



# AGENDA STAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Monday, May 5, 2014

Stayton Community Center  
400 W. Virginia Street  
Stayton, Oregon 97383

**CALL TO ORDER**

**7:00 PM**

**Mayor Vigil**

**FLAG SALUTE**

**ROLL CALL/STAFF INTRODUCTIONS**

**PRESENTATIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

a. Introduction of New Library Director, Katinka Bryk

Request for Recognition: If you wish to address the Council, please fill out a green "Request for Recognition" form. Forms are on the table at the back of the room.

*Recommended time for presentation is 10 minutes.*

*Recommended time for comments from the public is 3 minutes.*

**ANNOUNCEMENTS – PLEASE READ CAREFULLY**

*Items not on the agenda but relevant to City business may be discussed at this meeting. Citizens are encouraged to attend all meetings of the City Council to insure that they stay informed. Agenda items may be moved forward if a Public Hearing is scheduled.*

a. Additions to the agenda

b. Declaration of Ex Parte Contacts, Conflict of Interest, Bias, etc.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

a. April 21, 2014 City Council Action Minutes

***Purpose of the Consent Agenda:***

*In order to make more efficient use of meeting time, resolutions, minutes, bills, and other items which are routine in nature and for which no debate is anticipated, shall be placed on the Consent Agenda. Any item placed on the Consent Agenda may be removed at the request of any council member prior to the time a vote is taken. All remaining items of the Consent Agenda are then disposed of in a single motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. This motion is not debatable. The Recorder to the Council will then poll the council members individually by a roll call vote. If there are any dissenting votes, each item on the consent Agenda is then voted on individually by roll call vote. Copies of the Council packets include more detailed staff reports, letters, resolutions, and other supporting materials. A citizen wishing to review these materials may do so at Stayton City Hall, 362 N. Third Avenue, Stayton, or the Stayton Public Library, 515 N. First Avenue, Stayton.*

***The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. If you require special accommodations please contact Alissa Angelo, Deputy City Recorder at (503) 769-3425.***

**PUBLIC HEARING – None**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Alley and Street Right-of-Way Encroachments**

**Action**

- a. Staff Report – Dan Fleishman
- b. Council Discussion
- c. Council Decision

**Streets System Development Charge Update**

**Informational**

- a. Staff Report – David Kinney
- b. Council Discussion
- c. Council Decision

**PRESENTATIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

*Recommended time for presentations is 10 minutes.*

*Recommended time for comments from the public is 3 minutes.*

**BUSINESS FROM THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR**

**BUSINESS FROM THE MAYOR**

**BUSINESS FROM THE COUNCIL**

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS – May 19, 2014**

- a. Court Ordinances
- b. Water System Development Charges (SDC)
- c. Library Board Reappointments
- d. Non-Remonstrance Agreements
- e. AFSCME Union Contract – Executive Session

**ADJOURN**

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

### MAY 2014

Monday	May 5	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Tuesday	May 6	Budget Committee	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Thursday	May 8	Budget Committee	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Friday	May 9	Community Leaders Meeting	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Monday	May 12	Budget Committee	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Tuesday	May 13	Commissioner's Breakfast	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Monday	May 19	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Wednesday	May 21	Library Board	6:00 p.m.	E.G. Siegmund Meeting Room
<b>Monday</b>	<b>May 26</b>	<b>CITY OFFICES CLOSED IN OBSERVANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY</b>		
Tuesday	May 27	Planning Commission	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)

### JUNE 2014

Monday	June 2	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Tuesday	June 3	Parks & Recreation Board	7:00 p.m.	E.G. Siegmund Meeting Room
Tuesday	June 10	Commissioner's Breakfast	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Tuesday	June 10	PEG Commission	12:00 p.m.	City Hall Conference Room
Tuesday	June 10	Public Safety Commission	6:00 p.m.	City Hall Conference Room
Friday	June 13	Community Leaders Meeting	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Monday	June 16	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Wednesday	June 18	Library Board	6:00 p.m.	E.G. Siegmund Meeting Room
Monday	June 30	Planning Commission	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)

### JULY 2014

Tuesday	July 1	Parks & Recreation Board	7:00 p.m.	E.G. Siegmund Meeting Room
Friday	July 4	<b>CITY OFFICES CLOSED IN OBSERVANCE OF INDEPENDENCE DAY</b>		
Monday	July 7	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Tuesday	July 8	Commissioner's Breakfast	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Friday	July 11	Community Leaders Meeting	7:30 a.m.	Covered Bridge Café
Wednesday	July 16	Library Board	6:00 p.m.	E.G. Siegmund Meeting Room
Monday	July 21	City Council	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)
Monday	June 28	Planning Commission	7:00 p.m.	Community Center (north end)

**City of Stayton  
City Council Meeting Action Minutes  
April 21, 2014**

**LOCATION:** STAYTON COMMUNITY CENTER, 400 W. VIRGINIA STREET, STAYTON

**Time Start:** 7:02 P.M.

**Time End:** 8:16 P.M.

**COUNCIL MEETING ATTENDANCE LOG**

COUNCIL	STAYTON STAFF
Mayor Scott Vigil	Alissa Angelo, Deputy City Recorder
Councilor Emily Gooch	Keith Campbell, City Administrator
Councilor Catherine Hemshorn (excused)	Dan Fleishman, Director of Planning & Development
Councilor Jennifer Niegel	David Kinney, Public Works Director
Councilor Henry Porter	Mark Greenhalgh-Johnson, Interim Library Director
Councilor Brian Quigley	Rich Sebens, Police Chief
	Christine Shaffer, Finance Director
	David Rhoten, City Attorney (excused)

