

Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation

# TOOL FOR COSTING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLANNING: USER GUIDE

DRAFT

SEPTEMBER 2006



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1.  | INTRODUTION1   |
|-----|--|
| 1.1 | What is the Tool for Costing Sustainable Community Planning?1    |
| 1.2 | How Does this User Guide Work?                                   |
| 2.  | INSTALLING AND OPENING THE TOOL2                                 |
| 3.  | TOOL BASICS  |
| 3.1 | Structure  |
| 3.2 | Navigation4  |
| 4.  | UNDERSTANDING SCENARIOS6   |
| 4.1 | Choosing a Scenario  |
| 4.2 | Creating a New Scenario  |
| 4.3 | Deleting a Scenario  |
| 5.  | SPECIFYING COSTING VARIABLES8                                    |
| 6.  | SPECIFYING REVENUE VARIABLES10                                   |
| 7.  | ENTERING DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS10                           |
|     | Land Use and Locational Characteristics10                        |
|     | Development Type11   |
|     | Development Densities12  |
|     | Demographic Assumptions12  |
|     | Hard Infrastructure  |
|     | Transit Infrastructure13   |
| 8.  | SPECIFYING ALLOCATION OF COSTS                                   |
| 9.  | EXPLORING AND INCORPORATING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE<br>ALTERNATIVES |
| 10. | ENTERING COST SAVINGS16  |
| 11. | ADDING USER-DEFINED COSTS AND REVENUES                           |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

| 12.  | VIEWING RESULTS17                            |
|------|--|
| 12.1 | Hard Infrastructure and Municipal Services17 |
| 12.2 | Revenues and Cost Recovery                   |
| 12.3 | Private and External Costs                   |
| 12.4 | Printing Results                             |
| 13.  | CONDUCTING FURTHER ANALYSIS                  |

### 1. INTRODUTION

### 1.1 What is the Tool for Costing Sustainable Community Planning?

There has been much debate in recent years about the costs of development, both in terms of the true costs of different development forms as well how the costs of development are shared between the public, the private sector and the environment. There is mounting evidence that more compact, mixed-use development is a more cost-efficient and environmentally sustainable form of development than low-density suburban development. However, there are very few readily available tools to demonstrate the degree to which this is true, or to effectively compare different types of development.

The Tool for Costing Sustainable Community Planning (henceforth, "The Tool") was created to allow a user to estimate the major costs of community development, particularly those that change with different forms of development (e.g., linear infrastructure), and to compare alternative development scenarios. The Tool is geared towards estimating "planning-level" costs and revenues associated with the residential component of a development, although financial impacts of commercial and other types of development can be incorporated provided that infrastructure requirements are specified correctly.

The Tool is well suited to assessing development projects ranging in size from a collection of houses, to a block-by-block infill development, to an entire subdivision. A good measure of the applicability of the Tool to a given project is whether or not alternatives can be conceived that would result in significantly different densities or infrastructure requirements, or make use of different green infrastructure alternatives.

The Tool includes costing variables to allow the user to estimate costs for the following major categories:

- **Hard Infrastructure**, including roads, sewers, stormwater facilities, schools and recreation centres;
- **Municipal Services**, including transit services, school transit, fire services, police services and waste management services;
- Private User Costs, including driving costs and home heating costs;
- **External Costs**, including air pollution, climate change and motor vehicle collisions; and
- Green Infrastructure alternatives.

Revenues from development charges, property taxes, and user fees are also estimated. Users can easily estimate and compare costs and revenues among a variety of development scenarios. This tool allows users to consider the **lifecycle costs** of development, which are calculated over a **75**-**year** time horizon. Lifecycle costs include initial capital, annual operating, and replacement costs.

## CMHC and the Tool Developers assume no responsibility for the use of this Tool or any changes made by users.



### 1.2 How Does this User Guide Work?

This User Guide provides guidance on all aspects of Tool operation from installation, to development of scenarios, to outputting results, to viewing internal calculations, and conducting further analysis. The Guide can be read from "cover to cover" or can be referred to as necessary as specific questions arise. The purpose of this guide is not to provide detailed information on the assumptions and sources used in the development of default unit costs or built-in development scenarios. Further documentation, to be included in later versions of the Tool will include this detailed information.

The User Guide is structured into the following sections:

- Installing and opening the Tool
- Tool basics: structure and navigation
- Understanding scenarios
- Specifying costing variables
- Specifying revenue variables
- Entering development characteristics
- Specifying allocation of costs
- Exploring and incorporating green infrastructure alternatives
- Entering Cost Savings
- Adding user-defined costs and revenues
- Viewing results
- Further analysis

#### 2. INSTALLING AND OPENING THE TOOL

The Tool is developed in Microsoft Excel<sup>™</sup>, a software application familiar to most of its users, and is thus expected to be simple to install, open, and operate. To install and launch the Tool, follow the steps below:

- 1. Ensure Microsoft Excel<sup>™</sup> is installed on your computer.
- 2. Save a copy of Tool to the desired location on your computer as well as a backup copy.
- 3. Open Microsoft Excel<sup>™</sup> and set the Macro Security Level to "Medium" or "Low" (Tools>>Macro>>Security). If the Macro Security Level is "High", the Tool will not run properly.

| Microsoft Excel - Book1   | Security ?X   |
|---|---|
| Pile Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help   Al   A   B   C   A   C   A   B   C   A   B   C   C   A   C   B   C   C   C   C   C   C   C   A   C   B   C    C <t< td=""><td>Σ f       L</td></t<> | Σ f       L |
|   | OK Cancel   |

4. Run the Tool file. If you are prompted regarding the security of macros in the file, select "Enable Macros". The Main Menu of the Tool will then display.

| Microsoft Excel   |
|---|
| J:\0235\5.0 Work (Design) Phase\Development of Costing Mechanism\CMHC<br>Costing Model New Structure\Costing Tool 2006-09-18.xls contains macros. |
| Macros may contain viruses. It is always safe to disable macros, but if the macros are legitimate, you might lose some functionality.             |
| Disable Macros Enable Macros More Info  |

