

RESOLUTION NO. 1149

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE METHODOLOGIES AND
FEES FOR TRANSPORTATION AND PARKS
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES**

WHEREAS, the Canby City Council has determined by Ordinance No. 867 that a charge shall be imposed upon new development for acquiring funds for capital improvements, and for reimbursement of constructed excess capacity to the City's Transportation and Park system; and

WHEREAS, said Ordinance No. 867 provides that methodology and charges for capital acquisition, improvements, and reimbursements be established and amended by resolution; and

WHEREAS, ORS 310.145 requires that a governing body, when adopting or amending a fee resolution imposing new rates, may include a provision classifying said fees as subject to or not subject to the limitations set in Section 11 (b), Article XI of the Oregon Constitution; and

RESOLVED, that the following methodology for system development charges for the City of Canby, attached here to as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" be adopted to amend the current park and transportation system development charges effective immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, except as otherwise specified in Ordinance 867, future changes to the methodology and charges resulting solely from inflationary cost impacts shall be measured and calculated annually by the City Recorder and charged according based upon changes in the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index (ENR Index) of Portland, Oregon, with the current ENR Index as of enactment of this Resolution to be used for the basis of future calculations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canby City Council hereby classifies the charges imposed herein as not being subject to the limitations imposed by Section 11 (b), Article XI of the Oregon Constitution and that the City Recorder is hereby directed to publish notice in accordance with ORS 310.145.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Canby, as follows:

- (1) The Canby City Council adopts the City of Canby Transportation and Park System Development Charges as attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B".

This resolution shall take effect January 16, 2013.

ADOPTED BY THE CANBY CITY COUNCIL, at a regular meeting thereof on
January 16, 2013.



Brian Hodson
Mayor

ATTEST:



Kimberly Scheafer, MMC
City Recorder

Exhibit "A"

Canby, Oregon



Draft Report for PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE STUDY

October, 2012

FCS GROUP
4380 SW Macadam Ave. Suite 220
Portland, OR 97239
T: 503.841.6543 | F: 503.841.6573

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| SECTION I: BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| A. Policy | 1 |
| B. Project | 1 |
| SECTION II: METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| A. Reimbursement Fee | 4 |
| B. Improvement Fee | 4 |
| C. Compliance Costs..... | 4 |
| D. Summary | 5 |
| SECTION III: GROWTH CALCULATION | 7 |
| A. Relevant Types of Growth..... | 7 |
| B. Population Growth..... | 7 |
| B.1 Expected Growth..... | 7 |
| B.2 Conversion to Dwelling Units | 7 |
| C. Employment Growth..... | 8 |
| D. Demand..... | 8 |
| SECTION IV: COST CALCULATION | 11 |
| A. Current Facilities | 11 |
| B. Facility Needs | 11 |
| C. Facility Costs | 12 |
| C.1 Projects | 12 |
| C.2 Allocation to Residents and Employees..... | 12 |
| D. Adjustments..... | 12 |
| E. Summary | 13 |
| SECTION V: SDC CALCULATION | 14 |
| A. Residential Cost per Capita | 14 |
| B. Residential SDC per Dwelling Unit..... | 14 |
| C. Non-Residential SDC per Employee | 14 |
| D. Summary and Comparison..... | 14 |

SECTION I: BACKGROUND

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

A. POLICY

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.297 to 223.314 authorize local governments to establish system development charges (SDCs). These are one-time fees on new development, and they are 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 SDC:

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

B. PROJECT

The City last revised its methodology for parks and recreation SDCs in 2004. In 2011, the City contracted with FCS GROUP to update its parks and recreation SDCs.

We approached this project as a series of three steps:

- **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 planned facility costs and calculate draft SDC rates.
- **Draft Methodology Report Preparation.** In this step, we documented the calculation of the draft SDC rates included in this report.

SECTION II: METHODOLOGY

This section provides a non-numeric overview of the calculations that result in SDC rates.

A. REIMBURSEMENT FEE

In order for a reimbursement fee to be calculated, excess (i.e., not currently utilized) capacity must be available to serve future growth. Our analysis of the current inventory of parks and the level of service standards in the master plan indicates that the City currently has no excess capacity in its parks system. Therefore, no basis for a reimbursement fee exists.

B. IMPROVEMENT FEE

The improvement fee is the cost of capacity-increasing capital projects per unit of growth that those projects will serve. The unit of growth, whether number of new residents or number of new employees, is 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 SDC rate, 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 in proportion to the growth-related capacity that projects of a similar type will create. For example, suppose that a city’s master plan included the acquisition and development of 100 acres of new neighborhood parks. Suppose further that our analysis determined that 30 acres were required to meet existing demand, and 70 acres were required to serve future users. In that case, only 70 percent of the cost for any new neighborhood park would be eligible for recovery with an improvement fee.

Growth should be measured in units that most directly reflect the source of demand. In the case of parks, the most applicable units of growth are population and, where appropriate, population equivalents. However, the units in which demand is expressed may not be the same as the units in which SDC rates are charged. Many SDCs, for example, are charged in the basis of dwelling units. Therefore, conversion is often necessary from units of demand to units of payment. For example, using an average number of residents per household, the number of new residents can be converted to the number of new dwelling units.

C. COMPLIANCE COSTS

ORS 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs on “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, this report includes an estimate of compliance costs in its SDC rates.

D. SUMMARY

In general, SDC rates are calculated by adding the reimbursement fee (if applicable) component, improvement fee component, and compliance cost component. Each component is calculated by dividing the eligible cost by the growth of units of demand. The unit of demand becomes the basis of the charge. **Exhibit 1** shows this calculation in equation format:

| SDC Equation | | | Exhibit 1 |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Eligible costs of excess capacity in existing facilities | + | Eligible costs of capacity-increasing capital improvements | = |
| | + | Costs of complying with Oregon SDC law | |
| <hr/> Units of growth in demand (e.g., new residents) | | | SDC per unit of growth in demand |

Section III of this report provides detailed calculations related to growth in demand, which is the denominator in the SDC equation. **Section IV** of this report provides detailed calculations on eligible costs, which is the numerator in the SDC equation.

SECTION III: GROWTH CALCULATION

This section provides detailed calculations related to growth in demand, which is the denominator in the SDC equation.

A. RELEVANT TYPES OF GROWTH

Parks and recreation facilities benefit City residents, businesses, non-resident employees, and visitors. The methodology used to update the City's parks and recreation SDCs establishes the required connection between the demands of growth and the SDC by analyzing the proportionate need of residents and employees for such facilities. The SDCs to be paid by a development meet statutory requirements because they are based on the nature of the development and the extent of the impact of that development on the types of park and recreation facilities for which they are charged. The Parks and Recreation SDCs are calculated based on the specific impact a development is expected to have on the City's population and employment.

B. POPULATION GROWTH

Having established the relevance of population, we now quantify expected growth in population and convert the result to dwelling units.

B.1 Expected Growth

Exhibit 2 shows our population growth projections as calculated from both (1) data provided by the Population Research Center at Portland State University and (2) the assumptions of the transportation system plan (TSP).

| Growth in Population | | | Exhibit 2 |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Row | Description | Calculation | Value |
| a. | Population in 2012 | Note 1 | 15,830 |
| b. | Population in 2030 | Note 2 | 26,100 |
| c. | Compound average growth rate | $((b/a)^{1/(2030-2012)})-1$ | 2.82% |
| d. | Population in 2032 | $b*((1+c)^{(2032-2030)})$ | 27,591 |
| e. | Growth from 2012 to 2032 | d-a | 11,761 |
| Notes: | | | |
| 1. PSU Population Research Center estimate for July 1, 2011 | | | |
| 2. Canby TSP, Appendix G | | | |

B.2 Conversion to Dwelling Units

Residential SDCs are initially calculated based on costs per capita but are ultimately charged based on dwelling units. To convert population to dwelling units, we analyzed data gathered for Canby

from the most recent American Community Survey conducted by the U. S. Census Bureau. **Exhibit 3** shows the resulting conversion factors:

| Residents per Dwelling Unit | | Exhibit 3 |
|---|--|-----------|
| Type of Dwelling Unit | | Residents |
| Single-family | | 2.87 |
| Multi-family | | 2.99 |
| Manufactured | | 2.40 |
| Source: 2006-10 American Community Survey | | |
| Table B25024 (units in structure) | | |
| Table B25033 (pop. in occupied housing units) | | |

C. EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

Having established the relevance of employment, we now quantify expected growth in employment. **Exhibit 4** shows our population growth projections as calculated from the data and assumptions of the TSP.

| Growth in Employment | | | Exhibit 4 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Row | Description | Calculation | Value |
| a. | Employment in 2009 | Note 1 | 3,965 |
| b. | Employment in 2030 | Note 1 | 8,588 |
| c. | Compound average growth rate | $((b/a)^{1/(2030-2009)})-1$ | 3.75% |
| d. | Employment in 2012 | $a*((1+c)^{(2012-2009)})$ | 4,428 |
| e. | Employment in 2032 | $b*((1+c)^{(2032-2030)})$ | 9,244 |
| f. | Growth from 2012 to 2032 | e-d | 4,816 |
| Notes: | | | |
| 1. Canby TSP, Appendix G | | | |

D. DEMAND

The parks and recreation facilities described in the capital improvement plan below were mostly designed with the needs of both residents and non-resident employees in mind. It is therefore appropriate to allocate the cost of these facilities to both residents and non-resident employees. However, these two groups do not utilize parks and recreation facilities with the same intensity. To apportion the demand for facilities between non-resident employees and residents in an equitable manner, we must account for differential intensity of use by different types of users.

