

RESOLUTION NO. 639

**A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SCAPPOOSE
ADOPTING A METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES, AND ESTABLISHING SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT
CHARGES FOR PARKS AND RECREATION.**

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Ordinance No, 584 approving system development charges for parks and recreation and other services in accordance with ORS 223.279 to 223.314, and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 584 is to be implemented by a resolution adopting a Facilities Plan and Methodology and determining the amounts of such system development charges for each service, and

WHEREAS, the City has developed a master plan and methodology for establishing system development charges for parks and recreations services, which plan and methodology is attached hereto as Exhibit A,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED;

1. **PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES**

The City Council hereby approved and adopted the "City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Capital Facilities Master Plan and System Development Methodology Report," dated February 4, 1997, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

2. **PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES**

Pursuant to Ordinance No, 584 of the City of Scappoose, the City Council hereby establishes parks and recreation system development charges on residential dwelling units as follows:

SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

Type of Dwelling Unit	Average persons Per Dwelling Unit	Standard Cost per Capita	SDC Per Dwelling Unit
Single Family	2.91	\$514	\$1,496
Multi-Family	2.14	\$514	\$1,100
Manufactured Housing	2.28	\$514	\$1,172


3. EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of parks and recreation system development charges adopted hereby shall be the date of adoption. Charges adopted herein shall apply to dwelling units for which a building or development permit is applied for on or after that date.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Scappoose City Council and signed by me, and the City Recorder in authentication of its passage this 3rd day March, 1997.

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE, OREGON


Glenn E. Dorschler, Mayor

Attest: 
Donna J. Gedlich
City Recorder

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

**Parks and Recreation
Capital Facilities Master Plan**

and

**System Development Charges
Methodology Report**

February 4, 1997
(as amended and adopted
by Scappoose City Council
on March 3, 1997)

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 NEEDS ANALYSIS	1
A. Survey Data	1
B. Population Information	2
C. Inventory of Existing Facilities	3
D. Facility Types and Standards	3
3.0 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN	8
4.0 SDC METHODOLOGY	10
A. SDC Methodology Approach	10
B. "Reimbursement fee" and "Improvement fee" SDC's	12
C. Credits	12
D. Nexus of Benefit	13
E. Population Growth and Persons per Dwelling Unit	14
5.0 CALCULATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES SDC's	15
A. Formula 1: Net Growth-related Facilities Costs	15
B. Formula 2: Net Facilities Cost per Capita	16
C. Formula 3: Compliance/ Administration Cost per Capita	16
D. Formula 4: Standard Cost per Capita	17
E. Formula 4: SDC Per Dwelling Unit	18
6.0 ADDITIONAL FUNDING/FINANCING SOURCES	18
A. General Obligation Bonds (G.O. Bonds)	19
B. Revenue Bonds/Certificates of Participation	19
C. Special Assessment/Local Improvement District	19
D. General Fund Revenues	20
E. Serial Levies for Capital Improvements	20
F. User Fees and Rents	20
G. Federal/State/Other Grants	21
H. Sponsorships/partnerships	21
7.0 CONCLUSION	21
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Summary of Key Findings From 1991 Survey	
Appendix B: City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Facilities Planning Map	
Addendum (3/3/97)	

LIST of TABLES

TABLE 2.1:	City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory/ Current Level of Service Analysis	4
TABLE 2.2:	City of Scappoose Parks, Recreation and Open Space Facility Types and Standards	5
TABLE 2.3:	City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Capital Facility Needs	7
TABLE 4.1:	Estimated City Population Increase	14
TABLE 4.2:	Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit	14
TABLE 5.1:	Net Growth-Related Facilities Costs	15
TABLE 5.2:	Facilities Cost Per Capita	16
TABLE 5.3:	Compliance/ Administration Cost Per Capita	17
TABLE 5.4:	Standard Cost Per Capita	17
TABLE 5.5:	SDC Per Dwelling Unit	18

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE
Parks and Recreation Capital Facilities Plan and
System Development Charges Methodology Report

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Scappoose is experiencing tremendous population growth, and is expected to expand to nearly two-and-a-half times its current population during the next twenty years (1997 - 2016). Parks and recreation resources within the City are currently very limited, with schools providing for most neighborhood and community parks facility needs.

This plan identifies current levels of service, addresses growth needs through a detailed methodology for parks and recreation system development charges, , and provides suggestions for funding non-growth items as well as those growth-related capital improvements not paid by system development charges.

2.0 NEEDS ANALYSIS

The needs analysis section of this report presents the basis for development of the capital facilities plan. In particular, this section of the report includes:

- A. Survey data reviewed by the ad hoc committee
- B. Population information for the City of Scappoose
- C. Current inventory of parks and recreation facilities,
- D. Parks, recreation, and opens space facility types and standards, and
- E. Needs, based on the application of standards and other data.