### 3. TOOL BASICS

#### 3.1 Structure

The Tool is based on a step-by-step process consisting of up to nine steps as detailed in the main menu (see figure below). At a minimum, users must select or enter a new scenario (Step 1) and review or modify the development characteristics (Step 4). Users also have the option of changing assumptions on unit costs (Step 2), revenue variables (Step 3) and the allocation of costs (Step 5). Additionally, the Tool provides the flexibility to incorporate the costs of green infrastructure alternatives (Step 6) and user defined costs (Step 7). Step 8 provides the ability to account for in place infrastructure and resulting cost savings. Finally, Step 9 presents the results in various output formats.

| C OSTING SUSTAINABL  | E COMMUNITY PLANNING   |
|--|--|
| MAIN MENU  | BROUP WWW.cmhc.ca  |
| This tool is intened to help users explore and com<br>community planning alternatives that can help con<br>capable of providing planning-level cost and rever<br>detailed costing analyses. While all attempts have<br>estimates, CMHC assumes no responsibility for the<br>development costs can vary considerably by locat | pare the costs of different forms of development, and<br>tribute to more sustainable development. The tool is For Instructions and Definition of<br>true estimates only and should not be used as a substitute for<br>been made to develop reasonable cost and revenue<br>accuracy of the results of this tool. Community<br>ion and individual development. |
| Current Scenario: Outer Suburbs / Mediur   | n Density To view a different scenario click on "Create / Modify / View or<br>Delete Scenarios", and follow the steps  |
| 1. Create/Modify/View or Delete<br>Scenarios   | This module allows users to choose from six default scenarios or begin a new scenario. REQUIRED STEP.  |
| 2. Specify Costing Variables   | This module specifies the unit costs for all variables, as well as related costing parameters.   |
| 3. Specify Revenue Variables   | This module inputs revenue information such as property tax rates and development charges  |
| 4. Enter Development Scenario<br>Characteristics   | This module specifies the characterisitcs of the scenario<br>including development densities, length of roads, sewers, etc.<br>REQUIRED STEP   |
| 5. Specify Allocation of Costs and<br>Revenues   | This module allows users to allocate costs and revenues between developers, the municipality and users.  |
| 6. Explore Green Infrastructure<br>Alternatives  | This module explores the cost impacts of green infrastructure<br>alternatives and provides the option for these costs to be included<br>in the total development costs.  |
| 7. User Defined Costs and<br>Revenues  | This is an optional step where users can input costs or revenues that are not considered in the basic tool.  |
| 8. Cost Savings  | This module enables users to discount costs to account for infrastruture that may already be in place.   |
| 9. View Results  | This module illustrates results in several ways and allows users to compare up to three different scenarios.   |

### 3.2 Navigation

Navigation through the nine steps is facilitated by the Main Menu. After completing a step, users can simply select the button at the top right of each screen to go back to the Main Menu and proceed to the next step, review previous steps, or proceed to the results. In each of the steps that change input, users have the option to Save Changes to the input or revert to saved values for the current scenario, using the Revert Changes button at the top of each step. **Users are not permitted to change parameters for built-in scenarios.** If users exit a step without saving changes, values are replaced with the most recent saved values upon returning to the Main Menu. Note that in the Draft Tool Green Infrastructure Alternatives are not saved together with the scenarios and only the most recent green infrastructure inputs are saved upon saving the Excel spreadsheet.

| C OSTING SUSTAINAB  | LE COMM  | UNITY PLAN                          | NING                              | CMHC SCHL                                |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Step 3: Revenue Variables   |  | <u>S</u> ave Changes                | <u>R</u> evert Changes            | www.cmhc.ca<br>Main Menu                 |  |  |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT CHARGES   |  |                                     |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development charges are sometimes applied at the time of construction on a unit basis.<br>Development charges are intended to help pay for the cost of new infrastructure to serve development<br>Development charges vary by municipality<br>(Sumit) |  |                                     |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Detached   | \$ <u>9,000</u> @=   | These charges would inc             | lude local and Regional o         | development charges (where applicable)   |  |  |  |  |
| Serni-Detached<br>Rowhouse/Townhouse/Duplex<br>LowRise<br>HighRise  | <ul> <li>\$ 9,000</li> <li>\$ 7,000</li> <li>\$ 5,000</li> <li>\$ 5,000</li> </ul> | Note that some municipa             | miles apply reduced crial         | ges în centain zones (e.g. central aleas |  |  |  |  |
| After completing a step, using the or Revert Changes to previously s  | buttons at the   | e top right of ea<br>and then go ba | ach screen, use<br>ck to the Main | ers can Save Changes<br>Menu.            |  |  |  |  |

A number of visual queues are provided within the Tool to assist users:

common accepted values

|        | Provides specific information on the input assumptions, type of data to be entered, or cautionary notes. |
|--------|--|
|        | Provides reference to additional resources.  |
| Yellow | Denotes cells that can be changed by users.  |
| Grey   | Denotes cells that may be changed, but caution is advised since values represent                         |

### 4. UNDERSTANDING SCENARIOS

A scenario represents a unique combination of both development characteristics and costing variables and is the basic structure used for evaluation and comparison. The first step in the Main Menu is to Create/Modify/View or Delete Scenarios.

| C OSTING SUSTAINABLE COMMU   | NITY PLANNING   |
|--|---|
| Step 1: Create / Modify / View Scenarios   | DONE www.cmhc.ca  |
| SELECT SCENARIO  |   |
| Choose the scenario that best reflects the characteristics of the development s  | cenario you wish to explore.  |
| See below for a brief description of each of the six built-in scenarios Name / Description Scenario # Outer Suburbs / Medium Density | The scenario establishes a starting point for development parameters.<br>The parameters of this scenario can be modified in subsequent steps.<br>Scenarios 1 to 6 must be saved under a NEW name before they can be |
| If you want to modify the scenario under a NEW name, enter the new name  | modified. To simply view the results of a default scenario, click done above  |
| NEW Name / Description   | Creates a copy of the scenario selected. This step is mandatory if the user<br>wants to modify scenarios 1 to 6.  |
| If you want to delete the scenario selected above, click on Delete Scenario  | Deletes the scenario selected. Scenarios 1 to 6 cannot be deleted.  |

## 4.1 Choosing a Scenario

The Tool contains six built-in scenarios ranging from High-Density, Mixed-Use in the Inner area to Low-Density, Residential in the Outer Area as described below. These scenarios are provided to help users learn how to use the Tool, illustrate a range of possible inputs, and provide a basis for user-defined scenarios. Note that costing and revenue variables are consistent across the build-in scenarios.