First, we estimate the potential demand for parks and recreation facilities by type of user. **Exhibit 5** presents potential use by different population groups in a manner that averages day-of-week and seasonal effects. These averages are based on the maximum number of hours per day that each population group would consider the use of parks and recreation facilities to be a viable option.

| Season, Day, and Time | Residents | | | | Non-Residents |
|---|---|-------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Non-Employed, Ages 16+ | Ages 5-15 | Work inside City | Work outside City | Work inside City |
| | Potential Daily Demand by Population Group Exhibit 5 | | | | |
| Summer (June through September) | | | | | |
| Weekday | | | | | |
| Before work | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |
| Meals and breaks | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |
| After work | | | 2.00 | | 2.00 |
| Other leisure | 14.00 | 14.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | |
| Total weekday | 14.00 | 14.00 | 6.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| Weekend | | | | | |
| Total summer | 14.00 | 14.00 | 8.29 | 5.43 | 2.86 |
| Spring/fall (April, May, October, and November) | | | | | |
| Weekday | | | | | |
| Before work | | | 0.50 | | 0.50 |
| Meals and breaks | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |
| After work | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |
| Other leisure | 10.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | |
| Total weekday | 10.00 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 2.00 | 2.50 |
| Weekend | | | | | |
| Total spring/fall | 10.00 | 5.71 | 6.07 | 4.29 | 1.79 |
| Winter (December through March) | | | | | |
| Weekday | | | | | |
| Before work | | | 0.50 | | 0.50 |
| Meals and breaks | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |
| After work | | | 0.50 | | 0.50 |
| Other leisure | 9.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Total weekday | 9.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Weekend | | | | | |
| Total winter | 9.00 | 4.00 | 4.71 | 3.29 | 1.43 |
| Weighting factors | | | | | |
| Summer | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Spring/fall | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Winter | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Total weighting factors | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Daily weighted average hours | 11.00 | 7.90 | 6.36 | 4.33 | 2.02 |

Source: FCS GROUP

Second, we multiply the weighted average hours derived in **Exhibit 5** by an actual count for each population group. The counts in **Exhibit 6** are based on U. S. Census Bureau data for 2010.

Estimate and Allocation of Daily Demand

Exhibit 6

| Description | Residents | | | | Non-Residents | Total | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------|--------|
| | Non-Employed, Ages 16+ | Ages 5-15 | Work inside City | Work outside City | Work inside City | # | % |
| Census counts | 4,152 | 2,752 | 1,575 | 5,582 | 3,006 | 17,067 | |
| Daily weighted average hours | 11.00 | 7.90 | 6.36 | 4.33 | 2.02 | 32 | |
| Total potential daily demand in hours | 45,667 | 21,754 | 10,010 | 24,191 | 6,085 | 107,705 | |
| Allocation of demand: | | | | | | 0 | |
| Residence-related demand in hours | 45,667 | 21,754 | 6,823 | 24,191 | 0 | 98,434 | 91.4% |
| Employment-related demand in hours | 0 | 0 | 3,187 | 0 | 6,085 | 9,271 | 8.6% |
| Total potential daily demand in hours | 45,667 | 21,754 | 10,010 | 24,191 | 6,085 | 107,705 | 100.0% |

Source: U. S. Census Bureau (2010 data) and Exhibit 5

For most population groups, demand is clearly either residence-related or employment-related. Those who live and work inside Canby, however, have both types of demand. Based on **Exhibit 5**, a person who both lives and works in Canby has 3.1 times the demand for parks and recreational facilities than a person who just work in Canby. This multiple suggests that, for a person who both lives and works in Canby, residence-related demand is more than twice that person's employment-related demand. When this allocation is combined with other population groups (in the bottom three rows of **Exhibit 6**), 91.4 percent of all demand is residence related, and 8.6 percent is employment-related.

SECTION IV: COST CALCULATION

This section provides detailed calculations on eligible costs, which is the numerator in the SDC equation.

A. CURRENT FACILITIES

As detailed in **Exhibit 7**, the City has a current inventory of 71.0 developed acres in parks and recreation facilities.

| Current Park Inventory | | Exhibit 7 | | |
|------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Classification | Facility | Total Acres | Developed Portion | Developed Acres |
| Community Park | Canby Community Park | 14.5 | 100% | 14.5 |
| Community Park | Eco Park | 19.0 | 100% | 19.0 |
| Community Park | Skate Park | 1.5 | 100% | 1.5 |
| Mini-Park | 19th Avenue Loop | 1.8 | 100% | 1.8 |
| Mini-Park | Arneson Garden | 1.8 | 100% | 1.8 |
| Mini-Park | Faist Lot | 0.3 | 0% | 0.0 |
| Mini-Park | Holly Corners | 0.2 | 100% | 0.2 |
| Mini-Park | Locust Street Park | 1.0 | 100% | 1.0 |
| Mini-Park | Northwoods Park | 1.9 | 100% | 1.9 |
| Mini-Park | Viet Nam Memorial Park | 0.2 | 100% | 0.2 |
| Mini-Park | Wait Park | 2.0 | 100% | 2.0 |
| Neighborhood Park | Willamette Wayside: Disc golf facility | 10.0 | 100% | 10.0 |
| Neighborhood Park | Dog Park | 6.0 | 0% | 0.0 |
| Neighborhood Park | Willamette Wayside: Restricted | 64.0 | 0% | 0.0 |
| Neighborhood Park | Legacy Park | 5.7 | 100% | 5.7 |
| Neighborhood Park | Maple Street Park | 9.0 | 100% | 9.0 |
| Neighborhood Park | NW Neighborhood Park | 2.4 | 100% | 2.4 |
| | | <u>141.4</u> | | <u>71.0</u> |

Source: Canby Parks Acquisition Plan and City staff

B. FACILITY NEEDS

The City's adopted standard for parks and recreation facilities is 10 acres per 1,000 residents. With a population of 15,830 in 2012, the City currently needs 158.3 acres of parks to meet this standard. With a current inventory of only 71.0 acres, the City has a current deficiency of 87.3 acres. To meet the needs of growth by 2032, the City will need to cure this deficiency and provide an additional 117.6 acres.

The projects listed in the capital improvement plan are eligible for SDC funding only to the extent that the projects will benefit future users (rather than cure an existing deficiency). As shown in

Exhibit 8, only 57.4 percent of the planned capital improvements will benefit future users. Therefore, only 57.4 percent of the improvements' costs can be recovered through SDCs.

| Park Needs and SDC Eligibility | | Exhibit 8 | |
|---|--------|----------------------------|--------|
| Description | 2012 | Increase from 2012 to 2032 | 2032 |
| Parks needs | | | |
| Population | 15,830 | 11,761 | 27,591 |
| Parks standard per 1,000 residents | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Needed acres of parks | 158.3 | 117.6 | 275.9 |
| SDC eligibility | | | |
| Current developed parks in acres | 71.0 | | 71.0 |
| Needed additions in acres | 87.3 | 117.6 | 204.9 |
| Needed acres of parks | 158.3 | 117.6 | 275.9 |
| Deficiency/growth proportions | 42.6% | 57.4% | 100.0% |
| SDC Eligibility | | | |
| <i>Source: Exhibits 2 and 7, City staff</i> | | | |

C. FACILITY COSTS

Over the next 20 years, the City intends to acquire and/or develop parks and recreation facilities with a total estimated cost of \$39,470,100. Of that cost, \$22,658,754 (or 57.4 percent) can be recovered through SDCs.

C.1 Projects

Exhibit 9 shows the projects that constitute the capital improvement plan for parks and recreation facilities.

| Capital Improvement Plan for Parks | | | Exhibit 9 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Project | Estimated Cost | SDC Eligibility | SDC-Eligible Cost |
| Willamette Wayside Improvements | \$ 323,700 | 57.4% | \$ 185,828 |
| Logging Road Trail Corridor | 145,000 | 57.4% | 83,241 |
| Swim Center Replacement/Addition | 10,020,000 | 57.4% | 5,752,220 |
| Northwoods Park | 325,000 | 57.4% | 186,574 |
| NW Neighborhood Park North | 350,000 | 57.4% | 200,926 |
| Acquisition and Development | 28,306,400 | 57.4% | 16,249,965 |
| | <u>\$39,470,100</u> | | <u>\$ 22,658,754</u> |
| <i>Source: City staff</i> | | | |

C.2 Allocation to Residents and Employees

After determining the total SDC-eligible costs, these costs must be allocated between residents and employees. Using the allocation percentages from **Exhibit 6**, the portion of facility costs that is attributable to residents is \$20,708,328 (or 91.4 percent). The portion attributable to employees is \$1,950,426 (or 8.6 percent).

D. ADJUSTMENTS

The City incurs costs in the development and administration of SDCs and may recover those costs as provided in ORS 223.307(5). We estimate recoverable costs during the planning period of \$559,365.

Finally, because the City's SDC fund has a balance of \$843,521, the costs to be recovered through SDCs can also be reduced by that amount.

E. SUMMARY

Exhibit 10 summarizes and allocates SDC-eligible costs after all adjustments.

| Allocation of SDC-Eligible Costs | | Exhibit 10 | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Cost Type | SDC-Eligible Costs | Residents | | Employees | |
| | | % | \$ | % | \$ |
| Facilities | \$ 22,658,754 | 91.4% | \$ 20,708,328 | 8.6% | \$ 1,950,426 |
| Compliance | 559,365 | 91.4% | 511,216 | 8.6% | 48,149 |
| Fund balance | (843,521) | 91.4% | (770,912) | 8.6% | (72,609) |
| | <u>\$ 22,374,598</u> | | <u>\$ 20,448,631</u> | | <u>\$ 1,925,966</u> |
| Growth in residents/employees | | | 11,761 | | 4,816 |
| Cost per resident/employee | | | \$ 1,739 | | \$ 400 |
| <i>Source: Exhibits 2, 4, 6, 9 and FY 2010-11 CAFR</i> | | | | | |

SECTION V: SDC CALCULATION

This section provides a detailed calculation of the residential and non-residential SDCs.