A. Survey Data

The University of Oregon's Institute of Recreation Research and Service conducted a survey in 1991 on behalf of the Scappoose Park & Recreation District and the Scappoose Library District. The survey gathered a variety of information, including opinions concerning:

- the importance of various parks and recreation programs and activities to the quality of life,
- the level of interest in developing and building specific types of park, recreation, and cultural facilities improvements,
- desired community center programs, and
- programming activity suggestions

The survey responses were reviewed by the ad hoc committee and used in developing recommendations for improvements to be included in the capital facilities plan. A summary of key survey responses is included as Appendix A.

B. Population Information

The planning period for this report is twenty years (1997-2016). The population of the City of Scappoose grew from 3,529 persons in 1990 to about 4,130 in 1996, for an average annual growth rate of about 2.7%. Economic & Engineering Services, Inc., contracted by the City of Scappoose to conduct a water study, has performed a demographics analysis that forecasts growth at 4.0% per year through 2000, 4.5% per year between 2001 and 2005, 5.0% per year between 2006 and 2010, 5.5% per year between 2011 and 2015, and 1% per year between 2015 and 2020. Using these assumptions, the City will have a population of about 9,821 in the year 2016, nearly 2.5 times as many residents as in 1996!

As this growth occurs, the demographic make-up of the community may change, and the community's parks and recreation interests may also change significantly and rapidly. For this reason, it is recommended that community interests and parks and recreation needs be monitored through the use of surveys and similar techniques, and that the parks and recreation Capital Facilities Plan be updated at least once every three years.

C. Inventory of Existing Facilities

The City of Scappoose recently opened Heritage Park, a "town square" special use park located on the site of the City's new library and former "temporary" City Hall. The City also owns several parcels along Scappoose Creek that are suitable for use as part of a linear park/trail system, and an eighty (80) acre forested natural resource area.

Most of the City's active recreation facilities, including ballfields, tennis courts, playgrounds, and other facilities have been provided primarily by Scappoose School District 1J. Steinfield's, Inc., also provides land on which two little league baseball fields have been constructed. An inventory of existing facilities is included in Table 2.1. Facility locations are also indicated on the City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Facilities Planning Map (Appendix B).

D. Facility Types and Standards

Descriptions of each of the major types of parks and recreation facilities to be included in the City's parks and recreation system have been developed. They include:

- mini-park
- neighborhood park
- community/school park
- special use park/facility
- linear park/trail
- open space/forest/natural area resource
- athletic/sports facilities

Complete descriptions including use and characteristics, service area, desirable size, and Level of Service (LOS) standard are identified in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.1

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

**Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory/
Current Level of Service Analysis**

Component	Senior	Heritage	Nature	Creek-	Laurel	Mdow-	Stein-	High	Middle	Peter-	Grant	School Admin	Combined	Combined
	Center	Park	Preserve	view	Street	4th St.	brook	field's	School	School	School		Watt	Facilities Total
Special Use Park (acre)	2	2.3											4.30	1.04
Neighborhood Park (acre)											2	2	4.00	0.97
Community/School Park (acre)								10	7	1	3	5	26.00	6.30
Linear Park/Trail (acre)				2.71	0.72	1.98	2.04						7.45	1.80
Open Sp./Forest/Nat. Area (acre)			80										80.00	19.37
Outdr. Bsktball Crt. (ea.)									2	1			3.00	0.73
Ltd. Tennis Crt. (ea.)									2				2.00	0.48
Rec. Bsebl/Sftbl Fld. (ea.)								2	3		1	4	10.00	2.42
Ltd. Bsebl/Sftb. Fld. (ea)									1				1.00	0.24
Ltd. Soccer Field (ea)									1				1.00	0.24
Rec. Soccer / Ftbl. Fld.									1				1.00	0.24
Gymnasium (ea)									1	1	1	1	4.00	0.97
Football Stadium (ea)									1				1.00	0.24
Run/Walk Track (ea)									1	1			2.00	0.48
Community/Senior Cntr. (sq.ft.)	7865												7865.00	1904.36
Estimated 1996 City Population	4,130													

