

# City of Gladstone

## PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE METHODOLOGY REPORT

FINAL REPORT

March 2018

### Washington

7525 166th Avenue NE, Ste. D215  
Redmond, WA 98052  
425.867.1802

### Oregon

4000 Kruse Way Pl., Bldg. 1, Ste 220  
Lake Oswego, OR 97035  
503.841.6543

[www.fcsgroup.com](http://www.fcsgroup.com)

This entire report is made of readily recyclable materials, including the bronze wire binding and the front and back cover, which are made from post-consumer recycled plastic bottles.



**FCS GROUP**  
Solutions-Oriented Consulting

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Table of Contents .....	i
List of Figures.....	ii
Table of Appendices.....	ii
Section I. Introduction .....	1
I.A. System Development Charges .....	1
I.B. Updating The Parks SDC.....	2
I.C. Calculation Overview .....	2
Section II. Growth .....	3
II.A.1. Growth - Population .....	3
II.A.2. Current Demand - Employees .....	3
II.A.3. Growth - Employees.....	4
II.A.4. Growth Summary.....	5
Section III. SDC Calculation.....	6
III.A. Reimbursement Fee .....	6
III.B. Improvement Fee .....	6
III.B.1. Level of Service .....	6
III.B.2. Project List.....	7
III.B.3. Facility Needs Determination .....	8
III.B.4. Improvement Fee Calculation.....	9
III.C. Adjustments.....	9
III.C.1. SDC Component Summary .....	10
Section IV. Conclusion .....	11
IV.A. Calculated SDC .....	11
IV.B. Indexing.....	11
IV.C. SDC Comparisons.....	12

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 1.	SDC Equation .....	2
Figure 2.	Population Growth .....	3
Figure 3.	Population and Employment in Area, 2015 .....	3
Figure 4.	Hours per Week of Potential Park Use by Type per Person.....	4
Figure 5.	Hours per Week of Potential Park Use by Type – Total .....	4
Figure 6.	Residential Population Equivalent Calculation .....	4
Figure 7.	Employment Growth .....	5
Figure 8.	Employment Growth .....	5
Figure 9.	Project List by Improvement Fee Eligibility.....	7
Figure 10.	Inventory and Needs.....	8
Figure 11.	Project Cost Improvement Fee Eligibility .....	9
Figure 12.	Adjustments.....	10
Figure 13.	SDC Component Summary .....	10
Figure 14.	Residential SDC Fee Summary .....	11
Figure 15.	Non-Residential SDC Fee Summary .....	11
Figure 16.	Single Family Parks SDC Fee Comparison by Jurisdiction .....	12

## TABLE OF APPENDICES

---

Appendix A – Improvement Fee Project List

## Section I. INTRODUCTION

---

This section describes the policy context and project scope upon which the body of this report is based.

### I.A. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.297 to 223.314 authorize local governments to establish system development charges (SDCs), one-time fees on new development paid at the time of development. SDCs are intended to recover a fair share of the cost of existing and planned facilities that provide capacity to serve future growth.

ORS 223.299 defines two types of SDCs:

- A reimbursement fee designed to recover “costs associated with capital improvements already constructed, or under construction when the fee is established, for which the local government determines that capacity exists”
- An improvement fee designed to recover “costs associated with capital improvements to be constructed”

ORS 223.304(1) states, in part, that a reimbursement fee must be based on “the value of unused capacity available to future system users or the cost of existing facilities” and must account for prior contributions by existing users and any gifted or grant-funded facilities. The calculation must “promote the objective of future system users contributing no more than an equitable share to the cost of existing facilities.” A reimbursement fee may be spent on any capital improvement related to the system for which it is being charged (whether cash-financed or debt-financed) and on the costs of compliance with Oregon’s SDC law.

ORS 223.304(2) states, in part, that an improvement fee must be calculated to include only the cost of projected capital improvements needed to increase system capacity for future users. In other words, the cost of planned projects that correct existing deficiencies or do not otherwise increase capacity for future users may not be included in the improvement fee calculation. An improvement fee may be spent only on capital improvements (or portions thereof) that increase the capacity of the system for which it is being charged (whether cash-financed or debt-financed) and on the costs of compliance with Oregon’s SDC law.

