PORTLAND PARKS \& RECREATION
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland


# Park System Development Charge Methodology Update Report 

For Council Hearing
March 5, 2008

## CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 3
2.0 AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION ..... 4
A. Authority ..... 4
B. "Improvement fee" and "Reimbursement fee" SDCs ..... 4
C. Requirements and Options for Credits, Exemptions, and Discounts ..... 5
3.0 PARKS AND RECREATION SDC METHODOLOGY ..... 6
A. Population and Employment Growth ..... 6
B. Persons Per Dwelling Unit ..... 7
C. Benefit of Facilities ..... 7
D. Facility Needs ..... 10
E. Acquisition and Development Costs ..... 15
4.0 RESIDENTIAL PARKS AND RECREATION SDC RATES ..... 17
A. Formula 4a: Service Area Residential Improvements Cost Per Capita ..... 17
B. Formula 4b: Service Area Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit ..... 18
C Formula 4c: Total Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit ..... 19
D. Formula 4d: Residential Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit ..... 19
E. Formula 4e: Residential SDC Per Dwelling Unit ..... 20
5.0 NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKS AND RECREATION SDC RATES ..... 21
A. Formula 5a: Service Area Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent ..... 21
B. Formula 5b: Total Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent ..... 22
C. Formula 5c: Non-Residential Tax Credit Per Resident Equivalent ..... 22
D. Formula 5d: Non-Residential SDC Per Resident Equivalent ..... 23
E. Formula 5e: Non-Residential SDC Rates by Type of Development ..... 24
APPENDIX A: SDC Capital Improvements Plan

## TABLES

TABLE 3.1: Projected Population and Employment Increases ..... 7
From New Development (2007-2020)
TABLE 3.2: Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit ..... 7
TABLE 3.3: Estimates of Average Daily Availability ..... 8 of Parks and Recreation Facilities
TABLE 3.4: Total Annual Availability of Parks and Recreation Facilities ..... 9
TABLE 3.5: Total Resident and Non-Resident ..... 10
Availability of Parks and Recreation Facilities
TABLE 3.6: Non-Resident Parks Demand Percentage ..... 10
TABLE 3.7: Current Average Levels of Service (LOS) and Applied ..... 11 LOS Standards
TABLE 3.8: Facility Needs for Growth and Deficiency Repair (2007-2020) ..... 14
TABLE 3.9: Recommended Facilities for Growth and Deficiency Repair ..... 15 (2007-2020)
TABLE 3.10: Park Acquisition and Development Costs for Growth and ..... 16 Deficiency Repair (2007-2020)
TABLE 4.1: Service Area Residential Improvements Cost Per Capita ..... 17
TABLE 4.2: Service Area Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit ..... 18
TABLE 4.3: Total Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit ..... 19
TABLE 4.4: Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit ..... 20
TABLE 4.5: Residential SDC Per Dwelling Unit ..... 21
TABLE 5.1: Service Area Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per ..... 22
Resident Equivalent
TABLE 5.2: Total Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent ..... 22
TABLE 5.3: Tax Credit Per Resident Equivalent ..... 23
TABLE 5.4: Non-Residential SDC Per Resident Equivalent ..... 24
TABLE 5.5: Non-Residential SDC Rates by Type of Development ..... 25
MAPS
Central City SDC Boundary Map ..... 12
Citywide SDC Boundary Map ..... 13

# City of Portland <br> Parks and Recreation 

System Development Charge Methodology Update Report

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

System Development Charges (SDCs) are one-time fees charged to new development to help pay a portion of the costs associated with building capital facilities to meet needs created by growth. SDCs are authorized for five types of capital facilities including transportation, water, sewer, stormwater, and parks and recreation. The City of Portland adopted a Park SDC methodology in 1998 and last updated this methodology in 2004.

City parks, facilities, and services are important community resources benefiting both existing and future City residents, businesses, non-resident employees, and visitors. Currently, however, Portland's Park SDCs apply only to residential development. In 2005, the Portland City Council directed Portland Parks \& Recreation to prepare a recommendation for an updated Park System Development Charge Methodology that includes both a residential and a non-residential component. This report updates the City's Park SDC methodology and rates to accommodate the need for parks and recreation facilities generated by the growth of new residential and non-residential development, and documents the calculation of the Park SDC rates.

The park classifications included in Parks 2020 Vision provided the framework for identifying facility needs. For purposes of this methodology, some park classifications have been grouped into categories depending on whether they primarily serve "local access" needs or "citywide access" needs. In the Central City, Local Access Parks are considered to include Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Community Gardens, a portion of Local Access Regional Park acreage, and $50 \%$ of Urban Parks. In all park planning sub-areas outside the Central City (Non-Central City), Local Access Parks are considered to include Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Community Gardens, and a portion of Local Access Regional Parks acreage. Citywide Access facilities are considered to include Regional Parks (less that included in Local Access Regional Parks acreage), Botanical Gardens, and $50 \%$ of Urban Parks. Habitat and Trailways are considered to be citywide service facilities.

In March 2006, the City Council appointed an ad hoc Task Force of representatives from community, business, development, neighborhood, and other stakeholder groups to advise the update of the Park SDCs methodology. Their recommendations and observations are included in a separate Park SDC Task Force Report.

This report presents the technical basis for the methodology used to calculate the updates to the Park SDCs for new residential and non-residential development within the City of

Portland. The proposed fee structure differentiates between residential and non-residential developments, Central City and neighborhoods outside the Central City, and by the projected mix of users.