AGENDA	ACTIONS
<b>REGULAR MEETING</b>	
<b>Presentations / Comments from the Public</b>	None
<b>Announcements</b>	
a. Additions to the Agenda	None
b. Declaration of Ex Parte Contacts, Conflict of Interest, Bias, etc.	Councilor Gooch drove by to view the proposed heritage trees. Councilor Porter will abstain from voting on the Heritage Tree Designation request because the proposal comes from his wife.
<b>Consent Agenda</b>	
a. February 18, 2014 City Council Action Minutes	Motion from Councilor Gooch, seconded by Councilor Niegel, to approve the consent agenda. <b>Motion passed 4:0.</b>
<b>Public Hearing</b>	None
<b>Unfinished Business</b>	None
<b>New Business</b>	
a. Ordinance No. 969, Amending Ordinance No. 863, Non-Exclusive Gas Utility Franchise to Northwest Natural Gas Company	Motion from Councilor Niegel, seconded by Councilor Quigley, to adopt Ordinance No. 969 as presented. <b>Motion passed 4:0.</b>
b. Request for Heritage Tree Designation	Motion from Councilor Niegel, seconded by Councilor Gooch, to designate the Pin Oak and the California Laurel located at 985 N. Fourth Avenue as Heritage Trees. <b>Motion passed 3:0 (Porter abstained).</b>
c. Park System Development Charge Update	Mr. Fleishman and Mr. Kinney reviewed the Park System Development Charge Update staff report

	included in the Council packet. No action taken, informational only.
<b>Staff / Commission Reports</b>	
<b>Finance Director's Report – Christine Shaffer</b>	
a. March 2014 Monthly Finance Department Report	Ms. Shaffer reviewed her report.
<b>Police Chief's Report – Rich Sebens</b>	
a. March 2014 Statistical Report	Chief Sebens reviewed his monthly report.
<b>Public Works Director's Report – Dave Kinney</b>	
a. March 2014 Operating Report	Mr. Kinney briefly reviewed his reports included in the packet.
b. Public Works Update	A Pioneer Park Rehabilitation Project Open House will be held on Tuesday, April 29 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
c. Wilco Road – Future Improvements Conceptual Plan	Brief review of the concept plan memo included in the Council packet.
<b>Planning &amp; Development Director's Report – Dan Fleishman</b>	
a. March 2014 Activities Report	Mr. Fleishman briefly reviewed his report. Grass is growing and notifications to those with long grass have been mailed.
<b>Library Director's Report – Mark Greenhalgh-Johnson</b>	
a. March 2014 Activities	Mr. Greenhalgh-Johnson spoke about his report and mentioned the date for the upcoming author visit has changed and will be held on May 23 <sup>rd</sup> .
<b>Presentations / Comments From the Public</b>	None
<b>Business from the City Administrator</b>	Mr. Campbell briefly updated the Council on the progress of the Municipal Court remodel.
<b>Business from the Mayor</b>	None
<b>Business from the Council</b>	<p>Councilor Niegel asked where Mr. Cartwright was this evening. He didn't contact staff prior to the meeting, so they were unaware he'd be absent.</p> <p>Brief discussion of the removal of the fence on E. Burnett Street.</p> <p>Motion from Councilor Quigley, seconded by Councilor Gooch, to put a moratorium on the removal of the E. Burnett Street Fence until the next Council meeting.</p> <p><i>Discussion</i> – Discussion of location of fence and what the Council would like staff to bring to them at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Motion passed 4:0.</b></p>

**Future Agenda Items**

- a. Court Ordinances
- b. Water and Streets System Development Charges (SDC)
- c. Introduction of New Library Director
- d. Library Board Appointments

APPROVED BY THE STAYTON CITY COUNCIL THIS 5<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MAY 2014, BY A \_\_\_\_ VOTE OF THE STAYTON CITY COUNCIL.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

A. Scott Vigil, Mayor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Keith D. Campbell, City Administrator

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Alissa Angelo, Deputy City Recorder

DRAFT



**CITY OF STAYTON**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Mayor A. Scott Vigil and the Stayton City Council  
**THRU:** Keith Campbell, City Administrator  
**FROM:** David W. Kinney, Public Works Director  
Dan Fleishman, Director of Planning and Community Development  
**DATE:** May 5, 2014  
**SUBJECT:** Streets System Development Charge Update

---

**ISSUE**

Informational Report on the Streets SDC

**ENCLOSURES**

1. May 5, 2014 Street SDC Methodology Update
2. SDC Survey Results for 50+/- Oregon Cities (League of Oregon Cities)
3. Proposed SDC Project Map (2014)

**INTRODUCTION**

In 2012, the Comprehensive Plan Update Committee identified a number of issues with the methodologies used for the City's various System Development Charges. A basic summary of the concerns raised by the Update Committee is that the current SDCs are based upon adopted master plans that overestimate future growth in the City, therefore including capital projects that are not likely to be constructed within a 20-year timeframe and that SDCs need to be updated to reflect the actual costs of recent improvements instead of estimated costs. Upon receipt of that report, the City Council directed Staff to review the SDC methodology reports and return to the City Council with further analysis and proposed revisions. The Update Committee's report is enclosed as Attachment 1.