To choose one of the built-in scenarios, simply select one from the appropriate drop-down menu in the Step 1 screen. The scenario displayed in this field is always the active scenario. Select the "Done" button in the upper right of the screen, which will return you to the Main Menu. The scenario's costing, revenue, development, and other characteristics can then be viewed by selecting the appropriate button in the main menu.



### 4.2 Creating a New Scenario

New scenarios are created as modifiable copies of existing user-defined or built-in scenarios. To create a new scenario, navigate to the Step 1 screen and proceed to:

- 1. Using the drop down box, choose the existing scenario that best defined the characteristics of the development you want to explore.
- 2. In the second field, enter the name for the new scenario.
- 3. Select the button, "Save New Scenario" (to do this, you will first need to select an empty cell away from the field in which you entered the scenario name). The new scenario automatically becomes the active scenario.
- 4. To make modifications to your new scenario, select the "Done" button in the upper right of the screen, which will return you to the Main Menu, and proceed to appropriate screens.

There is no limit to the number of new scenarios that can be completed. However, in order to keep the file size manageable, it is recommended not to create more than 15 new scenarios in the same file. Additional scenarios can be created by saving the spreadsheet Tool as a new file.

### 4.3 Deleting a Scenario

To delete a scenario, navigate to the Step 1 screen and proceed to:

1. Using the drop down box, choose the scenario that you want to delete. **Built-in** scenarios cannot be deleted.

2. Select the "Delete Scenario" button select "Yes" in response to the deletion confirmation question.

### 5. SPECIFYING COSTING VARIABLES

Step 2, "Specify Costing Variables" allows the user to modify the unit cost assumptions related to hard infrastructure, municipal services, private costs, and external costs. The user can also modify the interest rate for amortizing capital costs and set capital and operating cost escalation factors to account for geographic, climatic or other unique circumstances.

Details about each specific cost are provided in the Tool using the Symbol. As discussed above, all yellow cells denote cells that can be changed by the user. Grey cells denote cells that may be changed, but caution is advised, since the values represent commonly accepted levels.

After completing this step, select the button at the top right of the screen to go back to the Main Menu and proceed to the next step, review previous steps, or proceed to the results. If you change any costing variables, you can select the button to "Save Changes" to the input or revert to save values for the current scenario, using the "Revert Changes" button at the top right of the screen. If you exit a step without saving changes, values are replaced with the most recent saved values upon returning to the Main Menu.

| Category            | Cost Type                                       | Variable                          | Unit               |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Canaral Cast        | Interest Rate for Amortizing Capital Costs      |                                   | %                  |
|                     | Cost Escalation Eactor                          | Capital Cost Factor               | -                  |
| rissumptions        |   | Operating Cost Factor             | -                  |
|                     |   | Basic Roadworks (7 Roadway Types) | \$/m               |
|                     | Deeds and Local Municipal Consists              | Sidewalks                         | \$/m               |
|                     | Roads and Local Municipal Services –            | Local Water Distribution          | \$/m               |
|                     |   | Local Sanitary Sewers             | \$/m               |
|                     |   | Local Storm Sewers                | \$/m               |
|                     | Designal Musicipal Consists - Constal           | Water Distribution                | \$/m of trunk pipe |
|                     | Regional Municipal Services – Capital           | Sanitary Sewer                    | \$/m of trunk pipe |
|                     | 60313   | Storm Sewer                       | \$/m of trunk pipe |
|                     | Local Storm Water Management –<br>Capital Costs | Retention Pond                    | \$/gross ha        |
|                     |   | Local Roads                       | \$/m               |
| Hard Infrastructure | Road - Operating Costs                          | Collector Roads                   | \$/m               |
|                     |   | Arterial Roads                    | \$/m               |
|                     | Weten Tesster and an d Distribution             | Traditional Suburban Development  | \$/household       |
|                     | Operating Costs                                 | Medium Density Development        | \$/household       |
|                     |   | Higher Density Development        | \$/household       |
|                     | Wastewater Treatment – Operating Costs          |                                   | \$/household       |
|                     | Sanitary and Storm Sewers – Operating C         | Costs                             | \$/m of trunk pipe |
|                     |   | Capital Costs                     | \$/student         |
|                     | Schools   | Operating Costs                   | \$/student         |
|                     |   | School Bus Capital Costs          | \$/student         |
|                     | Pocroational Facilitios                         | Capital Costs                     | \$/household       |
|                     |   | Operating Costs                   | \$/household       |

All costing variables are summarized in the table below.