Section 2.0 of this report presents authority and background information including (1) legislative authority for SDCs, (2) an explanation of "improvement fee" and "reimbursement fee" SDCs, and (3) requirements and options for credits, exemptions, and discounts. Section 3.0 presents the methodologies used to develop the updated Park SDCs, Section 4.0 presents the calculation of residential Park SDC Rates, and Section 5.0 presents the calculation of non-residential Park SDC Rates. The SDC Capital Improvement Plan that identifies acquisition and development projects that may be funded with SDC revenues is included as Appendix A to this report.

### 2.0 AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

## A. Authority

The source of authority for the adoption of SDCs is found both in state statute and the City's own plenary authority to adopt this type of fee. While SDCs have been in use in Oregon since the mid-1970s, State legislation regarding SDCs was not adopted until 1989, when the Oregon Systems Development Act (ORS 223.297-223.314) was passed. The purpose of this Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...." Additions and modifications to the Oregon Systems Development Act have been made in 1993, 1999, 2001, and 2003. Together, these pieces of legislation require local governments that enact SDCs to:

- adopt SDCs by ordinance or resolution;
- develop a methodology outlining how the SDCs were developed;
- adopt a capital improvements program to designate capital improvements that can be funded with "improvement fee" SDC revenues;
- provide credit against the amount of the SDC for the construction of "qualified public improvements";
- separately account for and report receipt and expenditure of SDC revenues, and develop procedures for challenging expenditures; and
- use SDC revenues only for costs related to capital expenditures (operations and maintenance uses are prohibited).


## B. "Improvement fee" and "Reimbursement fee" SDCs

The Oregon Systems Development Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDCs: (1) "improvement fee" SDCs, and (2) "reimbursement fee" SDCs. "Improvement fee" SDCs may be charged for new capital improvements that will increase capacity. Revenues from "improvement fee" SDCs may be spent only on capacity-increasing capital improvements identified in the required Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that lists each project, and the expected timing and cost of each project. "Reimbursement fee" SDCs may
be charged for the costs of existing capital facilities if "excess capacity" is available to accommodate growth. Revenues from "reimbursement fees" may be used on any capital improvement project, including major repairs, upgrades or renovations. Capital improvements funded with "reimbursement fee" SDCs do not need to increase capacity, but they must be included in the list of projects to be funded with SDC revenues.

## C. Requirements and Options for Credits, Exemptions, and Discounts

(1) Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC for a specific development. The Oregon SDC Act requires that credit be allowed for the construction of a "qualified public 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 on or contiguous to such property and is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project. The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (e.g., a parks and recreation improvement can only be used for a credit for a Park SDC), and may be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDCs that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.

In addition to these required credits, the City 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 (i.e., partnerships, other City revenues, etc.).
(2) Exemptions

The City may exempt certain types of development, such as "affordable housing" from the requirement to pay Park SDCs. Exemptions reduce SDC revenues and, therefore, increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as bonds and property taxes.

The City may discount the SDC rates by reducing the portion of growthrequired improvements to be funded with SDCs. A discount in the SDC rates may also be applied on a pro-rata basis to any identified deficiencies, which must to be funded from sources other than improvement fee SDCs. For example, the City may charge new development an SDC rate sufficient to recover only $85 \%$ of identified growth-required costs. The portion of growth-required costs to be funded with SDCs must be identified in the CIP.

Because discounts reduce SDC revenues, they increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as bonds or general fund contributions, in order to acquire and develop growth-required facilities.

### 3.0 PARK SDC METHODOLOGY

Level of Service (LOS) Standards, based primarily on existing levels of service were calculated and then used to determine future capital facility needs based on growth projections.

The methodology used to update the City's Park SDCs reflects the proportionate need for specific types of parks and recreation facilities for residents and resident equivalents. These SDCs meet statutory requirements because they are based on the type of development and its growth-related impact on parks and recreation facilities.

The Park SDCs are based on population (for the residential Park SDC) and resident equivalents (for the non-residential Park SDC), and the SDC rates are calculated based on the specific impact a development is expected to have on the City's parks and recreation needs. For facilities that are not generally used by non-residents (e.g., Local Access Parks outside the Central City), only a residential Park SDC may be charged. For facilities that benefit both residents and non-residents (i.e., Local Access Parks in the Central City, Citywide Access facilities, Trailways, etc.), Park SDCs may be charged for both residential and non-residential development.

## A. Population and Employment Growth

The Park SDCs are based on costs per "capita" (person). Estimates of current and projected population and employment within the city were calculated using data from Metro. Metro has developed estimates and projections for population and employment for each Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) within the region. The most recent TAZ data were developed in 2005 for the years 2005 and 2030. Projected increases in population and employment between 2007 and 2020 are shown in Table 3.1 on page 7. A map of the City's Central City and non-Central City park planning sub areas (e.g., North, Northwest, Northeast, Southeast, Southwest, and Outer East) is included on page 13 of this report.

## PROJECTED POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT INCREASES FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT (2007-2020)

|  | $\underline{2020 ~(P r o j e c t e d) ~}$ | Estimated $\underline{2007}$ |  | Projected Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City Population | 609,304 | 539,009 | = | 70,295 |
| Central City Population: | 69,697 | 44,064 | = | 25,633 |
| Non-Central City (North, Northwest, Northeast, Southeast, Southwest and Outer East) Population: | 539,607 | 494,945 | = | 44,662 |
| City Employment | 668,005 | 566,130 | = | 101,875 |
| Central City Employment: | 228,521 | 196,198 | = | 32,323 |
| Non-Central City (North, Northwest, Northeast, Southeast, Southwest and Outer East) Employment: | 439,484 | 369,932 | $=$ | 69,552 |

## B. Persons Per Dwelling Unit

The residential Park SDCs are based on costs per capita and are calculated based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, data gathered for the City for the 2000 Census and the 2005 American Community Survey (ACS) were analyzed. For the Central City, the average number of persons per dwelling unit was found to be approximately $83 \%$ of that for the City as a whole. These differences are reflected in the calculations displayed in Table 3.2.

