

**Draft Parks System Development Charge (SDC) Methodology Update Resolution**

*The yellow highlighted text refers to the proposed update that might qualify as a SDC methodology update. This draft also assumes Council will approve the proposed annual indexing resolution on April 15, 2025. Changes to this draft resolution may occur without re-notice or web posting if the changes do not impact the current Parks SDC Methodology.*

**RESOLUTION NO. TBD**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES,  
METHODOLOGY REPORT AND PROJECT LISTS AND  
REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 3644**

**The City of Gresham Finds:**

- A. Chapter 11, Infrastructure, of the Gresham Revised Code, provides that the Council shall establish certain fees and charges by resolution.
- B. On April 15, 2025\*, Council passed Resolution Number 3644 adopting Parks System Development Charges (SDCs), methodology report and project lists.
- C. Parks SDCs are charged based on the number of dwelling units, but Resolution No 3644 does not include a definition for “dwelling unit”.
- D. Periodic updating of project lists is required to address the changing infrastructure needs of the City as development occurs.

**THE CITY OF GRESHAM RESOLVES:**

**Section 1.** The fees and charges for Gresham Revised Code Chapter 11, Infrastructure relating to Parks System Development Charges are established as shown in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. Exhibit A is updated to include a definition for Dwelling Unit, which matches the existing definition found in the Transportation SDC resolution.

1. With the exception of Appendix A.2 and B.2 therein, the City hereby re-adopts without changes the report attached as Exhibit B, entitled “Parks and Recreation System Development Charges Methodology Update,” dated March 7, 2017, and the methodologies, assumptions, conclusions and findings in the report which refer to the determination of the Parks SDC. This report is hereinafter referred to as “Parks SDC Methodology Report.” The attached Exhibit C replaces Appendix A.2, Community & Neighborhood Parks Projects Project Costs and SDC Eligibility, and Exhibit D replaces Appendix B.2, Paths and Trails Cost & SDC Breakdown by Acquisition & Construction Type. The attached Exhibit C includes updates to the project list from the list adopted in Resolution 3644 to address the changing infrastructure needs of the City.

2. The Parks SDC is an Improvement Fee SDC.

**Section 2.** Resolution 3644 is hereby repealed.

**Section 3.** This resolution shall be effective on July 1, 2025.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_

No: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Passed by the Gresham City Council on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Schmidt  
City Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Travis Stovall  
Mayor

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ellen Van Riper  
City Attorney

DRAFT

# Exhibit A

## Parks System Development Charges

*Gresham Revised Code (GRC) and Gresham Community Development Code (GCDC) sections are for reference and are subject to change.*

*Establishing Resolution No. TBD was passed on May 20, 2025 and effective July 1, 2025.*

Charged per dwelling unit. A dwelling unit is defined as one or more rooms in a building, or portion thereof, designed for or that provides living facilities for cohabitating individuals and includes permanent provisions for sleeping and sanitation. Hotels and motels are not dwelling units. Rate depends on location as described below.

<b>Parks System Development Charges (GRC 11.05)</b>	<b>Fee</b>
Current City Limits*	\$ 5,132.00
Pleasant Valley**	\$ 6,948.00
Springwater***	\$ 8,911.00

*\*City limits of Gresham, except for the Pleasant Valley and Springwater Plan Districts, as they existed on January 1, 2006. Also includes the Kelley Creek Headwaters Plan Area.*

*\*\*The Pleasant Valley Plan District as defined by GCDC 4.1400.*

*\*\*\*The Springwater Plan District as defined by GCDC 4.1500.*



# Parks System Development Charges

## Methodology Report

Adoption Date: March 7, 2017

Effective Date: July 1, 2017

### HISTORY OF PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES IN GRESHAM

The City of Gresham began charging a Parks Systems Development Charge (SDC) for new residential developments in 1992 to provide a funding source to develop new park, path and trail infrastructure for Gresham's growing population by charging new residential units the SDC at the time of building permit. The last update to the SDC Methodology was in 2006 with Resolution 2835 (2006 Methodology). With the adoption of the 2006 Resolution:

- Commercial and industrial developments began being charged a modest Parks SDC based on a projected number of added employees which was determined by dividing the added floor area by a projected number of employees based on type of use.
- SDC rates were established for the Pleasant Valley and Springwater Plan Areas.
- An allowance and formula for indexing of the SDC rate was established. Using this formula, the Parks SDC was indexed in 2007 and 2008.

See the Legislative Authority and General SDC Background Information section beginning on **Page 4** for more general information about SDCs.

### CHANGES FROM THE 2006 METHODOLOGY AND PROJECT LIST

This parks SDC update is generally in keeping with the 2006 Methodology and project list currently in effect. This update will continue to use the Improvement-Driven Approach as the backbone of the methodology. Cost share for new and expanded community parks, paths and trails, defined on **Page 3** of this report, are still distributed equally between new residential development in Gresham, Pleasant Valley and Springwater. Cost share for Neighborhood Parks is limited to the area where they will be located (Gresham, Pleasant Valley or Springwater, referred to collectively as Districts for the remainder of this report).

The following is an overview of the major differences between the current methodology and project lists and the 2006 methodology and project lists:

### **Methodology**

- **Updated the construction and land costs** to align with current construction and land costs. The construction cost estimates were based on a review of recent park project costs in Gresham and the Portland metro area, and land costs were based on a review of recent land sales in Gresham.
- **Updated the population projections** to full build out based on the Metro forecasting model. The 2006 Methodology used the 2020 population forecast. Full build out projections were used because the project list is based on full build out of the City, so the population forecasting should match.
- **Eliminated the Commercial and Industrial Development SDC** because a review of commercial and industrial SDCs collected between 2012 and 2015 showed that only 2% of the SDCs collected were from Commercial and Industrial SDCs; the SDC calculation was complicated and didn't align well with actual new employee counts, and following a review of other jurisdictions, a better calculation was not found; and based on a review of the Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 223.301, it was possible that a commercial and industrial SDC based on new employees could be legally challenged.
- **Eliminated the tax credit.** The tax credit reduces the SDC when a bond is in place or going to be in place to cover new parks projects that are on the SDC project list. There is not currently a bond in place and no plans to request a bond approval from Gresham voters. If that changes, the SDC will need to be adjusted accordingly to avoid double charging new units. Note, tax credits and SDC credits, discussed later in this report, are not the same thing.

### **Projects Added**

Following a review of existing master plan documents, existing vacant park land, as well as Urban Design & Planning staff and Rockwood Urban Renewal staff, the following projects were added. Some projects may not have been included in the 2006 Methodology because the 2006 Methodology report only looked at projects for 20 years.

