

# Canby Park and Open Space Acquisition Plan

**Final Report**

**Submitted to:**  
City of Canby

**Prepared by:**  
**Community Planning Workshop**  
Community Service Center  
1209 University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403-1209  
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~cpw>

**January 2002**





# Table of Contents

	Page
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1:</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
BACKGROUND.....	1
PURPOSE OF PARK AND OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION PLAN .....	2
METHODS.....	2
PLAN ORGANIZATION .....	3
<b>CHAPTER 2: NEIGHBORHOOD NEEDS ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>1</b>
CITYWIDE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE NEED .....	2
NEIGHBORHOOD NEEDS ANALYSIS.....	5
SUMMARY .....	14
<b>CHAPTER 3:</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>ACQUISITION FRAMEWORK</b> .....	<b>1</b>
PURPOSE .....	1
ACQUISITION FRAMEWORK .....	1
SUMMARY .....	15
<b>CHAPTER 4: LAND ACQUISITION AND FUNDING STRATEGIES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
PURPOSE .....	1
PARK ACQUISITION COST ESTIMATES .....	1
LAND ACQUISITION AND FUNDING STRATEGIES .....	4
SUMMARY .....	13
<b>APPENDIX A</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>PUBLIC PROCESS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
METHODS.....	6
DETAILED NOTES .....	6
SUMMARY TABLE.....	12
<b>APPENDIX B</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>RESOURCES AND REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
REFERENCES/RESOURCE DIRECTORY .....	1
<b>APPENDIX C</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>FUNDING INFORMATION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
SHORT-TERM STRATEGIES .....	1
LONG TERM STRATEGIES .....	14



# Chapter 1: Introduction

## Background

Park and recreation facilities are important to any community's quality of life. Planning for park and recreation facilities is particularly important in fast-growing communities like Canby. The foundation of a good park and recreation system plan should include a framework for identifying and acquiring lands for future parks and open space.

Local governments may prepare and adopt local park master plans pursuant to OAR 660-034-0040. The City of Canby adopted its first Parks and Recreation Master Plan in 1991 to address the development of parks and recreation facilities during a period of rapid population growth. Canby sustained high rates of population growth throughout the 1990s. As residential development occurs and vacant land is converted to urban uses, open space is becoming more scarce. Canby's once-plentiful park and recreation system had begun to deteriorate due to age and heavy-use, and maintenance needs had increased.

In January of 1997, the City of Canby contracted with Community Planning Workshop (CPW) to update the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan. CPW gathered a wide range of data and citizen input from area residents and professionals—including a household survey—to determine how best to improve Canby's park and recreations system and to plan for the future needs of residents over a 20-year period. CPW organized the 1997 update in the same manner as the original Master Plan.

In 2000, the City contracted with CPW to update portions of the Parks Master Plan and to review the City's parks system development charge (SDC) and the potential for a mandatory parks dedication policy. The City decided to pursue a policy that leads with mandatory dedication of parkland for residential development. One of the recommendations CPW made to the City was that it should develop a park acquisition plan to complement the dedications ordinance.

At a March 20, 2001 joint meeting the Canby City Council, Planning Commission, and Parks and Recreation Advisory Board unanimously agreed to move forward with drafting a park ordinance that leads with land dedication. Prior to the adoption of the new dedication ordinance, the City wanted to have a parks and open space acquisition plan in place. The Canby Park and Open Space Acquisition Plan in intended to complement both the dedication ordinance and the Canby Park and Recreation Master Plan.

# Purpose of park and open space acquisition plan

The purpose of the Park and Open Space Acquisition Plan is to provide Canby with a framework for land acquisition over the next 20 years. Specifically, the Plan:

- Identifies park and open space need at the community and neighborhood level;
- Incorporates public input as a component of park and open space need;
- Identifies park and open space issues and opportunities for six sub-areas of Canby;
- Establishes a framework for evaluating park and open space acquisition priorities;
- Identifies funding strategies for park and open space acquisition; and
- Provides a five-year implementation plan for the City's park and open space acquisition program.

The acquisition plan is an important piece of the City's overall parks and recreation system strategy. It is intended to provide the overarching framework for establishing and evaluating park and open space acquisition over the next twenty years.

The Plan recognizes financial constraints. It includes a section on land acquisition and funding strategies. It also identifies a set of actions the City can take in the short-term (the next five years) to establish a more systematic parks acquisition program and stabilize funding for that program.

## Methods

The process of developing the Plan used a combination of technical analysis and public input. Specifically, the Plan incorporated the following steps:

1. *Define neighborhood analysis areas.* The first step in the project was to define neighborhood analysis areas. The Plan uses the six neighborhood sub-areas the City uses for planning purposes.
2. *Conduct landscape assessment.* CPW conducted a landscape level analysis to develop a long-range view of how the park system could develop. The intent was to take a broad approach that would the acquisition criteria from the Parks Master Plan to identify target areas and linkages for parks.
3. *Conduct neighborhood needs assessment.* This step included several components: (1) it built on the needs assessment in the 2000 Parks Master Plan Update to identify park needs at the neighborhood level; and (2) it evaluated vacant lands against the acquisition criteria described in the Parks Master Plan; and (3)

it included a series of five neighborhood workshops to identify citizen preferences.

4. *Develop acquisition framework.* Using information gathered in the previous steps, supplemented with a review of literature and plans from other jurisdictions, CPW developed a framework for parks acquisition and identified a set of acquisition priorities.
5. *Identify land acquisition and funding strategies.* This step began with developing estimates of how much it will cost to meet the City's 10-acre per 1000 person minimum standard. It identifies various approaches for parkland acquisition.
6. *Five-year implementation plan.* To assist the City in establishing a more systematic parkland acquisition program, the Plan includes a five-year implementation plan. The implementation element includes a set of recommended actions for the City to pursue to facilitate parkland acquisition.

CPW also facilitated a joint work session with the Canby City Council, Planning Commission and Parks Advisory Board in October 2001. The intent of the work session was to present the results of the research conducted during the summer of 2001 and to get input from the City decision makers.

City staff also facilitated a park funding workshop in early November to address larger issues regarding the City's park system. In addition to addressing land acquisition, the workshop gathered input on how to pay for the operation and maintenance of the City's park system.

The Park and Open Space Acquisition Plan reflects the combination of research and public input described above.

## Plan Organization

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

**Chapter 2: Neighborhood Needs Assessment** summarizes park and recreation needs from the 2000 Master Plan Update and presents and evaluation of park and recreation needs for six Canby neighborhoods. The needs assessment also identifies opportunities and issues for each neighborhood.

**Chapter 3: Acquisition Framework** describes a framework for developing parkland acquisition priorities and summarizes the City's acquisition strategy and identifies key opportunities for park and open space acquisition in Canby.

**Chapter 4: Land Acquisition and Funding Strategies** presents rough cost estimates for park and open space acquisition. It also presents potential funding sources and land acquisition strategies the City can pursue to meet its parkland standard.

**Chapter 5: Parkland Acquisition Implementation Program** presents a series of actions the City can take in the next five years

to establish and develop the park and open space acquisition program.

The plan also includes three appendices:

**Appendix A: Process Summary** describes the methods and input received during the five public workshops conducted in August 2001.

**Appendix B: Resource Directory** summarizes potential funding and partnership resources the City can pursue.

**Appendix C: Funding Sources** contains brief descriptions and contacts for specific funding strategies.

# Chapter 2: Neighborhood Needs Assessment

The 2000 update of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan resulted in a new citywide minimum parkland standard of 10 acres per 1000 persons. The Master Plan updated the needs assessment based on the new standard. While the Master Plan identified community-level park needs, and presented some general evaluation of park service areas by park classification, it did not include an assessment of parkland need at the neighborhood level.