TABLE 3.2

## AVERAGE PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT

| Unit | Central City | Non-Central City |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family | 2.06 | 2.48 |
| Multi-Family | 1.30 | 1.60 |
| Manufactured Housing | 1.70 | 2.05 |
| Accessory Dwelling Unit* | 1.03 | 1.24 |
| Single Room Occupancy** | 1.00 | 1.00 |

* accessory dwelling unit persons per unit estimated at $1 / 2$ of single family unit.
** single room occupancy unit persons per unit estimated at 1 person per unit.


## C. Benefit of Facilities

Facility needs must consider the proportionate benefit each type of facility provides for residents and non-residents. A resident is any person whose place of residence is within the City. A non-resident is any person whose place of residence is outside the City.

For purposes of this methodology, Local Access Parks outside the Central City are considered to be used primarily by residents, rather than by non-residents. All other facilities including Local Access Parks in the Central City, Citywide Access Parks, Habitat, Trailways, etc., are considered to be used by both residents and non-residents.

The amount of time parks and recreation facilities are available for use by non-residents is not the same as for residents. In order to equitably apportion facilities between nonresidents and residents, a non-resident demand percentage must be developed based on the potential time that facilities are available for use.

First, estimates for the average number of hours per day these facilities are available for use were identified. Children's ages, adult employment status, work location (inside or outside the City), and seasonal variances were taken into account and are displayed in Table 3.3.

The Annual Weighted Average Hours of availability was calculated for each category of resident and non-resident using the following formula:
[(Summer Hours/Day X 3 months) + (Spring/Fall Hours/Day X 6 months) + (Winter Hours/Day X 3 months)] $\div 12$ = Annual Average Weighted Hours of Daily Availability

TABLE 3.3

## ESTIMATES OF AVERAGE DAILY AVAILABILITY OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

| Non-Employed Adult (18+) |  | 5-17 Kids | Live In/ Work In | Live In/ Work Out | Live Out/ Work In |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summer (June-Sept) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday |  |  |  |  |  |
| Before Work |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Meals/Breaks |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| After Work |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Other Leisure | 12 | 12 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Sub-Total | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| Weekend |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leisure | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| Sub-Total | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| Summer Hrs/Day | 12 | 12 | 7.71 | 4.86 | 2.86 |
| Spring/Fall (April-May, Oct-Nov) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday |  |  |  |  |  |
| Before Work |  |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |
| Meals/Breaks |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| After Work |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Other Leisure | 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Sub-Total | 10 | 4 | 4.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
| Weekend |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leisure | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Sub-Total | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Spring/Fall Hours/Day | 10 | 5.71 | 6.07 | 4.29 | 1.79 |

Winter (December-March)

## Weekday

| Before Work |  |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meals/Breaks |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| After Work |  |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |
| Other Leisure | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Sub-Total | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Weekend |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leisure | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Sub-Total | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Winter Hours/Day | 8 | 3.71 | 4.43 | 3 | 1.43 |
| Annual Weighted Average Hours | 10 | 7.14 | 6.07 | 4.05 | 2.02 |

Next, the Annual Weighted Average Hours (from Table 3.3, above) were applied to population and employment data for the City (2005 American Community Survey and 2005 Metro TAZ Data) to determine the Total Annual Weighted Average Hours for each category. The results are displayed in Table 3.4.

TABLE 3.4
TOTAL ANNUAL AVAILABILITY OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

|  | Non-Employed Adult (18+) | 5-17 Kids | Live In/ Work In | Live In/ Work Out | Live Out/ Work In | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population \& Employment Data (2005 Amer. Community Survey and Metro TAZ data) | a 143,387 | 78,784 | 187,489 | 70,021 | 249,808 | 729,489 |
| x Annual Weighted Avg. Hours | 10 | 7.14 | 6.07 | 4.05 | 2.02 |  |
| Total Annual Weighted Average Hours | 1,433,870 | 562,743 | 1,138,326 | 283,418 | 505,564 |  |

Next, the available hours (from Table 3.4) were allocated between residents and nonresidents, as displayed in Table 3.5.

TABLE 3.5

## TOTAL RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT AVAILABILITY OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

| Resident Demand | Hours |
| :--- | ---: |
| Non-Employed Adult | $1,433,870$ |
| $5-17$ Kids | 562,743 |
| Live In/Work In | $1,138,326$ |
| Live In/Work Out | $\underline{283,418}$ |
| Total Resident Hours | $3,418,356$ |
| Non-Resident Demand |  |
| Non-Resident Hours | 505,564 |
| TOTAL HOURS | $3,923,921$ |

Finally, the Non-Resident Parks Demand Percentage was calculated by dividing the total non-resident hours by the total hours (from Table 3.5, page 9), with the result shown in Table 3.6.

TABLE 3.6
NON-RESIDENT
PARKS DEMAND PERCENTAGE

| Weighted Average <br> Hours per Non-Resident | Total Weighted <br> Average Hours | Non-Resident <br> Parks Demand <br> Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 505,564 | $\div$ | $3,923,920$ | $=$ |

## D. Facility Needs

The park classifications included in Parks 2020 Vision provided the framework for identifying facility needs. Specific needs were determined based on the application of Level of Service (LOS) standards based on "Units of Facility Per 1,000 Persons." The current average Levels of Service (LOS) for Local Access facilities, Citywide Access facilities, and Trailways were used as LOS standards providing the framework for identifying facility needs included in the SDC Capital Improvement Plan (Appendix A). For Habitat, the LOS standard is based on the amount of additional Habitat Parks and Natural Areas identified in the Portland Parks \& Recreation Natural Area Acquisition Strategy, accepted by the Portland City Council in November 2006.