ORS 223.307(5) also authorizes the expenditure of SDCs for “the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures.” To avoid spending monies for compliance that might otherwise have been spent on projects, a compliance cost estimate is included in the analysis.

## I.B. UPDATING THE PARKS SDC

The City of Gladstone (City) contracted with FCS GROUP to develop a parks SDC methodology based on the recently adopted Gladstone Parks Master Plan. We conducted the study using the following general approach:

- **Policy Framework for Charges.** In this step, we worked with City staff to identify and agree on the approach to be used and the components to be included in the analysis.
- **Technical Analysis.** In this step, we worked with City staff to isolate the recoverable portion of facility costs and calculate SDC rates.
- **Methodology Report Preparation.** In this step, we presented findings and recommendations to the City Council and documented them in this report.

## I.C. CALCULATION OVERVIEW

In general, SDCs are calculated by adding a reimbursement fee component and an improvement fee component – both with potential adjustments. Each component is calculated by dividing the eligible cost by growth in units of demand. The unit of demand becomes the basis of the charge. **Figure 1** shows this calculation in equation format.

Figure 1. SDC Equation

Eligible costs of available capacity in existing facilities	+	Eligible costs of capacity- increasing capital improvements	+	Pro-rata share of costs of complying with Oregon SDC law	=	SDC per unit of growth in demand
Units of growth in demand		Units of growth in demand				

## Section II. GROWTH

This section provides detailed calculations on growth. Growth is the denominator in both the improvement and reimbursement fee calculations, measured in units that most directly reflect the source of demand. The City’s park system serves residents and employees in the City. We therefore define growth for the parks SDC as a combination of growth in total population and employment during the planning period.

### II.A.1. Growth - Population

The first portion of growth is population, provided by the Gladstone Parks Master Plan. The Master Plan identifies a project list for the ten year period between 2018 and 2028 and population growth from 2016 to 2035. **Figure 2** shows population growth for the planning period inferred from the Master Plan growth projections.

**Figure 2. Population Growth**

	2015	2018	2028	2018-2028 Change	CAGR
Total Population	11,505	11,739	12,142	403	0.34%

**Source:** Gladstone Parks Master Plan.

**Abbreviations:** CAGR - compound annual growth rate

### II.A.2. Current Demand - Employees

In order to calculate current demand for employees, we must first identify their impact on the park system relative to the general population. The residential population equivalent (RPE) concept allows park system use by an employee to be compared to residents in the City. As shown in **Figure 3**, the City had 2,787 employees working in the City and 11,505 citizens in 2015.

**Figure 3. Population and Employment in Area, 2015**

	Living Inside Gladstone	Living Outside Gladstone	Total
<b>Working Inside City</b>	199	2,588	2,787
<b>Working Outside City</b>	5,133		
<b>Not Working</b>	6,173		
<b>Total</b>	11,505		

**Source:** Parks Master Plan and U.S. Census On the Map 2015 Primary Jobs Inflow/Outflow Analysis.

The next step is to identify the relative demand of residents and employees on the park system. **Figure 4** shows the number of hours of potential park use for each of the identified groups in **Figure 3**. It is presumed that each person has 16 hours per day of potential park use, with adjustments made for citizens that work or live outside of the City.

Figure 4. Hours per Week of Potential Park Use by Type per Person

	Living Inside Gladstone	Living Outside Gladstone
<b>Residential Demand</b>		
Working Inside City	72	0
Working Outside City	72	
Not Working	112	
<b>Non-Residential Demand</b>		
Working Inside City	40	40
Working Outside City	0	
Not Working	0	

Multiplying the potential park use per person by the total employees and residents in the City leads to total residential and non-residential hours of potential park use, in **Figure 5**.