The Public Works and Planning and Development Directors have been working on these analyses and updates since that time as time has allowed. This staff report presents the results of our efforts on the Streets System Development Charge.

## DISCUSSION

The City of Stayton adopted the *Stayton Transportation System Plan (TSP)* in March, 2005. Following adoption of the master plan the City's financial consultant Ray Bartlett, Economic and Financial Analysis, Inc. prepared a Park SDC Methodology Report. In April 2007 the City Council adopted a revised Streets SDC of \$2,512 per PM Peak-hour trip.

The 2007 Street SDC was established as an improvement fee. No reimbursement fee was established to recoup the cost of investments made in the city's transportation facilities prior to 2007.

The Street SDC is charged to residential, commercial, industrial or other non-residential developments. Non-residential Street SDC's are based on the PM Peak-Hour trip generation using an International Traffic Engineer's (ITE) table of traffic generated based on the type of use. New single family homes generate 1 PM Peak-Hour trip. The fee is collected from the developer at the time a building permit is issued.

Since the adoption of the 2007 Street SDC, the City has made investments in the City's streets as proposed in the TSP. These investments have resulted in the addition of a reimbursement fee component of the Street SDC. In addition, the City has refined plans for improvements to Wilco Road, Shaff Rd. and modified the proposed collector system network to reflect comments from Marion County and reflect a more realistic view of street improvement projects which are likely to be needed to serve new development in the UGB during the next 20 years. The development of these refinement plans warrant a review and update of the improvement fee portion of the Park SDC.

The proposed 2014 Streets SDC will be composed of both a reimbursement fee and an improvement fee. The projects used to calculate the Street SDC are those needed during the next 20 years to serve new growth in the community. Table 1 compares the current Street SDC with the maximum Street SDC the City may charge based on the 2014 Report.

**Table 1  
Current and Proposed Street SDC**

Type of SDC	2007 Transportation SDC	Proposed		Change	
		2014 Transportation SDC		\$	%
Transportation Improvement Fee	2,512	2,172		(340)	
Transportation Reimbursement Fee	-	200		200	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,512</b>	<b>2,372</b>		<b>(140)</b>	<b>-6%</b>

The proposed TransportationSDC will decrease from \$2,512 to \$2,372 per PM Peak-Hour trip.

The 2007 Street SDC indicates that the City would be adjusting the SDC annually to account for inflation in the cost of construction of public works projects. The City has not chosen not make those annual adjustments because for several years the inflation rate was negligible and because the desire to not increase costs during a time of low demand during the Great Recession and its



recovery. If annual adjustments had been made, the Streets SDC would be have increased by approximately 25% during the past seven years.

### SDC Amendment Process

System Development Charges amendments may be adopted by resolution after the City Council holds a public hearing and provides written notice of the proposed amendments to interested parties and to the public.

1. **Notice to Interested Parties:** The City is required to provide written notice to any person/entity who requests notice of a change in a City SDC fee. The notice must be provided a minimum of ninety (90) days in advance of any public hearing to consider a substantive amendment to an existing SDC methodology. The Marion County Homebuilder’s Association has a standing request for such notice.
2. **Media Notice:** The City is required to publish a notice (display ad) in a newspaper of general circulation, (e.g. *Stayton Mail*). When the City adopted the Mill Creek Sewer SDC update, the newspaper also had a large news article explaining the proposal. Distribution of information via social media was also provided via a News Blast.
3. **Public Hearing:** The Council must hold a public hearing before modifying an SDC. The staff anticipates a public hearing will be held to consider all of the proposed SDC modifications rather than individual hearings on each element. However, the City Council could choose to hold individual hearings and adopt changes to each SDC individually.

### Stayton SDC Comparison with Other Oregon Cities

In 2013 the League of Oregon Cities completed a survey of SDC charges for Oregon cities. The survey results show that Stayton’s SDCs are in the mid to high-range of SDC charges for similar size communities in the State of Oregon and Mid-Willamette Valley. Table 2 provides a comparison of Stayton’s current SDC charges compared to nearby, similar size or larger mid-Willamette Valley cities.

**Table 2  
Comparison of SDCs for Single Family Dwellings**

<i>City</i>	<i>2013 Total SDC Charges (per SF home)</i>
Stayton	\$11,065
<i>Linn-Benton County</i>	
Albany	\$7,963
Corvallis	\$12,364
Lebanon	\$5,796
Sweet Home	\$1,839
<i>Marion County</i>	
Aumsville	\$16,632
Keizer	\$3,210
Salem	\$13,193

Silverton	\$19,406
Sublimity	\$10,630
Woodburn	\$11,000 - \$13,000**
<b><i>Polk County</i></b>	
Dallas	\$12,347
Independence	\$11,813
Monmouth	\$6,536
<b><i>Yamhill County</i></b>	
Newberg	\$16,740

\*\* SDCs vary depending on dwelling size, location, etc.

Staff has compiled a spreadsheet summarizing SDC fees for 50+/- Oregon cities. The spreadsheet lists each city with a breakdown of the individual SDC amounts for Water, Sewer, Transportation, Storm Drainage and Parks and is enclosed as Attachment 3.

## QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

City of Stayton

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE UPDATE

May 5, 2014 Draft for City Council Review

Prepared by the City of Stayton  
Public Works Department and Planning & Development Department  
May 5, 2014

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	1
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LIST & TRIP GENERATION .....	2
UPDATE OF THE IMPROVEMENT FEE .....	5
REIMBURSEMENT FEE .....	5
APPLICATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION SDC .....	9
APPENDICES .....	10

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Current and Proposed Transportation SDC (per PM Peak-Hour Trip) .....	1
Table 2	Transportation System Capital Improvements Projects and Allocation to Growth.....	2
Table 3	Current and Forecast PM Peak-Hour Trips.....	3
Table 4	Calculation of Current Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips .....	3
Table 5	Calculation of Current Non-Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips .....	4
Table 6	Forecast of New Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips .....	4
Table 7	Forecast of New Commercial & Industrial PM Peak-Hour Trips .....	4
Table 8	Calculation of Improvement Fee .....	5
Table 9	Reimbursement Fee Eligible Projects Completed 2007 to 2013 .....	6
Table 10	Calculation of Reimbursement Fee .....	6
Table 11	Current and Proposed Transportation SDC .....	7

## SUMMARY

The City of Stayton adopted its Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) in April 2007, following the adoption of the *2005 Transportation System Plan (TSP)*. The TSP recommends improvements to correct deficiencies in the City’s transportation network and recommends street, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements to serve the transportation needs of the City that will result from future residential, commercial and industrial growth in Stayton’s Urban Growth Boundary.

The Transportation SDC is charged to all new developments based on the impact the new development is projected to have on the overall transportation network based on an estimate of the number of PM Peak Hour trips expected to be generated by the new development. The fee is collected from the developer at the time a building permit is issued. The 2007 Transportation SDC was established as an improvement fee. No reimbursement fee was established to recoup the cost of investments made in the City’s streets and transportation facilities prior to 2007.

In 2012, the City’s Comprehensive Plan Update Committee recommended to the City Council that all of the City’s SDCs be reviewed to assure that they properly account for planned improvements and reflect recent investments in city infrastructure. In 2013, the City adopted a Comprehensive Plan Update that incorporated new population projections through 2030.

Based on these updated population projections, the City has reassessed the timing for various transportation improvements listed in the TSP. In addition, the City has refined plans for improvements to Wilco Road, Shaff Road, and the new collector streets proposed in the TSP. New cost estimates have been prepared for some projects. When coupled with the 2005 TSP, the updated cost estimates, development of the refinement plans, and the modification of the timing of proposed improvements warrant a review and update of the improvement fee portion of the Transportation SDC.

The final change in the 2014 update to the System Development Charge is the creation of a reimbursement fee portion of the SDC to account for completed transportation improvements since 2007. The City of Stayton, Marion County and ODOT have made investments on some of the City’s streets, sidewalks and trails systems as recommended in the TSP. These investments serve existing residents, but will also serve the City as it grows in the next 20 years. Therefore, this report recommends a reimbursement fee component be added to the Transportation SDC. The proposed 2014 Transportation Fee will be composed of both a reimbursement fee and an improvement fee. Table 1 compares the current Transportation SDC with the proposed Transportation SDC. The proposed SDC per PM Peak-Hour trip will decrease.

**Table 1 - Current and Proposed Transportation SDC (per PM-Peak Hour Trip)**

Type of SDC	2007 Transportation SDC	Proposed 2014 Transportation SDC	Change	
			\$	%
Transportation Improvement Fee	2,512	2,172	(340)	
Transportation Reimbursement Fee	-	200	200	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,512</b>	<b>2,372</b>	<b>(140)</b>	<b>-6%</b>

The proposed TransportationSDC will decrease from \$2,512 to \$2,372 per PM Peak-Hour trip.

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LIST & TRIP GENERATION

Table 2 summarizes the list of capital improvements with costs estimated in 2013 dollars. Projects are listed using the same project numbers as in the 2007 Transportation SDC Report. Table 2 shows the allocation of costs to future development based on each project's contribution to excess capacity. Many of the improvements are needed, in part, to remediate existing problems and only 21 percent of the total cost is allocated to growth. Some projects are allocated 100 percent to growth. These are projects built in areas that are today predominately vacant and will be built only if development occurs in those areas. If development does not occur, these projects will not be needed.

Project No. 16 "Future Collectors" will serve new development areas in Stayton. Only 19% of the costs of the collector streets, \$2,023,976 is assigned to growth in Table 2. It is not the complete cost of constructing these streets. It represents the increased costs of constructing a collector street compared to a residential street. Collector streets are designed to carry cross-city traffic and connect to Highway 22 both to the north and east of the City. If these were not collectors, the developer would be entirely responsible for building a local street in a 60-foot right-of-way with a 34-foot-wide two-lane roadway and sidewalks. Since it is a collector street, the City requires it to be built on an 80-foot right-of-way with a 36-foot roadway with bike lanes and sidewalks. The pavement section for a collector is also thicker than for a local street. The 20% cost difference in land and construction costs between the two classifications of street is included as an SDC eligible cost shown in Table 2. The City anticipates 2.8 miles of new collector streets may be constructed in the 20-year planning period for which SDCs are collected. Developers who build these collectors will receive an SDC credit up to 20% cost of the over-sizing.