The LOS standards identified in Table 3.7 provided objective criteria by which the facility needs have been determined.

TABLE 3.7

## CURRENT AVERAGE LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS) AND APPLIED LOS STANDARDS

| Facility Type | Area of <br> Application | Current Average LOS <br> (Units per 1,000 persons) | Applied <br> LOS Standard |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Developed Central City <br> Local Access Park | Central City | 0.72 acres | 0.72 acres |
| Developed Non-Central City |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Local Access Park | Non-Central Sub-Areas | 2.21 acres | 2.21 acres |
| Trailways | Citywide | 0.54 acres | 0.54 acres |
| Habitat and Natural Areas | Citywide | 11.32 acres | $12.11 \mathrm{acres}^{*}$ |
| Citywide Access Facilities | Citywide | 1.54 acres | 1.54 acres |
| * the Applied LOS standard for Habitat and Natural Areas is based on the City's adopted Natural |  |  |  |
| Area Acquisition Strategy |  |  |  |

To determine facility needs, the LOS standards for facilities were applied to 2020 population and employment projections. For Citywide Access facilities, Habitat Parks and Natural Areas, and Trailways, the LOS standards were applied on a citywide basis, with needs determined for the City as a whole. For Local Access Parks, the LOS standards were applied to each of seven sub-areas of the City (Central City, Northwest, East, North, Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest). The boundary for the Central City sub-area is shown on the map on page 12. All other sub-area boundaries are shown on the map on page 13 .



Based on application of the LOS standards, there are deficiencies (e.g., fewer facilities than are required to serve the current population) in the number of Habitat and Natural Area acres and also in the acres of developed Local Access Parks available to serve current residents outside the Central City sub-area. Alternative, non-SDC sources of revenue must be used to repair these existing deficiencies. Improvement fee SDC revenues must be used only to address growth-required needs, and may not be used to remedy existing deficiencies.

Facility needs for $100 \%$ growth and deficiency repair needs are shown in Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8

## FACILITY NEEDS FOR GROWTH AND DEFICIENCY REPAIR (2007-2020)

| Facility Type | Current Acres | Deficiency Repair Acres | GrowthRequired Acres | Total Additional Needed Facilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City Local Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Land (acres) | 56.51 | 0.00 | 14.38 | 14.38 |
| Central City Local Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Development (acres) | 49.58 | 0.00 | 21.31 | 21.31 |
| Non-Central City Local Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Land (acres) | 1,254.18 | 49.23 | 60.36 | 109.60 |
| Non-Central City Local Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Development (acres) | 1,092.21 | 201.53 | 70.04 | 271.57 |
| Trailways (acres) | 333.46 | 0.00 | 45.46 | 45.46 |
| Habitat Parks and |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Areas (acres) | 7,002.91 | 410.34 | 1,010.56 | 1,420.90 |
| Citywide Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Land (acres) | 944.76 | 0.00 | 126.03 | 126.03 |
| Citywide Access Park |  |  |  |  |
| Development (acres) | 942.33 | 0.00 | 128.46 | 128.46 |

The recommended funding portions included in Table 3.9, page 15, have been used to develop the list of projects included in the SDC CIP (Appendix A).

TABLE 3.9
RECOMMENDED FACILITIES FOR GROWTH
AND DEFICIENCY REPAIR (2007-2020)

| Facility Type Rec | Recommended Funding | Recommended Deficiency Repair Acres | Recommended Growth- <br> Required Acres | $\begin{gathered}\text { Recommended } \\ \text { Total }\end{gathered}$ Additional Acres* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City Local |  |  |  |  |
| Access Park Land 58 | 58.55\%** | 0.00 | 8.43 | 8.43 |
| Central City Local |  |  |  |  |
| Access Park Development | ent 50\% | 0.00 | 10.66 | 24.18 |
| Non-Central City Local |  |  |  |  |
| Access Park Land | 100\% | 49.23 | 60.37 | 109.60 |
| Non-Central City Local |  |  |  |  |
| Access Park Development | ent 75\% | 151.15 | 52.53 | 203.67 |
| Trailways Acquisition | 100\% | 0.00 | 45.46 | 45.46 |
| Trailways Development | 100\% | 0.00 | 45.46 | 45.46 |
| Habitat Acquisition | 70\% | 287.24 | 707.39 | 994.63 |
| Habitat Restoration | 50\% | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Citywide Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Land | 100\% | 0.00 | 126.03 | 126.03 |
| Citywide Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Development | 100\% | 0.00 | 126.46 | 126.46 |
| * The total number of addition funding from SDCs and oth unless other funds are mad discounts. <br> ** $58.55 \%$ represents a con $50 \%$ for the non-residential | dditional acres to other revenues made available to <br> combination of ntial portion of grow | be acquired and DDCs exemptions replace lost reven <br> commended fund wth needs. | veloped depends nd discounts will es resulting from <br> g at 60\% for the | the availability of duce these totals exemptions and <br> idential portion an |

## E. Acquisition and Development Costs

The estimated growth costs for facility acquisition and development identified in Table 3.9 are displayed in Table 3.10, page 16.