* LOS = Level of Service per 1,000 persons

TABLE 2.2

**City of Scappoose
Parks, Recreation and Open Space
Facility Types and Standards**

<u>Type of Facility</u>	<u>Use and Characteristics</u>	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Desirable Size</u>	<u>LOS Standard/ 1,000 persons</u>
Mini-Park	Small designated park facility which may include benches, play equipment, picnic tables, and/or other similar amenities; usually easily accessible only to adjacent/nearby residents. May serve as neighborhood park for areas with restricted access to other park facilities.	variable	up to 1.0 acre	2.0 acres (w/neighborhood parks)
Neighborhood Park	Park facility designed to serve the daily active and passive recreation needs of a neighborhood. Usually includes playground equipment, picnic areas, and vegetation; may be co-located with or on a school site and may include areas for field games, court games, etc. Within safe and easy walking distance of area residents; does not require the crossing of major streets or other barriers. Does not include restrooms or on site parking.	up to 1/4 mile radius	1 to 5 acres	2.0 acres (w/mini parks)
Community/School Park	Area of diverse environmental qualities and uses designed to serve a population of 5,000 to 20,000 persons. May include passive recreation areas for picnicking, walking, etc. as well as areas for active recreational activities; may be co-located with or on a school site and may include areas for field games, court games, etc.. Usually includes restrooms and on-site parking. May also serve as neighborhood park for residents within 1/4 mile if playground equipment is provided.	City	5 to 20 acres	3.5 acres
Special Use Park/Facility	Facilities or areas for specialized or single purpose recreational activities, such as town squares, marinas, zoos, arenas, senior centers, etc.	variable	variable	no standard
Linear Park/Trail	Linear strip of land comprising natural or man-made resources such as a stream, river, ridge line, service road, utility or transit right-of-way. May be used to connect parks and other points of interest. Sufficient width to protect from adjacent infringements and maintain environmental integrity. Used for walking, hiking, bicycling, horseback riding, etc. Trailhead facilities may include restrooms and/or limited parking.	City	variable	1.86 acres
Open Space/Forest/ Natural Area Resource	Undeveloped forest, open space or natural area devoid of developed active recreation facilities; may include passive walkways, boardwalks, interpretive sites, etc.	variable	variable	no standard
Athletic/Sports Facilities	Facilities designed for use for specific athletic or sports activities such as soccer, baseball/softball, swimming, track and field, basketball, etc. May be located in a community or neighborhood park, or co-located with school/church facilities. May include off-street parking and restroom facilities. Examples of facilities include:	City	variable	see below
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Outdoor Basketball Courts b) Lighted Tennis Courts c) Rec. Baseball/Softball Fields d) Lighted Baseball/Softball Fields e) Lighted Soccer Fields f) Rec. Soccer/Football. Fields g) Gymnasiums/Recreation Centers h) Football Stadiums i) Run/Walk Tracks j) Aquatics Centers 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) no stndrd b) no stndrd c) no stndrd d) no stndrd e) no stndrd f) no stndrd g) no stndrd h) no stndrd i) no stndrd j) 0.05

E. Facility Needs

The facility standards identified in Table 2.2 provide objective criteria by which future facility needs can be determined. Using these criteria, the City can identify both deficiencies and growth-related needs, and develop a prioritized list of capital improvement projects. As improvements are completed, a new list of prioritized projects can be developed based on the facility standards.

The Capital Facilities Plan included in Section 3.0 of this report was developed through the application of the standards identified in Table 2.2. The plan identifies projects by year for the first five years, and then by five-year period for the next fifteen years. The plan is based on expected facility needs based on population growth through 2016. A list of facility needs, based on the application of the standards from Table 2.2, is included in Table 2.3.

The City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Facilities Planning Map (Appendix B), identifies existing facility locations, neighborhood/mini-park service areas, publicly owned potential park sites, vacant land within the existing City limits, and the proposed location of a linear park/trail system. This map can be used as a tool in planning for and siting future facilities.

TABLE 2.3

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

Parks and Recreation Capital Facility Needs

2016 Population Estimate: 9,821

1996 Population: 4,130

Component	Proposed	1996 Need	1996 Inventory	Surplus (Deficit)	2016 Need	Additional Required
	Standard/ 1,000 pers	Based on Standard			Based on Standard	
Neighborhood/Mini Park (acre)	2.00	8.26	4.00	(4.26)	19.64	15.64
Community/School Park (acre)	3.50	14.45	26.00	11.55	34.37	8.37
Linear Park/Trails (acre)	1.86	7.69	7.45	(0.24)	18.29	10.84
Aquatics Facilities	0.05	0.2065	0.0	(0.21)	0.49	0.49
Athletic/Sports Facilities*	no standard	n/a	variable	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community/Senior Center (sq. ft.)	no standard	n/a	7,865	n/a	n/a	n/a

* except for aquatics facilities, provision of athletic/sports facilities is considered in the cost estimates for Community/School Park facilities in the Capital Facilities Plan.

3.0 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

**Parks and Recreation
1997 - 2016**

		TOTAL PROJECT COST	% PARKS / REC USE	PARKS / REC COST	% PRKS GROWTH NEED	GROWTH PORTION OF PRKS COST	% NON-GROWTH GROWTH COST	NON-GROWTH PORTION OF TOTAL COST	PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES	
1	Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Acq. - acquire approximately 4.26 acres of land for neighborhood/mini parks in park deficient areas of the City	97-98	\$426,000	100%	\$426,000	0%	\$0	100%	\$426,000	Grants, Donations, Partnerships, LIDs
2	Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Acq. - acquire approximately 4 acres of land for neighborhood/mini parks in growing areas of the City	99-00	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	0%	\$0	SDC
3	Community/School Park Site Acq. - acquire approximately 8.37 acres of land for community/school park.	00-01	\$837,000	75%	\$627,750	100%	\$627,750	25%	\$209,250	SDC, Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships
4	Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Acq. - acquire approximately 4 acres of land for neighborhood/mini parks in growing areas of the City	01-02	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	0%	\$0	SDC
5	Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Dev. - develop approximately 4 acres of neighborhood/mini parks (i.e., tables, playgrounds, landscaping, etc.) in park deficient areas of City.	02-06	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	0%	\$0	100%	\$400,000	Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships, Sponsorships, LIDs
6	Linear Park/Trails - acquire/develop approximately 10 acres (3.3 miles) of linear park/trail facilities	02-06	\$300,000	100%	\$300,000	25%	\$75,000	75%	\$225,000	Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships, Sponsorships
7	Community/School Park Site Dev. - develop approximately 8.37 acre community/school park to include selected athletic/sports facilities, such as basketball courts, baseball/softball fields, football/soccer fields, tennis courts, etc.; and playgrounds, picnic facilities.	02-06	\$837,000	75%	\$627,750	100%	\$627,750	25%	\$209,250	SDC, Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships, Sponsorships