**Table 2 - Transportation System Capital Improvements Projects and Allocation to Growth**

Street Improvements (2014-2035)		2013\$	Allocation to Growth	
			%	\$
3	Golf Club Road (Hwy 22 to Shaff Rd.)	\$ 1,902,233	29%	\$ 550,503
7	Cascade Hwy/Whitney St. intersection	\$ 1,959,300	100%	\$ 1,959,300
8	Washington/Ida/Wilco/Stayton Rd. Intersection	\$ 1,212,357	100%	\$ 1,212,357
9	Fern Ridge Road (10th Ave to Hwy 22)	\$ 2,107,421	29%	\$ 609,884
10	Washington St/1st Ave Intersection Improvements	\$ 565,344	29%	\$ 163,610
12	1st Avenue/Ida Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 565,344	29%	\$ 163,610
13	3rd Avenue/Washington Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 565,344	29%	\$ 163,610
14	1st Avenue/Hollister Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 385,773	29%	\$ 111,642
16	Future Collector Streets (2.8 mi) - Yellow lines on TSP	\$10,652,506	19%	\$ 2,023,976
17	Shaff Rd. (Kindle Way to Fern Avenue)	\$ 1,500,000	50%	\$ 750,000
18	Shaff Rd. (Fern Avenue to 1st Avenue)	\$ 1,500,000	50%	\$ 750,000
19	Wilco Rd. (Shaff to Washington)	\$ 3,600,000	50%	\$ 1,800,000
<b>Total Street Improvements</b>		<b>\$26,515,621</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>\$ 10,258,492</b>
<b>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Improvements (2014-2035)</b>				
BP-4	Washington St (1st to Myrtle - North Side)	\$ 41,849	29%	\$ 12,111
BP-5	Washington St (Wilco to Evergreen --South Side)	\$ 187,687	29%	\$ 54,316
BP-6	Ida St. (Noble - 1st Avenue)	\$ 112,866	29%	\$ 32,663
BP-8	Locust St. (Wilco Rd. to 1st Avenue)	\$ 35,508	29%	\$ 10,276
<b>Total Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</b>		<b>\$ 377,910</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>\$ 109,367</b>
<b>Total Transportation System Plan Improvements (2014-2035)</b>		<b>\$26,893,531</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>\$ 10,367,858</b>

Three new projects have been added to Table 2, compared to Capital Improvement Projects list in the 2007 SDC methodology. These projects reflect efforts by the City to refine plans for improvements to Shaff Road and Wilco Road. The City has prepared preliminary plans for improvements to these two collector streets in order to provide guidance to property owners as land is developed and to apply for grants from state and federal agencies. The City has estimated the costs of the planned improvements and estimated that half of the costs of the proposed improvements may be allocated to growth.

Table 3 shows the current and forecast numbers of trips in Stayton. The current trips are based on the City's 2014 estimate of the number of housing units and the amount of commercial and industrial development. These figures are further developed in Tables 4 and 5 below. The City assumes that 35% of the trips in the city are vehicles that pass through the City, without having an origin or destination within the City, continuing the assumption in the 2007 SDC methodology.

**Table 3--Current and Forecast PM Peak Hour Trips**

	2004	2014	New Trips		
			2025	2035	2045
Trips that begin/end in Stayton	6,048	7,104	9,093	9,998	11,077
Trips that pass thru Stayton	3,257	4,618	5,910	6,499	7,200
Totals	9,305	11,722	15,003	16,496	18,277
Net New Trips	--	--	3,280	4,774	6,554
Share of Total Trips (% assigned to 2014 demand vs. % assigned to New Trips to serve future growth)		71%		29%	

Source: City of Stayton, *Final Draft-Transportation System Plan*, H. Lee & Associates, April 2004.  
Pass through trips are estimated as 65% of in-City trips.

The total number of PM Peak-Hour trips is derived from the City's Land Use and Housing chapters in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update, coupled with assumptions about the intensity and type of non-residential development. Table 4 shows the calculation of current existing residential trips and Table 5 shows the calculation of current commercial and industrial trips.

**Table 4 - Calculation of Current Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips**

	2000	2010	2014	Weekday PM Peak Hour Trip Rate	2014 PM Peak Hour Trips
Population	6,816	7,644	7,667		
Housing Units					
Single Family Units	1,896	2,301	2,328	1.01	2,351
Multi-Family Units	596	607	607	0.62	376
Manufactured Homes	176	148	148	0.59	
Totals	2,668	3,056	3,083		2,815

**Table 5 - Calculation of Current Non-Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips**

Zoning Type	Developed Acreage	Building Square Footage	ITE PM Peak Hour Trip Rate (Discounting Pass-by Trips)	2014 PM Peak-Hour Trips
Commercial	58	482,400	6.00	2,894
Industrial	163	1,423,600	0.98	1,395
Totals	221	1,906,000		4,290

Table 6 shows the calculation of future trips from residential uses. The projected population growth and household size from the Marion County Coordinated Population Projections for 2030 were used to project the population and number of households. The housing needs in 2030, from the 2013 Comprehensive Plan update was used as the basis for projecting future inventories of various housing types.