A neighborhood needs assessment is desirable for several reasons. First, such an assessment will identify inequities in level of service (e.g., how well the citywide standard is met at the neighborhood level). In other words, it will identify underserved areas. Next, a neighborhood-level assessment will identify constraints and opportunities that exist at the neighborhood level. Finally, a neighborhood-level needs assessment will assist in developing land acquisition priorities.

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a basis for the acquisition priorities identified in Chapter 3. It begins with a summary of citywide parks and open space need based on the 2000 Parks Master Plan Update. The remainder of the chapter presents a detailed evaluation of parks and open space in each of the six sub-areas (neighborhoods).

The neighborhood-level needs analysis builds from population and dwelling unit forecasts based on the City's 1998 buildable lands analysis. The intent was to estimate population in developed areas, and to estimate development capacity (and indirectly, population) in undeveloped areas. This evaluation applied the population forecasts to the City's park standard of 10 acres per 1000 residents to develop estimates of parkland need. The acquisition plan and funding strategy is built upon the need framework, findings, and public input contained in this chapter.

CPW gathered public input throughout the planning process to further refine need. Five neighborhood workshops were conducted in August 2001 to identify resident preferences regarding future park system development. Similar information was also gathered during the 1997 Park and Recreation Master Plan Update and the 2000 Park and Recreation Master Plan Update. The 1997 input included a survey of Canby residents on their attitudes and opinions on parks, student meetings, and 23 stakeholder interviews. In 2000, CPW conducted a community forum to identify goals for park and recreation development. The results of the 2001 neighborhood meetings were consistent with input received in the August 2000 meeting and the 1997 survey.

# Citywide parks and open space need

## Existing park facilities and level of service

According to the 2000 Parks and Recreation Master Plan update, Canby's park and recreation facility inventory consists-ten parks totaling 76.4 acres. The parks included in the level of service calculations are city owned and within the Urban Growth Boundary. Table 2-1 summarizes Canby park facilities as of November, 2001.

**Table 2-1. City of Canby park and recreation facilities summary, November,2001**

<b>Facility Name</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Status</b>
Arneson Garden	1.8	Mini-Park	Improved
Wait Park	2.0	Mini-Park	Improved
19th Avenue Loop	1.8	Mini-Park	Unimproved
Willow Creek Wetland	4.6	Mini-Park	Unimproved
Locust Street Park	1.0	Mini-Park	Improved
Maple Street Park	9.0	Neighborhood Park	Improved
13th Avenue Park	5.7	Neighborhood Park	Partially Improved
Canby Community Park	17.5	Community Park	Improved
Eco Park	19.0	Community Nature Park	Unimproved
Canby Regional Park	14.0	Community Park	Partially Improved
<b>Parks Total</b>	<b>76.4</b>		

Source: Canby Parks Master Plan, 2000 Update

In addition to facilities owned outright by the City of Canby, the Canby Utility Board owns approximately 55 acres of land directly adjacent to the Canby Regional Park site. While this property is not presently available to residents for recreation purposes, the site does provide a substantial amount of open space along the Molalla River. The Canby Utility Board land is not included in this analysis because the City does not own it and it is not available for recreational purposes at this time. Likewise, the Willamette Wayside and newly acquired Fish Eddy are not included in the park and recreation facility inventory.

The rationale for excluding these properties is twofold. First, the properties are outside the UGB and therefore, are not directly within Canby's park service area. Second, these properties are open space/river corridor areas with environmental significance. The National Recreation and Park Association's Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines state that, "the open space system cannot and should not be equated with a numerical standard of any kind. This approach is both impractical and counterproductive. There is no number of acres of floodplain or wetlands that every community should have in order to meet a national standard."<sup>1</sup> The Fish Eddy and Willamette Wayside are unique ecological resources, providing habitat for bald eagles, salmon, and blue herons. Because of their

<sup>1</sup> Mertes, James D and Hall, James R. (1995). *Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines*. National Park and Recreation Association. p 49.

environmental significance, these lands have a limited capability for recreational use beyond limited passive recreation, interpretation, and environmental education.

According to the 2000 Parks and Recreation Master Plan update, Canby's year 2000 population was 12,790. The 76.4 acres of parkland translates into about 6.0 acres of parkland per 1000 residents living in Canby in 2000 (see Table 2-2). Given the City's existing 10 acre per 1000 residents parks standard, this represents a 4 acre per 1000 residents deficit in available park and recreation lands.

**Table 2-2. Park and recreation facilities per 1,000 residents**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b># of Facilities</b>
Mini Park Total	11.2	5.0
Mini Park/1,000 residents	0.9	0.4
Neighborhood Park Total	14.7	2.0
Neighborhood Park/1,000 residents	1.1	0.2
Community Park Total	50.5	3.0
Community Park/1,000 residents	3.9	0.2
<b>Total Parks and Rec.</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>10.0</b>
<b>Total Parks and Rec./1,000 residents</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>

Source: City of Canby 2000 Parks Master Plan Update; Analysis by CPW

## Projected parkland need

Projecting future parkland need is a function of the City's minimum parkland standard and future population. Because the City was below the minimum standard of 10 acres per 1000 residents in 2000, it will have to acquire additional lands to bring the system up to the standard.

Table 2-3 shows the 2000 Census population for Canby and the City's coordinated population forecast in five-year increments through the year 2020.<sup>2</sup> The projections show that Canby is expected to grow significantly in the next 20 years, reaching 21,000 by the year 2020. The forecast represents a 64 percent increase from the 2000 population of 12,790, or a 2.5 percent average annual growth rate between 2000 and 2020.

<sup>2</sup> ORS 195.036 requires incorporated cities to "coordinate" their population forecasts with the regional coordinating body. The regional coordinating body for Canby is Clackamas County. The coordinated population forecasts provide consistency across jurisdictions and provide the basis for estimating a number of City facility needs.

**Table 2-3. Canby 20-year growth forecast**

Year	Population
2000	12,790
2005	14,920
2010	16,800
2015	18,850
2020	21,000
Change	8,210
Percent Change	64.2%
AAGR	2.5%

Source: OTAK Land Needs Study-most likely scenario; Analysis by CPW

Another approach to evaluate parkland need is to analyze existing and proposed land uses. This evaluation is relatively easy for developed areas—Census or other data sources may be used to estimate population in a sub-area, which can then be translated into parkland need using the City's standard.

**Sample Parkland Need Calculation**

Site area: 10 acres  
 Density: 10 DU/acre  
 Proposed DU: 100  
 Persons per DU: 2.7  
 Estimated population: 270

**Parkland need:** 2.7 acres  
 (270 persons/10 acres per 1000)

Estimating parkland need for undeveloped areas requires one to make assumptions about the type of future development, the density of that development, and the number of people that development will house (usually expressed in persons per household). For example, ten acres of land designated for multiple family residential use developed at 10 dwelling units (DU) per acre would contain 100 dwelling units. If those dwelling units were populated at 2.7 persons per dwelling unit, the acre would have 270 persons (see sample calculation). That population estimate can then be translated into a parkland need of 2.7 acres using the City's standard.