| Category               | Cost Type                        | Variable  | Unit                                       |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
|                        | Trancit                          | Capital Costs   | \$/bus                                     |
|                        | Transit                          | Operating Costs   | \$/vehicle service hour                    |
|                        | Fire Drotestian                  | Capital Costs   | \$/household                               |
| Municipal Services     | Fire Protection                  | Operating Costs   | \$/household                               |
|                        | Delias Convisos                  | Capital Costs   | \$/household                               |
|                        | Police Services                  | Operating Costs   | \$/household                               |
|                        | Waste Management                 | Operating Costs   | \$/household                               |
|                        | Driveta Vehielee                 | Annual Vehicle Ownership Costs  | \$/vehicle/annum                           |
| Private Costs          | Private venicles                 | Operating Costs   | \$/km                                      |
|                        | Home Heating                     | Annual Home Energy Costs (3 dwelling types)   | \$/household                               |
|                        | -                                | Average Fuel Efficiency for Passenger Vehicles  | L/100 km                                   |
|                        |                                  | GHG Emissions Factor  | g/L fuel                                   |
|                        |                                  | GHG Emission Cost   | \$/tonne of CO <sub>2</sub><br>equivalents |
| External Costs         | Climate Change and Air Pollution | Air Pollutant Emissions Factor (5 variables for<br>Volatile Organic Compounds, Carbon Monoxide,<br>Nitrogen Oxides, Sulphur Oxides, Particulate<br>Matter less than 10 microns, respectively) | g/L fuel                                   |
|                        |                                  | Emission Costs (5 variables for pollutants above)   | \$/tonne                                   |
|                        |                                  | Fatal Collision Rate  | collisions/VKT                             |
|                        |                                  | Fatal Cost  | \$/collision                               |
|                        | Motor Vehicle Collisions         | Injury Collision Rate   | collisions/VKT                             |
|                        |                                  | Injury Cost   | \$/collision                               |
|                        |                                  | Property Damage Collision Rate  | collisions/VKT                             |
|                        |                                  | Property Damage Cost  | \$/collision                               |
|                        | Local Deads                      | Years for Replacement   | years                                      |
|                        | LUCAI RUAUS                      | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | External Deads                   | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        |                                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Water Distribution               | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        |                                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Sanitary Sower                   | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        | Salillary Sewel                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Storm Sowor                      | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
| Replacement Period for | Storm Sewer                      | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
| Capital Assets         | Schools                          | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        | 3010013                          | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Pocreational Eacilities          | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        | Recreational raciities           | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Bus Transit                      | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        |                                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Fire Service Vehicles            | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        |                                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |
|                        | Police Service Vehicles          | Years for Replacement   | Years                                      |
|                        |                                  | Replacement Cost  | % of original capital cost                 |

### 6. SPECIFYING REVENUE VARIABLES

Step 3, "Specify Revenue Variables" allows the user to modify the revenue assumptions related to development charges, property taxes, and user charges

Details about each specific revenue variable are provided in the Tool using the results and the symbol. As discussed above, all yellow cells denote cells that can be changed by the user. Grey cells denote cells that may be changed, but caution is advised, since the values represent commonly accepted levels.

After completing this step, select the button at the top right of the screen to go back to the Main Menu and proceed to the next step, review previous steps, or proceed to the results. If you change any revenue variables, you can select the button to "Save Changes" to the input or revert to save values for the current scenario, using the "Revert Changes" button at the top right of the screen. If you exit a step without saving changes, values are replaced with the most recent saved values upon returning to the Main Menu.

| Category               | Revenue Type                   | Variable                                      | Unit    |  |  |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------|--|--|
|                        | Single Detached                | \$/unit                                       |         |  |  |
|                        | Semi-Detached                  | \$/unit                                       |         |  |  |
| Development<br>Charges | Rowhouse/Townhouse/Duple>      |   | \$/unit |  |  |
| onargoo                | Low Rise                       |   | \$/unit |  |  |
|                        | High Rise                      | \$/unit                                       |         |  |  |
|                        |                                | Single Detached                               | \$/unit |  |  |
|                        |                                | Semi-Detached                                 | \$/unit |  |  |
| Droporty Taxos         | Average Assessment Value       | Rowhouse/Townhouse/Duplex                     | \$/unit |  |  |
| Flopenty Taxes         |                                | Low Rise                                      | \$/unit |  |  |
|                        |                                | High Rise                                     | \$/unit |  |  |
|                        | Property Tax Rate              | %   |         |  |  |
| Lisor Chargos          | User charges not included in p | roperty taxes                                 | \$      |  |  |
| User Charges           | Transit Fare                   | Transit Costs Recovered Through Transit Fares |         |  |  |

All revenue variables are summarized in the table below.

### 7. ENTERING DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Step 4, "Enter Development Characteristics" allows the user to specify development characteristics, such as land use, demographic assumptions, residential densities, and the amount of hard infrastructure required. When assessing different development types for a given plot of land, unit cost and revenue assumptions will generally remain consistent, so that the development characteristics will be the defining characteristics that lead to different costs and revenues between the scenarios. Thus, it is important to specify these characteristics as accurately as possible. Explanations for each development characteristics category are provided below.

#### LAND USE AND LOCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Variable under this category related to the general locational and land use characteristics of the development and are used in the calculation of travel activity and related impacts as well as in the

allocation of costs between residential and non-residential uses. These variable are defined, as follows:

- **Distance to Central Business District**: The straight-line distance between the approximate centre of the development and the approximate centre of the nearest central employment area in kilometres. This variable is a significant determinant of travel activity.
- **Gross Land Area**: The total area of the development in hectares, including any area, such as streams or other sensitive areas that will not be developed.
- **Percent Residential**: Proportion of Gross Land Area that is designated for residential uses, including residential parcels, local roads, parks, schools, and other facilities integral to residential development. Setting this value will require some judgement. User should determine this percentage, while considering that this value is used as a scaling factor to estimate the proportion of infrastructure and municipal services costs associated with the residential component of the development. Cost for the "Residential Portion" are used to determine per household costs, which are used to compare the cost-efficiency of different developments (see Section 12, which discusses Step 9, "View Results"). Implicitly, this assumes that these costs vary proportionally with land allocation. This assumption is considered reasonable in most cases, but may be less accurate where there is a large difference in the intensity of development between residential and non-residential components of a development.

As an example, consider a ten-hectare site, with the following land allocation:

- 7 hectares dedicated to residential buildings, local roads, schools, and parks;
- 1.5 hectares dedicated to local and regional commercial uses;
- 1 hectare dedicated to regional arterial roads; and
- 0.5 hectares undeveloped.

Such a development would have a Gross Land Area of 10 hectares. Calculation of Percent Residential would require some judgement, particularly in the case of the regional arterial roads, which serve the local residential population as well as more regional traffic. Without further information, it is assumed that half of the land area for the regional arterial roads can be assumed a component of residential development. Thus, the Percent residential would be 75% (i.e.  $(7 + 1^*0.5)/10$ ).

#### **DEVELOPMENT TYPE**

This category requires the user to characterize the development as one of three types, which most represents the development under consideration:

- Compact development, retail services close by, bike lanes or trails available, grid network or continuous streets.
- Medium density residential development with some ancillary commercial uses. Generally a continuous grid network with good transit service and potentially bike lanes.