**Table 6 - Forecast of New Residential PM Peak-Hour Trips**

	2014	2025	2035	2045	Weekday PM Peak Hour Trip Rate	Net New Peak PM Trips 2025	Net New Peak PM Trips 2035	Net New Peak PM Trips 2045
Population	7,667	10,518	11,359	14,305				
Single Family Units	2,328	3,133	3,383	3,498	1.01	813	1,317	1,182
Multi-Family Units	607	723	781	1,566	0.62	72	143	595
Manufactured Homes	148	161	173	157	0.59	8	9	5
Totals	3,083	4,017	4,337	5,221		893	1,469	1,781

Table 7 shows the calculation of future trips from commercial and residential uses. In projecting future non-residential development an assumption was made that the current ratio of floor space per acre of developed land would continue. Data from the Land Use chapter in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan update was used for the amount of vacant land zoned commercial and industrial. Finally it was assumed that pace of commercial and industrial development would mirror that for residential development.

**Table 7 - Forecast of New Commercial & Industrial PM Peak-Hour Trips**

Zoning Type	Undeveloped Acreage	Gross to Net Acres) <sup>^</sup>	Floor to Land Area Ratio (FAR) <sup>*</sup>	Building Square Footage	ITE PM Peak Hr Trip Rate (Discounting by Trips) <sup>^^</sup>	2035 Net New PM Peak Hr	2045 Net New PM Peak
Commercial	42	0.75	8,317	261,470	6.00	1,020	1,569
Industrial	79	0.92	8,734	634,768	0.98	404	622
Totals	121			896,239		1,424	2,191

<sup>^</sup> 20 percent of land for public rights of way.

<sup>\*</sup> 50% of net buildable land reserved for landscaping and off-street parking.

<sup>^^</sup> Kittelson & Associates estimates.



## UPDATE OF THE IMPROVEMENT FEE

Of the approximately \$26.5 million of total project costs, only approximately \$8.873 million (29 percent) is used to calculate the updated improvement fee.

Using the results of Tables 2 and 3, we divide the capital improvement costs allocated to growth by the increase in the number of trips expected over the planning horizon (Table 3 above), which is 4,774 peak-hour trips. Each of project's costs allocated to growth is divided by the increase in weekday PM peak-hour trips and summed to provide the improvement fee per trip.

**Table 8 - Calculation of Improvement Fee**

TSP Project #	Eligible Projects for Transportation Improvement Fee (2014 to 2035)	Eligible Project Costs	Costs ÷ 4774 New Trips 2014-2035	Improvement Fee Cumulative
3	Golf Club Road (Hwy 22 to Shaff Rd.)	\$ 550,503	115.31	115.31
7	Cascade Hwy/Whitney St. intersection	\$ 1,959,300	410.41	525.72
8	Washington/Ida/Wilco/Stayton Rd. Intersection	\$ 1,212,357	253.95	779.67
9	Fern Ridge Road (10th Ave to Hwy 22)	\$ 609,884	127.75	907.42
10	Washington St/1st Ave Intersection Improvements	\$ 163,610	34.27	941.69
12	1st Avenue/Ida Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 163,610	34.27	975.76
13	3rd Avenue/Washington Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 163,610	34.27	1,010.23
14	1st Avenue/Hollister Street Intersection Improvements	\$ 111,642	23.39	1,033.62
16	Future Collector Streets (2.8 mi) - Yellow lines on TSP	\$ 2,023,976	423.96	1,457.57
17	Shaff Rd. (Kindle Way to Fern Avenue)	\$ 750,000	157.10	1,614.67
18	Shaff Rd. (Fern Avenue to 1st Avenue)	\$ 750,000	157.10	1,771.77
19	Wilco Rd. (Shaff to Washington)	\$ 1,800,000	377.04	2,148.81
<b>Total Street Improvements</b>		<b>\$ 10,258,492</b>	<b>2,148.81</b>	<b>2,148.81</b>
<b>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Improvements (2014-2035)</b>				
BP-4	Washington St (1st to Myrtle - North Side)	\$ 9,550	2.00	2.54
BP-5	Washington St (Wilco to Evergreen --South Side)	\$ 42,831	8.97	13.91
BP-6	Ida St. (Noble - 1st Avenue)	\$ 25,756	5.40	20.76
BP-8	Locust St. (Wilco Rd. to 1st Avenue)	\$ 8,103	1.70	22.91
<b>Total Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</b>		<b>\$ 86,241</b>	<b>22.91</b>	<b>22.91</b>
<b>Total Transportation System Plan Improvements (2014-2035)</b>		<b>\$ 8,873,337</b>	<b>2,172.72</b>	<b>2,172</b>

The proposed transportation improvement fee is \$2,172 per trip.

## REIMBURSEMENT FEE

The 2007 Transportation SDC Methodology was established as an improvement fee. It did not include a reimbursement fee. The City has completed a number of transportation improvement projects since adoption of the 2005 Transportation System Plan for which Transportation SDCs have been expended. It is therefore appropriate that a Reimbursement Fee now be included in the Transportation SDC. The Reimbursement Fee is based on the actual costs transportation improvement projects completed from 2007 to 2013. These projects are listed in Table 9.