This approach can be used to estimate total parkland need at full buildout of the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). To estimate total citywide need for future park facilities at UGB buildout, CPW used Geographical Information System (GIS) data to calculate the total vacant acreage within each residential plan designation. Population was estimated using the density assumptions from the Canby Land Needs Study prepared by OTAK. Finally CPW assumed an average household size of 2.7 persons to estimate total population at buildout. Table 2-4 shows Canby had about 1,750 acres of vacant buildable land designated for residential uses Canby UGB in 1998.<sup>3</sup> Applying the assumptions used in the *Canby Land Needs Study* yields a residential land capacity of 28,495 persons at full buildout.

<sup>3</sup> CPW used Comprehensive Plan Designation as opposed to zoning designations in order to account for future development of all residential lands inside the UGB.

**Table 2-4. Buildable residential land and population estimates by plan designation, Canby UGB**

Residential Designation	Number of Tax Lots	Total Acres	Assumed	Buildout Population
			Target Density*	
LDR	2,627	1,362	5.4	19,119
MDR	450	127	6.0	1,985
HDR	736	245	11.2	7,146
RC	52	16	6.0	245
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,865</b>	<b>1,750</b>		<b>28,495</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW. Buildout population assumes 2.7 persons per dwelling.

\*Density assumptions from Canby Land Needs Study completed by OTAK.

Table 2-5 applies the City of Canby’s current park standard of 10 acres per 1000 residents to estimate park acreage needed in five-year intervals over the next twenty years. Table 2-5 uses the total buildout population identified above to forecast total parks and recreation land need within the existing UGB. As noted above, Canby currently has a 4 acre per thousand parks and recreation land deficit when compared with the existing park standard.

**Table 2-5. Total parkland need, by year and at full UGB buildout**

Year	Population	Park Acreage Needed
2000	12,790	128
2005	14,920	149
2010	16,800	168
2015	18,850	189
2020	21,000	210
<b>UGB Build Out</b>	<b>28,495</b>	<b>285</b>

Source: OTAK Land Needs Study; Canby GIS. Analysis by CPW

In summary, given a parkland inventory of about 76.4 acres in 2000, Canby will need approximately 209 additional acres of parkland to meet its minimum standard at full buildout of the Urban Growth Boundary. The City will need about 134 additional acres between 2000 and 2020 to meet the minimum standard.


## Neighborhood needs analysis

City staff used six sub-areas of Canby for planning purposes. Staff used these sub-areas (called neighborhoods for the remainder of this report) to facilitate citizen involvement for Periodic Review of its comprehensive land use plan in 2001. The parks acquisition plan uses these neighborhood sub-areas for both identifying needs and describing

acquisition priorities. Map 2-1 illustrates the location of each neighborhood sub-area relative to the UGB.

CPW conducted five public meetings with residents of each neighborhood in August 2001 to solicit input on needed amenities and potential park sites. The public workshops built upon past community meetings held during the 1997 and 2000 park and recreation planning processes. The most recent workshops began with a presentation highlighting population growth, parkland need, and potential park amenities. Participants gave CPW feedback on future park amenities preferences and issues surrounding park acquisition. Finally, attendants drew on GIS maps of their neighborhood, to locate preferable sites for future parks, open space, and connectors. For a complete description of these meetings and suggested amenities by neighborhood, please see Appendix A.

**Map 2-1. Neighborhood Area location map**



Source: Canby GIS; Map by CPW

## Neighborhood Overview

Table 2-6 presents a summary of vacant land inside the Canby UGB by neighborhood. Neighborhood Five contains the largest supply of vacant residential land with approximately 106 acres of land designated for low-density residential development. The second largest supply of vacant land is designated for Light Industrial use, the majority of which is located within Neighborhood Four. In all, the city has over 450 acres of vacant land available for future development.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 2-6. Vacant land (acres) by comprehensive plan designation and neighborhood, Canby UGB**

Comprehensive Plan Designation	Neighborhood						Total
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	
Low Density Residential - LDR	0.3	26.3	23.7	7.9	105.9	26.2	<b>190.4</b>
Medium Density Residential - MDR	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>2.7</b>
High Density Residential - HDR	0.2	9.3	0.0	15.2	0.0	0.0	<b>24.6</b>
Downtown Commercial - DC	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>1.3</b>
Highway Commercial - HC	0.6	0.6	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	<b>9.1</b>
Convenience Commercial - CC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Commercial Manufacturing - CM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	<b>7.0</b>
Residential Commercial - RC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Light Industrial - LI	0.1	4.0	0.0	116.8	15.7	0.0	<b>136.6</b>
Heavy Industrial - HI	19.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	<b>46.3</b>
Agricultural - AG	30.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>30.6</b>
Flood Prone/Steep Slopes - FL	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	6.5	<b>7.0</b>
Public - P	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Private Recreation - PR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>175.0</b>	<b>128.3</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>455.6</b>

Source: OTAK Buildable Lands Study; Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

Table 2-7 presents a summary of underdeveloped land inside the Canby UGB by neighborhood. Underdeveloped parcels are parcels that have an existing improvement and are larger than one-half acre in size. For residential development, one-quarter acre was subtracted from the total acreage to estimate development potential.<sup>5</sup> There are 309 tax lots designated for Low-Density Residential development classified as Underdeveloped totaling 573.0 acres. Subtracting one-quarter acre from each lot results in 231.8 acres of Low-Density Residential potentially available for further development. Using the same methodology, an additional 39.6 acres of lands designated for Medium and High-Density Residential development is potentially available for further development bringing the total underdeveloped residential land potential to 271.4 acres.

<sup>4</sup> This analysis does not separate land inside the City limit from land outside the city limit. Annexation would be required prior to development of any vacant lands located outside of the existing City limit.

<sup>5</sup> Underdeveloped land assumptions are based on the 1999 Canby Land Needs Study completed by OTAK.

**Table 2-7. Underdeveloped land (acres) by plan designation and neighborhood, Canby UGB**

Comprehensive Plan Designation	Neighborhood						Total
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	
Low Density Residential - LDR	102.6	129.1	225.1	0.0	71.6	44.5	<b>573.0</b>
Medium Density Residential - MDR	1.1	8.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	<b>11.4</b>
High Density Residential - HDR	14.0	34.7	6.9	0.0	22.6	3.7	<b>81.9</b>
Downtown Commercial - DC	10.6	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>17.5</b>
Highway Commercial - HC	1.1	0.0	12.2	0.0	5.0	11.5	<b>29.8</b>
Convenience Commercial - CC	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>1.0</b>
Commercial Manufacturing - CM	13.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5	5.2	<b>22.8</b>
Residential Commercial - RC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	3.3	<b>10.6</b>
Light Industrial - LI	36.2	2.6	17.9	132.6	19.3	4.5	<b>213.2</b>
Heavy Industrial - HI	10.3	0.0	0.0	51.0	0.0	0.0	<b>61.3</b>
Agricultural - AG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Flood Prone/Steep Slopes - FL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Public - P	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Private Recreation - PR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>189.1</b>	<b>182.8</b>	<b>262.1</b>	<b>186.6</b>	<b>129.2</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>1,022.6</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

## Neighborhood One

Neighborhood One is bounded on the north and west by the UGB, on the east by Ivy Street, and on the south by Southwest First Avenue. Significant characteristics of this sub-area include the Canby Regional Park property, 55 acres of riverfront property owned by the Canby Utility Board, and roughly 30 acres of Agricultural land located inside the city limit but outside the UGB.

This neighborhood also contains a majority of the downtown core, two schools, and 15 acres of vacant land designated for industrial use. Table 2-8 summarizes the existing land classifications located in Neighborhood One.