- All missing parks and plazas listed in the Springwater and Pleasant Valley Master Plans
- Hogan Butte Nature Park development
- Phase 3 of Pat Pfeiffer park in the Rockwood plan district
- Rockwood Plan district neighborhood park and a plaza
- Civic Neighborhood Plan area neighborhood park and a plaza
- Construction costs for a futsal/soccer court in Rockwood
- Columbia View Park construction at NE 169<sup>th</sup> and Hassalo
- Vance Park parking lot

### **Projects Removed/Reduced in Scope**

- All **Greenway acquisition and development.** In general, greenways are protected by environmental zoning or overlay zoning. Areas of special environmental importance have or will be acquired by Gresham or other public agencies for conservation unrelated to parks. Those areas of environmental importance may or may not be open for recreational purposes. Parks SDCs should only be used to acquire those lands when they serve a recreational purpose. Parks

SDCs will continue to aid in the purchase of easements for paths and trails located in privately owned greenways; the costs to acquire easements or purchase land to place a trail or path in a privately-owned greenway, has been incorporated into the paths and trails' portion of the SDC costs. The Stormwater SDC Methodology update will provide a funding source to protect greenways and compensate land owners by acquiring conservation easements over all privately-owned Environmental Sensitive Resource/Restoration Area (ESRA) zones in Pleasant Valley and Springwater; the 2006 Parks methodology only offered compensation for some ESRA land.

- **Springwater Community Park**, which is shown in planning documents on the north boundary of the Springwater Plan area, west of Kane Road. It was removed due to proximity to Gradin Sports Park, Hogan Butte Nature Park and proposed Springwater Plazas. It is also topographically constrained, the majority of the land is owned by Metro, mostly zoned ESRA and located further from many residential users than other parks due to nearby lower planned urban densities and industrial zones.
- As it related to the SDC methodology, the size of **Southwest Neighborhood Park** was reduced in size from 8 acres to up to 2.5 acres based on steep slopes, ESRA and the fact that Metro and the City of Portland own a large percentage of the surrounding area. Hogan Butte Nature Park and South Central Neighborhood Park are to be located in close proximity.

### **Project List Clarifications**

- The parks projects in the downtown plan area have been refined, although exact project locations will be determined at the time of park master planning and development.
- Paths and trails projects mapped and aligned with the Paths and Trails Master Map adopted June 2, 2015. The 2006 Methodology did not clearly delineate trail projects, just total length of SDC eligible paths and trails. The proposed project list and map also now include the location of SDC eligible bridges and controlled crossings.
- Paths along Roadways have been moved to the Transportation SDC.
- Master Planning and Design costs have been called out separately in the project costs (Reference **Appendix A.2**).

## **PROJECT TYPES**

**Neighborhood Parks** are designed to serve users located within ½ mile for informal, non-organized recreation. For the purposes of the methodology, all of the plazas in the project list have been grouped into this category. As noted above, the costs for the neighborhood parks in each area (Gresham, Pleasant Valley and Springwater), are separated resulting in a different rate for each area.

**Community Parks** are designed with amenities that would attract users from anywhere in the City. Community Parks includes Special Use Areas such as Gradin Sports Park, the Zimmerman House and Hogan Butte Nature Park. Because a community park is expected to draw users from the entire City, the cost for the community park is distributed evenly across the all three districts.

**Paths and Trails** in the project list include most of the paths and trails proposed on the Gresham Paths and Trails Master Map, which was adopted as Appendix J of the Parks and Recreation Trails and Natural Areas Master Plan via Resolution 3199 on June 2, 2015. As shown in **Appendix C**, it does not include proposed paths and trails that are located in proposed parks, which are covered in the respective park's

project costs. It also does not include paths along roadways as those are going to be included in the updated Transportation SDC project list. Because paths and trails are expected to draw users from the entire City, cost for paths and trails are distributed evenly to all three districts.

## LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY & GENERAL SDC BACKGROUND INFORMATION

System Development Charges are one-time fees on new development, which are paid at the time of development. SDCs are intended to recover a fair share of the cost of existing unused capacity and planned facilities that will provide capacity to serve future growth.

While SDCs have been in use in Oregon since the mid 1970's, state legislation regarding SDCs was not adopted until 1989, when the Oregon SDC Act (ORS 223.297 to 223.314) was passed. This purpose of this Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...".

Per the Act, local governments that enact SDCs are bound by the following requirements:

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

### SDC Improvement vs. Reimbursement Fee

ORS 223.229 defines two components of an SDC:

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

ORS 223.304(2) states, in part, that an *improvement fee* must be calculated to include only the cost of projected capital improvements needed to increase system capacity for future users. In other words, the cost of planned projects that correct existing deficiencies or do not otherwise increase capacity for future users may not be included in the improvement fee calculation. An improvement fee may be spent

only on capital improvements (or portions thereof) that increase the capacity of the system for which it is being charged (whether cash-financed or debt-financed).

Neither the 2006 Methodology or this methodology proposes to adopt a reimbursement fee.

### **SDC Credits**

An SDC 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 is

1. Required as a condition of land use approval of the specific development;
2. Identified in the City’s capital improvement program; and
3. Either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject to 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.

The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (e.g. a parks improvement credit can only be used for a parks SDC), and may be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standards facility size or capacity needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credits generated in earlier phases may be applied against the charges accrued in the subsequent phases.

### **Allocated Capacity**

Allocated System Capacity is the amount of capacity that a specific property may utilize subject to compliance with applicable laws. Allocated system capacity is provided for prior payment of system development charges on a project site provided adequate proof of payment can be determined.

Allocated system capacity also exists for uses on the site prior to the adoption of system development charges. No refunds are provided for unused allocated system capacity if the use is removed or downsized.

### **Methodology Approaches**

There are three basic approaches used to develop improvement fee SDCs.

1. The Standards-Driven Approach is based on the application of level of service (LOS) standards for facilities by type (e.g. Neighborhood Park, Community Park, etc.) Facility needs are determined by applying the LOS Standards to projected growth. SDC-eligible amounts are calculated based on the costs of facilities needed to serve growth. The approach works best where current and planned LOS has been identified but no specific list of projects is available.
2. 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 cost of growth-required projects by the projected increase in growth. This approach works best where a detailed master plan or project list is available and the benefits of projects can be readily apportioned between growth and current use.
3. The Combination/Hybrid Approach includes elements of both of the above approaches. LOS standards may be used to create a list of planned capacity-increasing projects, and the growth-



required portions of a projects can be used as the basis for determining SDC-eligible costs. This approach works best when LOS have been identified and the benefits of individual projects are not easily apportioned between and current users.