3.0 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN										
Parks and Recreation										
1997 - 2016										
PROJECT	YRS	TOTAL PROJECT COST	% PARKS /REC USE	PARKS /REC COST	% PRKS GROWTH NEED	GROWTH PORTION OF PRKS COST	% NON-GROWTH COST	NON-GROWTH PORTION OF TOTAL COST	PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES	
8 Aquatics/Athletics/Community Cntr. - construct a multipurpose aquatics, athletics (i.e., gym, weights, dance, etc.), and community center (theater, etc.)	02-06	\$6,000,000	90%	\$5,400,000	75%	\$4,050,000	32%	\$1,950,000	Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships, Sponsorships	
9 Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Dev. - develop approximately 4 acres of neighborhood/mini parks (i.e., tables, playgrounds, landscaping, etc.) in growing areas of City.	02-06	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	100%	\$400,000	0%	\$0	SDC	
10 Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Acq. - acquire approximately 3.38 acres of land for neighborhood/mini parks in growing areas of the City	07-11	\$338,000	100%	\$338,000	100%	\$338,000	0%	\$0	SDC	
11 Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Dev. - develop approximately 4 acres of neighborhood/mini parks (i.e., tables, playgrounds, landscaping, etc.) in growing areas of City.	07-11	\$364,000	100%	\$364,000	100%	\$364,000	0%	\$0	SDC	
12 Linear Park/Trails - acquire/develop approximately 8.29 acres (3.3 miles) of linear park/trail facilities	07-11	\$248,700	100%	\$248,700	98%	\$243,726	2%	\$4,974	Grants, Donations, Bonds, Partnerships, Sponsorships	
13 Neighborhood/Mini Park Site Dev. - develop approximately 3.38 acres of neighborhood/mini parks (i.e., tables, playgrounds, landscaping, etc.) in growing areas of City.	12-16	\$338,000	100%	\$338,000	100%	\$338,000	0%	\$0	SDC	
TOTALS		\$11,288,700		\$10,270,200		\$7,864,226		\$3,424,474		

Don Ganer & Associates

9

2/4/97 (as adopted 3/3/97)

4.0 SDC METHODOLOGY

The methodology section of this report presents the rationale for how the Parks and Recreation SDC's were developed. In particular, this section of the report:

- A. Discusses and presents the methodology approach used to develop the SDC's,
- B. Explains the difference between "reimbursement fee" and "improvement fee" SDC's,
- C. Analyzes credits,
- D. Establishes the rational nexus of benefit for the SDC, and
- E. Presents growth projections and summarizes census data regarding persons per dwelling unit.

A. SDC Methodology Approach

The three basic approaches used in developing SDC's are: (A) Level of Service (LOS)-Driven, (B) Capital Projects-Driven, and (C) Combination. LOS-Driven SDC's work best when individual public facilities cannot be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data, and instead are provided on the basis of a level of service. The amount of the SDC is determined by multiplying the proposed LOS for each facility by the estimated cost per unit of facility. Prior to the Supreme Court decision in *Dolan v. Tigard*, the LOS-Driven approach was routinely used in developing parks and recreation SDC's; however, this approach has been largely replaced because of the stricter requirements imposed by *Dolan*.

Capital Projects-Driven SDC's are based on a specific list of planned capital improvements, and the amount of the SDC is determined by allocating a portion of the cost of the planned improvements (the "fair share" that can be attributed to growth) among the projected developments that will be paying SDC's. Capital Projects-Driven SDC's work best when individual public facilities can be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data.

A "combination" approach uses elements of both the LOS-Driven approach and the Capital Projects-Driven approach. LOS standards are used to determine facility needs, identify deficiencies, and develop a list of capital improvement projects. These projects are then used as the basis for an "improvement fee" SDC. A "reimbursement fee" SDC may also be developed if excess capacity exists.

The City of Scappoose parks and recreation SDC was developed using a "combination approach" and includes only an "improvement fee" component.