TABLE 3.10

## PARK ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS FOR GROWTH AND DEFICIENCY REPAIR (2007-2020)

Estimated \begin{tabular}{c}
Deficiency <br>
Facility Type

$\quad$

Residential <br>
CDC-Eligible <br>
Cost Per Unit

$\quad$

Non-Residential <br>
RDC-Eligible
\end{tabular}

## Central City Local Access Service Area Facilities

| Central City Local |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Access Park Land | $\$ 4,000,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3,266,629$ | $\$ 4,251,927$ |
| Central City Local Access |  |  |  |  |
| Park Development | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 28,027,205$ | $\$ 4,733,441$ |

TOTAL CENTRAL CITY
LOCAL ACCESS FACILITY COSTS \$0 \$58,293,833 \$8,985,368

## Non-Central City Local Access Service Area Facilities

Non-Central City Local
Access Park Land \$450,000 \$22,153,500 \$27,687,825 \$0
Non-Central City Local
Access Park Development \$500,000 \$75,576,250 \$0
TOTAL NON-CENTRAL CITY
LOCAL ACCESS FACILITY COSTS \$97,729,750 \$54,456,833 \$0

## City-Wide Service Area Facilities

| Trailways Acquisition | \$125,000 | \$0 | \$4,880,537 | \$947,489 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trailways Development | \$398,997 | \$0 | \$15,578,556 | \$3,024,361 |
| Habitat Acquisition | \$80,000 | \$22,979,932 | \$48,603,936 | \$9,435,782 |
| Habitat Restoration | \$10,640 | \$0 | \$913,839 | \$177,409 |
| Citywide Access Park Land | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$43,297,426 | \$8,405,596 |
| Citywide Access Park Development | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$55,165,311 | \$10,709,582 |
| TOTAL CITYWIDE SERVICE AREA FACIL | COSTS | \$22,979,932 | \$168,439,604 | \$32,700,219 |

* reflects a $3.85 \%$ reduction in total funds required from residential growth to account for SDC fund balance (approx. \$10.5M), and includes a 6\% surcharge for compliance and administration costs.
** includes a 6\% surcharge for compliance and administration costs.


### 4.0 RESIDENTIAL PARKS SDC RATES

The City's residential Park SDC rates are calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yields the total SDC rate for each new dwelling unit in the City. The formulas identify:
a) the service area residential improvements cost per capita (Formula 4a, below),
b) the service area residential improvements cost per dwelling unit (Formula 4b, page 18),
c) the total residential improvements cost per dwelling unit (Formula 4c, page 19),
d) the residential tax credit per dwelling unit (Formula 4d, page 20), and
e) the residential SDC per dwelling unit (Formula 4e, page 20).

The residential Park SDC is an "improvement fee" only, and does not include a "reimbursement fee" component.

## A. Formula 4a: Service Area Residential Improvements Cost Per Capita

The residential improvements cost per capita for each service area is calculated by dividing the residential portion of net SDC-Eligible Costs (identified in Table 3.10, page 16) by the increase in the population expected to be created by new development during the planning period (from Table 3.1, page 7).

| Residential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4a. |
| SDC-Eligible |
| Improvements Cost |$\div \quad$ Population $\quad$ Increase $\quad$| Residential |
| :---: |
| Improvements Cost |
| Per Capita |

Table 4.1 presents the calculation of the residential improvements cost per capita for each service area (Citywide, Central City, and Non-Central City).

TABLE 4.1

## SERVICE AREA RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS COST PER CAPITA

| Service Area | ```Residential SDC Eligible Costs``` |  | Population Increase | Residential Improvements Cost Per Capita |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Citywide Service Facilities | \$168,439,604 | $\div$ | 70,295 |  |  | $=\$ 2,396$ |
| Central City Local Access Facilities | \$58,293,833 | $\div$ | 25,633 |  |  | \$2,274 |
| Non-Central City Local Access Facilities | \$54,456,850 | $\div$ | 44,662 |  |  | $=\quad \$ 1,219$ |

## B. Formula 4b: Service Area Residential Improvement Costs Per Dwelling Unit

The residential improvements cost per dwelling unit for each service area is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (from Table 3.2, page 7) by the residential improvements cost per capita (from Table 4.1, page 17).

Residential
Residential
4b. Persons Per x Improvements Cost = Dwelling Unit Per Capita Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 4.2.

## TABLE 4.2

## SERVICE AREA RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS COST PER DWELLING UNIT

|  | Average |  | Residential <br> Persons Per | $\times$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Residential |
| :---: |
| Improvements |$=$| Improvements Cost |
| :--- |

Citywide Service Area Facilities
CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREA

|  | 2.06 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 4,936$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Central City Single Family | 1.30 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 3,115$ |
| Central City Multi-family | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 4,073$ |  |
| Central City Manufactured Housing | 1.70 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 2,468$ |
| Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | 1.03 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 2,396$ |

NON-CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREAS

| Non-Central City Single Family | 2.48 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 5,942$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Central City Multi-family | 1.60 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 3,834$ |
| Non-Central City Manufactured Housing | 2.05 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 4,912$ |
| Non-Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | 1.24 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 2,971$ |
| Non-Central City Single Room Occupancy 1.00 | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 2,396$ |  |

Local Access Service Area Facilities

CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREA

| Central City Single Family | 2.06 | \$2,274 | \$4,684 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City Multi-family | 1.30 | \$2,274 | \$2,956 |
| Central City Manufactured Housing | 1.70 | \$2,274 | \$3,866 |
| Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | 1.03 | \$2,274 | \$2,342 |
| Central City Single Room Occupancy | 1.00 | \$2,274 | \$2,274 |
| NON-CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREAS |  |  |  |
| Non-Central City Single Family | 2.48 | \$1,219 | \$3,024 |
| Non-Central City Multi-family | 1.60 | \$1,219 | \$1,951 |
| Non-Central City Manufactured Housing | 2.05 | \$1,219 | \$2,500 |
| Non-Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | 1.24 | \$1,219 | \$1,512 |
| Non-Central City Single Room Occupancy | 1.00 | \$1,219 | \$1,219 |