• Primarily residential development built on closed network street patterns (e.g. cul-desacs) with limited transit accessibility and few or no bike lanes.

This input is used by the Tool to assume approximate values for several variables, which play a minor role in the estimation of auto ownership. These variables include weekday transit service hours within a 1 kilometre radius, percent curvilinear road layout, and the ratio of bike lanes to road kilometres, among others.

#### **DEVELOPMENT DENSITIES**

The number of residential units by housing type is required to determine many factors, such as the number of households and per household costs, revenues, population, and auto ownership and use, among others. The Tool considers five dwelling types: single detached, semi-detached, rowhouse/townhouse/ duplex, low rise, and high-rise. Each built-in scenario is the same size (i.e. 40 hectares), but has different breakdown of housing units by type. These values can be modified for new scenarios.



#### DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

Demographic assumptions are important in calculations regarding auto ownership and use and school costs. Assumptions include the average household size by dwelling type, the number of adults per household, average household income, and the number of jobs within 5 kilometres of the development. Jobs within 5 kilometres of the development and the distance to the central business district should be calculated from a location, which is approximately in the centre of the development.

#### HARD INFRASTRUCTURE

The amount of required road, water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure determine much of the costs of the development. Due to possible differences in allocation of costs, road inputs are divided into internal and external road requirements. Internal road lengths can be specified in terms

of seven different road types ranging from public laneways, to four-lane arterials, to user-specified facilities (i.e., user can create a new road type defined by its unit cost in Step 2).

Internal water and sewer infrastructure requirements do not need to be specified as they are assumed to follow the internal road requirements. Water and sewer unit costs by road type are specified in the Revenue Variables sheet. Water and sewer infrastructure external to the development is identified explicitly, including the length of required trunk pipes for water distribution, storm sewers, and sanitary sewers, as well as the size of stormwater management pond required.

#### TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE

Public transit infrastructure is specified in terms of the vehicle service hours per capita and the number of buses required per 1000 vehicle service hours. Vehicle service hours per capita (or revenue service hours per capita) can be estimated from local results from your community. Contact your local transit agency or look to the Canadian Transit Fact Book published by the Canadian Urban Transit Association (http://www.cutaactu.ca/).

#### 8. SPECIFYING ALLOCATION OF COSTS

A key factor in determining the costs of a development is the question of who pays. Allocation of capital and operating costs associated with hard infrastructure and municipal services is specified in Step 5, "Allocation of Costs". Users can specify how each cost is shared between four different partners: the developer, the municipality, the user, and an "Other" category.

The cost allocation input screen is shown below. The default for each cost is to allocate 100% of the cost to the municipality. The user can modify this as appropriate, but should ensure that the total column for each cost sums to 100%.

| COST ALLOCATION                       |                         |           |      |        |       |   |                           |           |      |        |       |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|---|---------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|
|                                       | CAPITAL Cost Allocation |           |      |        | Tatal |   | OPERATING Cost Allocation |           |      |        | T-4-1 |
|                                       | Municipal               | Developer | User | Others | TOTAL | ħ | Municipal                 | Developer | User | Others | Totai |
| Infrastructure Costs                  |                         |           |      |        |       |   |                           |           |      |        |       |
| Local Roads                           | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Regional Roads                        | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Water Distribution and Water Treat.   | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Sanitary Sewers and Wastewater Treat. | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Storm Sewers and Water Management     | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| School Construction and Operation     | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Recreational Facilities               | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Municipal Services                    |                         |           |      |        |       |   |                           |           |      |        |       |
| Bus Transit                           | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| School Transit                        | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Fire Service                          | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Police Service                        | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |
| Waste Management Service              | 100%                    | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |   | 100%                      | 0%        | 0%   | 0%     | 100%  |

# 9. EXPLORING AND INCORPORATING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES

Step 6, "Green Infrastructure" allows the user to explore a wide variety of green infrastructure alternatives and estimate associated costs and revenues, in many cases. In this discussion, the term "green infrastructure" is used broadly to refer to all infrastructure components of a development that can enhance the environmental sustainability of the development relative to

conventional approaches. Since costs and benefits associated with several green infrastructure alternatives, such as Tree Preservation, are highly variable and dependent on many factors, information on these alternatives is included to provide decision support, but costs and revenues cannot be estimated directly. The table below lists the green infrastructure alternatives considered in the Tool and whether associated costs can be estimated.

| Green Infrastructure Alternative | Costs Estimate<br>Available |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths     | $\checkmark$                |
| Permeable Pavement               | $\checkmark$                |
| Exfiltration Trenches            | $\checkmark$                |
| Stormwater Harvesting            | $\checkmark$                |
| Green Roofs                      | $\checkmark$                |
| Rain Barrels                     | $\checkmark$                |
| Naturalized Landscaping          | $\checkmark$                |
| District Heating and Cooling     | $\checkmark$                |
| Photovoltaics                    | $\checkmark$                |
| Distributed Power                |                             |
| Building Orientation and Design  |                             |
| Traffic Calming                  | $\checkmark$                |
| Alternative Road Standards       | $\checkmark$                |
| Tree Preservation                |                             |

A separate screen is provided for each green infrastructure alternative, which can be reached from the Step 6 screen. Each specific screen has a similar layout, which consists of four sections: "General Description and Importance to Sustainability", "Typical Costs", Typical Savings", and "Costs", as shown in the screen for Naturalized Landscaping, to the right.

Costs of the different green infrastructure alternatives are summarized in the Step 6 screen, as shown below. Total green infrastructure costs are carried forwarded to the Results screen and displayed in their own category.

Note that inputted values and estimated costs for Green Infrastructure Alternatives are not saved together with the scenarios. Only the most recent green infrastructure inputs are saved upon saving the Excel spreadsheet Tool.

#### NATURALIZED LANDSCAPING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION AND IMPORTANCE TO SUSTAINABILITY Low maintenance landscapes are designed on principles of low-water consumption and reduced maintenance, primarily through the use of drought tolerant, native plant material.