**Table 2-8. Neighborhood One Land Classification Summary**

Classification	Number of	
	Tax Lots	Acreage
Parks and Open Space	8	16.0
Logging Road Trail	0	0.0
Schools/Public Facilities	3	22.3
Vacant	15	51.5
Underdeveloped	191	189.1
Developed	729	182.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>946</b>	<b>461.1</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

This neighborhood contains several features of importance for parkland acquisition. First, the Molalla River runs along the eastern boundary of the neighborhood. The potential to connect adjacent areas to the river or provide for bicycle, pedestrian and nature trails is high in this area.

In addition, the 30-acre farm near the center of the neighborhood presents a good opportunity to preserve views of Mt. Hood. The farm is presently not in the UGB (even though it is surrounded by the UGB) and presents a potential long-term acquisition opportunity in this area.

Residents highlighted several opportunities during the public workshop for Neighborhood One. Suggested amenities include trail/open space connectivity, dog parks, signage, a spray park (e.g., a park with a water feature children can play in), sports fields, playgrounds, and ponds. Residents suggested the river area and the north end of neighborhood one could be preserved and linked to existing parks with trails. A good place for a dog park would be on the southwest ridge where the noise will be less intrusive and few children will be nearby. Vacant land on the northern part of Neighborhood One could be used for sports fields. Residents also suggested a mini park with a natural water feature at Territorial and Holly Roads.

Other issues surrounding park acquisition included planning for small, centrally located hub parks, with trails connecting to the neighborhood. Residents also valued tree preservation, and interactive nature areas.

## Neighborhood Two

Neighborhood Two is bounded on the west by Ivy Street, on the north by the UGB, on the east by the Logging Road Trail, and on the south by US Highway 99E. Neighborhood Two contains the Willamette Valley Country Club and the Clackamas County Fairgrounds, as well as Maple Street Park and the Canby “Eco Park”. Table 2-9 summarizes the land classifications located in Neighborhood Two.

**Table 2-9. Neighborhood Two Land Classification Summary**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Number of Tax Lots</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Parks and Open Space*	4	28.0
Logging Road Trail	2	7.2
Schools/Public Facilities	1	37.8
Vacant	39	44.2
Underdeveloped	229	182.8
Developed	957	445.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,232</b>	<b>745.1</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

\*Does not include the Willamette Wayside located outside the UGB

An opportunity in Neighborhood Two is to capitalize on the logging road trail as a primary bike and pedestrian connection. Emphasis should be placed on improving the northern section of the trail and improving connections to locations outside the UGB. Additional locations for pocket parks should be developed as they present themselves. Both of these opportunities were also identified by citizens at the public meeting for Neighborhood Two.

Needed amenities suggested at the public meeting included restrooms, water fountains, benches, mini-parks, playgrounds, fitness stations along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, parking at Eco Park, and multi-use trails.

Residents also recommended park sites and goals for park acquisition. First, residents suggested a recreation corridor, linking river property with trails. In addition, land along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue was identified as a good location for future neighborhood or mini-parks. Lastly, issues of importance were protecting riparian habitat and preserving the rural feel of the edge of town.

### Neighborhood Three

Neighborhood Three is bounded on the north and east by the UGB, on the south by SE First Avenue, and on the west by the Logging Road Trail. Largely outside the City Limit, lands within this neighborhood are primarily designated for low-density residential development. This subarea also contains several significant natural features including two known wetlands and a riparian corridor flowing to the Willamette River.<sup>6</sup> Table 2-10 summarizes the land classifications located in Neighborhood Three.

**Table 2-10. Neighborhood Three Land Classification Summary**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Number of Tax Lots</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Parks and Open Space	1	6.4
Logging Road Trail	0	0.0
Schools/Public Facilities	0	0.0
Vacant	10	23.9
Underdeveloped	109	262.1
Developed	209	68.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>361.3</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

Neighborhood Three has a large quantity of vacant and underdeveloped land within its boundary. Park acquisition and development in this area, specifically for smaller parks, should capitalize on these lands—preferably before development proposals occur. Additional opportunities for open space and trail connections exist in the southern half of the neighborhood with wetland and remnant riparian zones found on several parcels within this neighborhood.

Residents highlighted several opportunities during the public workshop for Neighborhood Three. Suggested future amenities included picnic

<sup>6</sup> The recently acquired “fish eddy” property (state park donation) abuts the northern edge of this neighborhood, but is out of the UGB. Approximately 20 acres of land along the Willamette will be designated a community nature park, while the rest of the land will be used for the expansion of the waste water treatment plant. This property is not reflected in table 2-10.

shelters, small parks with playground equipment, new or improved water features, and trails with fitness areas.

Areas recommended for future park or open space acquisition included the subdivision between Redwood Street and Hwy 99 and wetlands protection between Hwy 99 and Meadow Springs Road.

## Neighborhood Four

Neighborhood Four is bounded on the north by NE First Avenue, on the east and south by the UGB, and on the west by the Logging Road Trail. Neighborhood Four is primarily designated for commercial and industrial use. Existing recreation facilities include the Logging Road Trail and the Arneson Garden's park southeast of the Fred Meyer shopping center. In addition, the Zion Memorial Cemetery is located on the north side of South Township Road. Table 2-11 summarizes the land classifications located in Neighborhood Four.

**Table 2-11. Neighborhood Four Land Classification Summary**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Number of</b>	
	<b>Tax Lots</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Parks and Open Space	1	1.8
Logging Road Trail	0	0.0
Schools/Public Facilities	0	0.0
Vacant	13	175.0
Underdeveloped	26	186.6
Developed	15	59.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>422.6</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

Neighborhood Four can provide trail connections to other parks and places of work. However, it may be inappropriate to site mini- or neighborhood parks here due to its commercial/industrial classification. Any parkland acquisition or development should consider adjacent uses, access, and traffic.

More intensive recreation activities such as lighted ballfields may be appropriate for this area. The area presents opportunities for such facilities in areas where they minimize conflicts with neighboring residential uses.

## Neighborhood Five

Neighborhood Five is bounded on the north by US Highway 99E, on the east by the Logging Road Trail, on the south by the UGB, and on the west by Ivy Street. This sub-area contains three schools, the community recreation and swim center and an unimproved neighborhood park. Also of significance is a large amount of high-density residential land located in the north half of the neighborhood. Table 2-12 summarizes the land classifications located in Neighborhood Five.

**Table 2-12. Neighborhood Five Land Classification Summary**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Number of</b>	
	<b>Tax Lots</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Parks and Open Space	2	6.7
Logging Road Trail	2	9.5
Schools/Public Facilities	3	53.0
Vacant	12	128.3
Underdeveloped	136	129.2
Developed	942	275.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,097</b>	<b>602.4</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

Given the large amount of property designated for medium density residential development, and existing vacant or underdeveloped areas, the City should capitalize on opportunities for infill park development. In addition, opportunities exist to connect the logging road trail to park and school sites within the neighborhood. Finally, there are several large undeveloped lots on the southern portion of the neighborhood present opportunities to establish parks prior to or concurrent with residential development.

Residents highlighted several needed amenities during the public workshop for Neighborhood Five. Amenities included more sports fields, historic interpretive centers, picnic areas with tables, playgrounds, benches, BBQ pits, and equipment for young children. Residents also preferred parks with informal recreation opportunities, where one could relax.

Residents also discussed several issues related to locating parks. These included connectivity (emerald necklace), parks within walking distance and close to schools, and equity in placement.

Possible park locations discussed during the meeting include the former Filbert orchard, lots in Township Village, on 10<sup>th</sup> and Lupine, trails connecting with Pine Street, and trails connecting with the Molalla River.