## C. Formula 4c: Total Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit

The total residential improvements cost per dwelling unit is calculated by adding the Citywide Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit (from Table 4.2, page 18) to the Residential Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit for each local access parks service area (from Table 4.2).

$$
\text { 4c. } \begin{gathered}
\text { Citywide Residential } \\
\text { Improvements Cost } \\
\text { Per Dwelling Unit }
\end{gathered} \quad \begin{gathered}
\text { Local Access Residential } \\
\text { Improvements Cost } \\
\text { Per Dwelling Unit }
\end{gathered}=\begin{gathered}
\text { Total Residential } \\
\text { Improvements Cost } \\
\text { Per Dwelling Unit }
\end{gathered}
$$

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS COST PER DWELLING UNIT

|  | Citywide Residential <br> Improvements Cost | Local Access Residential <br> + Improvements Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Area/Unit |  |  |
| Per Dwelling Unit | $\underline{\text { Per Dwelling Unit }}$ | Total Residential <br> Improvements Cost |
| $\underline{\text { Per Dwelling Unit }}$ |  |  |

CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREA

| Central City Single Family | $\$ 4,936$ | $\$ 4,684$ | $\$ 9,620$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Central City Multi-family | $\$ 3,115$ | $\$ 2,956$ | $\$ 6,071$ |
| Central City Manufactured Housing | $\$ 4,073$ | $\$ 3,866$ | $\$ 7,939$ |
| Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | $\$ 2,468$ | $\$ 2,342$ | $\$ 4,810$ |
| Central City Single Room Occupancy | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 2,274$ | $\$ 4,670$ |

NON-CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREAS

| Non-Central City Single Family | $\$ 5,942$ | $\$ 3,024$ | $\$ 8,966$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Central City Multi-family | $\$ 3,834$ | $\$ 1,951$ | $\$ 5,785$ |
| Non-Central City Manufactured Housing | $\$ 4,912$ | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 7,412$ |
| Non-Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | $\$ 2,971$ | $\$ 1,512$ | $\$ 4,483$ |
| Non-Central City Single Room Occupancy | $\$ 2,396$ | $\$ 1,219$ | $\$ 3,615$ |

## D. Formula 4d: Residential Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit

Bonds and property taxes have been used in the past and will likely be used as future sources for funding capacity improvements needed to repair deficiencies. A portion of these future bond repayments and property taxes will be paid by growth, so a credit must be calculated to account for these payments in order to avoid charging growth twice: once through the SDC, and a second time through property taxes. A credit has been calculated to account for outstanding debt and possible future debt based on the following assumptions:

- $\$ 60.0$ million in 20 year G.O. bonds at $4.5 \%$ for park improvements to be issued in 2011, with another $\$ 60.0$ in 20 year G.O bonds issued in 2017,
- $5.0 \%$ average annual increase in total City property valuation for taxes,
- $3.0 \%$ annual increase in assessed property valuations,
- $3.0 \%$ annual inflation (decrease in value of money),
- average 2007 per unit property valuations for new construction in the Central City at $\$ 600,000$ for single family, $\$ 350,000$ for multi-family, $\$ 220,000$ for manufactured housing, \$150,000 for accessory dwelling unit, and \$80,000 for single room occupancy; and
- average 2007 per unit property valuations for new construction outside the Central City at $70 \%$ of the valuation for the Central City.
4d.
Present Value Tax
of Property
$=\quad$ Credit Per
Tax Payments Dwelling Unit

The amounts of this credit are shown in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4

## TAX CREDIT PER DWELLING UNIT

| Unit | Tax Credit Per |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dwelling Unit |  |

CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREA

| Central City Single Family | $\$ 1,952$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Central City Multi-family | $\$ 1,132$ |
| Central City Manufactured Housing | $\$ 476$ |
| Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | $\$ 488$ |
| Central City Single Room Occupancy | $\$ 260$ |

NON-CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREAS
Non-Central City Single Family \$1,366
Non-Central City Multi-family \$797
Non-Central City Manufactured Housing \$333
Non-Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit \$342
Non-Central City Single Room Occupancy \$182

## E. Formula 4e: Residential SDC Per Dwelling Unit

The residential SDC per dwelling unit is calculated by subtracting the tax credit per dwelling unit (Table 4.4) from the improvements cost (Table 4.3, page 19).

| Improvements Cost |  |  | Tax Credit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4e. | Per | Per |  |
|  | Dwelling Unit |  | Dwelling Unit |$\quad$| Residential SDC |
| :---: |
| Per Dwelling Unit |

The results of these calculations are shown in Table 4.5, page 21.