The Improvements Driven approach is the methodology currently in place and is proposed for this update.

## ANALYSIS

Staff has reviewed the project list adopted with the 2006 Methodology, existing park land and master plans to revise the project lists for parks, paths and trails. The project list for Parks is included as **Appendix A** and for Paths and Trails as **Appendix B**. Additionally, a map of the parks, paths and trails projects are included as **Appendix C** and Project Notes are included as **Appendix D**. A more detailed, full sized map is available upon request.

The growth models used in 2006 Methodology were based on the 2000 US Census and the 2020 Population Forecasts. This updated methodology utilizes Metro’s Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) number of household forecasts for full residential build out of each District and multiplies those estimates by their estimated people per household estimates for 2040 to determine full build out population projections for each district. 2040 household estimates are used in because household size estimates were not available for full build out. The TAZ 2015 Households and Full Build out Household estimates are shown in **Table 1.1**, the TAZ Average People per Household estimates for 2040 are shown in **Table 1.2** and the resulting Population Projections for each District are shown in **Table 1.3**

**Table 1.1**  
**Estimates Households**

District	2015	Build Out	Increase
Gresham	39,041	50,945	11,904
Pleasant Valley	200	7,478	7,278
Springwater	220	2,899	2,679
Total	39,461	61,332	21,861

**Table 1.2**  
**Average People per Household Estimates**

District	2040 Estimate
Gresham	2.70
Pleasant Valley	2.64
Springwater	2.48

**Table 1.3**  
**Population Projections**

District	2015	Build Out	Increase
Gresham	112,569	137,409	24,840
Pleasant Valley	551	19,777	19,226
Springwater	584	7,197	6,613
Total	113,704	164,383	50,679

The population estimates will be utilized in **Table 2** to determine the percent of the project’s cost that is SDC eligible and the household estimates will be utilized in **Table 4** and **Table 6** to determine the SDC rate for each District.

To determine the percent break between the existing population’s need, which is not SDC eligible, and growth, which is SDC eligible, it is necessary to look at the existing developed facilities as it compares to the project lists and land allocated for facility needs at full build out and then compare it to the existing and projected population. As discussed above, and with the 2006 Methodology, Community Parks (including nature parks, sports parks and community centers) as well as paths and trails are considered facilities to be shared by the entire Gresham population, including Pleasant Valley and Springwater residents. Neighborhood Park projects, meant to serve the population within a half-mile radius, and the populations themselves are separated into their respective district.

**Table 2**  
**SDC Eligible Share**

Inventory & Needs, Improvement Fee Eligibility	Community Parks (acres)	Paths & Trails (miles)	Neighborhood Parks (acres)		
			Gresham	Pleasant Valley	Spring-water
<b>Current Inventory of Parks Facilities</b>					
Fully Developed Facilities	74.94	24.59	64.92	0	0
Undeveloped Land	139.37	0	34.97	2.00	0
Total	214.31	24.59	99.89	2.00	0
<b>Planned Projects</b>					
Land Acquisition	35.47	28.80	14.50	18.22	13.36
Development	174.84	28.80	49.47	20.21	13.36
<b>Inventory at Completion of Planned Projects</b>					
Fully Developed Facilities	249.78	53.39	114.39	20.21	13.36
<b>Population Estimates</b>					
2015 Population (Residents)	113,704	113,704	112,569	551	584
Full Build Out Projection (Residents)	164,383	164,383	137,409	19,777	7,197
<b>Realized Level of Service</b>					
Fully Developed Facilities per 1,000 Residents	1.52	0.32	0.83	1.02	1.86
<b>Required Inventory Based on Realized Level of Service</b>					
<b>Fully Developed Facilities Required</b>					
Full Build Out	249.78	53.39	114.39	20.21	13.36
In 2015	172.77	36.93	93.71	0.56	1.08
To accommodate growth	77.01	16.46	20.68	19.65	12.27
<b>Total Land Required</b>					
Full Build Out	249.78	53.39	114.39	20.21	13.36
In 2015	172.77	36.93	93.71	0.56	1.08
To accommodate growth	77.01	16.46	20.68	19.65	12.27
<b>Analysis of Land Acquisition</b>					
Total	35.47	28.80	14.50	18.22	13.36
Curing Deficiency	0	12.34	0	0	1.08
Accommodating Growth	35.47	16.46	14.50	18.22	12.27
<b>Analysis of Planned Development</b>					
Total	174.84	28.80	49.47	20.21	13.36
Curing Deficiency	97.83	12.34	28.79	0.56	1.08
Accommodating Growth	77.01	16.46	20.68	19.65	12.27
<b>Accommodating Growth (SDC eligible)</b>					
Land Acquisition	100.00%	57.15%	100%	100%	91.89%
Development	44.05%	57.15%	41.80%	97.21%	91.89%

Due to rounding, numbers might vary slightly.

To explain **Table 2**, it seems best to provide an explanation of one category (column) within the table. Looking at the Community Parks column, there are currently 74.94 acres of fully developed community parks land and 139.37 acres of undeveloped community park land in Gresham for a total of 214.31 acres. The project list calls for 35.47 additional acres of community park land to be acquired in addition to the 214.31 acres such that the total community park land to be developed is 249.78 acres at full build out.

Based on Metro TAZ projections, the population for Gresham, Pleasant Valley and Springwater is expected to increase from 113,704 residents in 2015, to 164,383 residents when the City is fully built out.

The realized level of service will be 1.52 acres of fully developed community park land per 1,000 residents (249.78 acres divided by 164,383/1,000 residents). Based on that proportionality, the City would currently have a total of 172.77 acres of fully developed park land to accommodate its current population (1.52 acres per 1,000 residents multiplied by 113,704 residents). Therefore 97.83 acres (172.77 needed facilities minus 74.94 current fully developed facilities) represents an existing deficiency and 77.01 (249.78 minus 172.77) will accommodate growth and is SDC eligible for a total of 174.84. The percentage eligible for growth is 44.05% (77.01 divided by 174.84) Regarding the land itself, irrespective of park development, 214.31 acres of community park land exists, which is greater than the required 172.77 acres for existing residents, therefore 100% of newly acquired park land would accommodate growth.

This means that 44.05% of the construction costs for community parks are SDC eligible and 100% of the land acquisition costs are SDC eligible. It also means that the costs at those percentages will be distributed to new dwelling units in the form of Parks SDCs.