Naturalized landscaping, or xeriscaping, reduces potable water requirements and the use of fertilizers and pesticides, in addition to enhancing and proteoting biodiversity. Water savings of as much as 65% over traditional horticultural landscapes can be achieved, if xeriscapes are properly designed and maintained once established. (CMHC, <u>Definitely in My Backyard</u>: <u>Making the Best Choices for You and the Environment</u>, 2000)

#### **TYPICAL COSTS**

- Xeriscaping: - Capital: \$18.00 per m2
- Capital: \$8.00 per m2
- Maintenance \$0.10 per m2
   Typical irrigation requirements: 8 L/m2
- Maintenance \$0.50 per m2 L/m2 - Typical water use: 38 L/m2

Conventional Landscaping:

Conventional landscaping = conventional sod (i.e. Kentucky Blue Grass) with 10cm of topsoil Xeriscaping = specialized drought tolerant sod (i.e. fine-leafed fescue) with 30cm of topsoil. The extra depth of topsoil is for the benefit of the street trees, in addition to the extra volume in the tree pits that is accounted for in the tree costs.

Maintenance includes watering, fertilizing, application of pesticides, mowing, mulching, etc. (Dillon Consulting, <u>Regent Park Sustainable Neighbourhood Plan</u>, 2004)

#### **TYPICAL SAVINGS**

Xeriscape landscapes can initially cost more than conventional landscapes due to the need for professional design, and the use of native plant species, which can be harder to obtain, however, current research by Canada Mortgage and Housing indicates that maintenance costs of xeriscaping are considerably lower than other types of landscaping (potential water savings of 65%).

#### COSTS

Enter total area of xeriscaping (m2):

\$

10,000

10.00

100,000.00

Enter unit cost differential for xeriscaping (\$/m2):

Total Cost of Naturalized Landscaping to be carried forv 💲

| C OSTING SUSTAINAB               | LE COMM                   | JNITY PLAN                 | NING                          | СМНС            | SCH  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Step 6: Green Infrastructure     |                           |                            | DONE                          | www.cr          | nhc. |
| 🖙 To examine representative Gree | n Infrastructure alternat | ves, click on its correspo | ndent button                  |                 |      |
| Bicycle & Pedestrian Paths       | \$750,000                 |                            | Photovoltaics                 | Discussion Only |      |
| Permeable Pavement               | \$25,000                  |                            | Distributed Power             | Discussion Only |      |
| Exfiltration Trenches            | \$0                       | Bld                        | lg Orientation & Design       | Discussion Only |      |
| Stormwater Harvesting            | \$0                       |                            | Traffic Calming               | \$171,000       |      |
| Green roofs                      | \$117,000                 | Alte                       | ernative Road Standards       | -\$893,050      |      |
| Rain Barrels                     | \$20,000                  |                            | Tree Preservation             | Discussion Only |      |
| Naturalized Landscaping          | \$100,000                 | Miscellaneou               | us Green Infrastructure Costs | \$0             |      |
| District Heating & Cooling       |                           | Total                      | Green Infrastructure Costs    | \$289 950       |      |

### 10. ENTERING COST SAVINGS

Step 7, "Infrastructure Cost Savings" enables users to discount costs to account for infrastructure that may already be in place. Areas such as brownfields, for example, may have excess capacity to accommodate new growth without the need for additional infrastructure. Users can enter the proportion of infrastructure that already exists and is considered space capacity. Final costs will be multiplied by the difference between the percentage entered and 100%. Entering 0% means that no cost savings are incurred due to excess infrastructure and all costs are attributed to the development.

| C OSTING SUSTAINAB   | LE COMMUN  | NITY PLAY   | INING  | CMHC & SCHL   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Step 7: Infrastructure Cost Savings  |  | <u>S</u> ave Changes  | <u>R</u> evert Changes   | Main Menu   |
| Local Roads<br>Regional Roads<br>Water Distribution and Water Treatment<br>Sanitary Sewers and Water Management<br>Storm Sewers and Water Management<br>Schools<br>Recreational Facilities | Percentage<br>in place<br>0%<br>0%<br>0%<br>0%<br>0% | Areas such<br>accommoda<br>infrastructur<br>that already<br>will be multij<br>entered and<br>incurred due<br>to the develo<br>to the develo | as brownfields may have<br>te new growth without the<br>e. Users can enter the p<br>exists and is considered<br>biled by the difference be<br>100%. Entering 0% mea<br>to excess infrastructure<br>opment. | excess capacity to<br>need for additional<br>roportion of infrastructure<br>space capacity. Final costs<br>tween the percentage<br>ans that no cost savings are<br>and all costs are attributed |

### 11. ADDING USER-DEFINED COSTS AND REVENUES

The Tool includes many of the most common types of costs associated with a development. However, there may be other costs and revenues that users may wish to include such as:

- Home construction costs;
- Land costs;
- Site remediation costs due to pre-existing environmental contamination;
- Noise remediation;
- Demolition costs;
- Green Infrastructure Funds;
- Brownfield redevelopment funds;
- Revenues from sale of lands or other resources; or
- Revenues from district energy production or other green ventures.

Step 8, "User-Defined Costs and Revenues" any other miscellaneous initial capital costs, annual operating costs, or revenues. Revenues should be entered as an annual equivalent amortized over the lifecycle (i.e., 75 years).