## **Neighborhood Six**

Neighborhood Six is bounded on the north by Southwest First Avenue, on the east by Ivy Street, and on the south and west by the UGB. This neighborhood contains the Canby High School as well as the Canby Community Park. A wide mix of land-use designations characterizes the neighborhood. Table 2-13 summarizes the land classifications located in Neighborhood Six.

**Table 2-13. Neighborhood Six Land Classification Summary**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Number of</b>	
	<b>Tax Lots</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Parks and Open Space	2	17.5
Logging Road Trail	0	0.0
Schools/Public Facilities	1	41.6
Vacant	6	32.7
Underdeveloped	71	72.7
Developed	711	235.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>400.1</b>

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

Neighborhood Six has an opportunity for multi-use paths within the area, providing access to other parks and schools. There is also the potential to acquire land along the Molalla River as trails, contributing to the emerald necklace concept.

During the neighborhood meeting, residents recommended amenities needed. Those amenities included swimming areas along the Molalla River, a spray park, playgrounds for multiple age groups, safe playground equipment, sports fields for large events, signage for parks and bathrooms, and multi use paths with lights.

Residents also discussed possible park locations during the public meeting in Neighborhood Six. These included a soccer field on the Canby Utility property, areas within or near the Hope Village development, land at the end of cul-de-sacs, land around Elm Street and 13<sup>th</sup> that could be a picnic area with a small pond and connect with the river, and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue as trail access to the Logging Road Trail.

## Summary

Table 2-14 presents a summary of park need by neighborhood. Park acreages listed do not include open space or trail facilities, public facilities such as schools or fairgrounds, or Canby Utility property. The data indicate that roughly 209 acres of parkland will need to be acquired by the City in order to meet the 10 acre per 1000 resident parkland standard at UGB buildout. As of 2000, Canby is under its 10-acre-per-thousand parkland standard by 51.5 acres.<sup>7</sup> Based on population, the most underserved neighborhood in Canby at this time is Neighborhood Five with a 28.5-acre deficit of parkland. Conversely, Neighborhood Six currently shows a surplus of park acreage.

<sup>7</sup> Source: City of Canby Park and Recreation Master Plan Update – Table 8.5, Year 2000 Level of Service.

**Table 2-14. Summary of Park Need by Neighborhood**

	Neighborhood						Total
	One	Two*	Three	Four	Five	Six	
% of Total Population at Buildout**	15.0%	25.9%	16.1%	2.8%	27.5%	12.6%	100.0%
2000 Population	1,921	3,318	2,060	364	3,517	1,610	12,790
2000 Park Need	19.2	33.2	20.6	3.6	35.2	16.1	128
Existing Park Holdings	16.0	28.0	6.4	1.8	6.7	17.5	76
Park Surplus/(Deficit)	(3.2)	(5.2)	(14.2)	(1.8)	(28.5)	1.4	(51.5)
2010 Population	2,523	4,358	2,706	478	4,620	2,115	16,800
2010 Park Need	25.2	43.6	27.1	4.8	46.2	21.2	168
Existing Park Holdings	16.0	28.0	6.4	1.8	6.7	17.5	76
Park Surplus/(Deficit)	(9.2)	(15.6)	(20.7)	(3.0)	(39.5)	(3.7)	(91.6)
2020 Population	3,153	5,447	3,383	597	5,775	2,644	21,000
2020 Park Need	31.5	54.5	33.8	6.0	57.8	26.4	210
Existing Park Holdings	16.0	28.0	6.4	1.8	6.7	17.5	76
Park Surplus/(Deficit)	(15.5)	(26.5)	(27.4)	(4.2)	(51.1)	(8.9)	(133.6)
Buildout Population	4,279	7,391	4,590	810	7,837	3,588	28,495
Buildout Park Need	42.8	73.9	45.9	8.1	78.4	35.9	285
Existing Park Holdings	16.0	28.0	6.4	1.8	6.7	17.5	76
Park Surplus/(Deficit)	(26.8)	(45.9)	(39.5)	(6.3)	(71.7)	(18.4)	(208.6)

Source: Canby GIS; Analysis by CPW

\*Neighborhood Two park holdings does not include the Willamette Wayside located outside the UGB.

\*\*Buildout percentage was calculated by dividing the neighborhood population forecast at buildout into the total population forecast at buildout.

The citywide need, neighborhood need, and public input provide direction for future park acquisition. The needs identified by the community during the August 2001 public meetings further refine the goals. The amenities, locations, and issues residents discussed touched upon the following themes:

- Trails with park and neighborhood connections
- Safety concerns: crosswalks at intersections
- More mini- and neighborhood parks in more locations
- Preserve river area; create an “emerald necklace,” with land adjacent to the Molalla River and Willamette River
- Need an equitable distribution of parks

These themes are consistent with the findings of the Canby Park and Recreation Community Survey and the Middle School and High School Questionnaire both conducted during the 1997 Park and Recreation Master Plan Update. For example, the 1997 survey found that the most important facilities the City should expand or develop include multi-use trails, natural areas and open space, and bike lanes. These findings coincide with the themes of trail connectivity from the August 2001 public input.

The Middle School and High School Questionnaire also found that students wanted more places to walk, jog, ride bikes, play sports, and socialize. The most popular location for bike riding was the Logging Road. The input received during the August 2001 public meetings

recommended more connections to the Logging Road. Future acquisitions can provide more opportunities for biking along the logging road trail, and connections to other parks.

The August 2001 responses are also consistent with the public input received during the 2000 Park and Recreation Master Plan Update. During an August 2000 Community Forum, residents identified park connectivity as an important goal in Canby's park and recreation facility development.

Even though some public input coincided with past efforts, there were also new recommendations. In the August 2001 meetings, residents identified a desire for spray parks and dog parks. In addition, there was a desire to have interpretive areas, describing natural features or places with historic significance. The emergence of new ideas highlights the importance of seeking public input on a regular basis. The City should continue to solicit the community's opinion to be responsive to and maintain its commitment for a high level of park and recreation service.

# Chapter 3:

## Acquisition Framework

### Purpose

This chapter provides a framework for land acquisition and establishes priorities for future acquisition of parkland in Canby. The acquisition framework provides direction for the evaluation and acquisition of parklands in Canby consistent with the City's park standards. More specifically, the framework establishes a process for reviewing individual land acquisitions through both dedication ordinance language and other methods of acquisition such as land purchases or partnerships. This process is also intended to be consistent with the City's land dedication and planned unit development ordinance.<sup>8</sup>

The Acquisition Plan does not identify specific tax lots or parcels for acquisition; rather, it identifies areas of need and matches them with opportunities and approximate locations for future parks. Identification of specific parcels for acquisition would place a significant burden on both the City and property owners. It would not allow for reasonable negotiations to occur between the City and property owners during a land acquisition. Moreover, it would place the City at a competitive disadvantage in those negotiations by identifying the City's interest in a property and potentially inflating prices.

### Acquisition framework

The acquisition framework identifies goals for parkland acquisition and presents a framework for evaluating land acquisition—including lands dedicated through the City's dedication ordinance. The framework also proposes a process for staff to review and prioritize land acquisitions.

### Parkland acquisition goals

Listed below are goals for Canby's parkland acquisition program. These goals are consistent with public input received during forums for the 1997 Parks Master Plan, 2000 Update, and the Parks Acquisition Plan. The goals provide the City with direction in order to build the park and recreation system desired by the citizens of Canby.

#### **Goal 1: Ensure the system addresses the park and recreation needs of all city residents**

- To provide parks and recreation for the diverse population of Canby including different ages, abilities, and ethnicities.