The next step is to determine the SDC eligible portion of each Project based on the SDC eligible percentages results in **Table 2** and apply them to the project costs. This is done in **Appendix A.2** for Parks and **Appendix B.2** for Paths and Trails and summarized below in **Table 3**. The SDC Eligible project costs are the portion of the project that can be paid with SDCs based the analysis shown in **Table 2** (improvement). This is also the portion of the project that may receive SDC Credits if a developer builds the improvement or provides the land. The ineligible portion is the portion that is accommodating the existing population, not growth. Other funding sources, such as grants, would be needed to pay for this portion of the project costs.

**Table 3**  
**SDC Eligible Project Costs**

Project Type	Total Project Cost	SDC Eligible Project Costs	SDC Ineligible Project Costs
Community Parks	\$ 82,978,344	\$ 43,621,659	\$ 39,356,684
Paths and Trails	\$ 19,211,927	\$ 10,979,015	\$ 8,232,913
Gresham Neighborhood Parks	\$ 35,140,522	\$ 18,735,775	\$ 16,404,748
Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Parks	\$ 21,800,751	\$ 21,414,301	\$ 386,450
Springwater Neighborhood Parks	\$ 12,745,418	\$ 11,711,193	\$ 1,034,225
	<b>\$ 171,876,963</b>	<b>\$ 106,461,943</b>	<b>\$ 65,415,019</b>

Due to rounding, numbers might vary slightly.

To determine the SDC for each project type, it is necessary to divide the projected additional housing units by the SDC Eligible Project cost as shown in **Table 4**.

**Table 4**  
**SDC Per Project Type/Location**

Type	SDC Eligible Project Costs	Additional Housing Units Projected	SDC
Community Parks	\$ 43,621,659	21,861	\$ 1,995
Paths and Trails	\$ 10,979,015	21,861	\$ 502
Gresham Neighborhood Parks	\$ 18,735,775	11,904	\$ 1,574
Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Parks	\$ 21,414,301	7,278	\$ 2,942
Springwater Neighborhood Parks	\$ 11,711,193	2,679	\$ 4,371

Due to rounding, numbers might vary slightly.

The aggregate SDC project costs for each district must be reduced to account for the current fund balances. Because the current methodology placed the SDCs into categories based only on the District where they were paid, all of the existing SDC fund balances will be applied to their respective neighborhood park project costs. **Table 5** reflects the unallocated SDC fund balance for each District and **Table 6**, provides the adjusted SDC Eligible Project cost.

**Table 5**  
**Unallocated SDCs in SDC Accounts**

District	Unallocated SDC Balance
Gresham	\$ 1,375,000
Pleasant Valley	\$ 607,685
Springwater	\$ 0

**Table 6**  
**SDC Per Project Type/Location Adjusted**

Type	SDC Eligible Project Costs Adjusted	Additional Housing Units Projected	SDC Adjusted
Community Parks	\$ 43,621,659	21,861	\$ 1,995
Paths and Trails	\$ 10,979,015	21,861	\$ 502
Gresham Neighborhood Parks	\$ 17,360,775	11,904	\$ 1,458
Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Parks	\$ 20,806,616	7,278	\$ 2,859
Springwater Neighborhood Parks	\$ 11,711,193	2,679	\$ 4,371

Due to rounding, numbers might vary slightly.

## RESULT

**Table 7** outlines the resulting SDC for each District below. A comparison of the proposed SDCs to the existing SDCs are included in **Appendix E**.

**Note: These rates have been subsequently indexed. See Exhibit A of this resolution for current rates.**

**Table 7**  
**Parks SDCs**

Fee Type	Facility Type	Gresham	Pleasant Valley	Springwater
Base Fee	Community Park	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,995
Base Fee	Paths and Trails	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502
Gresham Only	Neighborhood Park	\$ 1,458		
Pleasant Valley Only	Neighborhood Park		\$ 2,859	
Springwater Only	Neighborhood Park			\$ 4,371
<b>Total SDC</b>		<b>\$ 3,955</b>	<b>\$ 5,356</b>	<b>\$ 6,868</b>

Unlike the 2006 Methodology, the three types of facilities are broken out separately in the calculation. This makes it clear that the Base Fee portions of the SDC, which are the community parks, and the paths and trails, are funded by all Districts. Neighborhood parks are funded separately by each District.

For the purposes of calculating the parks SDC, each new dwelling unit, as defined in the GRC, will be required to pay the SDC that is applicable to its District.

# Appendix A.1

## Community & Neighborhood Parks Projects Size & Cost per Acre Multipliers

ID	NAME	TYPE	Area (Acres)			Cost Per Acre			
			Construct Area Total	Acquisition Max		Construction	Acquisition		
				Total	Not HCA/ESRA		HCA/ESRA	Non-HCA	HCA
<b>Gresham</b>									
7	SOUTHWEST NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.50	2.50	1.25	1.25	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
9	SOUTH CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.91	-	-	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
10	EAST GRESHAM NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	5.53	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
14	SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	6.53	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
73	NADAKA NATURE PARK (Final Phase)	NEIGHBORHOOD	0.25	-	-	-	\$ 80,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
15	JENNE BUTTE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	6.73	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
66	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #1	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 87,120
16	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #2 - EAST	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 87,120
65	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 87,120
76	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD-1996 AGREEMENT	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
69	COLUMBIA VIEW NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	7.46	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
75	VANCE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	0.57	-	-	-	\$ 771,930	\$ 800,000	\$ 87,120
70	ROCKWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 87,120
2	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD STATION PLAZA	NEIGHBORHOOD	1.00	-	-	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 87,120
74	ROCKWOOD SOCCER/FUSTAL COURT	NEIGHBORHOOD	5.00	-	-	-	\$ 30,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 87,120
19	ROCKWOOD URBAN PLAZA	NEIGHBORHOOD	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 87,120
4	SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PARK	COMMUNITY	16.13	-	-	-	\$ 440,440	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
6	PAT PFEIFER PARK (Final)	COMMUNITY	6.67	-	-	-	\$ 344,332	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
8	ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM	COMMUNITY	5.89	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
67	MAIN CITY PARK	COMMUNITY	2.00	-	-	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
5	SOUTHWEST COMM.PARK (to completion)	COMMUNITY	34.11	-	-	-	\$ 379,966	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
20	GRADIN SPORTS PARK (to completion)	COMMUNITY	22.56	-	-	-	\$ 1,114,902	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
3	HOGAN BUTTE NATURE PARK (to completion)	COMMUNITY	52.02	-	-	-	\$ 46,139	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
			<b>188.84</b>	<b>14.50</b>	<b>12.25</b>	<b>2.25</b>			