Figure 5. Hours per Week of Potential Park Use by Type – Total

	Living Inside Gladstone	Living Outside Gladstone	Total
<b>Residential Demand</b>			
Working Inside City	14,328	0	14,328
Working Outside City	369,576	0	369,576
Not Working	691,376	0	691,376
<b>Non-Residential Demand</b>			
Working Inside City	7,960	103,520	111,480
Working Outside City	0	0	0
Not Working	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			
<b>Residential Hours</b>	1,075,280	0	1,075,280
<b>Non-Residential Hours</b>	7,960	103,520	111,480

Finally, dividing the total residential and non-residential hours by citizens and employees, respectively, results in average hours per person per week. The ratio of non-residential hours of park use to residential hours of park use results in the RPE, shown in **Figure 6**.

Figure 6. Residential Population Equivalent Calculation

	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential Population Equivalent
<b>Persons</b>	11,505	2,787	0.24
<b>Hours</b>	1,075,280	111,480	0.10
<b>Hours per Person</b>	93.5	40.0	<b>0.43</b>

### II.A.3. Growth - Employees

The final step in identifying RPE growth is to identify growth in employment during the analysis period. **Figure 7** shows the growth in employment between 2018 and 2028 based on Metro's Metroscope 2040 Gamma Forecast, inferred based on 2015 employment data from **Figure 3**.

**Figure 7. Employment Growth**

	2015	2018	2028	2018-2028 Change	CAGR
Total Employees	2,787	2,908	3,350	442	1.42%

**Source:** Census On The Map and Metroscope 2040 Gamma Forecast.

**Abbreviations:** CAGR - compound annual growth rate

#### II.A.4. Growth Summary

Combining the population growth with employee growth (multiplied by the RPE) results in the denominator of the SDC equation in residential population equivalents. **Figure 8** shows total growth during the analysis period.

**Figure 8. Employment Growth**

	2018	2028	Growth	Growth Share
Population	11,739	12,142	403	
Employee RPEs <sup>1</sup>	1,244	1,434	189	
<b>Total RPEs</b>	<b>12,983</b>	<b>13,575</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>4.36%</b>

**Source:** Gladstone Parks Master Plan, Census On the Map, and Metro.

<sup>1</sup> Residential Population Equivalents (RPEs) equal to 0.43 people per job.



## Section III. SDC CALCULATION

---

This section provides the rationale and calculations for the proposed parks SDC. As discussed in **Section I**, an SDC can include three components: a reimbursement fee, an improvement fee, and compliance cost recovery. Below we provide detailed calculations for the reimbursement and improvement fee components.

### III.A. REIMBURSEMENT FEE

The reimbursement fee is the value or cost of available capacity per unit of growth that such available capacity will serve. In order for a reimbursement fee to be calculated, unused capacity must be available to serve future growth. For facility types that do not have available capacity, no reimbursement fee may be calculated. The methodology proposed indicates that there is no unused system capacity available for inclusion in the reimbursement fee.

In addition, a parks reimbursement fee calculation must deduct assets that were gifted by developers or funded with general government revenues. These have been the City's primary sources of park system funding.

### III.B. IMPROVEMENT FEE

The improvement fee is the cost of planned capacity-increasing capital projects per unit of growth that those projects will serve. The unit of growth becomes the basis of the fee. In reality, the capacity added by many projects serves a dual purpose of both meeting existing demand and serving future growth. To compute a compliant improvement fee, growth-related costs must be isolated and costs related to current demand must be excluded.

We have used the capacity approach to allocate costs to the improvement fee basis. Under this approach, the cost of a given project is allocated to growth by the portion of total project capacity that represents capacity for future users. That portion, referred to as the improvement fee eligibility percentage, is multiplied by the total project cost for inclusion in the improvement fee cost basis.

#### III.B.1. Level of Service

SDC-eligible costs for the parks system are determined by a level of service (LOS), which is typically expressed as a quantity of facility (e.g., acres) per 1,000 residents.

A reimbursement fee is possible only if the current LOS exceeds the ultimate identified LOS for the park type. For example, if the City currently has 11 acres of neighborhood parks but only needs 10 acres to serve its current population based on the identified LOS, the City may be able to include the one acre above the current required LOS in a reimbursement fee cost basis.