## RESIDENTIAL SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

| Total Service Area/Unit Improvem Per D | idential nts Cost ng Unit | Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit | $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREA |  |  |  |
| Central City Single Family | \$9,620 | $(1,952)$ | \$7,668 |
| Central City Multi-family | \$6,071 | $(1,139)$ | \$4,932 |
| Central City Manufactured Housing | \$7,939 | (476) | \$7,463 |
| Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | \$4,810 | (488) | \$4,322 |
| Central City Single Room Occupancy | \$4,670 | (260) | \$4,410 |
| NON-CENTRAL CITY SERVICE AREAS |  |  |  |
| Non-Central City Single Family | \$8,966 | $(1,366)$ | \$7,600 |
| Non-Central City Multi-family | \$5,785 | (797) | \$4,988 |
| Non-Central City Manufactured Housing | \$7,412 | (333) | \$7,079 |
| Non-Central City Accessory Dwelling Unit | \$4,483 | (342) | \$4,141 |
| Non-Central City Single Room Occupancy | \$3,615 | (182) | \$3,433 |

### 5.0 NON-RESIDENTIAL PARK SDC RATE

The City's non-residential Park SDC rates are calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yields the total Park SDC rates for new non-residential development in the City. The formulas identify:
a) the service area non-residential improvements cost per resident equivalent (Formula 5a, page 22),
b) the total non-residential improvements cost per resident equivalent (Formula 5b, page 22),
c) the non-residential tax credit per resident equivalent (Formula 5c, page 23),
d) the non-residential SDC per resident equivalent (Formula 5d, page 23), and
e) the non-residential SDC rates by type of development (Formula 5e, page 24).

The non-residential Park SDC is an "improvement fee" only, and does not include a "reimbursement fee" component.

## A. Formula 5a: Service Area Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent

The non-residential improvements cost per resident equivalent for each service area is calculated by dividing the non-residential portion of net SDC-Eligible Costs (identified in Table 3.10, page 16) by the increase in the employment expected to be created by new development during the planning period (from Table 3.1, page 7).

5a. \begin{tabular}{c}
Non-Residential <br>
SDC-Eligible <br>
Improvements Cost

$\div \quad$

Employment <br>
Increase

$=$

Non-Residential <br>
Improvements Cost <br>
Per Resident Equivalent
\end{tabular}

Table 5.1 presents the calculation of the non-residential improvements cost per resident equivalent for each service area (Citywide, Central City, and Non-Central City).

TABLE 5.1

## SERVICE AREA NON-RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS COST PER RESIDENT EQUIVALENT

| Service Area | Non-Residential SDC <br> Eligible Costs |  | Employment Increase | Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City-Wide Service Facilities | \$32,700,219 | $\div$ | 101,875 | $=$ | \$321 |
| Central City Local Access Facilities | \$8,985,368 | $\div$ | 32,323 | $=$ | \$278 |
| Non-Central City Local Access Facilities | \$0 | $\div$ | 69,552 | $=$ | \$0 |

## B. Formula 5b: Total Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent

The total non-residential improvements cost per resident equivalent is calculated by adding the Citywide Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent (from Table 5.1) to the Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent for each Local Access Parks service area (from Table 5.1).

City-Wide Local Access Total<br>Non-Residential<br>Non-Residential<br>Non-Residential<br>5b. Improvements Cost + Improvements Cost $=$ Improvements Cost<br>Per Resident Equivalent Per Resident Equivalent Per Resident Equivalent

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 5.2.

TABLE 5.2

## TOTAL IMPROVEMENTS COST PER RESIDENT EQUIVALENT

| City-Wide <br> Non-Residential <br> Improvements Cost/ | Local Access <br> Non-Residential | Total <br> Zone/Unit <br> Resident Equivalent | Improvements Cost/ <br> Resident Equivalent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Residential |
| :---: |
| Central City Resident Equivalent |

## C. Formula 5c: Non-Residential Tax Credit Per Resident Equivalent

Bonds and property taxes have been used in the past and will likely be used as future sources for funding capacity improvements needed to repair deficiencies. A portion of these future bond repayments and property taxes will be paid by growth, so a credit must be calculated to account for these payments in order to avoid charging growth twice: once through the SDC, and a second time through property taxes. A credit has been calculated to account for outstanding debt and possible future debt based on the following assumptions:

- $\$ 60$ million in 20 year G.O. bonds at $4.5 \%$ for park improvements to be issued in 2011, with another $\$ 60$ in 20 year G.O bonds issued in 2017,
- $5.0 \%$ average annual increase in total City property valuation for taxes,
- $3.0 \%$ annual increase in assessed property valuations,
- $3.0 \%$ annual inflation (decrease in value of money), and
- average 2007 property valuations for new non-residential construction in the Central City equivalent to $\$ 70$ per resident equivalent; and
- average 2007 property valuations for new non-residential construction outside the Central City at $70 \%$ of the valuation for the Central City.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc} 
& \text { Present Value of } & \text { Tax Credit Per } \\
\text { 5c. } & \text { Property Tax Payments }
\end{array}=\begin{gathered}
\text { Resident Equivalent }
\end{gathered}
$$

The amounts of this credit are shown in Table 5.3.

TABLE 5.3
TAX CREDIT PER RESIDENT EQUIVALENT

| Tax Credit |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Unit | $\underline{\text { Per Resident Equivalent }}$ |

Central City Resident Equivalent \$228
Non-Central City Resident Equivalent
\$159

## D. Formula 5d: Non-Residential SDC Per Resident Equivalent

The non-residential SDC per resident equivalent is calculated by subtracting the tax credit per resident equivalent (Table 5.3) from the improvements cost (Table 5.2, page 22).

| Improvements |  |  | Tax Credit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5d. | Cost Per | Per |  |
| Resident Equivalent |  |  |  |$\quad$| Non-Residential |
| :---: |
| Resident Equivalent |$\quad$| SDC Per |
| :---: |
| Resident Equivalent |

The results of these calculations are shown in Table 5.4, page 24.