<b>Pleasant Valley</b>									
21	KELLEY CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.00	-	-	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
61	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #1	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.62	2.62	2.62	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
22	PACIFIC LANDMARK NH PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	3.03	3.03	3.03	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
23	182ND AVE NH PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	3.23	3.23	3.23	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
24	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #2	NEIGHBORHOOD	2.93	2.93	2.93	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
25	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #3	NEIGHBORHOOD	3.41	3.41	3.41	-	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
62	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #1	NEIGHBORHOOD	1.45	1.45	1.44	0.01	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
63	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #2	NEIGHBORHOOD	1.56	1.56	1.56	-	\$ 800,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
26	PLEASANT VALLEY COMM. PARK	COMMUNITY	25.76	25.76	17.70	8.06	\$ 300,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
			<b>45.97</b>	<b>43.97</b>	<b>35.90</b>	<b>8.07</b>			

<b>Springwater</b>									
31	VILLAGE CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NEIGHBORHOOD	6.12	6.12	6.12	0	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
64	PARK BLOCKS AND CIRCLE	NEIGHBORHOOD	7.23	7.23	7.23	0	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
33	EAST SPRINGWATER COMMUNITY PARK	COMMUNITY	9.71	9.71	9.71	0	\$ 500,000	\$ 435,600	\$ 87,120
			<b>23.07</b>	<b>23.07</b>	<b>23.07</b>	<b>-</b>			

Project notes included in Appendix D

Appendix A.2

Replaced By Exhibit C of this resolution.

Community & Neighborhood Parks Projects Project Costs and SDC Eligibility

ID	NAME	TYPE	Project Costs				SDC Eligible		SDC Eligible Project Costs					
			Master Plan /Design	Construction*	Not HCA/ESRA	HCA/ESRA	Planning, Design Const.	Acquisition	Master Plan /Design	Construction*	Not HCA/ESRA	Acquisition		
													Total	Total
<b>Gresham</b>														
7	SOUTHWEST NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 544,500	\$ 108,900	\$ 2,728,400	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 836,011	\$ 344,500	\$ 108,900	\$ 1,520,762
9	SOUTH CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,326,759	-	-	\$ 2,401,759	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 972,598	-	-	\$ 1,003,949
10	EAST GRESHAM NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 2,763,421	-	-	\$ 2,863,421	41.80%	100%	\$ 41,801	\$ 1,155,125	-	-	\$ 1,196,926
14	SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,264,911	-	-	\$ 3,364,911	41.80%	100%	\$ 41,801	\$ 1,044,751	-	-	\$ 1,406,551
73	NADAKA NATURE PARK (Final Phase)	N'HOOD	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000	-	-	\$ 30,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 4,180	\$ 8,360	-	-	\$ 12,540
15	JENNE BUTTE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,364,535	-	-	\$ 3,464,535	41.80%	100%	\$ 41,801	\$ 1,406,394	-	-	\$ 1,448,195
66	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #1	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 3,275,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 668,809	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 2,300,159
16	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #2 - EAST	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 3,275,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 668,809	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 2,300,159
65	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 3,275,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 668,809	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 2,300,159
76	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD-1996 AGREEMENT	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 799,700	-	-	\$ 799,700	41.80%	100%	-	\$ 334,279	-	-	\$ 334,279
69	COLUMBIA VIEW NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,727,798	-	-	\$ 3,827,798	41.80%	100%	\$ 41,801	\$ 1,558,240	-	-	\$ 1,600,041
75	VANCE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 110,000	\$ 440,000	-	-	\$ 550,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 45,981	\$ 183,922	-	-	\$ 229,903
70	ROCKWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK #1	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,000,000	-	\$ 2,675,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 668,809	\$ 1,000,000	-	\$ 1,700,159
2	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD STATION PLAZA	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	\$ 1,075,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 418,006	-	-	\$ 449,356
74	ROCKWOOD SOCCER/FUSTAL COURTS	N'HOOD	\$ 10,000	\$ 150,000	-	-	\$ 160,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 4,180	\$ 62,701	-	-	\$ 66,881
19	ROCKWOOD URBAN PLAZA #1	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 500,000	-	\$ 1,375,000	41.80%	100%	\$ 31,350	\$ 334,404	\$ 500,000	-	\$ 865,755
4	SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 326,441	\$ 7,106,390	-	-	\$ 7,432,831	44.05%	100%	\$ 143,781	\$ 3,130,018	-	-	\$ 3,273,800
6	PAT PEIFER PARK (Final)	COMM.	\$ 425,252	\$ 2,295,057	-	-	\$ 2,720,309	44.05%	100%	\$ 187,303	\$ 1,010,861	-	-	\$ 1,198,163
8	ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM	COMM.	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,945,000	-	-	\$ 3,020,000	44.05%	100%	\$ 33,034	\$ 1,297,129	-	-	\$ 1,330,163
67	MAIN CITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	\$ 1,075,000	44.05%	100%	\$ 33,034	\$ 440,451	-	-	\$ 473,485
5	SOUTHWEST COMM.PARK (to completion)	COMM.	\$ 425,252	\$ 12,959,295	-	-	\$ 13,384,547	44.05%	100%	\$ 187,303	\$ 5,707,937	-	-	\$ 5,895,240
20	GRADIN SPORTS PARK (to completion)	COMM.	\$ 2,123,509	\$ 25,146,686	-	-	\$ 27,270,195	44.05%	100%	\$ 935,302	\$ 11,075,889	-	-	\$ 12,011,191
3	HOGAN BUTTE NATURE PARK (to completion)	COMM.	\$ 150,000	\$ 2,400,000	-	-	\$ 2,550,000	44.05%	100%	\$ 66,068	\$ 1,057,083	-	-	\$ 1,123,151
<b>Total</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>92,593,404.30</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>44,040,967</b>
<b>Pleasant Valley</b>														
21	KELLEY CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,596,011	-	-	\$ 1,671,011	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,551,544	-	-	\$ 1,624,454
61	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #1	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,094,088	\$ 1,140,231	-	\$ 3,309,319	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 2,035,744	\$ 1,140,231	-	\$ 3,248,886
22	PACIFIC LANDMARK NH PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,512,523	\$ 1,317,710	-	\$ 2,905,234	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,470,383	\$ 1,317,710	-	\$ 2,861,003
23	182ND AVE NH PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,613,064	\$ 1,405,301	-	\$ 3,093,365	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,568,122	\$ 1,405,301	-	\$ 3,046,334
24	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #2	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,342,991	\$ 1,275,759	-	\$ 3,693,750	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 2,277,713	\$ 1,275,759	-	\$ 3,626,382
25	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #3	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,706,124	\$ 1,486,376	-	\$ 3,267,500	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,658,590	\$ 1,486,376	-	\$ 3,217,876
62	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #1	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,160,558	\$ 625,492	1,286	\$ 1,862,336	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,128,224	\$ 625,492	1,286	\$ 1,827,912
63	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #2	N'HOOD	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,245,217	\$ 678,021	-	\$ 1,998,237	97.21%	100%	\$ 72,910	\$ 1,340,524	\$ 678,021	-	\$ 1,961,455
26	PLEASANT VALLEY COMM. PARK	COMM.	\$ 150,000	\$ 7,726,783	\$ 7,708,465	702,165	\$ 16,287,412	44.05%	100%	\$ 66,068	\$ 3,403,271	\$ 7,708,465	702,165	\$ 11,879,968
<b>Total</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>38,088,163.78</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>33,294,270</b>
<b>Springwater</b>														
31	VILLAGE CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,062,340	\$ 2,667,911	-	\$ 5,830,251	91.89%	91.89%	\$ 91,886	\$ 2,813,847	\$ 2,451,424	-	\$ 5,357,156
64	PARK BLOCKS AND CIRCLE	N'HOOD	\$ 150,000	\$ 3,615,416	\$ 3,149,751	-	\$ 6,915,167	91.89%	91.89%	\$ 137,828	\$ 3,322,044	\$ 2,894,165	-	\$ 6,354,037
33	EAST SPRINGWATER COMMUNITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 150,000	\$ 4,856,803	\$ 4,231,246	-	\$ 9,238,049	44.05%	100%	\$ 66,068	\$ 2,139,185	\$ 4,231,246	-	\$ 6,436,499
<b>Total</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>21,983,466.96</b>			<b>Total</b>				<b>18,147,692</b>