An improvement fee is calculated for the portions of planned projects identified to serve the future population based on the LOS. For example, if the City has an identified LOS of 10 acres per 1,000 residents and plans to grow by 2,000 residents, 20 acres of planned acquisitions would be improvement fee eligible.

Any park land in the project list that cures an existing deficiency (e.g. if the City needs an additional 10 acres to meet the identified LOS in the current year) or is built in excess of the LOS (e.g. if the City plans to build 20 acres but only needs 15 acres for the future population) may not be included in the improvement fee cost basis, per statute.

In this report, we use a realized level of service approach to determine the SDC. The realized LOS is the LOS that the park system will achieve after completing the project list. The realized LOS is calculated as the inventory of parks facilities at the end of the analysis period divided by the population at the end of the planning period. The LOS is then applied to current population to determine any surpluses (where the realized LOS exceeds the current LOS) or deficiencies (where the current LOS exceeds the realized LOS) in the current inventory.

In calculating the LOS, the City’s specific park categories (community, neighborhood, pocket, open space/natural area, special facility, trail, and dog park facilities) are collapsed into one ;parks’ category.

### III.B.2. Project List

The City provided a project list which will serve as the basis for calculating the improvement fee. Many projects do not add or develop acreage to the park system, which means they are not easily addressed by the LOS methodology above. Projects that do not add capacity fall into three categories: Master Plan projects, projects that are growth share eligible, and projects that do not increase capacity.

Master Plan projects are planning efforts for future development in a specific park. Those projects are allocated to the improvement fee cost basis proportionally to the total improvement fee cost allocation of other projects for that park.

Projects that are growth share eligible are projects which upgrade the parks system without providing additional acreage. This includes projects like providing parking or adding Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant routes or play equipment. These projects will serve current and future users proportionally. Improvement fee eligibility is calculated based on population growth during the analysis period as a percent of total population in the future (termed ‘growth share’ in **Figure 8**).

Finally, projects that do not increase capacity are projects that do not increase capacity of the park system. These include repair and replacement projects as well as interpretive sign projects. These are not SDC eligible.

**Figure 9** shows the project costs by project type. See **Appendix A** for a detailed project list.

**Figure 9. Project List by Improvement Fee Eligibility**

Project Type	Number of Projects	Acres Added	Project Costs
Acreage Additions	8	8.84	\$2,202,500
Dog Park	1	2.00	40,000
Neighborhood	5	3.74	2,115,000
Trail	2	3.10	47,500
Master Planning	3		120,000
Community	1		45,000
Neighborhood	1		25,000

Project Type	Number of Projects	Acres Added	Project Costs
Trail	1		50,000
Growth Share Eligible	14		671,000
Does Not Increase Capacity	18		1,619,900
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>8.84</b>	<b>\$4,613,400</b>

**Source:** Gladstone Parks Master Plan.

### III.B.3. Facility Needs Determination

Facility needs are determined by the LOS, expressed as a quantity of facility (e.g., acres) per 1,000 residents. **Figure 10** shows how the inputs of inventory, growth, and projects come together to determine the proportion of project costs that can be recovered in an improvement fee.

**Figure 10. Inventory and Needs**

Inventory and Needs	Acreage
<b>Inventory</b>	
Current Inventory	139.09
Planned Projects	8.84
Inventory Reduction/Conversion	-2.57
Inventory at Completion of Planned Projects	145.36
<b>Level of Service - Realized</b>	
Level of Service per 1,000 Residents	11.97
<b>Required Inventory Based on Level of Service</b>	
Required in 2018	140.54
Required to Accommodate Growth	4.82
Required in 2028	145.36
<b>Analysis of Planned Park Development</b>	
Curing Deficiency	1.45
Accommodating Growth	4.82
Excess	0.00
Total Park Development	6.27
<b>Improvement Fee Eligibility</b>	
Percent of Total Project Costs	76.90%

**Source:** Gladstone Parks Master Plan.

The Figure above begins the analysis of future needs by looking at the current inventory of park facilities. In the ‘Inventory’ section, the City currently has 139.09 acres and plans to develop and additional 8.84 acres, with 2.57 acres of existing parkland being redeveloped from one type of park to another, totaling 145.36 acres at the end of the planning period.