TABLE 5.4

## NON-RESIDENTIAL SDC PER RESIDENT EQUIVALENT

| Tota <br> Service Area/Unit <br> Per R | Total Non-Residential Improvements Cost Per Resident Equivalent | Tax Credit Per Resident Equivalent | $=\begin{gathered} \text { Non-Residential } \\ \text { SDC Per } \\ \text { Resident Equivalent } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City Resident Equivalent | \$599 | (228) | \$371 |
| Non-Central City Resident Equivalent | \$321 | (159) | \$162 |

## E. Formula 5e: Non-Residential SDC Rates by Type of Development

The non-residential SDC for each type of non-residential development is calculated by multiplying the Non-Residential SDC Per Resident Equivalent (from Table 5.4) by the number of resident equivalents per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development.

| Non-Residential |
| :---: |
| 5e. |
| SDC |
| Per Resident Equivalent |$+$| Resident Equivalents |
| :---: |
| Per 1,000 Square Feet |$=$| Non-Residential |
| :---: |
| SDC Rate by |
| Type of Development |

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 5.5.
TABLE 5.5
NON-RESIDENTIAL PARK SDC RATES BY TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

| Building Use Types |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General <br> Occupancy <br> Category | Additional uses <br> in Category | Resident <br> Equivalents <br> Per 1,000 sq. ft. | Central City <br> SDC Rate <br> Per 1,000 sq. ft. | Non-Central City <br> SDC Rate |
| Hospital | Convalescent 1,000 sq. ft. <br> Hospital, Day <br> Care | 2.86 | $\$ 1,062$ | $\$ 462$ |

1. Building Use Occupancy Categories and Code Groups per Oregon Structural Specialty Code.



| PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION Page 3 <br> SDC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN $2 / 22 / 08$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. CITY-WIDE <br> Estimated Project Timing | SERVICE FACILITIES <br> Facility | Estimated Project Cost <br> (\$) | Growth- <br> Required <br> Portion (\%) | SDC-Eligible <br> Growth Share (\$) | Deficiency <br> Repair Share (\$) |
| 2008-2011 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> HABITAT ACQUISITION <br> Acquire habitat acres to serve growth and non-growth needs. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 26,480,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 26,480,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 71.12\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 18,832,576 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 18,832,576 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 7,647,424$ $\$ 7,647,424$ |
| 2012-2015 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> HABITAT ACQUISITION <br> Acquire habitat acres to serve growth and non-growth needs. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 26,480,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 26,480,000 \end{array}$ | 71.12\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 18,832,576 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 18,832,576 \end{array}$ | $\$ 7,647,424$ $\$ 7,647,424$ |
| 2016-2020 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> HABITAT ACQUISITION <br> Acquire habitat acres to serve growth and non-growth needs. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 26,610,400 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 26,610,400 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 71.12\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 18,925,316 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 18,925,316 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 7,685,084 \\ & \$ 7,685,084 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2008-2020 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> habitat restoration <br> Restore habitat acres to serve growth. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 1,064,000 \\ \$ 1,064,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100.00\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 1,064,000 \\ \$ 1,064,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$0 $\$ 0$ |
| 2008-2011 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK LAND <br> Acquire land for City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 16,804,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 16,804,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100.00\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 16,804,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 16,804,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$0 |
| 2012-2015 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK LAND <br> Acquire land for City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 16,804,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 16,804,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100.00\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 16,804,000 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 16,804,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$0 |


| PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION SDC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Page } 4 \\ 2 / 22 / 08 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. CITY-WIDE SERVICE FACILITIES <br> Estimated Project Timing Facility |  |  |  | Estimated Project (\$) Cost | Growth- <br> Required Portion (\%) | SDC-Eligible <br> Growth Share (\$) | Deficiency <br> Repair Share (\$) |
| 2016-2020 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK LAND <br> Acquire land for City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. |  |  | $\$ 16,804,000$ $\$ 0$ $\$ 16,804,000$ | 100.00\% | $\$ 16,804,000$ $\$ 0$ $\$ 16,804,000$ | \$0 |
| 2008-2011 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK DEVELOPMENT <br> Develop City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. |  |  | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | 100.00\% | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | \$0 |
| 2012-2015 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK DEVELOPMENT <br> Develop City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. |  |  | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | 100.00\% | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | \$0 |
| 2016-2020 | SERVICE AREA: CITY-WIDE <br> CITY-WIDE ACCESS PARK DEVELOPMENT <br> Develop City-Wide Access Parks such as regional parks, urban parks, botanical gardens, etc. to serve growth. |  |  | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | 100.00\% | \$0 $\$ 21,410,000$ $\$ 21,410,000$ | \$0 |
| 2008-2020 | SERVICE AREA <br> TRAILS LAND <br> Acquire land <br> total acres: <br> SDC acres: <br> recovery \% : | CITY-WID CQUISITION trails to <br> 45.46 <br> 45.46 <br> 100\% | owth. <br> Acquisition <br> Development <br> Total Cost | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,682,500 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 5,682,500 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100.00\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,682,500 \\ \$ 0 \\ \$ 5,682,500 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$0 |
| 2008-2020 | SERVICE ARE <br> TRAILS DEVE <br> Develop trails <br> total acres: <br> SDC acres: <br> recovery \% : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CITY-WIDI } \\ & \text { PMENT } \\ & \text { serve gr } \\ & 45.46 \\ & 45.46 \\ & 100 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Acquisition <br> Development <br> Total Cost | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 18,138,404 \\ \$ 18,138,404 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100.00\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \$ 18,138,404 \\ \$ 18,138,404 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$0 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { Land } \\ \text { Development } \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 219,097,304 \\ \$ 135,664,900 \\ \$ 83,432,404 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 89.51\% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 196,117,372 \\ \$ 112,684,968 \\ \$ 83,432,404 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 22,979,932 \\ \$ 22,979,932 \\ \$ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Sustaining a bealthy park and recreation system to make Portland a great place to live, work and play. www.PortlandParks.org • Commissioner Dan Saltzman • Director Zari Santner