Project notes included in Appendix D

\*Construction Cost includes Permitting & Overhead (Admin) & Contingency.



# Appendix B.1

## Paths and Trails Project Names, Lengths and Types

### Trails

ID	NAME	TYPE	Length (Lineal Feet)
28	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR PATH	PATH OFF ROAD	6,637
29	KELLEY CREEK PATH	PATH OFF ROAD	9,900
35	VILLAGE CENTER LOOP TRAIL	SOFT SURFACE	7,168
40	BUTTES TRAILS (GRESHAM)	SOFT SURFACE	55,634
41	BUTLER CREEK GREENWAY TRAIL	SOFT SURFACE	3,423
43	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR PATH	PATH OFF ROAD	4,225
45	GRANT BUTTE TRAIL	SOFT SURFACE	7,076
47	BUTTES TRAIL (SPRINGWATER)	SOFT SURFACE	1,223
51	JENNE BUTTE TRAIL	SOFT SURFACE	9,611
52	KANE ROAD PARK TRAIL	SOFT SURFACE	1,892
53	KELLEY CREEK TRAIL (GRESHAM)	SOFT SURFACE	4,770
57	SPRINGWATER PATH	PATH OFF ROAD	2,626
58	SPRINGWATER TRAIL #1	SOFT SURFACE	2,649
59	SPRINGWATER TRAIL #2	SOFT SURFACE	1,022
60	WY'EAST PATH	PATH OFF ROAD	2,024
77	KELLEY CREEK PATH (GRESHAM)	PATH OFF ROAD	413
78	KELLEY CREEK TRAIL- NORTH SOUTH	SOFT SURFACE	1,947
<b>Total Length Lineal Feet</b>			<b>122,239</b>
<b>Total Length Miles</b>			<b>23.15</b>

### Bridges for Paths

ID	NAME	Quantity
28	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR TRAIL	1
29	KELLEY CREEK PATH	1
57	SPRINGWATER PATH	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>

### Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) for Paths

ID	NAME	Type	Quantity
28	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR PATH	COLLECTOR	2
28	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR PATH	ARTERIAL	1
29	KELLEY CREEK TRAIL PATH	COLLECTOR	3
29	KELLEY CREEK TRAIL PATH	ARTERIAL	2
43	EAST BUTTES POWERLINE CORRIDOR PATH	ARTERIAL	1
57	SPRINGWATER PATH	COLLECTOR	1
<b>Total</b>			<b>10</b>

Project notes included in Appendix D

Replaced By Exhibit D of this resolution.

## Appendix B.2

### Paths and Trails Cost & SDC Breakdown by Acquisition & Construction Type

Type of Cost		Length (LF)/ Quantity	Cost Per Lineal Ft	Total Cost	SDC Eligible 57.15%
Acquisition Non-HCA/ESRA	Path Off Road	12,576	\$ 225.00	\$ 2,829,554.02	\$ 1,617,001.49
Acquisition -HCA/ESRA	Path Off Road	8,611	\$ 36.00	\$ 309,994.90	\$ 177,152.38
Acquisition Non-HCA/ESRA	Soft Trail	3,964	\$ 125.00	\$ 495,457.61	\$ 283,138.50
Acquisition -HCA/ESRA	Soft Trail	11,887	\$ 20.00	\$ 237,730.25	\$ 135,855.39
Construction	Path Off Road	25,825	\$ 210.62	\$ 5,439,185.72	\$ 3,108,324.26
Construction	Soft Trail	96,414	\$ 96.33	\$ 9,288,004.98	\$ 5,307,803.89
Construction	Bridge - Path Off Rd	3	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 137,152.48
Construction	RRFB (Collector)	6	\$ 32,000.00	\$ 192,000.00	\$ 109,721.99
Construction	RRFB (Arterial)	4	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 180,000.00	\$ 102,864.36
<b>Total Cost</b>				<b>\$ 19,211,927.48</b>	<b>\$ 10,979,014.73</b>

*Project notes included in Appendix D*



# APPENDIX C PARKS, PATHS & TRAILS SDC PROJECT MAP


Adopted: 3/7/17

Effective Date: 7/1/17

- Park Project Boundary
- Community Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Existing Park/Open Space
- Trail or Path-Existing
- Trail or Path-Planned-No Credit\*
- Path Off Road
- Soft Surface Trail
- New Bridge
- New Protected Crossing

\*Planned paths along roadways will be SDC creditable as part of the Transportation SDC. Off Road Paths located in SDC creditable parks projects are included as part of the project cost for that park.

Larger scale map available at the City of Gresham on request.