A. RESIDENTIAL COST PER CAPITA

As shown in **Exhibit 10**, total residential costs of \$20,448,631 divided by expected growth of 11,761 residents results in a cost per capita of \$1,739.

B. RESIDENTIAL SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

When we convert population to the dwelling units described in **Exhibit 3**, we can determine the total SDC per dwelling unit as shown in **Exhibit 11**.

| SDC per Dwelling Unit | | | Exhibit 11 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Type of Dwelling Unit | Cost per Capita | Residents per Dwelling Unit | SDC per Dwelling Unit |
| Single-Family | \$1,739 | 2.87 | \$ 4,987 |
| Multi-Family | \$1,739 | 2.99 | \$ 5,192 |
| Manufactured | \$1,739 | 2.40 | \$ 4,165 |

Source: Exhibits 3 and 10

C. NON-RESIDENTIAL SDC PER EMPLOYEE

As shown in **Exhibit 10**, total employment-related costs of \$1,925,966 divided by expected growth of 4,816 employees results in a cost per employee of \$400.

D. SUMMARY AND COMPARISON

Exhibit 12 concludes our report by summarizing the SDC calculations and comparing them with SDCs currently in effect.

Comparison of SDCs

Exhibit 12

| Type of SDC | Fee | | Change | |
|--|---------|----------|----------|--------|
| | Current | Proposed | \$ | % |
| Residential, Single-Family | \$4,725 | \$ 4,987 | \$ 262 | 5.5% |
| Residential, Multi-Family | \$3,869 | \$ 5,192 | \$ 1,323 | 34.2% |
| Residential, Manufactured | \$3,874 | \$ 4,165 | \$ 291 | 7.5% |
| Non-Residential, Per Employee | \$ 129 | \$ 400 | \$ 271 | 210.0% |
| <i>Source: Master Fee Schedule, Exhibits 10 and 11</i> | | | | |

EXHIBIT "B"

Canby, Oregon



Draft Report for TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE STUDY

October 5, 2012

FCS GROUP
4380 SW Macadam Ave. Suite 220
Portland, OR 97239
T: 503.841.6543 | F: 503.841.6573

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| SECTION I: BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| A. Policy | 1 |
| B. Project | 1 |
| SECTION II: METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| A. Reimbursement Fee cost basis..... | 4 |
| B. Improvement Fee cost basis..... | 4 |
| C. Compliance Costs..... | 5 |
| D. Summary | 5 |
| SECTION III: GROWTH CALCULATION | 7 |
| A. Relevant Types of Growth..... | 7 |
| B. Growth in TRIP Ends | 7 |
| B.1 Expected Growth Levels | 7 |
| B.2 Calculating the Growth Share | 8 |
| SECTION IV: COST CALCULATION | 9 |
| A. improvement fee | 9 |
| A1. Cost Per Person Trip-End..... | 9 |
| A2. Adjustment for Current Fund Balance | 10 |
| A3. New Person Trip-Ends Per Unit of Development | 11 |
| A4. Trip-Length Adjustment..... | 11 |
| A5. Motor Vehicle Improvements Cost Per Unit of Development..... | 12 |
| A6. Non-Motorized Facility Improvements Cost Per Unit of Development | 12 |
| A7. Compliance Cost Per Unit of Development | 12 |
| B. Reimbursement fee..... | 13 |
| C. TOTAL TRANSPORTATION SDC..... | 13 |
| SECTION V: SUMMARY | 15 |
| A. SDC Cost per unit of development | 15 |
| B. credits, exemptions and discounts..... | 16 |
| C. Indexing | 16 |
| D. Summary and Comparison..... | 17 |
| APPENDIX | 18 |
| A. Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis | |
| B. Long Range Transportation Capital Improvement Program | |
| C. Transportation SDC by Land Use Classification | |

SECTION I: BACKGROUND

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

A. POLICY

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.297 to 223.314 authorize local governments to establish system development charges (SDCs). These are one-time fees on new development, and they are 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 SDC:

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

B. PROJECT

The City last revised its methodology for transportation SDCs in 2004. In 2011, the City contracted with FCS GROUP to update its transportation SDCs.

We approached this project as a series of three steps:

- **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 planned facility costs and calculate draft SDC rates.
- **Draft Methodology Report Preparation.** In this step, we documented the calculation of the draft SDC rates included in this report.

SECTION II: METHODOLOGY

This section provides a non-numeric overview of the calculations that result in SDC rates.

A. REIMBURSEMENT FEE COST BASIS

Canby currently charges a reimbursement fee related to the estimated cost of unused system capacity investments on the local collector and arterial street system. In order for a reimbursement fee to continue to be collected and calculated, excess (i.e., not currently utilized) capacity must be available to serve future growth.

The current estimated value of Canby's excess capacity in the transportation system was determined based on the prior actual City cost of SDC-funded capacity projects. The actual historic cost incurred by the City of Canby for capacity-increasing transportation facilities is shown in **Appendix A**. The eligible reimbursement costs is determined by adjusting the actual capital facility cost expenditures downward to reflect the amount of capacity that has "used up" since the facility was constructed. Next, all costs were converted to year 2012 dollar amounts to adjust for inflation using factors derived from the *Engineering News Record*, Seattle Cost Index. The resulting calculated reimbursement fee cost basis of the unused roadway capacity in the transportation system is **\$4,650,750**.

B. IMPROVEMENT FEE COST BASIS

The "improvements-driven" approach is based on a specific list of planned capacity-increasing capital improvements. The portion of each project that is attributable to growth is determined, and the SDC-eligible costs are calculated by dividing the total costs of growth-required projects by the projected increase in demand. This approach works best where a detailed and up-to-date master plan or project list is available and the benefits of projects can be readily apportioned between growth and current users.

We recommend that Canby continue to utilize the "improvements-driven capacity approach" to allocate costs to the improvement fee basis for roadways as well as non-motorized facilities, including sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Canby's current transportation SDC methodology uses a variation of an "improvements-driven capacity approach" to allocate costs to the improvement fee basis. Under the "improvements-driven capacity approach," the cost of a given project is allocated to growth proportionately by the capacity made available for growth.

Ideally, the most directly applicable measure of capacity demand should be used as the basis for allocation. The *Canby Transportation System Plan, (2010)*, includes a list of "financially constrained" transportation system plan (TSP) improvements that are needed to address future

growth needs. The Canby TSP long-range capital improvement project list has been adjusted to account for non-capacity projects and non-local funding sources (please refer to Appendix B).

According to the *Canby TSP (2010)* “financially constrained” plan, and after adjusting for projects that have already been completed, the long-range TSP facility improvements needed to address future capacity needs in Canby is \$38,828,000 (adjusted to 2012 dollars).

After accounting for capacity and local funding share assumptions (shown in **Appendix B**), \$25,016,000 in capital improvements is considered to be SDC eligible (locally SDC funded and needed to address growth). **The SDC eligible facility cost includes \$19,483,000 in roadway facilities, \$2,960,000 in bicycle facilities, and \$2,573,000 in pedestrian facilities** (costs in 2012 dollars), as reflected in **Appendix B**.

C. COMPLIANCE COSTS

ORS 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs on “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, **this TSDC methodology update assumes that local City compliance costs will equate to 2.5% of the eligible TSDC facility costs (equals \$625,400 over the next 20 years or an average cost of \$31,270 per year).**

D. SUMMARY

In general, SDC rates are calculated by adding the reimbursement fee component, improvement fee component, and compliance cost component. Each component is calculated by dividing the eligible cost by the growth of units of demand.

Section III of this report provides detailed calculations related to growth in demand, which is the denominator in the SDC equation. **Section IV** of this report provides detailed calculations on eligible costs, which is the numerator in the SDC equation.

SECTION III: GROWTH CALCULATION

This section provides detailed calculations related to growth in demand, which is the denominator in the SDC equation.

A. RELEVANT TYPES OF GROWTH

Canby's existing transportation SDCs are based on projected "equivalent length new daily trips" for motor vehicle trip generation. In light of the fact that the current *Canby TSP (2010)* plans to provide a balanced transportation system with a mix of roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, it is recommended that the City's revised SDC methodology utilize an average daily (weekday) "person trip" basis for determining local SDCs required to pay for the growth-related share of all types of transportation modes of travel (including roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities).

Transportation engineers commonly use peak-hour trip or average daily trip estimates to assess transportation performance and determine system needs. Average weekday P.M. peak-hour vehicle trip generation rates were derived from the *Canby TSP (2010)* with internal (inside city limit) trip estimates for 2010 and projections for 2030. Using the traffic modeling assumptions from the *Canby TSP*, internal trip rates were interpolated for year 2012 and extrapolated for year 2032. Average weekday *motor vehicle* trip generation statistics provided in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual* for each land use type and development size serve as the basis for converting peak-hour vehicle trip-ends to average weekday trip-end estimates and projections.

This new transportation SDC methodology includes additional calculations to identify average daily *person-trips*. In addition to trips by motor vehicles, *person-trips* also include non-motor vehicle trips that utilize bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The proposed charges continue to adjust for linked trips (also known as pass-by trips) and average trip length. The calculation of the proposed TSDC rates is summarized below.