A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) designed to increase the LOS provided to all City residents during the next twenty years (1997 - 2016) has been developed and is included in section 3.0 Capital Facilities Plan. SDC's cannot be used to pay for eliminating deficiencies in the current LOS, or for providing a higher LOS than that which currently exists unless either (1) alternative revenue sources are identified to pay for eliminating existing deficiencies, or (2) the primary recipients of the higher LOS will be future residents. The CFP identifies the portion of the cost of each project that is intended to serve growth. Project costs which are attributable to growth may be funded through the use of SDC revenues, and remaining costs must be funded from non-SDC sources.

The growth-related portion of facilities costs identified in the CFP totals \$7,864,226. The City has determined that SDC's will be used to fund 100% of the growth-related costs of neighborhood/mini park site acquisition and development, and 50% of the growth-related costs of community/school park site acquisition and development. These costs total \$2,867,750. The remaining \$4,996,476 in identified growth-related facility needs including linear park/trails, aquatics/athletics/community center, and 50% of community/school park site acquisition and development will be funded from non-SDC sources, such as grants, donations, bonds, partnerships, sponsorships, and combinations of these methods.

B. "Reimbursement fee" and "Improvement fee" SDC's

The Oregon Systems Development Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDC's: (1) "reimbursement" fees, and (2) "improvement" fees. Reimbursement fee SDC's may be charged for the costs associated with capital improvements which are already constructed or are under construction, and may be charged if "excess" capacity is available to accommodate growth. "Improvement" fees may be charged for new capital improvements that will increase capacity available for new development.

The standard for each facility included in this plan is based primarily on the current Level of Service (LOS) provided to City residents. The City currently owns an eighty (80) acre tract designated as a Forest/Natural Area Resource. The NRPA does not recommend the application of LOS standards to these types of facilities, so determinations of "capacity" cannot be made. The City does not yet provide any other facilities at levels which exceed those included in the standards; therefore, no excess capacity exists. The SDC is an "improvement fee" only and does not include a "reimbursement fee" component.

C. Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC which a development is required to pay. A credit must be allowed for the construction of a "qualified public improvement". A "qualified public improvement" is a capital improvement which (1) is required as a condition of development approval, (2) is identified in the capital improvement plan, and (3) either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval, or is located in whole or in part on or contiguous to property the subject of development approval and required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related.

The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (i.e., parks and recreation, etc.), and may be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity (LOS standard) needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDC's that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.

In addition to these required credits, the City of Scappoose may, if it so chooses, provide a greater credit, establish a system providing for the transferability of credits, provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the capital improvement plan, or provide a share of the cost of an improvement, by other means. Credits which exceed those required by statute may be provided, but they must be applied uniformly to all development.

D. Nexus of Benefit

The "rational nexus of benefit" principle requires a reasonable connection (1) between the need for new parks and recreation facilities and growth from SDC-paying development, and (2) between the expenditure of SDC revenues and the benefits received by SDC-paying development. SDC revenues must be expended within a "reasonable" period of time (usually interpreted to mean within 10 years) in order for any benefits from new capital facilities to be considered timely.

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) identifies the capacity-increasing improvements planned for parks and recreation facilities in the City of Scappoose. Because the SDC is an "improvement fee" and includes no reimbursement component, the CFP provides the nexus of benefit between the SDC-paying development and the benefit to be received.

SDC revenues may be used to expand existing community facilities, add new community facilities, and add neighborhood facilities in order to meet the capacity needs created by growth. SDC revenues may not be used to add or expand facilities in order to alleviate deficiencies in built-out areas, or to construct facilities which are not related to growth; these needs must be addressed using non-SDC revenue sources.

The City's parks and recreation facilities are used, for the most part, by individuals and groups rather than businesses or other non-residential land uses, therefore the SDC for parks and recreation facilities is charged only to residential development.

E. Population Growth and Persons per Dwelling Unit

The SDC is based on projected growth-related capital costs per "capita" (person) and is calculated by dividing the growth related costs by the projected increase in population during the planning period (1996 - 2016). Estimated population growth was based on a population estimates included in a recent study of water needs for the City of Scappoose. The estimated population increase is shown in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1

ESTIMATED CITY POPULATION INCREASE

<u>Projected 2016 Population</u>		<u>Estimated 1996 Population</u>		<u>Est. Increase in Population</u>
9,821	-	4,130	=	5,691

The SDC is based on capital costs per capita and is charged based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. Dwelling units typically house different numbers of persons depending on the type of unit (i.e., single family, multi-family, etc.). To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, census data maintained by the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University was analyzed, and the resulting calculations are displayed in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

AVERAGE PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT

<u>Type of Unit</u>	<u>1990 Census Avg. Persons Per Dwelling Unit</u>
Single-Family	2.91
Multi-Family	2.14
Manufactured Housing	2.28

5.0 CALCULATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES SDC's

City of Scappoose Parks and Recreation Facilities SDC is calculated using a series of formulas which identify:

- a) the net growth-related facilities costs to be included in calculating the improvement fee component,,
- b) the net growth-related facilities cost per capita
- c) the compliance and administrative cost per capita,
- d) the standard cost per capita, and
- e) the SDC rates for each type of dwelling unit.