**DISCLAIMER AND NOTICE:**  
 The information on this map has been gathered from a variety of sources. The City of Gresham attempts to offer the most current, correct, and complete information available for property within the City limits. However, errors may occur or there may be a time delay between changes in information and updates. The City of Gresham does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the information. The information contained herein is subject to change at any time and without notice.

# Appendix D

## Appendix A, B & C Notes

General Notes	
Construction cost includes Permitting, Overhead (Administration) & Contingency.	
Used Construction & Master Planning costs from the 2016/17 - 2020/21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) where available.	
Unless indicated otherwise below, construction costs for projects not included in the CIP were based on \$800,000 per acre for projects under 3 acres, \$500,000 per acre for projects between 3-10 acres and \$300,000 an acre for projects over 10 acres.	
For partially built parks, the area of the park to be built is based on the portion of the estimated cost between the necessary improvements and the already constructed portion. Maintenance not included for purposes of SDCs.	
No acquisition costs included for projects located on land currently publically owned.	
ID numbers in this methodology do not define project priority. Projects are prioritized through the capital improvement program process and, in the case of privately constructed improvements, the development community.	

Area Specific	
Area	Notes
Civic	Acquisition Costs provided by Urban Design and Planning staff.
Downtown	Acquisition Costs provided by Urban Design and Planning staff.
Rockwood	Acquisition Costs provided by Urban Renewal staff.

Project Specific	
ID	Notes
2	The exact location of this park has not been determined but will be located somewhere on 1S3E04DB 00100.
7	The exact location of this park has not been determined. The project map shows a general location.
16	Project to be located within the Downtown Boundary
19	Project to be located within the Rockwood Plan District.
23	Map shows the location of this park shifted to the west which is the preferred location of this park. Current Pleasant Valley Master plan show the parks bisected by 182nd Ave.
47	This trail is located in Springwater. The contiguous length of trail located in Gresham is part of 40. They are divided to follow the CIP format.
65	Project to be located in the Civic Neighborhood Plan Area
66	Project to be located in the Downtown Boundary, east of Kelly Avenue.
70	Project to be located in the Rockwood Plan District.
74	Project to be located in the Rockwood Plan District within existing parks.
75	Vance Park parking lot would likely require an agreement with the County for long term use of the parking lot.
76	Project per Gresham Civic Neighborhood Financing Agreement, recorded at Multnomah County: Instrument 96-144654 (City Agreement A 1996-83). The agreement does not require the City of Gresham to cover the non-SDC eligible portion of this project. Includes: 1S3E04DB 401, 402 & 403 and 1S3E04DC 600.

# Appendix E

## SDC Rate Comparison with Other Jurisdictions

City/District	One Dwelling Unit
Hillsboro - South Hillsboro	\$ 13,252
Tualitan Hills Parks & Rec District - Bonny Slope	\$ 12,789
Lake Oswego	\$ 12,642
Tualitan Hills Parks & Rec District - South Cooper Mt	\$ 12,624
Tualitan Hills Parks & Rec District - North Bethany	\$ 12,268
Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec District- Outside plan areas	\$ 10,800
West Linn	\$ 10,216
Portland - Central City -2000 sq ft home	\$ 8,359
Portland - Outside Central City	\$ 10,381
Sherwood	\$ 7,669
Tigard - River Terrace	\$ 7,566
Tigard - Outside plan area	\$ 7,178
<b>Gresham - Springwater Plan District</b>	<b>\$ 6,868</b>
Clackamas County - West of I-205	\$ 6,760
Clackamas County - Sunnyside Village	\$ 6,075
Clackamas County - East of I-205	\$ 6,075
<b>Gresham - Pleasant Valley Plan District</b>	<b>\$ 5,356</b>
Hillsboro - Outside plan area	\$ 4,647
Oregon City	\$ 4,279
<b>Gresham - Existing City (outside new community plan districts)</b>	<b>\$ 3,955</b>
Troutdale	\$ 2,500
Fairview	\$ 2,040
Average	\$ 7,781

# Exhibit C

## Community & Neighborhood Parks Projects - Costs and SDC Eligibility

This exhibit replaces Appendix A.2 of the 2017 Parks System Development Charges Methodology Report. It reflects Council-approved project cost indexing.

ID	NAME	TYPE	Project Costs				SDC Eligible				SDC Eligible Project Costs				Total
			Master Plan /Design	Construction*	Acquisition		Planning, Design Const.	Acquisition	Master Plan/Design	Construction*	Acquisition		Total		
					No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay					No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay			
<b>Gresham</b>															
7	SWNEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,593,578	\$ 706,102	\$ 141,220	\$ 3,538,160	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 1,084,130	\$ 706,102	\$ 141,220	\$ 1,972,107	
9	SOUTH CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 3,017,315	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,114,575	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 1,261,255	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,301,909	
10	EAST GRESHAM NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 129,679	\$ 3,583,573	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,713,253	41.80%	100%	\$ 54,207	\$ 1,497,954	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,552,160	
14	SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 129,679	\$ 4,233,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,363,579	41.80%	100%	\$ 54,207	\$ 1,769,794	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,824,000	
73	NADAKA NATURE PARK (Final Phase)	N'HOOD	\$ 12,968	\$ 25,936	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,904	41.80%	100%	\$ 5,421	\$ 10,841	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,262	
15	JENNE BUTTE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 129,679	\$ 4,363,091	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,492,771	41.80%	100%	\$ 54,207	\$ 1,823,797	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,878,003	
66	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #1	N'HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,074,862	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 4,246,984	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 867,304	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 2,982,821	
16	DOWNTOWN NH PARK #2 - EAST	N'HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,074,862	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 4,246,984	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 867,304	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 2,982,821	
65	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 194,518	\$ 3,371,651	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 5,641,033	41.80%	100%	\$ 81,310	\$ 1,409,369	\$ 2,074,862	\$ -	\$ 3,565,541	
76	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD-1996 AGREEMENT	N'HOOD	\$ -	\$ 806,897	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806,898	41.80%	100%	\$ -	\$ 337,288	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 337,288	
69	COLUMBIA VIEW NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 129,679	\$ 4,834,167	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,963,846	41.80%	100%	\$ 54,207	\$ 2,020,709	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,074,915	
75	VANCE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	N'HOOD	\$ 142,647	\$ 570,587	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 713,234	41.80%	100%	\$ 59,627	\$ 238,509	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 298,136	
70	ROCKWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK #1	N'HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,074,862	\$ 1,296,789	\$ -	\$ 3,468,911	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 867,304	\$ 1,296,789	\$ -	\$ 2,204,748	
74	ROCKWOOD SOCCER/FUSTAL COURTS	N'HOOD	\$ 12,968	\$ 194,518	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 207,487	41.80%	100%	\$ 5,421	\$ 81,310	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 86,730	
19	ROCKWOOD URBAN PLAZA #1	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 1,037,431	\$ 648,394	\$ -	\$ 1,783,085	41.80%	100%	\$ 40,655	\$ 433,652	\$ 648,394	\$ -	\$ 1,122,701	
4	SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 423,325	\$ 9,215,488	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,638,814	44.05%	100%	\$ 186,454	\$ 4,058,973	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,245,427	
6	PAT PFEIFER PARK (Final)	COMM.	\$ 551,462	\$ 2,976,205	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,527,667	44.05%	100%	\$ 242,892	\$ 1,310,873	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,553,765	
8	ZIMMERMAN HERITAGE FARM	COMM.	\$ 97,259	\$ 3,819,044	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,916,303	44.05%	100%	\$ 42,838	\$ 1,682,102	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,724,940	