The 2000 Update found that sections of Canby's population are growing, especially those in the 5 to 17, 45 to 54, and 55 to 64 year age brackets. People between 45 and 64 years old continue to be

---

<sup>8</sup> The language adopted in the dedication ordinance should be considered the definitive language.

one of the fastest growing segments of the population. Because there is a correlation between age and mobility limitations, meeting the needs of mobility-limited residents as they age will become increasingly important.

The 2000 Update also found that the population of children is increasing. As a result, there will be an increased need for park and recreation facilities and programs for youth.

In addition, Canby is growing more ethnically diverse according to the 2000 Update. The Hispanic population is the largest and fastest growing minority in Canby. Hispanic children comprise 9.5 percent of Canby School District's enrollment. Because of this growth, understanding and meeting the park and recreation needs of minority residents is becoming increasingly urgent.

- The City should review demographic characteristics of the population at least every five years to determine emerging trends and reflect those trends in its acquisition priorities and capital improvement program.

**Goal 2: Acquire a minimum of parkland to archive the City's 10 acres per 1,000 residents standard.**

- The 10 acres of 1,000 residents is the standard for the *minimum* amount of parkland. That standard is for developed parkland and does *not* include open space.
- The City's coordinated population forecast indicates that Canby is expected to grow significantly in the next 20 years, reaching 21,000 by the year 2020. In summary, given a parkland inventory of about 76.4 acres in 2000, Canby will need 137 additional acres of parkland to meet its minimum standard in 2020.
- To achieve this standard, Canby should use a combination of mandatory dedications for new development and other methods of land acquisition including but not limited to donations, partnerships, bond, levies, formation of a park and recreation district, and grants.
- The City's park acquisition and funding program should include provisions for acquisition (through the dedication ordinance) *and* improvement and reimbursement fees (through a Systems Development Charge). The methodology should rely on a combination of parkland dedication and system development charges.

**Goal 3: Ensure that all neighborhoods (sub areas) in Canby are equitably served by all park types**

- Canby will need to acquire an additional 137 parkland acres between 2001 and 2020. Further, 209 acres of additional parkland

will be needed in order to meet the 10-acre per 1000 resident parkland standard at UGB buildout.

- At present time, Canby is currently under its 10-acre per-thousand parkland standard by approximately 52 acres.<sup>9</sup> Based on population, the most underserved neighborhood in Canby at this time is Neighborhood Five with a 28.5-acre deficit of parkland. Conversely, Neighborhood Six currently shows a surplus of park acreage.

#### **Goal 4: Provide linkages between parks and neighborhoods**

- Trails and linear parks should be a component of the City's acquisition program to provide safe connections between neighborhoods, parks, schools, and other public facilities.
- The map generated during the 2000 Update public process identifies Canby Transportation System Plan recommendations and recommended bike and multi-use trails as a conceptual planning tool, identifying *potential* trail connections. This map should be used as a general guide to trail linkages, but should not constrain the City from identifying and working on other linkage opportunities.

#### **Goal 5: Maintain and develop open space in the city**

- Open space is loosely defined by the National Park and Recreation Association as natural or open lands with environmental significance. The determination of "environmentally significant" is a local decision. However, open space should not be equated with a numerical standard.
- Canby should develop open space acquisition policies that reflect the unique resources of the community and could be the basis for the open space system.
- Local determination of lands with environmental significance is part of the Statewide Planning Goal 5: Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources.

These goals are based on public input from the 1997 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the 2000 Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update and the Park Acquisition Plan. The goals should guide the City as they proceed with development and adoption of a parkland dedication ordinance as well as other methods of parkland acquisition. To provide Canby staff and decision-makers direction in the implementation of these goals, this plan describes an acquisition framework that addresses park distribution, specific park needs by neighborhood, and a process to evaluate dedicated land and land purchases.

---

<sup>9</sup> Source: City of Canby Park and Recreation Master Plan Update – Table 8.1, City of Canby Current Park Acreage. This does not include the Willamette Wayside and Adult Swim Center, see Chapter 2.

## Park classification and distribution

It is best to discuss park distribution by park since each type serves different needs and radial areas. Table 3-1 describes the size, use, service area, and an example of each park type.

**Table 3-1. Canby park classification**

	<b>Community Park</b>	<b>Neighborhood Park</b>	<b>Mini-Park</b>
<b>Size</b>	30 - 50 acres	5 - 10 acres	2,500 ft <sup>2</sup> – 1 acre, and up to 5 acres
<b>Use</b>	Informal recreation, trails, picnic areas, or nature study	Sports, play, picnicking, or trails	Limited, isolated, or unique recreational needs
<b>Service Area</b>	1.5 mile	0.5 mile	0.25 mile
<b>Example</b>	Eco Park	Maple St. Park	Wait Park

These definitions, however, exclude two important pieces of a successful park and recreation system; trails/linear parks and open space.

### Trail/Linear Parks and Open Space

The National Park and Recreation Association encourages communities to work with citizens to acquire a trail and open space system. However, trails and open space should not be factored into a level of service calculation. This is because each community has different opportunities for these types of recreation amenities.

Trails or linear parks are areas that facilitate activities and connections to parks, recreation, and open space areas. The City should require pedestrian connections, where appropriate, as a condition of subdivision and PUD approval. Because there is not a standard for these trails and linear parks, they will not count toward the developer's park dedication or system development charge.

Canby should develop open space policies that reflect their unique resources and respond to the desires of the residents.

Table 3-2 shows park distribution by classification in 2000, and provides some general ranges of what a reasonable distribution of parkland would be in 2020. The parkland need estimates presented in Chapter 2 and shown in the Total row of Table 3-2 indicate that Canby will need a park system with a total 210 acres in 2020 to meet its 10-acre per 1000 persons standard. The City will need to acquire a minimum of 137 acres to meet the City standard in 2020.

More importantly, Table 3-2 provides general guidelines for the distribution of park classifications. Columns two and three (2000 system, acres/percent) summarize the distribution of parkland by classification in 2000. Columns four and five show total acres needed in the 2020 system,

and the percentage of acres, while columns six and seven show the need between 2000 and 2020.<sup>10</sup>

Parkland need by type is intentionally presented in broad ranges. It is unlikely that Canby’s system would conform to a single set of percentages. The purpose of Table 3-2 is to establish a general range of acres or percentage of acres for each parkland classification at any given point in time. The figures in Table 3-2 should be considered as guidelines, not as targets to strictly adhere to.

**Table 3-2. Parkland distribution by classification, 2000 and 2020**

Park Type	2000 System		2020 System		Need 2000-2020	
	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent
Mini-Parks	11.2	15%	30-65	15%-30%	18-50	15%-30%
Neighborhood Parks	14.7	19%	30-65	15%-30%	17-48	15%-30%
Community Parks	50.5	66%	85-150	40%-70%	35-100	40%-70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: 2000 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, future need estimates by CPW

In summary, the distribution of need by park classification is intended to provide general guidelines. The City can change the distribution need by park classification as situations change.

### **Building Canby’s park system**

The 2000 Master Plan Update and the Acquisition Plan are in direct response to the inability of Canby’s park system to keep up with population growth. The intent of this Plan is to establish a land acquisition program that ensures Canby addresses the goals described above.

Given those goals, how does the city build that system? Review of other municipal programs indicates that it must occur through a variety of approaches that occur more or less simultaneously and are continued over a long period of time (20 years for the purpose of this plan).

