,835	83,220,614	0.00192	159,783.63	0	159,783.63	-
34	Clarkston	15,059,012	1,122,632	13,936,380	0	-	-	-	-
44	Doraville	47,289,232	2,940,420	44,348,812	0	-	-	-	-
44A	Doraville Annex	1,661,936	109,440	1,552,496	0.00192	2,980.80	0	2,980.80	-
50	Dunwoody	1,316,796,837	43,337,607	1,273,459,230	0.00192	2,445,041.51	0	2,445,041.51	-
54	Lithonia	2,547,108	393,080	2,154,028	0	-	-	-	-
61	Atlanta	736,888,281	21,376,423	715,511,858	0.00192	2,432.79	0	2,432.79	-
61A	Atlanta Annex	1,267,080	-	1,267,080	0.00192	-	0	-	-
74	Pine Lake	6,619,496	253,480	6,366,016	0	-	-	-	-
74A	Pine Lake Annex	20,840	-	20,840	0.00192	40.01	-	40.01	-
84	Stone Mountain	20,525,315	1,604,768	18,920,547	0	-	-	-	-
92	Decatur	663,083,112	22,763,698	640,319,414	0	-	-	-	-
92A	Decatur Annex	2,238,840	14,000	2,224,840	0.00192	4,271.69	0	4,271.69	-
S1	Lenox Park (Brookhaven)	17,564,868	559,780	17,005,088	0.00192	32,649.76	0	32,649.76	-
T104	Tad #1 (Unincorporated)	4,206,176	266,960	3,939,216	0.00192	7,563.23	0	7,563.23	-
T114	Tad #1 (Avondale Estates)	822,960	822,960	-	-	-	-	-	-
T204	Tad #2 (Unincorporated)	674,360	91,720	582,640	0.00192	1,118.68	0	1,118.68	-
T304	Tad #3 (Unincorporated)	80,440	-	80,440	0.00192	154.44	-	154.44	-
TAV1	TAD Avondale Estates	624,480	14,560	609,920	0	-	-	-	-
TSM1	TAD Stone Mountain	593,840	95,640	498,200	0	-	-	-	-
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>9,367,877,957</b>	<b>391,736,566</b>	<b>8,976,141,391</b>		<b>14,081,911</b>		<b>14,081,911</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>M&amp;O Homesteaded Taxes before HOST</b>		<b>126,515,823.86</b>							
<b>Bond Homesteaded Taxes before HOST</b>		<b>14,081,911</b>							
<b>Total Homesteaded Taxes before HOST</b>		<b>140,597,734.89</b>							