### 12. VIEWING RESULTS

Step 9, "View Results" allows users to view and print summaries of costs and revenues and compare results from different scenarios. As shown in the screenshot of the Results Navigation Window, below, users can be directed to result summaries and scenario comparisons under three categories: "Hard Infrastructure and Municipal Services", "Revenues and Cost Recovery", and "Private Costs and External Costs". Directions for viewing the data and performing scenario comparisons are provided in the sections below.

| C OSTIN  | G SUS                                     | TAINABL                             | E COMM                               | [UN] | ITY PLANN  | ING            |                 | CMHC + SCHL  |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|--|----------------|-----------------|--|
| Step 9: View Resu  | ilts                                      |                                     |                                      |      |  | Main Menu      |                 | www.cmhc.ca  |
| Current Scenario:  | Outer Subu                                | rbs / Low Density                   |                                      |      |  |                |                 |  |
| Hard Infrastr<br>Municipal Se<br>Initial Capi<br>Operating | ucture<br>ervices<br>tal Costs<br>g Costs | Revenues a<br>Recovery<br>Revenue-O | nd Cost<br>/enues<br>Cost Allocation |      | Private Costs and<br>External Costs<br>Private Costs<br>External Costs | <sup>ا م</sup> | ₽ C<br>oi<br>si | lick on the cost category of interest.<br>r pick compare scenarios to see a<br>ummary of the results |
| Lyfecycle<br>Compare S                                     | e Costs<br>cenarios                       | Compar                              | e Scenarios                          |      | Compare Scenarios  |                |                 |  |

### 12.1 Hard Infrastructure and Municipal Services

#### **Result Summaries**

Under the category of "Hard Infrastructure and Municipal Services", the Tool generates tables and graphs summarizing initial capital costs, annual operating costs, and lifecycle costs. **Lifecycle costs** are expressed on an annual basis and are calculated as initial capital costs, annual operating costs, and replacement costs amortized over the 75-year time-horizon. Sample screenshots of these summaries are shown below.

Summary tables subdivide costs into total development costs, residential costs, household costs, and percentage breakdown. Residential costs refer to the infrastructure and service costs associated with the residential portion of the development and are calculated as total costs multiplied the Percent Residential Land Area, specified in Step 4, "Enter Development Characteristics" (see Section 7). Household costs simply express the costs of the residential portion of the development on a per-household basis.

For each cost summary, pie and bar charts provide a visual breakdown of hard infrastructure and municipal services costs. Note that due to the large magnitude of school operating costs, these costs are not included in the pie chart for annual operating costs. A "View Other Result" button below each of these charts allows the user to easily return to the Results Navigation Window and then view other results.

GREEN INFR.

USER DEFINED

#### CANADIAN MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION TOOL FOR COSTING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLANNING: USER GUIDE

| INITIAL CAPITAL COSTS                  |             |             |           |           |                                       |                         |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
|  |             |             |           |           |                                       |                         |
|  |             | Residential | Household | Percent   | Distribution of Initial Capital Costs | Local Roads             |
|  | Development | Portion     | Costs     | Breakdown | (Residential Portion)                 |                         |
|  | \$millons   | \$ millons  | \$/hh     | %         |                                       | Regional Roads          |
| HARD INFRASTRUCTURE Local Roads        | 2,509,400   | 2,509,400   | 10,456    | 0         |                                       |                         |
| Regional Roads                         | 975,200     | 975,200     | 4,063     | 0         |                                       | Vater Distribution and  |
| Water Distribution and Water Treatment | 1,018,400   | 1,018,400   | 4,243     | 0         |                                       | Water Treatment         |
| Sanitary Sewers and Wastewater Treat.  | 816,000     | 816,000     | 3,400     | 0         |                                       | Sanitary Sewers and     |
| Storm Sewers and Water Management      | 1,712,000   | 1,712,000   | 7,133     | 0         |                                       | Wastewater Treat.       |
| Schools                                | 784,920     | 784,920     | 3,271     | 0         |                                       | Storm Sewers and Water  |
| Recreational Facilities                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         |                                       | Management              |
| MUNICIPAL SERVICES Transit Services    | 37,800      | 37,800      | 158       | 0         |                                       | Schools                 |
| Fire Services                          | 13,680      | 13,680      | 57        | 0         |                                       |                         |
| Police Services                        | 7,200       | 7,200       | 30        | 0         |                                       | Recreational Facilities |
| GREEN INFR. Green Infrastructure Items | 289,950     | 289,950     | 1,208     | 0         |                                       |                         |
| USER DEFINED User Defined Costs        | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         |                                       | Transit Services        |
| Total Costs                            | \$8,164,550 | \$8,164,550 | \$34,019  | 100%      |                                       |                         |
|  |             |             |           |           |                                       | Fire Services           |
|  |             |             |           |           |                                       |                         |
|  |             |             |           |           |                                       |                         |
|  |             |             |           |           |                                       |                         |
|  |             |             |           |           | V                                     | ew Other Result         |



|                   | 0                        |             |             |           |           |   |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| LIFECYCLE COST    | 5                        |             |             |           |           |   |
|                   |                          | Total       | Residential | Household | Percent   |   |
|                   |                          | Development | Portion     | Costs     | Breakdown | Annualized Lifecycle Costs* (Residential Portion) |
|                   |                          | \$ millons  | \$ millons  | \$        | %         | 1   |
| HARD INFRASTRUC   | CTURE Local Roads        | \$160,747   | \$160,747   | \$670     | 8%        | <u> </u>  |
|                   | Regional Roads           | \$63,804    | \$63,804    | \$266     | 3%        | Hear Defined Costs                                |
|                   | Water Distribution       | \$161,247   | \$161,247   | \$672     | 8%        | User Defined Costs                                |
|                   | Sanitary Sewers          | \$154,134   | \$154,134   | \$433     | 5%        | Vaste Management                                  |
|                   | Storm Sewers             | \$128,552   | \$128,552   | \$536     | 7%        |   |
|                   | School Transit           | \$96,000    | \$96,000    | \$400     | 5%        | Fire Services                                     |
|                   | Recreational Facilities  | \$72,000    | \$72,000    | \$300     | 4%        |   |
| MUNICIPAL SERVI   | CES Transit Services     | \$26,601    | \$26,601    | \$111     | 1%        | Becreational Facilities                           |
|                   | Fire Services            | \$79,801    | \$79,801    | \$333     | 4%        |   |
|                   | Police Services          | \$120,267   | \$120,267   | \$501     | 6%        | Storm Sewers                                      |
|                   | Waste Management         | \$44,160    | \$44,160    | \$184     | 2%        |   |
| GREEN INFR. Gr    | een Infrastructure Items | \$17,620    | \$17,620    | \$73      | 1%        | Water Distribution                                |
| USER DEFINED      | User Defined Costs       | \$0         | \$0         | \$0       | 0%        |   |
| SCHOOLS           | School Costs             | \$883,024   | \$883,024   | \$3,679   | 45%       | Local Roads                                       |
| Total Costs (Excl | uding School Costs)      | \$1,124,933 | \$1,124,933 | \$4,478   |           |   |
| Total Costs (Incl | luding School Costs)     | \$2,007,957 | \$2,007,957 | \$8,157   | 100%      | \$0 \$200 \$400 \$000 \$000 \$1,000               |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           | * Evoluties School Costs Thousands                |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           |   |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           |   |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           | + Deserview 75 voew eventuale version             |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           | * Based on 70 year analysis period.               |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           | Includes replacement costs. View Other Result     |
|                   |                          |             |             |           |           |   |