The answer, in part, is that the City’s parkland dedication ordinance will be a key tool. The dedication ordinance will provide the basis for land acquisition policy and will ultimately determine how much parkland the City can acquire by dedication. This Plan assumes the target will be the 10-acre per 1000 person standard, but that actual dedications will be somewhat less than that due to a fee-in-lieu of dedication provision that gives the Planning Commission discretion in determining whether or not to accept dedications.

Moreover, the dedication approach has limitations. The primary park type acquired through the ordinance will be mini-parks and possibly a

<sup>10</sup> No parkland needs are allocated to facilities because facilities are not classified as a needed park type in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

neighborhood parks.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the City will need to pursue alternative approaches for dedication of most, if not all, community parks, and perhaps a substantial percentage of neighborhood parks. In summary, the dedication ordinance will be most effective for mini-parks and should target mini-parks.

It is important to note that Canby is adding a tool—parkland dedication through the subdivision and PUD process—to its land acquisition tool bag. The City must not depend solely on dedication to both raise the level of service per 1,000 residents *and* acquire new parkland for new population. Mandatory dedications should be considered as one mechanism—along with fees in lieu of dedications, partnerships and other approaches—to acquire parkland and protect open space. Canby can acquire community and neighborhood parks by using these additional mechanisms, and will need to in order to meet its standard and provide for a reasonable distribution of park types.

### **Park need by population and subarea**

Chapter two described how well neighborhoods are presently served, and identified how many acres of parkland would be needed in each neighborhood to meet the City standard. This section presents a framework for how the City can ensure that future parkland acquisition equitably serves each subarea. The analysis in Chapter 2 indicates that, based on population projections and city zoning, neighborhoods Five and Three are be most underserved by parks.

Canby will need a minimum of 210 acres by the year 2020. However, some areas of the City need more parks than other areas. The chapter addresses ways to distribute acquired parkland by park type and location. Based on public input from the 2000 Update and this acquisition plan, residents are concerned about the equitable distribution of mini parks and neighborhood parks as well as connectivity to a larger park system including the “emerald necklace.”

Table 3-3 shows parkland acquisition priorities by neighborhood and classification. The priority was determined using the service area by park classification map and population data.

---

<sup>11</sup> An example will underscore this point. If we assume that the largest residential development proposed might be on the order of several hundred dwelling units, and is not phased (or if it is, the City requires the entire parkland dedication up front), this would imply a population of 810 persons (300 dwelling units at 2.7 persons per dwelling unit). If the City chooses to require the dedication meet the full 10-acre per 1000 person standard, the developer would be required to dedicate 8.1 acres—which falls within the City’s “neighborhood” park classification. The largest subdivision in recent history was 285 lots, with many ranging between 100 and 200 lots.

**Table 3-3. Parkland acquisition priorities by neighborhood and classification, 2000-2020**

<b>Neighborhood</b>	<b>Community Park</b>	<b>Neighborhood Park</b>	<b>Mini-Park</b>
<b>One</b>	Low	Medium	Medium
<b>Two</b>	Low	Low	Medium
<b>Three</b>	Low	Medium	<i>High</i>
<b>Four</b>	Low	Low	Low
<b>Five</b>	Medium	<i>High</i>	High
<b>Six</b>	Medium	<i>High</i>	Medium

Source: Analysis of park distribution by type and neighborhood, CPW

The six neighborhoods the City uses for planning purposes are inadequate to ensure an equitable distribution of parks. Thus, the neighborhoods are further divided into 23 neighborhood subareas. Map 3-1 shows the neighborhood subarea boundaries as well as existing parks and schools in Canby. The map shows many subareas have no parks at this time, including several that are near full build out in residential uses.

Map 3-1 is intended to provide a systematic approach to ensure that every area of Canby is considered when evaluating parkland acquisitions. It will be a difficult task to acquire parkland in each of the neighborhood subareas. Moreover, the map is not intended as an absolute guide to where new parkland should be acquired, and should not be construed as to prohibit acquisition of parkland in subareas that already have parkland. It is intended to serve as a general guide for equitable geographic distribution of parks in Canby.

## Map 3-1. Park Sub-Areas

## Public Input

CPW held five public workshops in August 2001 to seek residents' input regarding needed amenities and the general location of future parks and trails. The opportunities map highlights input from all the meetings as well as email and personal contact with City staff.

In order for Canby to build the system discussed during the public processes, the following priorities must be set.

- More small parks that serve neighborhoods
- Ensuring parkland is reserved before or when new development is proposed
- Capitalizing on opportunities as they present themselves

The residents also highlighted various areas as potential sites for parks and open space. These are general sites, identified as either need or good location based on connections, environmental constraints, and adjacent land uses. The following bullets summarize some of the opportunities identified in the public meetings (note that they are *not* prioritized):

- Protect land along the rivers;
- Pursue partnerships to acquire more parkland;
- Acquire more mini- and neighborhood parks in future developments;
- Provide trails in commercial/industrial and residential areas;
- Link parks to neighborhoods with trails;
- Protect Mt. Hood view sheds;
- Preserve rural character of northern edge of Canby with parks along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (neighborhood 2);
- Acquire land outside of UGB for open space and greenways;
- Create interpretive areas of historical and natural features;
- Develop water features including spray parks and community ponds;
- Promote wetland protection between Highway 99 and Meadow Spring Road (neighborhood 3);
- Provide connections between schools and parks;
- Place sports fields in appropriate areas, i.e. consider adjacent uses; and
- Mitigate potential neighborhood nuisances.

Map 3-2 shows the general location of potential park sites identified during the public meetings held in August 2001. The location of the sites should not be construed as an intent of the City to acquire a specific parcel, but as an indication of a general area that residents' would like to have parks sited.

**Map 3-2. Potential park sites identified during public workshops,  
August 2001**

Map 3-3 shows the conceptual trail map, developed in the August 2000 Community Forum. The map identifies the Canby Transportation System Plan recommendations and potential linkages between parks, schools, and other public facilities. These include bike trails and multi-use trails. The Community Forum located likely routes for trail extensions and connections. When depicted with the TSP recommendations, potential linkages to schools, parks and other sites emerge as possible future acquisition and improvement projects. This map is advisory in nature and provides a conceptual idea of potential projects; location may vary when specific project planning takes place.

## **Evaluation of land dedication and acquisition**

### **Dedication Ordinance**

The ordinance language reflects the City's parkland standard and must demonstrate the nexus, or connection, between new development and dedication of parkland and the system development charge. The nexus is park demand created by new population which is estimated by the number of dwelling units. In summary, the City's standard states: 1000 persons of incoming population will require 10 acres of parkland based on Canby's level of service.

### **How does the City determine whether to accept a specific site?**

The dedication ordinance sets forth specific criteria. The staff report on the development application will evaluate the dedication criteria and provide a fact base for a Planning Commission decision.

It is important to consider what kind of land the developer wishes to dedicate for parks in the context of city standards and needs. Areas that have constraints, such as flood, wetlands, or steep slopes may limit the land use and its benefit to the public as a park.

The City's dedication ordinance requires parkland dedication as a condition of approval for a tentative plat of a subdivision or partition, design review for a multi-family development or manufactured home park, or the replat or amendment of any site plan for multi-family development where dedication has not occurred or where density will increase.

### Map 3-3. Bicycle and Multi-use Trail Connections

Prior to parkland dedication, the City requires an environmental assessment of the proposed lands. The City also assesses the following factors when deciding whether to accept land or fees in lieu:

- The dedication must provide 10 acres per 1000 persons or equivalent fees-in-lieu of the dedication;
- The topography, geology, access to, parcel size, and location of land in the development available for dedication;
- Potential adverse/beneficial effects on environmentally sensitive areas;
- Compatibility with the Parks Master Plan and Parks Acquisition Plan in effect at the time of dedication;
- Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site;
- Availability of previously acquired property; and
- The average value per acre of comparable land over the past three years in order to determine if the land value will exceed the equivalent SDC amount and the size of the potential park.