**Table 9 – Reimbursement Fee eligible projects completed since 2007**

TSP Project #	Eligible Project Costs for Transportation SDC Reimbursement Fee (2007 to 2013)	Total Project Costs	Outside Agencies, Other City \$ and Grants	SDC Funds Expended
	Transportation SDC Analysis & Preparation	48,748		48,748
1	Hwy 22 – Joseph St. Project (City Share)	59,920		59,920
7	Cascade Hwy / Whitney Traffic Signal	345,061		345,061
	Cascade Hwy / Fern Ridge Rd. Widening & Signal	255,000		255,000
11	1 <sup>st</sup> Ave (N. Santiam River Bridge to Ida St.)	200,000	200,000	-
15	10 <sup>th</sup> Ave (Fern Ridge to Jefferson)	1,969,565	1,765,953	203,612
BP-1	Shaff Rd. (Drainage & Bike Path improvements)	350,000	261,521	88,479
<b>Total Transportation System Improvement Costs</b>		<b>3,228,294</b>	<b>2,227,474</b>	<b>1,000,820</b>

The street improvement projects completed since 2007 and included in Table 9 are needed to meet existing traffic demands and are also necessary to serve future growth during the next 20 years (2014-2035).

Table 2 shows that in 2014, there are an estimated 11,722 PM Peak-Hour trips. By 2034, the number of PM Peak-Hour trips will grow to 16,496, an increase of 4,474 PM Peak-Hour trips from 2014 to 2034. The 4,474 new trips will comprise 29% of the total PM Peak-Hour trips in the year 2034. Therefore, up to \$862,000 (29%) of the \$2,973,294 cost of the completed projects may be eligible for use of systems development charge funds because that proportion of the projects will benefit new growth.

The reimbursement fee is calculated using the actual amount of SDC funds (\$745,820) expended by the City on the eligible projects during the years 2007 to 2013. It does not include eligible project costs paid for by federal and state grants, ODOT, Marion County or City Street funds. Table 9 summarizes the actual costs incurred for the period 2007 to 2013 and lists the expenditure of SDC funds for each eligible project.

In order to calculate the reimbursement fee, the actual costs expended are divided by the increase in the number of new PM Peak-Hour trips (4,474) expected over the 20-year planning horizon. Table 10 divides each eligible project cost by 4,474 to estimate the reimbursement fee for that project. The individual reimbursement fees are added together to provide the total reimbursement fee per trip.

**Table 10 - Calculation of Reimbursement Fee**

TSP Project #	Eligible Projects for Transportation SDC Reimbursement Fee (2007 to 2013)	Eligible Project Costs	Costs ÷ 4774 New Trips 2014-2035	Reimbursement SDC Cumulative
	Transportation SDC Analysis & Preparation	48,748	10.21	10.21
1	Hwy 22 – Joseph St. Project (City Share)	59,920	12.55	22.76
7	Cascade Hwy / Whitney Traffic Signal	345,061	72.28	85.04
7	Cascade Hwy / Fern Ridge Traffic Signal	255,000	53.41	138.45
11	1 <sup>st</sup> Ave (N. Santiam River Bridge to Ida St.)	0	0.00	138.45
15	10 <sup>th</sup> Ave (Fern Ridge to Jefferson)	203,612	42.65	181.10
BP-1	Shaff Rd. (Drainage & Bike Path improvements)	88,479	18.53	199.63
<b>Total Transportation System Improvement Costs</b>		<b>745,820</b>	<b>199.63</b>	<b>200.00</b>

The proposed Transportation Reimbursement Fee is \$200 per trip.

## APPLICATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION SDC

The resulting Transportation SDC is comprised of the improvement fee of \$2,172 plus the \$200 reimbursement fee. The Transportation SDC fee for all projects is \$2,372 per trip, a reduction of \$140 per trip. Table 11 shows the comparison.

**Table 11 - Current and Proposed Transportation SDC**

Type of SDC	2007 Transportation SDC	Proposed 2014 Transportation SDC	Change	
			\$	%
Transportation Improvement Fee	2,512	2,172	(340)	
Transportation Reimbursement Fee	-	200	200	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,512</b>	<b>2,372</b>	<b>(140)</b>	<b>-6%</b>

The City will apply the SDC per trip to the average number of trips reported in the most current edition of the *Trip Generation Manual* published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The 2007 SDC methodology referenced the 7<sup>th</sup> edition. The current version is the 9<sup>th</sup> edition.

The City has been using “adjustment factors” for non-residential developments to account for linked and pass-by trips. These are shown in the Appendix, and will not change.