B. GROWTH IN TRIP ENDS

Having established the relevance of average weekday person-trip ends, we now quantify expected growth rates.

B.1 Expected Growth Levels

To convert vehicle trips to person trips, we analyzed data from the *Canby TSP (2010)* and applied factors to convert average weekday vehicle trips to average weekday person trips using findings from the *U.S. National Household Transportation Survey (2009)*, conducted by the U. S. Department of Transportation. Based on the current *Canby TSP* trip-end estimates and projections, the number of internal average weekday person-trip-ends in Canby is projected to increase by 162,431 between

2012 and 2032, as shown in **Table 1**. The rate of increase in trips equates to 3.1% annually over this time period.

B.2 Calculating the Growth Share

New collector or arterial facilities (roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities) that are only needed to serve growth are 100% SDC eligible.

Existing roadways and bicycle/pedestrian facilities that are planned for expansion may only be partially eligible for SDC funding. The share of existing transportation facilities that are planned for capacity upgrades to serve future growth needs is determined to be 46.8%, as shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Canby Existing and Projected Weekday Person-Trip-Ends: 2012 to 2032

| a | b | c | d | e | f | g |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Trip Generator | Est. 2012 (Avg. Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends) ¹ | Proj. 2032 (Avg. Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends) ¹ | Est. 2012 (Avg. Weekday Person Trip Ends) ² | Proj. 2032 (Avg. Weekday Person Trip Ends) ² | Increase in Person Trip- ends (e - d) | Trip End Avg. Annual Growth Rate (AAGR) |
| Residential Trip-ends | 49,647 | 83,161 | 83,406 | 139,711 | 56,304 | 2.6% |
| Retail Trip-ends | 26,605 | 57,043 | 44,697 | 95,832 | 51,136 | 3.7% |
| Non-retail Trip-ends | 33,583 | 66,315 | 56,419 | 111,410 | 54,991 | 3.3% |
| Total Trip-ends | 109,835 | 206,520 | 184,522 | 346,953 | 162,431 | 3.1% |
| New person trips as a % of total future trips | | | | | 46.8% | |
| <i>Notes:</i> | | | | | | |
| 1 Derived from Canby Transportation System Plan, March 2010, with 2012 estimates and 2032 projections based on extrapolations of 2010 to 2030 forecast. Assumes peak trips account for 10% of average weekday trip rates. | | | | | | |
| 2 Person trip conversion rate of 1.68 derived from 2009 U.S. National Household Transportation Survey findings. | | | | | | |

SECTION IV: COST CALCULATION

This section provides detailed calculations on eligible costs, which is the numerator in the SDC equation. The Canby Transportation SDC rates are calculated using the following series of formulas which:

- a) Calculate the cost per person trip-end for motor vehicle improvements, non-motorized facility improvements, reimbursement costs, and compliance costs,
- b) Identify the number of new person trips for each type of land use,
- c) Adjust trip rates by land use type to allow for differences in “linked” or “pass-by” trips,
- d) Adjust trip rates by land use type to allow for differences in trip lengths,
- e) Calculate the motor vehicle improvements cost and SDC fee per trip-end and unit of development,
- f) Calculate the non-motorized (bicycle and pedestrian) facility improvements cost and SDC fee per trip-end and unit of development,
- g) Calculate the reimbursement cost and SDC fee per trip-end and unit of development,
- h) Calculate the compliance cost and SDC fee per trip-end and unit of development, and
- i) Calculate the total transportation SDC cost per unit of development.

A. IMPROVEMENT FEE

The projects listed in the financially constrained long-range transportation capital improvement plan that are eligible for SDC funding can only to the extent that the projects will benefit future users (rather than cure an existing deficiency). As mentioned previously, the total eligible SDC share of local transportation facilities is \$25,016,000, of which \$19,483,000 is for planned roadway facilities and \$5,533,000 is for planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities (costs in 2012 dollars), as reflected in **Appendix B**.

To calculate the improvement fee by unit of development, the following calculations were made.

A1. Cost Per Person Trip-End

The capital improvements included in the appendices include both motor vehicle improvements and non-motorized facility improvements. The cost per person trip-end is calculated for each of these modes and for compliance costs by dividing the SDC-eligible costs by the increase in the average number of new person trip-ends shown in **Table 2**, using the following formula:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} & & \text{Increase In} & & \text{SDC-Eligible Cost} \\ & \text{SDC-Eligible} & \text{Person} & = & \text{Per Person} \\ & \text{Cost (after reserves)} & \text{Trip-Ends} & & \text{Trip-End} \end{array}$$

The SDC-Eligible Cost Per Person Trip-End for each mode and for compliance costs are shown in **Appendix C-1** and summarized in **Table 2**, below.

Table 2

SDC-Eligible Cost Per Person Trip End, Before Existing SDC Fund Balance

| Type of Cost | SDC-Eligible Cost | Avg. Weekday Person Trip-Ends | = | Cost Per New Person Trip-End* |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Motor Vehicle Facility Cost | \$19,483,000 | ÷ 162,431 | = | \$119.95 |
| Non-Motorized Facility Cost | \$5,533,000 | ÷ 162,431 | = | \$36.06 |
| Compliance Cost | \$625,000 | ÷ 162,431 | = | \$3.85 |

* denotes cost per person-trip end before deducting existing fund balance.

A2. Adjustment for Current Fund Balance

The transportation improvement SDC fund balance that has been collected by the City but not yet committed or spent has been deducted from total eligible SDC facility costs. According to City staff the existing fund balance is estimated to equate to approximately \$438,000. The adjusted eligible SDC for motor vehicle facility costs per person trip-end after deducting the current fund balance from the SDC cost per trip end is shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3

SDC-Eligible SDC Cost Per Person Trip End, After Existing SDC Fund Balance

| a | b | c | d | e |
|--|---------------------|--|--|---|
| | TSDC Eligible Cost | Growth in Avg. Weekday Person Trip Ends ⁴ | Eligible TSDC Cost Per Person Trip End Before Fund Balance (b / d) | Eligible TSDC Cost Per Person Trip End After Fund Balance |
| Motor Vehicle Facility Costs ¹ | \$19,483,000 | 162,431 | \$119.95 | \$117.90 |
| Pedestrian/Bicycle Facility Costs ¹ | \$5,533,000 | 162,431 | \$34.06 | \$33.48 |
| Subtotal | \$25,016,000 | | | |
| Compliance Costs ² | \$625,000 | 162,431 | \$3.85 | \$3.78 |
| Subtotal | \$25,641,000 | | | |
| Less SDC Fund Balance ³ | (\$438,000) | 162,431 | -\$2.70 | |
| Total | \$25,203,000 | 162,431 | \$155.16 | \$155.16 |

Notes:

¹ Derived from Appendix B. Amounts shown are adjusted to 2012 dollars.

² Assumed to be 2.5% of total SDC eligible capital costs, and allocated based on capital cost allocation shown above.

³ Based on City staff estimates.

⁴ Derived from Table 1.

A3. New Person Trip-Ends Per Unit of Development

The number of new person trip-ends generated per day is calculated for each type of land use using the following formula:

$$\text{ITE Trip Rate} \times \text{Number of Person Trips} \times \text{Percent New Trips} = \text{New Person-Trip Ends}$$

The ITE *Trip Generation* manual contains trip rates based on trip generation studies conducted nationwide, and provides the base data of unadjusted counts of trips generated by various types of land use. The trip rates included in *Trip Generation* include all traffic entering or leaving a primary location, and do not account for traffic that is passing by and interrupts a “primary” trip between two other locations. These “pass-by” trips are not “new” because they would occur regardless of development activity.

"New" trips are often based on the assumption that all trips from residential land uses are new trips (therefore, percentage = 100%), and all other land uses are evaluated to reflect the percentage of their trips that are "new" versus the remainder (which are "pass-by" trips). No land use category has greater than 100% new trips, but some categories have as few as 34% new trips. The percentages used to account for pass-by trips in this methodology are based on pass-by data included in the ITE *Trip Generation Handbook, 2nd Edition* (2004).

Appendix C-1 lists the number of new trips generated for each selected ITE land use category, using Formula 2. Column 1 lists land use categories and their ITE code numbers. Column 2 contains the Weekday Average Trip Rate from ITE Trip Generation. Column 3 identifies the total person-trips (Column 2 X 1.68) (projected total person trips for all modes of travel per motor vehicle trip per *U.S. National Household Transportation Survey, 2009*). Column 4 identifies the percentage of trips that are new, as opposed to pass-by trips. Column 5 is the result of multiplying columns 3 and 4 by each other, producing the number of new person trips generated per day for each land use category. (NOTE: Because of small sample sizes in Trip Generation, some land use categories do not include trip rates or a number of net new trips generated. For these categories, the trip generation rate for the land use which is the most similar to actual land use will be used in determining the amount of the Transportation SDC).

A4. Trip-Length Adjustment

The ITE trip generation rates do not account for differences in the lengths of trips for different types of development. Because longer trips have a relatively greater impact on the road system than do shorter trips, an adjustment factor is needed to account for differences in trip lengths relative to the length of an “average” trip. The net adjusted trip-ends generated per day is determined for each type of land use by multiplying the number of new person trip-ends (from Formula 3) by the trip length factor for each type of land use:

$$\text{New Person Trip-Ends} \times \text{Trip Length Factor} = \text{Net Adjusted Trip-Ends Per Day}$$

Trip length data from surveys conducted for the U.S. Department of Transportation and published in the "*National Household Travel Survey*" (2009) were used in developing the Trip Length Factors, as were concepts and methods recommended by James C. Nicholas, in "The Calculation of Proportionate-Share

Impact Fees" (American Planning Association, 1988), and "Development Impact Fee Policy and Administration", (American Planning Association, 1990).