The next section, ‘Level of Service – Realized’ shows the LOS used to define SDC-eligible needs calculated as total acreage at the end of the planning period (145.36 acres) divided by the 2028 population (in 1,000s). The City will have a realized LOS for parks of 11.97 acres per 1,000 residents.

The next section, ‘Required Inventory Based on Level of Service’, shows the amount of park development required to accommodate growth based on the LOS identified above. Applying the realized LOS to the current population results in the required inventory in 2018 of 140.54 acres. The

difference between future and current required inventory, 4.82 acres, serves as the upper limit of acreage that can be improvement fee eligible.

The next section, ‘Analysis of Planned Development’, divides the planned project acreage into three categories. The ‘Curing Deficiency’ portion is the amount of acreage that the City must add to achieve the LOS identified in 2018. Put differently, the ‘Current Inventory’ must at least equal the ‘Required in 2018’ inventory before any improvement fee eligible costs can be calculated. The City must add 1.45 acres in order to bring the current LOS to the realized LOS and begin including acreage in the improvement fee. The ‘Accommodating Growth’ line is the improvement fee eligible acreage, which has an upward limit equal to the amount in ‘Required to Accommodate Growth’. The final part of this section, ‘Excess’, includes all acreage the City will construct during the planning period beyond the identified LOS. The acreage not in the ‘Curing Deficiency’ category is in the ‘Accommodating Growth’ category since the realized LOS is calculated based on acreage at the end of the planning period.

The final section, ‘Improvement Fee Eligibility’, determines the total improvement fee eligible percent for all projects that expand park acreage. This is the row ‘Accommodating Growth’ divided by the row ‘Total Park Development’. The improvement fee eligibility is decreased below 100 percent since the City must cure an existing acreage deficiency in the system.

### III.B.4. Improvement Fee Calculation

The improvement fee eligibility above reflects the amount of the project list that will provide capacity for future users. To calculate the improvement fee, we apply the improvement fee eligibility from **Figure 10** to the projects that add acreage and then calculate improvement fee eligibility for master planning projects accordingly. **Figure 11** shows the improvement fee eligible costs by category. See **Appendix A** for a complete list of projects with SDC eligibility by project.

**Figure 11. Project Cost Improvement Fee Eligibility**

Project Type	Number of Projects	Acres Added	Cost to City	Improvement Fee Eligibility	Improvement Fee Eligible Costs
Acreage Additions	8	8.84	\$2,202,500		
Dog Park	1	2.00	40,000	76.90%	\$30,761
Neighborhood	5	3.74	2,115,000	76.90%	1,626,482
Trail	2	3.10	47,500	76.90%	36,529
Master Planning	3		120,000		
Community	1		45,000	15.54%	6,995
Neighborhood	1		25,000	50.30%	12,575
Trail	1		50,000	76.90%	38,451
Growth Share Eligible	14		671,000	4.36%	29,254
Does Not Increase Capacity	18		1,619,900	0.00%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>8.84</b>	<b>\$4,613,400</b>		<b>\$1,781,045</b>

**Source:** Gladstone Parks Master Plan.

### III.C. ADJUSTMENTS

Two cost basis adjustments are potentially applicable in the SDC calculation: fund balances and compliance costs. The City does not currently have a park SDC and therefore no fund balances are deducted.

ORS 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs for “the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures.” To avoid spending monies for compliance that might otherwise have been spent on growth-related projects, we includes an estimate of compliance costs in the SDC calculation. In total, the City will spend \$3,000 per year on compliance costs, shown below.

- **Cost of SDC Methodology.** During the ten year analysis period, the City estimates it will complete one SDC methodology study at a total cost of \$10,000.
- **City Cost of Administering the SDC.** The City estimates the cost of administering the SDC at \$2,000 per year.