Systems Development Charges  
Comparison of SDC Charges for Oregon Cities

	City	Water	Sewer	Storm	Transport.	Parks	Total	2010 Pop.
1	Pendleton				\$1,472	\$138	\$1,610	16,612
2	Sweet Home	\$1,215	\$624				\$1,839	8,925
3	Ontario	\$975	\$481		\$1,288		\$2,744	11,366
4	Clatskanie	\$1,250	\$1,500				\$2,750	1,737
5	Keizer	\$905			\$1,187	\$1,610	\$3,702	36,478
6	Coquille	\$1,901	\$2,951	\$228	\$280	\$289	\$5,649	3,866
7	Tillamook	\$3,149	\$1,225	\$1,293			\$5,667	4,935
8	Turner	\$2,269	\$2,615		\$479	\$895	\$6,258	1,854
9	Monmouth	\$1,464	\$2,852	\$157	\$394	\$1,726	\$6,593	9,534
10	Sisters	\$2,053	\$2,968		\$1,026	\$613	\$6,660	2,038
11	Coburg	\$3,312			\$728	\$2,835	\$6,875	1,737
12	Fairview	\$2,921	\$2,600	\$342		\$1,746	\$7,608	8,920
13	Sandy	\$1,525	\$1,834		\$2,430	\$2,311	\$8,100	9,570
14	St Helens	\$2,511	\$3,738	\$260	\$251	\$1,362	\$8,122	12,883
15	Roseburg	\$2,052	\$2,082	\$940	\$2,929	\$550	\$8,553	21,181
16	Milwaukie	\$1,620	\$893	\$765	\$1,758	\$3,985	\$9,021	20,291
17	Albany	\$2,211	\$2,645		\$2,582	\$1,745	\$9,183	50,158
18	Brownsville	\$2,095	\$5,160	\$1,970			\$9,225	1,668
19	Wood Village	\$1,524	\$7,794				\$9,318	3,878
20	Klamath Falls	\$2,761	\$5,591			\$1,295	\$9,647	20,840
21	Medford	\$948	\$1,212	\$574	\$3,664	\$3,433	\$9,831	74,907
22	Junction City	\$1,100	\$6,849		\$1,116	\$1,090	\$10,155	5,392
23	Lebanon	\$2,141	\$3,581	\$160	\$1,492	\$2,788	\$10,162	15,518
24	Hood River	\$3,883	\$1,508	\$650	\$1,802	\$2,605	\$10,448	7,167
25	Woodburn	\$2,085	\$2,977	\$220	\$3,532	\$1,752	\$10,566	24,071
26	Sublimity	\$2,370	\$3,370	\$1,880	\$1,810	\$1,200	\$10,630	2,681
27	Madras	\$790	\$4,755	\$198	\$3,323	\$1,685	\$10,751	6,046
28	Newport	\$2,366	\$3,891	\$840	\$1,090	\$2,591	\$10,778	9,989
29	Florence	\$3,557	\$4,456	\$2,050	\$865		\$10,928	8,466
30	<b>Stayton</b>	<b>\$2,670</b>	<b>\$3,528</b>		<b>\$2,562</b>	<b>\$2,305</b>	<b>\$11,065</b>	<b>7,644</b>
31	Lincoln City	\$2,815	\$5,878	\$28	\$660	\$1,900	\$11,281	7,930
32	Independence	\$2,445	\$3,573	\$823	\$3,231	\$1,741	\$11,813	8,591
33	Prineville	2809	4199		\$3,176	\$1,887	\$12,071	9,253
34	Eugene	\$2,689	\$2,191	\$586	\$1,865	\$3,845	\$12,181	156,185
35	Creswell	\$5,277	\$4,746		\$627	\$1,539	\$12,189	5,031
36	Dallas	\$3,940	\$4,027	\$932	\$1,167	\$2,281	\$12,347	14,583
37	Ashland	\$4,264	\$4,264	\$760	\$2,044	\$1,041	\$12,372	20,078
38	North Plains	\$4,298	\$3,200	\$500	\$523	\$3,910	\$12,431	1,947
39	Corvallis	\$1,122	\$3,492	\$174	\$2,471	\$5,449	\$12,708	54,462
40	Salem	\$3,907	\$3,093	\$494	\$1,954	\$3,745	\$13,193	156,455
41	Troutdale	\$1,326	\$4,426	\$852		\$7,137	\$13,741	15,962
42	Cottage Grove	\$6,940	\$1,135	\$694	\$1,680	\$3,659	\$14,108	9,686
43	Veneta	\$1,937	\$6,264	\$168	\$2,024	\$4,066	\$14,459	4,561
44	Redmond	\$2,407	\$3,366	\$2,301	\$3,876	\$2,672	\$14,622	26,215
45	Oregon City	\$4,495	\$3,732	\$650	\$2,606	\$3,543	\$15,026	31,859
46	Springfield	\$3,312	\$5,470	\$1,887	\$1,278	\$3,499	\$15,446	59,403
47	Canby	\$5,933	\$2,337	\$100	\$2,440	\$4,725	\$15,535	15,829
48	Brookings	\$2,222	\$9,646	\$959	\$1,210	\$1,578	\$15,615	6,336
49	West Linn	\$4,628	\$2,633	\$456	\$4,897	\$3,030	\$15,644	25,109
50	Forest Grove	\$4,000	\$1,240	\$500	\$3,600	\$6,888	\$16,228	21,083
51	Aumsville	\$3,979	\$5,291	\$1,050	\$3,701	\$2,611	\$16,632	3,584
52	Gresham	\$4,153	\$5,056	\$824	\$2,795	\$3,837	\$16,665	105,594
53	Newberg	\$5,837	\$5,666	\$311	\$2,909	\$2,017	\$16,740	22,300
54	Hillsboro	\$6,146	\$3,100	\$500	\$3,600	\$4,083	\$17,429	91,611
55	Bend	\$4,520	\$2,840		\$4,574	\$5,782	\$17,716	76,639
56	Tualatin	\$3,397	\$4,665	\$275	\$6,665	\$3,892	\$18,894	26,054
57	Silverton	\$5,043	\$4,731	\$2,070	\$3,057	\$4,505	\$19,406	9,222
58	Tigard	\$7,044	\$3,100	\$500	\$3,440	\$5,997	\$20,081	48,035
59	Beaverton	\$4,953	\$4,665	\$945	\$6,665	\$5,247	\$22,475	89,803
60	Wilsonville	\$7,002	\$4,233	\$780	\$6,340	\$4,602	\$22,957	19,509
61	Pacific City Joint Water & Sanitary District	\$15,033	\$8,121				\$23,154	1,000
62	Lake Oswego	\$6,763	\$2,463	\$135	\$4,195	\$11,650	\$25,206	36,619