A. Formula 1: Net Growth-related Facilities Costs

The Net growth-related facilities costs to be included in calculating the SDC rates are determined by subtracting from the total growth-related costs (from the CFP) any estimated amounts that are expected to be paid from non-SDC sources, such as bonds or general tax revenues.

$$\begin{array}{rclcl}
 1. & \text{Total} & & \text{Expected} & & \text{Net} \\
 & \text{Growth-Related} & - & \text{Funds From} & = & \text{Growth-Related} \\
 & \text{Facilities Costs} & & \text{Other Sources} & & \text{Facilities Costs}
 \end{array}$$

Table 5.1 presents the calculation of the net growth-related facilities costs.

TABLE 5.1

NET GROWTH-RELATED FACILITIES COSTS

<u>Total Growth-Related Facilities Costs</u>	-	<u>Expected Funds From Other Sources</u>	=	<u>Net Growth-Related Facilities Costs</u>
\$7,864,226	-	\$4,996,476	=	\$2,867,750

B. Formula 2: Net Facilities Cost per Capita

The facilities cost per capita is calculated by dividing the net growth-related facilities cost by the expected increase in the City of Scappoose's population during the next twenty years.

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} 2. \text{ Net Growth-Related} & \div & \text{Population} & = & \text{Facilities Cost} \\ \text{Facilities Cost} & & \text{Increase} & & \text{Per Capita} \end{array}$$

Table 5.2 presents the calculation of the facilities cost per capita.

TABLE 5.2

FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

<u>Net Growth-Related Facilities Cost</u>	÷	<u>Population Increase</u>	=	<u>Facilities Cost Per Capita</u>
\$2,867,750		5,691		\$504

C. Formula 3: Compliance/Administration Cost per Capita

ORS 223.307(5) allows the City of Scappoose to recoup the direct costs of complying with Oregon law regarding SDC's. Recoupable costs include consulting, engineering, and legal fees as well as the cost of accounting for revenues and expenditures. The total compliance/administrative cost is estimated to be 5% of collected SDC revenues. The compliance/administrative cost per capita is determined by dividing the estimated total compliance/administration cost by the estimated population increase during the planning period:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} 3. \text{ Total Compliance/} & \div & \text{Population} & = & \text{Compliance/Admin.} \\ \text{Administration Cost} & & \text{Increase} & & \text{Cost Per Capita} \end{array}$$

Table 5.3 presents the calculation of the compliance cost per capita.

TABLE 5.3

COMPLIANCE / ADMINISTRATION COST PER CAPITA

<u>Total Compliance/ Administration Cost</u>		<u>Estimated Population Increase</u>		<u>Compliance/ Admin Cost Per Capita</u>
\$ 143,350	÷	5,691	=	\$25

D. Formula 4: Standard Cost per Capita

The Standard Cost per Capita represents the equivalent amount of revenue required from each new resident in order to pay for required capital facilities and pay compliance/administration costs. The calculation is completed by adding the facilities cost per capita (from Table 5.2) and the compliance/administration cost per capita (from Table 5.3).

4.	Facilities Cost Per Capita	+	Compliance/ Admin Cost Per Capita	=	Standard Cost Per Capita
----	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

The results of this calculation are displayed in Table 5.4.

TABLE 5.4

STANDARD COST PER CAPITA

<u>Facilities Cost Per Capita</u>		<u>Compliance/ Admin Cost Per Capita</u>		<u>Standard Cost Per Capita</u>
\$504	+	\$25	=	\$529

E. Formula 5: SDC Per Dwelling Unit

The SDC Per Dwelling Unit is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (Table 4.2) by the Standard Cost Per Capita (Table 5.4).

$$5. \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Persons Per} \\ \text{Dwelling Unit} \end{array} \times \begin{array}{c} \text{Standard Cost} \\ \text{Per Capita} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{SDC Per} \\ \text{Dwelling Unit} \end{array}$$

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 5.5:

TABLE 5.5

SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

<u>Type of Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Standard Cost Per Capita</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>SDC Per Dwelling Unit</u>
Single-Family:	2.91		\$529		\$ 1,539
Multi-Family:	2.14		\$529		\$ 1,132
Manufactured Housing: (in designated manufactured housing park)	2.28		\$529		\$ 1,206

The City has determined that manufactured housing which is sited in areas other than designated manufactured housing parks places a burden on facilities comparable to that of site-constructed single-family housing. Therefore, manufactured housing which is not located in a designated manufactured housing park will pay the same SDC as other single-family dwelling units.

6.0 ADDITIONAL FUNDING/FINANCING SOURCES

This section provides a description of a variety of alternative revenue sources which may be used to fund parks and recreation facilities and improvements. For each of the funding alternatives listed, there is a brief description and a short discussion of the potential for implementing the alternative in the City. The following is an overview of commonly used funding sources. Additional funding sources not

A. General Obligation Bonds (G.O. Bonds)

G.O. Bonds are debt instruments which may be sold by the City to fund new parks and recreation facilities, or make improvements to existing facilities. These are repaid with property tax revenue generated by a special levy that is outside the limits imposed by ballot measure #5 (1990), and #47 (1996). Voters must approve G.O. Bond sales. The City is experiencing rapid growth, and the assessed valuation of real and personal property within the City can be expected to increase substantially in future years because of the high level building activity and rising property values. This high rate of growth increases the City's debt capacity for financing needed facilities and makes G.O. Bonds a good option for supplementing SDC revenues to fund large projects or groups of projects during the next twenty years.