Appendix C-2 lists the net adjusted trip-ends per day for each type of development, as calculated using Formula 2. Column 1 repeats the ITE codes and land use categories, and Column 2 repeats the new trips per day from the last column of Appendix C-1. Column 3 presents the trip length factor for each type of land use. As the result of multiplying the number of trips (Column 2) by the trip length factor (Column 3), Column 4 displays the net adjusted trips per day for each land use category.

A5. Motor Vehicle Improvements Cost Per Unit of Development

The motor vehicle improvements cost per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use by the motor vehicle improvements cost per trip-end.

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \text{Net Adjusted} & & \text{Motor Vehicle} & & \text{Motor Vehicle} \\ \text{Person Trip-Ends} & \times & \text{Improvements} & = & \text{Improvements} \\ \text{Per Unit} & & \text{Cost Per Trip-End} & & \text{Cost Per Unit} \end{array}$$

Appendix C-3 displays the motor vehicle improvements cost per unit for each land use category. Column 1 repeats the ITE land use codes and categories, Column 2 repeats the net adjusted trip-ends for each land use category (from Appendix C-2), and column 3 shows the motor vehicle improvements cost per trip-end (from Appendix C-1). The Motor Vehicle Improvements Cost Per Unit, shown in Column 4, is calculated by multiplying the net adjusted trip-ends (Column 2) by the motor vehicle improvements cost per trip-end (Column 3).

A6. Non-Motorized Facility Improvements Cost Per Unit of Development

The non-motorized facility cost per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use by the non-motorized (bicycle and pedestrian facility) improvements cost per trip-end.

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \text{Net Adjusted} & & \text{Non-Motor Vehicle} & & \text{Non-Motor Vehicle} \\ \text{Person Trip-Ends} & \times & \text{Improvements} & = & \text{Improvements} \\ \text{Per Unit} & & \text{Cost Per Trip-End} & & \text{Cost Per Unit} \end{array}$$

Appendix D-4 displays the non-motorized facility improvements cost per unit for each land use category. Column 1 repeats the ITE land use codes and categories, and Column 2 repeats the net adjusted trip-ends for each land use category (from Appendix C-2). The non-motorized facility improvements cost per trip-end is shown in Column 3.

A7. Compliance Cost Per Unit of Development

The compliance cost per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use by the compliance cost per trip-end.

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \text{Net Adjusted} & & \text{Compliance} & & \text{Compliance} \\ \text{Person Trip-Ends} & \times & \text{Cost Per} & = & \text{Cost} \\ \text{Per Unit} & & \text{Trip-End} & & \text{Per Unit} \end{array}$$

Appendix C-5 displays the compliance cost per unit for each land use category. Column 1 repeats the ITE land use codes and categories, and Column 2 repeats the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use category. The compliance cost per trip-end is shown in Column 3. The Compliance Cost Per Unit shown in Column 4 is calculated by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use category (Column 2) by the compliance cost per person trip-end (Column 3).

B. REIMBURSEMENT FEE

As mentioned previously, the eligible reimbursement cost basis is **\$4,650,760**. The reimbursement fee is determined by dividing the reimbursement fee cost basis (\$4,650,760) by the projected increase in person-trip-ends (162,431) that is expected to occur in Canby between 2012 and 2032.

The reimbursement cost per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use by the compliance cost per trip-end.

$$\begin{array}{rcccl}
 \text{Net Adjusted} & & \text{Reimbursement} & & \text{Compliance} \\
 \text{Person Trip-Ends} & \text{X} & \text{Cost Per} & = & \text{Cost} \\
 \text{Per Unit} & & \text{Trip-End} & & \text{Per Unit}
 \end{array}$$

Appendix C-6 displays the reimbursement cost per unit for each land use category. Column 1 repeats the ITE land use codes and categories, and Column 2 repeats the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use category. The reimbursement cost per trip-end is shown in Column 3. The Reimbursement Cost Per Unit shown in Column 4 is calculated by multiplying the net adjusted person trip-ends for each land use category (Column 2) by the reimbursement cost per person trip-end (Column 3).

C. TOTAL TRANSPORTATION SDC

The Total Transportation SDC per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by adding the motor vehicle improvements SDC per unit (from Appendix C-3), the non-motorized facility improvements SDC per unit (from Appendix C-4), the compliance cost per unit (from Appendix C-5) and the reimbursement cost per unit (from Appendix C-6).

SECTION V: SUMMARY

This section provides a detailed calculation of the residential and non-residential SDCs.

A. SDC COST PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT

Table 4 displays the total Transportation SDC cost for selected ITE land use categories, which is determined from adding together the motor vehicle improvements SDC per unit (from Appendix C-3), the non-motorized facility improvements SDC per unit (from Appendix C-4), the compliance cost per unit (from Appendix C-5) and the reimbursement cost per unit (from Appendix C-6).

Table 4
Canby Transportation SDC Cost Per Unit of Development

| ITE LAND USE CODE/ CATEGORY | Motor Vehicle SDC ² | Non- Motor Vehicle SDC ³ | Compli- ance Cost ⁴ | Reim- bursement Cost ⁵ | Total Transpor- tation SDC | Unit ⁶ |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 210 Dwelling Unit | \$1,896 | \$538 | \$61 | \$460 | \$2,955 | /dwelling unit |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | \$1,327 | \$377 | \$43 | \$322 | \$2,069 | /dwelling unit |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | \$102 | \$29 | \$3 | \$25 | \$159 | /student |
| 560 Church | \$1,353 | \$384 | \$43 | \$329 | \$2,110 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | \$355 | \$101 | \$11 | \$86 | \$553 | /student |
| 630 Clinic | \$6,603 | \$1,875 | \$212 | \$1,604 | \$10,294 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | \$3,244 | \$921 | \$104 | \$788 | \$5,058 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 820 Shopping Center | \$3,143 | \$893 | \$101 | \$763 | \$4,900 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 850 Supermarket | \$10,887 | \$3,092 | \$349 | \$2,644 | \$16,972 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 853 Convenience Market | \$23,943 | \$6,800 | \$768 | \$5,815 | \$37,325 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | \$7,642 | \$2,170 | \$245 | \$1,856 | \$11,913 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | \$13,798 | \$3,919 | \$443 | \$3,351 | \$21,511 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | \$5,078 | \$1,442 | \$163 | \$1,233 | \$7,916 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | \$21,127 | \$6,000 | \$678 | \$5,131 | \$32,936 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 942 Automobile Care Center | \$2,936 | \$834 | \$94 | \$713 | \$4,576 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | \$6,030 | \$1,712 | \$193 | \$1,464 | \$9,400 | /V.F.P. |
| 710 General Office Building | \$2,181 | \$619 | \$70 | \$530 | \$3,400 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | \$7,156 | \$2,032 | \$230 | \$1,738 | \$11,156 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 110 General Light Industrial | \$1,381 | \$392 | \$44 | \$335 | \$2,152 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | \$297 | \$84 | \$10 | \$72 | \$463 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 150 Warehouse | \$982 | \$279 | \$32 | \$239 | \$1,532 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | \$495 | \$141 | \$16 | \$120 | \$772 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from Appendix Table C-3.

³ Derived from Appendix Table C-4.

⁴ Derived from Appendix Table C-5.

⁵ Derived from Appendix Table C-6.

⁶ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

B. CREDITS, EXEMPTIONS AND DISCOUNTS

The exiting Canby SDC administrative procedures will continue to establish local policies for issuing credits and exemptions, annual adjustments, and other administrative procedures.

(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 City's capital improvements program, 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 transportation improvement can only be used for a credit for a future transportation SDC), and must 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 up to the amount of the improvement fee. 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 City's SDC Capital Improvements 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" specific classes of development (i.e., minor additions, etc.) from the requirement to pay transportation SDCs.

(3) Discounts

The City may "discount" the amount of the SDC by reducing the portion of growth-required improvements to be funded with SDCs. Alternatively, the City may decide to charge only a percentage (i.e., 50%, 75%, etc.) of the SDC rates required to fund identified growth-related facility costs. Because discounts reduce SDC revenues, they increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as general fund contributions in order for the City to maintain levels of service.

C. 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 of Canby index its charges to the **Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index (CCI)** for the City of Seattle, and adjust the charges annually as per that index. There is no comparable Oregon-specific index.

D. SUMMARY AND COMPARISON

Table 5 summarizes the SDC calculations and compares them with SDCs currently in effect.

Table 5 Existing and Revised Transportation SDCs in Canby

| LAND USE TYPE | Prior/Current Transportation SDC ¹ | New Revised Transportation SDC | Change |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Residential: Single family per Dwelling Unit | \$2,603 | \$2,955 | \$352 |
| Residential: Multi-family per Dwelling Unit | \$1,738 | \$2,069 | \$331 |
| Commercial: Shopping Center (50,000 SF floor area) | \$165,655 | \$196,017 | \$30,362 |
| Office building (4,000 SF floor area) | \$7,786 | \$13,598 | \$5,812 |
| Light Industrial building (60,000 SF floor area) | \$127,400 | \$129,129 | \$1,729 |
| Commercial/Industrial Rate <u>per avg. daily vehicle-trip-end</u> | \$272 | -- | varies |
| Commercial/Industrial Rate <u>per avg. daily person-trip-end</u> ² | \$162 | \$184 (avg.) | \$22 (avg.) |

Notes:

¹ Based upon City of Canby Master Fee Schedule, effective as of 1/2/2012.