ID	NAME	TYPE	Project Costs				SDC Eligible				SDC Eligible Project Costs				
			Master Plan /Design	Construction *	Acquisition		Planning, Design Const.	Acquisition	Master Plan/Design	Construction*	Acquisition		Total	SDC Eligible Project Costs	
					No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay					No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay		No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay
67	MAIN CITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 97,259	\$ 1,296,789	\$ -	\$ -	44.05%	100%	\$ 42,838	\$ 571,172	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 614,010		
5	SOUTHWEST COMM.PARK (to completion)	COMI.	\$ 551,462	\$ 16,805,471	\$ -	\$ -	44.05%	100%	\$ 242,892	\$ 7,401,990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,644,882		
20	GRADIN SPORTS PARK (to completion)	COMM.	\$ 2,753,743	\$ 32,609,945	\$ -	\$ -	44.05%	100%	\$ 1,212,890	\$ 14,363,090	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,575,980		
3	HOGAN BUTTE NATURE PARK (to completion)	COMM.	\$ 194,518	\$ 3,112,294	\$ -	\$ -	44.05%	100%	\$ 85,676	\$ 1,370,814	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,456,489		

Pleasant Valley														
ID	NAME	TYPE	Master Plan /Design	Construction *	No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay	Planning, Design Const.	Acquisition	Master Plan/Design	Construction*	No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay	Total	SDC Eligible Project Costs
21	KELLEY CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,069,689	\$ -	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 2,012,025	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,106,574	
61	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #1	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,715,590	\$ 1,478,639	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 2,639,931	\$ 1,478,639	\$ -	\$ 4,213,119	
22	PACIFIC LANDMARK NH PARK	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 1,961,424	\$ 1,708,792	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 1,906,776	\$ 1,708,792	\$ -	\$ 3,710,118	
23	182ND AVE NH PARK	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,091,803	\$ 1,822,379	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 2,033,523	\$ 1,822,379	\$ -	\$ 3,950,452	
24	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #2	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 3,038,365	\$ 1,654,390	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 2,953,713	\$ 1,654,390	\$ -	\$ 4,702,652	
25	PLEASANT VALLEY NH PARK #3	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 2,212,483	\$ 1,927,515	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 2,150,841	\$ 1,927,515	\$ -	\$ 4,172,906	
62	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #1	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 1,504,999	\$ 811,131	\$ 1,668	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 1,463,068	\$ 811,131	\$ 1,668	\$ 2,370,417	
63	PLEASANT VALLEY URBAN PLAZA #2	NHBR HOOD	\$ 97,259	\$ 1,614,783	\$ 879,250	\$ -	97.21%	100%	\$ 94,549	\$ 1,569,794	\$ 879,250	\$ -	\$ 2,543,593	
26	PLEASANT VALLEY COMM. PARK	COMM.	\$ 194,518	\$ 10,020,007	\$ 9,996,252	\$ 910,560	44.05%	100%	\$ 85,676	\$ 4,413,324	\$ 9,996,252	\$ 910,560	\$ 15,405,812	

Springwater														
ID	NAME	TYPE	Master Plan /Design	Construction *	No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay	Planning, Design Const.	Acquisition	Master Plan/Design	Construction*	No Natural Resources Overlay	Natural Resources Overlay	Total	SDC Eligible Project Costs
31	VILLAGE CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	NHBR HOOD	\$ 129,679	\$ 3,971,209	\$ 3,459,717	\$ -	91.89%	91.89%	\$ 119,156	\$ 3,648,966	\$ 3,178,979	\$ -	\$ 6,947,101	
64	PARK BLOCKS AND CIRCLE	NHBR HOOD	\$ 194,518	\$ 4,688,432	\$ 4,084,562	\$ -	91.89%	91.89%	\$ 178,734	\$ 4,307,990	\$ 3,753,121	\$ -	\$ 8,239,845	
33	EAST SPRINGWATER COMMUNITY PARK	COMM.	\$ 194,518	\$ 6,298,248	\$ 5,487,034	\$ -	44.05%	100%	\$ 85,676	\$ 2,774,071	\$ 5,487,034	\$ -	\$ 8,346,781	

Project notes included in Appendix D of the 2017 Parks System Development Charges Methodology Report.

\*Construction Cost includes Permitting & Overhead (Admin) & Contingency.

# Exhibit D

## Paths and Trails Cost & SDC Breakdown by Acquisition & Construction Type

This exhibit replaces Appendix B.2 of the 2017 Parks System Development Charges Methodology Report. It reflects Council-approved project cost indexing.

Type of Cost		Length (LF)/ Quantity	Total Cost	SDC Eligible 57.15%
Acquisition - Non-Resource Area	Path Off Road	12,576	\$ 3,669,335	\$ 2,096,910
Acquisition -Resource Area	Path Off Road	8,611	\$ 401,998	\$ 229,729
Acquisition Non-Resource Area	Soft Trail	3,964	\$ 642,504	\$ 367,171
Acquisition -Resource Area	Soft Trail	11,887	\$ 308,286	\$ 176,176
Construction	Path Off Road	25,825	\$ 7,053,477	\$ 4,030,841
Construction	Soft Trail	96,414	\$ 12,044,583	\$ 6,883,102
Construction	Bridge - Path Off Rd	3	\$ 311,230	\$ 177,858
Construction	RRFB (Collector)	6	\$ 248,984	\$ 142,287
Construction	RRFB (Arterial)	4	\$ 233,423	\$ 133,394
			<b>\$ 24,913,820</b>	<b>\$ 14,237,468</b>

Project notes included in Appendix D of the 2017 Parks System Development Charges Methodology Report.