B. Revenue Bonds/Certificates of Participation

Revenue bonds and certificates of participation are debt instruments which commit specific revenue sources, such as service/user fees or special tax revenues for repayment of principal and interest on borrowed funds. Revenue bonds are widely used by utility and enterprise operations to fund large scale improvements, and they do not require voter approval. In order for them to be used for parks and recreation facilities would have to identify and pledge a non-ad valorem source of revenues, such facility user fees. A reliable long-term source of revenue is not currently available to commit for large scale projects. In order for revenue bonds and/or certificates of participation to be viable funding options, new revenue sources would be needed.

C. Special Assessment/Local Improvement District

Residents may choose to form a local improvement district (LID) to pay for capital improvements through special assessments on their property for a period of years. This method requires the approval of at least 60% of the owners of land within the proposed district, and must represent at least 60% of the land abutting the proposed improvement. The use of LID's may be appropriate for neighborhood parks.

D. General Fund Revenues

General funds revenues consist chiefly of property tax revenues derived from the voter approved tax base and operating levies, and are subject to the \$10 combined limit on local government taxing agencies imposed by Measure #5 (1990), and the "cut and cap" limits imposed by Measure #47 (1996). General fund revenues may offer a limited source of funds for operations and maintenance, or for "pay-as-you-go" capital improvements. The restrictions and requirements imposed by ballot measures #5 and #47 make the use of current unrestricted general fund revenues very unlikely for parks and recreation operations and maintenance or capital improvements.

E. Serial Levies for Capital Improvements

A serial levy for capital improvements provides for a separate property tax levy outside the limits of ballot measure #5 and #47, to fund a specific list of projects over a specified period of time. This method is similar to a G.O Bond except that instead of borrowing a large amount all at once and then repaying the bonded debt, projects are scheduled and paid for on a "pay as you go" basis. These levies require voter approval and, per ballot measure #47, must receive that approval in a general election in an even numbered year, or in another election in which at least 50% of registered voters participate. The City could use this method to develop "packages" of projects to be completed over a specified period of years. Unlike bonds, this revenue source is "debt-free" and provides for funding without commitment of other revenues.

F. User Fees and Rents

User fees and rents are direct charges to individuals and groups who use specific programs, facilities and services. These fees and rents help pay a portion of the costs of providing programs and services. Any fees that are imposed as the result of conversion or a shift from ad valorem taxes require voter approval, per ballot measure #47. User fees generally are set at levels sufficient to cover only a portion of program and maintenance costs, and are rarely used to fund capital costs.

G. Federal/State/Other Grants

Grants from federal, state, and other government agencies, and foundations sometimes make funds available to serve specific purposes related to parks and recreation, such as land and water conservation, open space preservation, and blighted area improvement. Grants often have conditions and limitations, such as providing for project planning but not for construction, and/or they may require a local match, either in dollars, in-kind services, or both. The availability of grants has decreased in recent years due to federal and state cutbacks in funding. The City should explore the availability of grants to provide for needs identified in the twenty year master plan and for other worthwhile projects.

H. Sponsorships/partnerships

Public, private, and/or not-for-profit organizations may be willing to fund outright or join together or with the City to provide a facility and/or service for the community. The City has a rich history of public/private partnerships and sponsorship of recreation activities and facilities, making this a viable way of meeting some facility and programming needs.

7.0 CONCLUSION

The City's explosive growth will require a combination of techniques, including system development charges, bond revenues, and other sources to pay for capital facilities needed to serve the parks and recreation needs of current and future residents. As growth occurs and the demographics of the community change, the City's parks and recreation facility needs will also change and should be periodically monitored through the use of opinion surveys and similar techniques. The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) should be reviewed and updated at least once every three years to reflect changes in parks and recreation facility needs. The System Development Charges methodology should also be periodically updated when significant changes are made to the CFP, and/or when cost estimates become outdated.