² Conversion of current transportation SDC from vehicle trips to person trips based on factor used for current methodology report.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Cumulative |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Calendar Year | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Amount |
| Transportation SDC Expenditures | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Beginning Balance in Year 1 ¹ | \$ 1,637,155 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional Annual Expenditure ² | \$ 163,589 | \$ 182,690 | \$ 316,112 | \$ 231,525 | \$ 163,206 | \$ 183,903 | \$ 577,630 | \$ 668,044 | \$ 682,790 | \$ 98,168 | \$ 32,008 | \$ 26,033 | |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 1,800,744 | \$ 182,690 | \$ 316,112 | \$ 231,525 | \$ 163,206 | \$ 183,903 | \$ 577,630 | \$ 668,044 | \$ 682,790 | \$ 98,168 | \$ 32,008 | \$ 26,033 | \$ 4,962,853 |
| | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Depreciation Deduction Factor ³ | 0.4447 | 0.4011 | 0.3588 | 0.3178 | 0.2780 | 0.2394 | 0.2020 | 0.1657 | 0.1305 | 0.0963 | 0.0632 | 0.0311 | |
| Depreciation Deduction Values | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 1-Expenditures (12 years of dep.) | \$ (800,862) | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ (800,862) |
| Year 2 Expenditures (11 years of dep.) | | \$ (73,280) | | | | | | | | | | | \$ (73,280) |
| Year 3 Expenditures (10 years of dep.) | | | \$ (113,423) | | | | | | | | | | \$ (113,423) |
| Year 4 Expenditures (9 years of dep.) | | | | \$ (73,574) | | | | | | | | | \$ (73,574) |
| Year 5 Expenditures (8 years of dep.) | | | | | \$ (45,369) | | | | | | | | \$ (45,369) |
| Year 6 Expenditures (7 years of dep.) | | | | | | \$ (44,026) | | | | | | | \$ (44,026) |
| Year 7 Expenditures (6 years of dep.) | | | | | | | \$ (116,666) | | | | | | \$ (116,666) |
| Year 8 Expenditures (5 years of dep.) | | | | | | | | \$ (110,681) | | | | | \$ (110,681) |
| Year 9 Expenditures (4 years of dep.) | | | | | | | | | \$ (89,091) | | | | \$ (89,091) |
| Year 10 Expenditures (3 years of dep.) | | | | | | | | | | \$ (9,458) | | | \$ (9,458) |
| Year 11 Expenditures (2 years of dep.) | | | | | | | | | | | \$ (2,024) | | \$ (2,024) |
| Year 12 Expenditures (1 years of dep.) | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ (811) | \$ (811) |
| Total Depreciation Deduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ (1,479,265) |
| Remaining Transportation SDC Reimbursement Value | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nominal current year value | \$ 999,882 | \$ 109,410 | \$ 202,689 | \$ 157,951 | \$ 117,837 | \$ 139,877 | \$ 460,964 | \$ 557,363 | \$ 593,699 | \$ 88,710 | \$ 29,984 | \$ 25,222 | \$ 3,483,588 |
| Inflation adjusted value (2012 \$) ⁴ | \$ 1,549,882 | \$ 163,511 | \$ 292,048 | \$ 219,425 | \$ 157,827 | \$ 180,628 | \$ 573,908 | \$ 669,038 | \$ 687,094 | \$ 98,983 | \$ 32,256 | \$ 26,161 | \$ 4,650,760 |
| Projected Increase in Person Trips ⁵ | | | | | | | | | | | | | 162,431 |
| Reimbursement Cost Per Person Trip | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ 28.63 |
| Notes: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ¹ Derived from prior adopted Canby Transportation SDC Methodology report (2001). | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ² Actual TSDC expenditures based on city budget documents, provided by City of Canby. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ³ Depreciation factors based on trip generation model growth in vehicle trip ends, Canby Transportation System Plan, 2010 (3.11%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ⁴ Inflation escalation factors based on Engineering News Record, Seattle Construction Cost Index average cost increase between 2000 and 2011 (3.72%). | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ⁵ Derived from Table 1. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX B

CITY OF CANBY
SDC-Eligible Transportation System Projects List
Financially Constrained List (as of August 2012)

| PLAN/ PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | MOTOR VEHICLE | | | | BICYCLE | | | | PEDESTRIAN | | | | TOTAL SDC- ELIGIBLE COSTS |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | ESTIMATED MOTOR VEHICLE PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share [#] | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE VEHICLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS | ESTIMATED BICYCLE FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share [#] | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE COSTS | ESTIMATED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share [#] | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE PED % | SDC- ELIGIBLE PEDESTRIAN COSTS | |
| B1 | N Holly St. (NW 6th Ave. to Multi-Use Trail). Install enhancements to create a bicycle boulevard. | \$ - | | | \$ - | \$ 30,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 14,040 | \$ - | | | \$ - | \$ 14,040 |
| B3 | N Holly St. (NW 22nd Ave. to NW 6th Ave.). Stripe bike lanes (widen as needed). | | | | | \$ 663,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 310,284 | | | | | \$ 310,284 |
| B6 | Pine St. (OR 99E to NE 4th Ave.). Install bike lanes. | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | - |
| B7 | Otto Rd. (OR 99E to Mulino Rd.). Install bike lanes. | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | - |
| B8 | SE 4th Ave. (Sequoia Pkwy. To Mulino Rd.). Install bike lanes. | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | - |

Notes:

| Local Cost Assumptions | Source |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Streets | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Bicycle | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Pedestrian | TSP, page 9-5 |

² Local TSDC Cost Share, ranges from 67% for projects with non-local funding to 100%. Derived from Canby TSP, Table 9-5.

³ Growth Required percentage calculation derived from Table 1.

APPENDIX B (continued)

| PLAN/ PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | MOTOR VEHICLE | | | | BICYCLE | | | | PEDESTRIAN | | | | TOTAL SDC- ELIGIBLE COSTS |
|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | ESTIMATED MOTOR VEHICLE PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share ² | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE VEHICLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS | ESTIMATED BICYCLE FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share ² | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE COSTS | ESTIMATED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share ² | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE PED % | SDC- ELIGIBLE PEDESTRIAN COSTS | |
| C1 | OR 99E and UPRR (at Elm St.). Improve crosswalk and ramps. | | | | | | | | | \$ 40,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 12,542 | \$ 12,542 |
| C2 | OR 99E and UPRR (at Grant St.). Improve crosswalk and ramps; install pedestrian refuge island. | | | | | | | | | \$ 30,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 9,407 | \$ 9,407 |
| C3 | OR 99E and UPRR (at Ivy St.). Improve crosswalk and ramps; install pedestrian refuge island. | | | | | | | | | \$ 30,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 9,407 | \$ 9,407 |
| C4 | OR 99E (between Ivy St. and Locust St.). Install pedestrian refuge island. | | | | | | | | | - | | | | \$ - |
| C5 | S Ivy St. (north leg at Township Rd.). Install crosswalk and ramps. | | | | | | | | | - | | | | \$ - |
| C6 | Township Rd. (at Sequoia Pkwy.). Provide crosswalk. | | | | | | | | | - | | | | \$ - |
| C7 | OR 99E and UPRR (at Pine St.). Improve crosswalk and ramps. | | | | | | | | | - | | | | \$ - |
| C8 | S Ivy St. (south leg at SW 3rd Ave.). Install crosswalk, ramps, and pedestrian refuge island (remove crosswalk striping on north leg). | | | | | | | | | - | | | | \$ - |

Notes:

| Local Cost Assumptions | Source |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Streets | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Bicycle | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Pedestrian | TSP, page 9-5 |

² Local TSDC Cost Share, ranges from 67% for projects with non-local funding to 100%. Derived from Canby TSP, Table 9-5.

³ Growth Required percentage calculation derived from Table 1.

APPENDIX B (continued)

| PLAN/ PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | MOTOR VEHICLE | | | | BICYCLE | | | | PEDESTRIAN | | | | TOTAL SDC- ELIGIBLE COSTS |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | ESTIMATED MOTOR VEHICLE PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE VEHICLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS | ESTIMATED BICYCLE FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE COSTS | ESTIMATED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE PED % | SDC- ELIGIBLE PEDESTRIAN COSTS | |
| 11 | Township Rd./S Ivy St. Install traffic signal (includes project C5). | \$ 300,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 140,400 | | | | | | | | | \$ 140,400 |
| 12 | Township Rd./Sequoia Pkwy.. Convert to all-way stop and install eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes (includes project C6). | \$ 510,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 238,680 | | | | | | | | | \$ 238,680 |
| 13 | N Ivy St./N 1st Ave. Remove southbound stop sign, restrict east leg to right-in/right-out, and install diverter on west leg to only allow southbound right turns. | \$ 10,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 4,680 | | | | | | | | | \$ 4,680 |
| 14 | N Grant St./NW 1st Ave. Remove southbound stop sign. | \$ 10,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 4,680 | | | | | | | | | \$ 4,680 |
| 15 | Knights Bridge Rd./Cedar St. Restripe northbound approach to include a right-turn lane. | \$ 5,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 2,340 | | | | | | | | | \$ 2,340 |
| 16 | S Grant St./SW 2nd Ave. Install westbound right-turn lane. | \$ 100,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 46,800 | | | | | | | | | \$ 46,800 |
| 17 | S Ivy St./SW 2nd Ave. Install eastbound right-turn lane. | \$ 100,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 46,800 | | | | | | | | | \$ 46,800 |
| 18 | S. Ivy St./SW 3rd Ave. Install partial diverter on west leg to close westbound receiving lane (includes project C8). | \$ 40,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 18,720 | | | | | | | | | \$ 18,720 |
| L1 | Offo Rd. Extension (OR 99E to Mulino Rd.). Construct new road (includes two roundabouts and projects B7 and S10). | \$ 8,915,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 8,915,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 8,915,000 |
| L2 | OR 99E/Offo Rd. Install traffic signal (associated with Offo Rd. Extension). | \$ 300,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 300,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 300,000 |
| L3 | NE 4th Ave./Pine St. | \$ 1,255,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 1,255,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 1,255,000 |
| L4 | OR 99E/Pine St. and Adjacent UPRR Crossing | \$ 2,000,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 2,000,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 2,000,000 |
| L5 | SE 4th Ave. Extension (Sequoia Pkwy. To Mulino Rd.) | \$ 3,140,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 3,140,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 3,140,000 |
| L6 | NE 3rd Ave. (Locust St. to NE 4th Ave.) and NE 4th Ave. (Locust St. to NE 3rd Ave.) | 1bd | 100% | 100% | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |

APPENDIX B (continued)

| PLAN/ PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | MOTOR VEHICLE | | | | BICYCLE | | | | PEDESTRIAN | | | | TOTAL SDC- ELIGIBLE COSTS |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | ESTIMATED MOTOR VEHICLE PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE VEHICLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS | ESTIMATED BICYCLE FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE COSTS | ESTIMATED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE PED % | SDC- ELIGIBLE PEDESTRIAN COSTS | |
| N1 | OR 99E (Elm St. to Locust St.). Construct multi-modal improvements and repave highway (includes projects C4 and S1). | \$ 3,770,000 | tbd | 0% | - | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| N2 | All traffic signals on OR 99E within Canby city limits. Convert to adaptive signal system. | \$ 400,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 125,424 | | | | | | | | | \$ 125,424 |
| N3 | 13th Ave. (Berg Pkwy. To Sequoia Pkwy. Extension). Perform safety study and construct traffic calming and other safety improvements prior to constructing Sequoia Pkwy. Extension to SE 13th Ave. | \$ 750,000 | tbd | 0% | - | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| O1 | SE 1st Ave./Haines Rd./Mulino Rd./Bremer Rd. Install roundabout. | \$ 2,000,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 936,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 936,000 |
| O2 | Township Rd./Redwood St. Install roundabout. | \$ 1,000,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 468,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 468,000 |
| O3 | Township Rd./Mulino Rd. Install roundabout. | \$ 1,000,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 468,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ 468,000 |
| P1 | Safe Routes to School (yearly funding). | | | | | | | | | \$ 1,050,000 | tbd | 0% | | \$ - |
| P2 | ADA Improvements (yearly funding). | | | | | | | | | \$ 1,050,000 | tbd | 0% | | \$ - |
| R1 | UPRR (at Elm St.). Improve rail crossing. | | | | | \$ 100,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 31,356 | | | | | \$ 31,356 |
| R2 | UPRR (at Grant St.). Improve rail crossing. | | | | | \$ 100,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 31,356 | | | | | \$ 31,356 |
| R3 | UPRR (at Ivy St.). Improve rail crossing. | | | | | \$ 100,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 31,356 | | | | | \$ 31,356 |
| R4 | UPRR (at Pine St.-NE 4th Ave.). Provide rail crossing. | | | | | \$ - | | 46.8% | \$ - | | | | | \$ - |
| R5 | OPRR (at Township Rd.). Move guardrail and improve rail crossing. | | | | | \$ 100,000 | 67% | 46.8% | \$ 31,356 | | | | | \$ 31,356 |

APPENDIX B (continued)

| PLAN/ PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | MOTOR VEHICLE | | | | BICYCLE | | | | PEDESTRIAN | | | | TOTAL SDC- ELIGIBLE COSTS |
|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | ESTIMATED MOTOR VEHICLE PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE VEHICLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS | ESTIMATED BICYCLE FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE % | SDC- ELIGIBLE BICYCLE COSTS | ESTIMATED PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PORTION OF PROJECT | Local TSDC Cost Share* | GROWTH REQUIRED SDC- ELIGIBLE PED % | SDC- ELIGIBLE PEDESTRIAN COSTS | |
| S01 | OR 99E (north side, Knott St. to Locust St.). Install sidewalks (north side). | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| S04 | S Ivy St. (OR 99E to Lee Elementary). Fill in sidewalk gaps. | | | | | | | | | \$ 490,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 229,320 | \$ 229,320 |
| S05 | Pine St. (OR 99E to NE 4th Ave.). Install sidewalks. | | | | | | | | | \$ - | | 46.8% | \$ - | \$ - |
| S07 | N. Holly St. (Knights Bridge Rd. to NW Territorial Rd.). Fill in sidewalk gaps. | | | | | | | | | \$ 550,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 257,400 | \$ 257,400 |
| S08 | Territorial Rd. (Holly St. to OR 99E). Fill in sidewalk gaps. | | | | | | | | | \$ 1,230,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 575,640 | \$ 575,640 |
| S09 | NE 10th Ave. (Holly St. to Pine St.). Install sidewalks. | | | | | | | | | \$ 830,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 830,000 | \$ 830,000 |
| S10 | Otto Rd. (OR 99E to Mulino Rd.). Install sidewalks, crosswalks, ramps. | | | | | | | | | \$ - | | 100% | \$ - | \$ - |
| S11 | S Ivy St. (S 13th Ave. to S 16th Ave.). Fill in sidewalk gaps. | | | | | | | | | \$ 100,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 |
| S12 | S Township Rd. (OP RR to Sequoia Pkwy.). Install sidewalks. | | | | | | | | | \$ 200,000 | 100% | 100% | \$ 200,000 | \$ 200,000 |
| S13 | SE 4th Ave. (Sequoia Pkwy. To Mulino Rd.). Install sidewalks. | | | | | | | | | \$ - | | 46.8% | \$ - | \$ - |
| T1 | OR 99E and Molalla Forest Rd. Trail. Connect multi-use trail to sidewalks on south side of OR 99E. | | | | | | | | | \$ 360,000 | 100% | 46.8% | \$ 168,480 | \$ 168,480 |
| T2 | Parallel Route to OR 99E (between Elm St. and Molalla Forest Rd. Trail). Construct 12'-wide multi-use trail along rail corridor. | | | | | \$ 3,435,000 | 67% | 100% | \$ 2,301,450 | | | | | \$ 2,301,450 |
| Costs in 2010 dollars | | \$ 25,605,000 | | | \$ 18,110,524 | \$ 4,528,000 | | | \$ 2,751,198 | \$ 5,960,000 | | | \$ 2,392,196 | \$ 23,253,918 |
| Costs in 2012 dollars | | \$ 27,545,000 | | | \$ 19,483,000 | \$ 4,871,000 | | | \$ 2,960,000 | \$ 6,412,000 | | | \$ 2,573,000 | \$ 25,016,000 |

Notes:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ¹ Local Cost Assumptions | Source |
| Streets | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Bicycle | TSP, page 9-5 |
| Pedestrian | TSP, page 9-5 |

² Local TSDC Cost Share, ranges from 67% for projects with non-local funding to 100%. Derived from Canby TSP, Table 9-5.

³ Growth Required percentage calculation derived from Table 1.

**APPENDIX TABLE C-1
NEW AVG. WEEKDAY TRIP-ENDS PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | <u>Weekday Avg. Vehicle Trip Ends</u> | <u>Est. Person Trip Ends</u> ² | <u>% New Trips</u> ³ | <u>New Person Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Unit</u> ⁴ |
|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 210 Single Family Dwelling | 9.6 | 16.08 | 100% | 16.08 | /dwelling unit |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | 6.7 | 11.26 | 100% | 11.26 | /dwelling unit |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | 1.3 | 2.17 | 100% | 2.17 | /student |
| 560 Church | 9.1 | 15.30 | 100% | 15.30 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 4.5 | 7.53 | 100% | 7.53 | /student |
| 630 Clinic | 31.5 | 52.84 | 100% | 52.84 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | 44.3 | 74.46 | 44% | 32.76 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 820 Shopping Center | 42.9 | 72.14 | 44% | 31.74 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 850 Supermarket | 102.2 | 171.76 | 64% | 109.93 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 853 Convenience Market | 738.0 | 1239.82 | 39% | 483.53 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 90.1 | 151.30 | 51% | 77.16 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 156.5 | 262.89 | 53% | 139.33 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | 90.0 | 151.12 | 57% | 86.14 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 496.1 | 833.48 | 43% | 358.40 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 942 Automobile Care Center ⁵ | 40.1 | 67.37 | 44% | 29.64 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 168.6 | 283.18 | 43% | 121.77 | /V.F.P. |
| 710 General Office Building | 11.0 | 18.50 | 100% | 18.50 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 36.1 | 60.70 | 100% | 60.70 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 110 General Light Industrial | 7.0 | 11.71 | 100% | 11.71 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | 1.5 | 2.52 | 100% | 2.52 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 150 Warehouse | 5.0 | 8.33 | 100% | 8.33 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | 2.5 | 4.20 | 100% | 4.20 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from U.S. National Household Transportation Survey, 2009.

³ Reflects percent of trips that are direct vs. "linked": Source: ITE, Trip Generation Handbook, 8th Ed.

⁴ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

⁵ Because there is no ITE Weekday Average Trip Rate for this land use category, the trip rate shown is the ITE P.M. peak-hour trip rate multiplied by a factor of ten.