The total adjustment amount is based on an estimate of accounting costs associated with the SDC program as a percent of the proposed SDC. **Figure 12** shows the adjustments for the current LOS, resulting in a 2 percent compliance fee.

**Figure 12. Adjustments**

Avg. Annual Residential Equivalent Growth	59
Avg. Annual SDC Revenue	\$178,105
SDC Updates (\$10k per study every ten years)	\$1,000
SDC Fee Administration (\$2k per year)	2,000
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>
<b>Compliance Fee</b>	<b>2%</b>

Source: City of Gladstone.

### III.C.1. SDC Component Summary

A summary of the SDC calculation is identified in **Figure 13**, which shows a \$3,009 improvement fee and \$51 compliance fee per residential equivalent.

**Figure 13. SDC Component Summary**

Parks SDC	Total	SDC-Eligible	Units
<b>Improvement Fee</b>			
Capacity Expanding CIP	\$4,613,400	\$ 1,781,045	
Less: Fund Balance	-	-	
<b>Improvement Fee Cost Basis</b>	\$ 4,613,400	\$ 1,781,045	
<b>Growth to End of Planning Period</b>		592	Residential Equivalent
<b>Improvement Fee</b>		<b>\$ 3,009</b>	per Residential Equivalent
<b>Total System Development Charge</b>			
Reimbursement Fee		\$ -	per Residential Equivalent
Improvement Fee		<b>\$ 3,009</b>	per Residential Equivalent
Compliance Fee	2%	<b>\$ 51</b>	per Residential Equivalent
<b>Total SDC per</b>		<b>\$ 3,060</b>	per Residential Equivalent

## Section IV. CONCLUSION

This section summarizes the calculated SDC. It also addresses indexing the charge and a comparison to regional SDCs.

### IV.A. CALCULATED SDC

The SDC calculation above shows a charge per RPE. SDCs for residential development are calculated by multiplying the average number of occupants (by housing category) by the SDC residential equivalent. The data used to determine people per dwelling unit type is based on Gladstone Census data. **Figure 14** shows the charge per residential housing type and per employee.

**Figure 14. Residential SDC Fee Summary**

	RPE per Unit	SDC
Per Residential Equivalent	1.00	\$3,060
Single Family	2.44	\$7,477
Multi-Family	1.95	\$5,954
Accessory Dwelling Units	1.45	\$4,437
Employee	0.43	\$1,316

**Source:** US Census (American Community Survey 2012-2016) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Generally, non-residential park SDCs per employee are converted to a charge per 1,000 square feet to ensure ease of administration. **Figure 15** shows the SDC per employee conversion to an SDC per 1,000 square feet, based on Metro's 2014 Urban Growth Report.

**Figure 15. Non-Residential SDC Fee Summary**

	SF per Employee	Employees per 1,000 SF	SDC per 1,000 SF
General Industrial	800	1.25	\$1,645
Warehousing/Distribution	1,250	0.80	\$1,053
Flex	625	1.60	\$2,105
Office	300	3.33	\$4,386
Retail	450	2.22	\$2,924
Institutional	500	2.00	\$2,632

**Source:** Metro 2014 Urban Growth Report. SF per employee from 'Inner Ring' city assumptions.

### IV.B. INDEXING

Oregon law (ORS 223.304) also allows for the periodic indexing of system development charges for inflation, as long as the index used is:

- “(A) A relevant measurement of the average change in prices or costs over an identified time period for materials, labor, real property or a combination of the three;
- (B) Published by a recognized organization or agency that produces the index or data source for reasons that are independent of the system development charge methodology; and

(C) Incorporated as part of the established methodology or identified and adopted in a separate ordinance, resolution or order.”

We recommend that the City index its charges to the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index for the City of Seattle and adjust its charges annually. There is no comparable Oregon-specific index.

#### IV.C. SDC COMPARISONS

**Figure 16** compares the City’s proposed SDC compared to surrounding jurisdictions. Implementing the SDC at the maximum defensible rate results in the SDC would mean that the park SDC is slightly higher than some jurisdictions and lower than others.