Appendix A

Summary of Key Findings From 1991 Survey

- Survey completed for Scappoose Park & Recreation District and Scappoose Library District by Institute of Recreation Research and Service; Department of Leisure Studies & Services and Department of Planning, Public Policy, and Management; University of Oregon.
- Survey mailed to 500 randomly selected households within City of Scappoose and surrounding regions; 124 completed survey questionnaires were returned (25%).
- Average length of residency of respondents: 17.6 years

1. Importance of factors to Quality of Life (in %) - Survey Question #1:

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Very Unimportant</u>
Park Maintenance	21.0	48.5	26.3	1.0	3.0
Cultural Activities	8.0	33.0	45.0	6.0	8.0
Sports Programs	27.0	35.0	27.0	2.0	9.0
Youth Programs	47.6	39.8	8.7	1.0	2.9
Adult Programs	12.1	44.4	33.3	3.0	7.1
Family Activities	31.3	38.4	23.2	3.0	4.0
Senior Activities	28.0	43.0	23.0	4.0	2.0
Open Space	37.1	23.7	29.9	4.1	5.2
Bike Trails	26.3	33.3	24.2	10.1	6.1
Fishing Areas	27.0	36.0	27.0	3.0	7.0
Library Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

2. Park, recreation, and cultural facilities improvements needed (in %)
- Survey Question #2:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Develop a community center (meeting/class rooms, gym, dance, etc.)	31.4	28.5	21.9	10.5	6.7
Build riverfront parks	27.5	33.3	22.5	7.8	8.8
Build neighborhood parks	21.4	40.8	21.4	7.8	8.7
Improve athletic fields	11.8	30.4	36.3	13.7	7.8
Develop more walking, jogging, bike trails	26.7	41.9	16.2	7.6	7.6
Build racquetball crts.	5.0	7.9	40.6	22.8	23.8
Build skateboard fac.	1.0	17.2	38.4	20.2	23.2
Build community pool	46.2	27.4	12.3	3.8	10.4
Acquire land for parks and open spaces	28.6	25.7	32.4	6.7	6.7
Develop facilities for the performing arts	5.0	17.8	41.6	16.8	18.8
Bicycle motorcross (BMX)	3.0	6.9	35.6	22.8	31.7

3. Desired community center programs (in %) - Survey Question #3:

<u>Program</u>	<u>% of respondents requesting program/activity</u>
Community Theater	26.8
Skateboard Facility	9.8
Weight Lifting Room	21.4
Fitness Center (floor space for aerobics)	50.0
Gymnasium (for volleyball, gymnastics)	40.2
Teen Recreation Area	57.1
Indoor Swimming Pool	67.0
Rooms for Meetings, Banquets, Arts & Crafts, etc.	50.0
Other	3.6

4. Other programming activity suggestions (by number of occurrences)
- Survey Question #7 (top 19 suggestions):

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Respondent and Respondent's Children</u>
Swimming	20
Dancing	11
Equestrian	9
Art Class	8
Windsurfing	8
Fitness Program	6
Hiking	6
Hiking	6
Fishing	5
Water Skiing	5
Music Class	5
Snow Skiing	5
Baseball	4
Bowling	4
Cycling	4
Drama Class	4
Golf	4
Martial Arts	4
Skating	4
Racquetball/Tennis	3

Appendix B

CITY OF SCAPPOOSE

Parks and Recreation Facilities Planning Map

Addendum

The SDC rate of \$529 per capita included in this methodology report is based on a population increase of 5,691 people between 1996 and 2016, with SDC's being used to fund 100% of the City's growth-related neighborhood/mini park needs, and 50% of community/school park needs. The City Council has the discretion to charge SDC's which are less than the rate justified in the methodology report, and has chosen to charge an SDC rate of \$514 per capita; \$15 less than the rate justified in the methodology report. The adopted SDC rates are as follows:

ADOPTED SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

<u>Type of Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Standard Cost Per Capita</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>SDC Per Dwelling Unit</u>
Single-Family:	2.91		\$514		\$ 1,496
Multi-Family:	2.14		\$514		\$ 1,100
Manufactured Housing: (in designated manufactured housing park)	2.28		\$514		\$ 1,172

The City has determined that manufactured housing which is sited in areas other than designated manufactured housing parks places a burden on facilities comparable to that of site-constructed single-family housing. Therefore, manufactured housing which is not located in a designated manufactured housing park will pay the same SDC as other single-family dwelling units.

**CITY OF SCAPPOOSE
PARKS AND RECREATION
FACILITIES PLANNING MAP**

NEIGHBORHOOD/MINI PARK
GENERAL SERVICE AREA
(1/4 MILE RADIUS)



POTENTIAL LINEAR PARK/TRAIL



EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION
FACILITIES (INCLUDES CITY, SCHOOL
DISTRICT, NON-PROFIT, AND COUNTY
FACILITIES)



PUBLICLY-OWNED POTENTIAL PARK SITES



VACANT LAND INSIDE CURRENT CITY LIMITS
(NO PERMANENT STRUCTURES)



ZONING DESIGNATIONS

R-1	LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
R-4	MODERATE DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
A-1	HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
MH-1	MANUFACTURED HOME-RESIDENTIAL
C	COMMERCIAL
EC	EXPANDED COMMERCIAL
LI	LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
R-W	RSH-WILDLIFE

LEGEND

750' 0' 750' 1500'
GRAPHIC SCALE 1" = 1,500'

BPA EASEMENT	=====
CITY LIMITS	-----
CREEK	~~~~~
RAILROAD	+ + + + +
URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY	- - - - -
ZONING BOUNDARY	—————
ZONING DESIGNATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - PUBLIC LANDS	