APPENDIX TABLE C-2
NET ADJUSTED PERSON TRIP-ENDS PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT
AVG. TRIP LENGTH ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

| <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | <u>New Person Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Trip Length Adjustment Factor</u> ² | <u>Net Person Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Unit</u> ³ |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 210 Single Family Dwelling | 16.08 | 1.00 | 16.08 | /dwelling unit |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | 11.26 | 1.00 | 11.26 | /dwelling unit |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | 2.17 | 0.40 | 0.87 | /student |
| 560 Church | 15.30 | 0.75 | 11.48 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 7.53 | 0.40 | 3.01 | /student |
| 630 Clinic | 52.84 | 1.06 | 56.01 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | 32.76 | 0.84 | 27.52 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 820 Shopping Center | 31.74 | 0.84 | 26.66 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 850 Supermarket | 109.93 | 0.84 | 92.34 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 853 Convenience Market | 483.53 | 0.42 | 203.08 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 77.16 | 0.84 | 64.82 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 139.33 | 0.84 | 117.04 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | 86.14 | 0.50 | 43.07 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 358.40 | 0.50 | 179.20 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 942 Automobile Care Center | 29.64 | 0.84 | 24.90 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 121.77 | 0.42 | 51.14 | /V.F.P. |
| 710 General Office Building | 18.50 | 1.00 | 18.50 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 60.70 | 1.00 | 60.70 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 110 General Light Industrial | 11.71 | 1.00 | 11.71 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | 2.52 | 1.00 | 2.52 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 150 Warehouse | 8.33 | 1.00 | 8.33 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | 4.20 | 1.00 | 4.20 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from U.S. National Household Transportation Survey, 2009.

³ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

**APPENDIX TABLE C-3
MOTOR VEHICLE FACILITY COST PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | <u>Net</u> | <u>Motor Veh.</u> | <u>Motor Veh.</u> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | <u>Person</u> | <u>Cost Per</u> | <u>Cost</u> |
| | <u>Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Person Trip-End²</u> | <u>Per Unit</u> |
| 210 Single Family Dwelling | 16.08 | \$117.90 | \$1,896 |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | 11.26 | \$117.90 | \$1,327 |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | 0.87 | \$117.90 | \$102 |
| 560 Church | 11.48 | \$117.90 | \$1,353 |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 3.01 | \$117.90 | \$355 |
| 630 Clinic | 56.01 | \$117.90 | \$6,603 |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | 27.52 | \$117.90 | \$3,244 |
| 820 Shopping Center | 26.66 | \$117.90 | \$3,143 |
| 850 Supermarket | 92.34 | \$117.90 | \$10,887 |
| 853 Convenience Market | 203.08 | \$117.90 | \$23,943 |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 64.82 | \$117.90 | \$7,642 |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 117.04 | \$117.90 | \$13,798 |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | 43.07 | \$117.90 | \$5,078 |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 179.20 | \$117.90 | \$21,127 |
| 942 Automobile Care Center | 24.90 | \$117.90 | \$2,936 |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 51.14 | \$117.90 | \$6,030 |
| 710 General Office Building | 18.50 | \$117.90 | \$2,181 |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 60.70 | \$117.90 | \$7,156 |
| 110 General Light Industrial | 11.71 | \$117.90 | \$1,381 |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | 2.52 | \$117.90 | \$297 |
| 150 Warehouse | 8.33 | \$117.90 | \$982 |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | 4.20 | \$117.90 | \$495 |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from Table 3.

³ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

**APPENDIX TABLE C-4
NON-MOTOR VEHICLE FACILITY COST PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| <u>Unit</u> ³ | <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | Net | Non-MV | Non-MV | <u>Unit</u> ³ |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | | Person | Cost Per | Cost | |
| | | <u>Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Person Trip-End</u> ² | <u>Per Unit</u> | |
| /dwelling unit | 210 Single Family Dwelling | 16.08 | \$33.48 | \$538 | /dwelling unit |
| /dwelling unit | 220 Multifamily ¹ | 11.26 | \$33.48 | \$377 | /dwelling unit |
| /student | 520 Elementary School (Public) | 0.87 | \$33.48 | \$29 | /student |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 560 Church | 11.48 | \$33.48 | \$384 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /student | 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 3.01 | \$33.48 | \$101 | /student |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 630 Clinic | 56.01 | \$33.48 | \$1,875 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.L.A. | 814 Specialty Retail Center | 27.52 | \$33.48 | \$921 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.L.A. | 820 Shopping Center | 26.66 | \$33.48 | \$893 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 850 Supermarket | 92.34 | \$33.48 | \$3,092 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 853 Convenience Market | 203.08 | \$33.48 | \$6,800 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 64.82 | \$33.48 | \$2,170 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 117.04 | \$33.48 | \$3,919 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 931 Quality Restaurant | 43.07 | \$33.48 | \$1,442 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 179.20 | \$33.48 | \$6,000 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.L.A. | 942 Automobile Care Center | 24.90 | \$33.48 | \$834 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| /V.F.P. | 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 51.14 | \$33.48 | \$1,712 | /V.F.P. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 710 General Office Building | 18.50 | \$33.48 | \$619 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 60.70 | \$33.48 | \$2,032 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 110 General Light Industrial | 11.71 | \$33.48 | \$392 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 120 General Heavy Industrial | 2.52 | \$33.48 | \$84 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 150 Warehouse | 8.33 | \$33.48 | \$279 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| /T.S.F.G.F.A. | 151 Mini-Warehouse | 4.20 | \$33 | \$141 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from Table 3.

³ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

**APPENDIX TABLE C-5
COMPLIANCE COST PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | <u>Net</u> | <u>Compliance</u> | <u>Compliance</u> | <u>Unit</u> ³ |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>Person</u> | <u>Cost Per</u> | <u>Cost</u> | |
| | <u>Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Person Trip-End</u> ² | <u>Per Unit</u> | |
| 210 Single Family Dwelling | 16.08 | \$3.78 | \$61 | /dwelling unit |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | 11.26 | \$3.78 | \$43 | /dwelling unit |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | 0.87 | \$3.78 | \$3 | /student |
| 560 Church | 11.48 | \$3.78 | \$43 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 3.01 | \$3.78 | \$11 | /student |
| 630 Clinic | 56.01 | \$3.78 | \$212 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | 27.52 | \$3.78 | \$104 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 820 Shopping Center | 26.66 | \$3.78 | \$101 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 850 Supermarket | 92.34 | \$3.78 | \$349 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 853 Convenience Market | 203.08 | \$3.78 | \$768 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 64.82 | \$3.78 | \$245 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 117.04 | \$3.78 | \$443 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | 43.07 | \$3.78 | \$163 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 179.20 | \$3.78 | \$678 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 942 Automobile Care Center | 24.90 | \$3.78 | \$94 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 51.14 | \$3.78 | \$193 | /V.F.P. |
| 710 General Office Building | 18.50 | \$3.78 | \$70 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 60.70 | \$3.78 | \$230 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 110 General Light Industrial | 11.71 | \$3.78 | \$44 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | 2.52 | \$3.78 | \$10 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 150 Warehouse | 8.33 | \$3.78 | \$32 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | 4.20 | \$3.78 | \$16 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from Table 3.

³ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

**APPENDIX TABLE C-6
REIMBURSEMENT COST PER UNIT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| <u>ITE LAND USE CODE/CATEGORY</u> | Net | Reimbursement | Compliance | <u>Unit</u> ³ |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | Person | Cost Per | Cost | |
| | <u>Trip-Ends</u> | <u>Person Trip-End</u> ² | <u>Per Unit</u> | |
| 210 Single Family Dwelling | 16.08 | \$28.63 | \$460 | /dwelling unit |
| 220 Multifamily ¹ | 11.26 | \$28.63 | \$322 | /dwelling unit |
| 520 Elementary School (Public) | 0.87 | \$28.63 | \$25 | /student |
| 560 Church | 11.48 | \$28.63 | \$329 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 565 Day Care Center/Preschool | 3.01 | \$28.63 | \$86 | /student |
| 630 Clinic | 56.01 | \$28.63 | \$1,604 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 814 Specialty Retail Center | 27.52 | \$28.63 | \$788 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 820 Shopping Center | 26.66 | \$28.63 | \$763 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 850 Supermarket | 92.34 | \$28.63 | \$2,644 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 853 Convenience Market | 203.08 | \$28.63 | \$5,815 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 880 Pharmacy/Drugstore | 64.82 | \$28.63 | \$1,856 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 911 Bank/Savings: Walk-in | 117.04 | \$28.63 | \$3,351 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 931 Quality Restaurant | 43.07 | \$28.63 | \$1,233 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 934 Fast Food Restaurant | 179.20 | \$28.63 | \$5,131 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 942 Automobile Care Center | 24.90 | \$28.63 | \$713 | /T.S.F.G.L.A. |
| 944 Gasoline/Service Station | 51.14 | \$28.63 | \$1,464 | /V.F.P. |
| 710 General Office Building | 18.50 | \$28.63 | \$530 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 720 Medical-Dental Office Building | 60.70 | \$28.63 | \$1,738 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 110 General Light Industrial | 11.71 | \$28.63 | \$335 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 120 General Heavy Industrial | 2.52 | \$28.63 | \$72 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 150 Warehouse | 8.33 | \$28.63 | \$239 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |
| 151 Mini-Warehouse | 4.20 | \$28.63 | \$120 | /T.S.F.G.F.A. |

Notes:

¹ Based on ITE land use code for apartment dwelling.

² Derived from Appendix B.

³ Abbreviations used in the "Unit" column:

T.S.F.G.F.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Floor Area

T.S.F.G.L.A. = Thousand Square Feet Gross Leasable Area

V.F.P. = Vehicle Fueling Position