**Figure 16. Single Family Parks SDC Fee Comparison by Jurisdiction**

	Fee
Lake Oswego	\$13,595
West Linn	\$10,616
Sherwood	\$7,669
<b>Gladstone (proposed)</b>	<b>\$7,477</b>
Happy Valley	\$7,000
North Clackamas PRD - West of I-205	\$6,760
North Clackamas PRD - East of I-205	\$6,075
Oregon City	\$4,881
North Clackamas PRD - Milwaukie	\$3,985

## APPENDIX A – IMPROVEMENT FEE PROJECT LIST

Project #	Project	Description	Type	Timing	Acres	Project Cost	Percent Eligible for Improvement Fee	Improvement Fee Eligible Costs	Other Notes
COM 1a	Meldrum Bar Park	Repair roadway connecting to Dahl Beach	Community	0-6 Years		\$42,000	0.00%	\$0	
COM 1b	Meldrum Bar Park	Replace furnishings (i.e., picnic tables) with ADA-compliant models & install additional	Community	0-6 Years		32,000	4.36%	1,395	
COM 1c	Meldrum Bar Park	Add accessible routes to amenities for ADA compliance	Community	0-6 Years		4,000	4.36%	174	
COM 1d	Meldrum Bar Park	Replace existing play equipment and fall safety surfacing	Community	0-6 Years		75,000	0.00%	0	
COM 1e	Meldrum Bar Park	Conduct site master plan to guide park redevelopment & ties to Dahl Beach	Community	7-10 Years		45,000	15.54%	6,995	
COM 1f	Meldrum Bar Park	Realign trail ("orchard trail") to the west toward boat launch	Community	7-10 Years		15,000	0.00%	0	
COM 1g	Meldrum Bar Park	Design and install fenced off-leash dog area	Dog Park	7-10 Years	2.00	40,000	76.90%	30,761	Community park converted to dog park
COM 2a	Dahl Beach Park	Upgrade parking and fishing areas for ADA compliance	Community	0-6 Years		115,000	4.36%	5,014	
COM 2b	Dahl Beach Park	Stabilize bank to prevent erosion and safety concerns	Community	0-6 Years		12,000	0.00%	0	
COM 2c	Dahl Beach Park	Install wildlife viewing area and environmental interpretive signs	Community	7-10 Years		40,000	0.00%	0	



Project #	Project	Description	Type	Timing	Acres	Project Cost	Percent Eligible for Improvement Fee	Improvement Fee Eligible Costs	Other Notes
<b>COM 3a</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Level, resurface & restripe courts for multi-sport play (w/ hoops & replace practice wall)	Community	0-6 Years		60,000	0.00%	0	
<b>COM 3b</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Replace tennis court fence and gates	Community	0-6 Years		22,000	0.00%	0	
<b>COM 3c</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Provide ADA parking (sign & stripe) near spray park	Community	0-6 Years		550	4.36%	24	
<b>COM 3d</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Add accessible routes to amenities for ADA compliance	Community	0-6 Years		18,250	4.36%	796	
<b>COM 3e</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Convert the spray park from a recirculating system to a waste water system	Community	0-6 Years		30,000	0.00%	0	
<b>COM 3f</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Repaint picnic shelters	Community	0-6 Years		6,000	0.00%	0	
<b>COM 3g</b>	Max Patterson Memorial Park	Replace damaged furnishings with ADA compliant models	Community	0-6 Years		7,200	0.00%	0	
<b>NH 1a</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Acquire adjacent residential property on Webster	Neighborhood	0-6 Years	0.47	425,000	76.90%	326,834	
<b>NH 1b</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Conduct site master plan to guide park redevelopment	Neighborhood	0-6 Years		25,000	50.30%	12,575	
<b>NH 1c</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Add amenities, such as nature play, picnic table and benches	Neighborhood	7-10 Years		90,000	4.36%	3,924	
<b>NH 1d</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Formalize and add parking, including at least one ADA stall	Neighborhood	0-6 Years		23,500	4.36%	1,025	
<b>NH 1e</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Install a secondary trail system	Neighborhood	0-6 Years	0.45	30,000	76.90%	23,071	
<b>NH 1f</b>	Gladstone Nature Park	Install permanent restroom	Neighborhood	7-10 Years		150,000	4.36%	6,540	