#### **Comparing Scenarios**

Under the heading, "Comparison of Hard Infrastructure and Municipal Costs – Residential Portion", the Tool allows the user to compare per household initial capital, annual operating, and annual lifecycle costs among up to three scenarios. Both user-defined and built-in scenarios can be compared with the active scenario. Use the drop down menus to select the appropriate scenario for Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 as shown in the sample screenshot below.



### 12.2 Revenues and Cost Recovery

#### **Result Summaries**

Under the category of "Revenues and Cost Recovery", the Tool generates tables summarizing revenues and comparing them to costs associated with infrastructure, municipal services, personal consumption, and externalities. As shown below, the Tool summarizes lifecycle costs and allocates annualized lifecycle costs between four parties: Developer, Municipality, User, and Other. Allocation of costs is based on the user-specified distribution of initial capital and annual operating costs, which is set in Step 5, "Specifying Allocation of Costs".

As mentioned earlier, **lifecycle costs** are expressed on an annual basis and are calculated as initial capital costs, annual operating costs, and replacement costs amortized over the 75-year time-horizon.

| ANNUAL REVENUE-COST A    | LLOCATIO       | IS                  |                  |                                |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| ANNUALIZED               |                |                     |                  |                                |
| LIFECYCLE COSTS          | Developer      | Municipal           | User Fees        | Others                         |
| Infrastructure Costs     | \$128,381      | \$612,976           | \$0              | \$0                            |
| Municipal Services       | \$0            | \$350,545           | \$11,868         | \$4,416                        |
| Green Infrastructure     |                |                     |                  | \$17,620                       |
| Schools                  | \$14,310       | \$868,715           | \$0              | \$0                            |
| User Defined Costs       |                |                     |                  | \$0                            |
| Ann LC Costs*            | \$142,690      | \$1,832,235         | \$11,868         | \$22,036                       |
|                          |                |                     |                  |                                |
| ANNUAL REVENUES          |                |                     |                  |                                |
| Taxes & Develop. Charges |                | \$1,551,916         |                  |                                |
| User Charges             |                | \$83,340            |                  |                                |
| User Defined Revenues    |                | \$0                 |                  |                                |
| Ann LC Revenues          |                | \$1,635,256         |                  |                                |
|                          |                |                     |                  |                                |
| ANNUAL PRIVATE COSTS     |                |                     |                  | _                              |
| Driving Costs            |                |                     | \$4,337,972      |                                |
| Home Energy              |                |                     | \$518,307        |                                |
| Ann LC Private Costs     |                |                     | \$4,856,279      |                                |
|                          |                |                     |                  |                                |
| ANNUAL EXTERNAL COST     | S              |                     |                  |                                |
| Climate Change           |                |                     |                  | \$55,220                       |
| Air Pollution            |                |                     |                  | \$47,049                       |
| Motor Vehicle Collisions |                |                     |                  | \$325,427                      |
| Ann LC External Costs    |                |                     |                  | \$427,697                      |
|                          |                |                     |                  | _                              |
| * Based on 75 y          | ear life. Inci | ludes initial capit | al, annual opera | iting, and replacements costs. |

#### **Comparing Scenarios**

Under the title "Comparison of Costs and Revenues – Residential Portion", the Tool allows the user to compare municipal costs and municipal revenues among up to three scenarios. These values are expressed as annual lifecycle costs and revenues per household for the residential component of the development. An example of this comparison is shown in the screenshot below.

Caution should be observed in comparing municipal costs against municipal revenues, as municipal revenues are intended to cover a wide range of services. Similarly, due to varied approaches used by municipalities for providing credits for development charges, it is not recommended that development charges be compared directly with developer costs.



### 12.3 Private and External Costs

#### **Result Summaries**

The Tool summarizes private costs associated with personal transportation and home heating, two major household costs that depend on development form. Displayed private costs include annual driving costs (i.e., vehicle ownership and operation), transit fares, and home heating. Default driving unit costs are based on the 2005 Driving Costs report by the Canadian Automobile Association, while home heating costs are based on the National Energy Code For Housing Standards from the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes. Auto ownership and use is estimated based on a variety of development and socio-economic characteristics (e.g., jobs within 5 km, income, etc.) based on methods developed in the CMHC Tool for Evaluating Neighbourhood Sustainability (www.cmhc.ca).

External costs associated with vehicle use are also estimated including motor vehicle collisions, air pollution, and climate change. Sources for default unit costs are noted in the Tool, but it is emphasized that the valuation of external costs is highly varied and results should be viewed as approximate.

#### **Comparing Scenarios**

Under the title "Comparison of Private Costs and External Costs, the Tool allows the user to compare private and external costs among up to three scenarios. These values are expressed as annual costs per household. An example of this comparison is shown in the screenshot below.



#### **12.4 Printing Results**

To print results, select (File>>Print>>OK). Printing settings (i.e., Print Area settings) are already set so that the results are laid out in an organized and clear manner.

### 13. CONDUCTING FURTHER ANALYSIS

Advanced users may wish to review the Tool Structure and background calculations. To do this, change the option to view tabs (Tools>>Options>>View>>Sheet Tabs) un-hiding the hidden sheets. The worksheet, "Intermediate Calculations" contains many of the background calculations. Calculations and default values for the built-in scenarios are password protected.

Users can conduct further analysis by copying Tool results into another Excel file or other application.

## CMHC and the Tool Developers assume no responsibility for the use of this Tool or any changes made by users.

Document1\2006-10-11\JEY