Project #	Project	Description	Type	Timing	Acres	Project Cost	Percent Eligible for Improvement Fee	Improvement Fee Eligible Costs	Other Notes
NH 2	Ridgegate Open Space	Develop portion of Ridgegate adjacent to school as neighborhood park	Neighborhood	7-10 Years	0.57	725,000	76.90%	557,541	Converted from open space to neighborhood park
NH 3	Dierickx Memorial Park	Add accessible routes to amenities for ADA compliance	Neighborhood	0-6 Years		14,600	4.36%	637	
NH 4	Neighborhood Park Acquisition	Develop ~1 acre of upland adjacent to Glen Echo Wetlands as parkland	Neighborhood	0-10 Years	1.00	385,000	76.90%	296,074	
NH 5	Neighborhood Park Acquisition	Acquire 1-1.5 acres near High st. & Kenmore as future parkland	Neighborhood	7-10 Years	1.25	550,000	76.90%	422,962	
P 1a	Robin Hood Park	Install accessible route through park and to playground	Pocket	7-10 Years		8,500	4.36%	371	
P 1b	Robin Hood Park	Restripe basketball court	Pocket	7-10 Years		900	0.00%	0	
P 2a	Nick Shannon Memorial Park	Replace existing play equipment and fall safety surfacing	Pocket	0-6 Years		4,100	0.00%	0	
P 2b	Nick Shannon Memorial Park	Install ADA playground equipment	Pocket	0-6 Years		100,000	4.36%	4,360	
P 2c	Nick Shannon Memorial Park	Install a paved path system to provide access to park amenities	Pocket	0-6 Years		10,000	4.36%	436	
OS 1	Olson Wetlands	Install nature/interpretive trail, boardwalk and viewing areas	Open Space/ Natural Area	0-6 Years		650,000	0.00%	0	
OS 2	Glen Echo Wetlands	Install nature/interpretive trail, boardwalk and viewing areas	Open Space/ Natural Area	0-6 Years		450,000	0.00%	0	
OS 3a	Cross Park	Repair and upgrade trail; Repair retaining wall; Remove abandoned stairway	Open Space/ Natural Area	0-6 Years		5,700	0.00%	0	
OS 3b	Cross Park	Stabilize bank to prevent erosion and safety concerns	Open Space/ Natural Area	0-6 Years		20,000	0.00%	0	

Project #	Project	Description	Type	Timing	Acres	Project Cost	Percent Eligible for Improvement Fee	Improvement Fee Eligible Costs	Other Notes
T 1	PTC/Abernathy Lane Trail	Improve street crossings for safety and ADA compliance	Trail	0-6 Years		14,600	4.36%	637	
T 2	Abernathy Lane Trail to Clackamas	Extend trail along Portland Avenue to trail at Charles Ames Memorial Park	Trail	0-6 Years	1.35	31,000	76.90%	23,840	
T 3a	Clackamas Waterfront	Conduct planning assessment for Highway 99E trail crossing	Trail	0-6 Years		50,000	76.90%	38,451	
T 3b	Clackamas Waterfront	Extend trail between Dahl Beach and Charles Ames Memorial Park	Trail	0-6 Years	1.75	16,500	76.90%	12,689	
System 1	Wayfinding & Sign Program	Install coordinated park entry, directional and regulatory signage system	General	0-6 Years		40,000	0.00%	0	
System 2a	Minor Repairs & Renovations		General	0-10 Years		140,000	0.00%	0	
System 3a	ADA Compliance Upgrades	ADA-compliant benches, picnic tables, ramps, signs, accessways	General	0-10 Years		90,000	4.36%	3,924	
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$4,613,400</b>		<b>\$1,781,045</b>	

Source: Gladstone Parks Master Plan.