These factors will be evaluated at the time of the preliminary plat or PUD application to determine the feasibility of the dedication.

**What happens if the City does not find all or some the site acceptable?**

If the land is not suitable, the City will require the developer to pay a fee-in-lieu-of dedication. In some cases where part of the land to be dedicated is not suitable for parks, the City will receive a combination of land and fees. The total SDC and/or fee will not exceed the value of the land based on the average market value of comparable land over a 3-year period as recorded by the Clackamas County Assessor.

Fees gathered in lieu of dedication will be used to acquire parkland through outright purchase. This allows the City flexibility in determining what parcels of land are the most beneficial for the overall park system. Fees in lieu of dedication may make more sense for smaller subdivisions because as land divisions occur in smaller numbers, the overall burden on the park system is offset by fees paid for park acquisition and development.

In addition to the above methodology, park SDCs will be assessed for a combination of improvement and reimbursement fees. Improvement fees are “forward-looking” fees that will pay for capital improvements after they are collected. An “improvement fee” SDC may also be set aside to pay for a future debt issue. A “reimbursement fee” is the recovery from new development of an amount that would have been attributed to the new development if it had originally financed the capital improvement capacity that is presently available. It looks backward to consider circumstances in order to establish an equitable buy-in for latecomers.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> League of Oregon Cities (April 1994). *A Model System Development Charge Ordinance: A Commentary*.

Fees in-lieu of dedications are a common way for communities to acquire park and open space and have stood up to court challenge. The courts generally accept fees in-lieu-of dedications if the fees are deemed not to put an undo burden on the developer.<sup>13</sup> Fees are paid in two primary situations: (1) where the dedicated piece of land does not meet the City's list of criteria for dedication; and (2) where the development does not include an identified park site in the Acquisition Plan.

The criteria list is an essential piece of the Acquisition Plan because, when adopted into the ordinance, the list provides the basis for Canby to decide whether to accept a dedication or require fees be paid in-lieu-of dedication.

Fees in-lieu-of dedications are established based on the locale's assessed values or market land values. Canby bases their fees in-lieu-of dedications on an average market value over the past three years.

Because these fees will be used to purchase land outright, they must be comparable to the value of the dedication itself so that one option is not more onerous than the other for the developer. Another important reason for fees to be comparable to the value of the dedication itself is so the end result is the same: either Canby gets the land for a park or Canby gets enough money to buy the land for a park.

### **Land acquisition through donation or purchase**

Not all parkland will be acquired through dedications. Thus, the City needs a framework for evaluating and prioritizing land that are acquired through donation, purchase, or other methods.

Table 3-4 presents a scoring matrix staff can use to determine land suitable for parks, recreation, or open space. The matrix rates the site for its environmental attributes and its compatibility with the goals of the Acquisition Plan. Parcels that receive a yes to "meets criteria" on three or more of the criteria should be further considered for acquisition.

Criteria 5 and 6 should be used, in addition to criteria 1-4, to evaluate open space acquisitions.

---

<sup>13</sup> Frielich, Robert H. and Michael M. Shultz. (1995). *Model Subdivision Regulations*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Chicago: American Planning Association.

**Table 3-4. Parkland acquisition scoring matrix**

<b>Step</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Meets Criteria (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Within an area identified as strategic or a priority? (List appropriate reference)		
2	Is the topography, geology, access to, parcel size, and location of land in the development good for parks? List characteristics		
3	Is the action compatible with the Parks Master Plan, Public Facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan, and the City of Canby Parks Acquisition Plan in effect at the time of dedication?		
4	The site is accessible by multiple transportation modes or can be accessed by multiple transportation modes		
5	Are there potential adverse/beneficial effects on environmentally sensitive areas? (List threats, if any)		
6	Does it protect natural and historical features, scenic vistas, watersheds, timber and wildlife for parks? (Describe)		

## Summary

This chapter presents the framework for parks and open space acquisition in Canby. It identifies a need for about 137 additional park acres between 2001 and 2020, and establishes specific acquisition priorities.



# Chapter 4: Land Acquisition and Funding Strategies

## Purpose

The previous chapter described a framework for land acquisition and established priorities for future acquisition of parkland in Canby. This chapter answers the questions of how much it will cost to meet the City's minimum parkland standard over the next 20 years, and describes several land acquisition and funding strategies.

The land acquisition and funding strategies are divided into short-term strategies (e.g., strategies that can be pursued immediately), and long-term strategies (strategies that require additional analysis, or local review and decision). The plan emphasizes partnerships as a cornerstone to stretching limited resources.

## Park Acquisition Cost Estimates

### Overview and methods

The City has developed a vision of what its park system will be in 2020. An important question is:

How much will it cost to acquire enough parkland to meet the City's 10-acre per 1000 person standard between 2001 and 2020?

The answer to that question depends on a number of factors including how much of the City's system is acquired through dedications, when acquisitions occur, where they occur and a myriad of other factors that affect real estate values.

This section presents a provisional answer to that question. It presents estimates of how much it will cost to acquire the land needed to achieve and maintain the parkland standard between 2001 and 2020. The estimates are based on the assumption that different types of land have different values:

- Vacant land inside the UGB is more expensive than the vacant land outside the UGB
- Serviced land is more valuable than land without services
- Platted residential lots in subdivisions are more valuable than residential tracts
- Lands closer to existing developed areas are more valuable than lands further from development
- If trends observed during the 1990s continue, land costs will increase at a rate faster than inflation—in other words, land in the future may be more expensive than land today (measured in today's dollars)

Of course, there will always be exceptions to the patterns described above. This discussion is not intended to provide an empirical formula for determining land costs—rather, it is intended to underscore the tradeoffs that exist when evaluating specific lands for acquisition. Figure 4-1 shows the key relationships.

**Figure 4-1. Land by location and parcel size**




Figure 4-1 suggests that the City can stretch its acquisition dollars further if it is strategic about where and when it acquires land.

CPW estimates parkland acquisition costs using the following process:

1. *Analyze vacant land value.* CPW used GIS data to analyze land value by planned use, location, and size. To supplement the GIS analysis, CPW interviewed local realtors, who provided additional information and insight into local land values. Table 4-1 summarizes the results of the land value analysis using assessment data.

The assessment data show several clear trends. First, land inside the City limit is more valuable than land between the City Limit and UGB. Land outside the UGB is the least valuable. These trends are not surprising, they reflect development rights and access to infrastructure.

Second, land value increases as parcel size decreases. While this isn't surprising for land inside the UGB, it is somewhat surprising for land outside. The reasons for this trend are that smaller parcels tend to be serviced and closer to developed areas. This makes them more accessible, and thus more desirable for development.

The second trend apparent in Table 4-1 is that residential land inside the City limit is more valuable than non-residential land.

**Table 4-1. Average land value by location and type**

Location/Size	Land Designation		All Land
	Residential	Non-Residential	
<b>Inside City Limit</b>			
<1 acre	\$182,595	\$156,823	\$154,816
1-9 acres	\$21,538	\$23,289	\$23,059
10 or more acres	\$3,434	\$19,220	\$15,783
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$73,423</b>	<b>\$45,851</b>	<b>\$46,428</b>
<b>Between City Limit &amp; UGB</b>			
<1 acre	\$67,463	\$7,102	\$42,280
1-9 acres	\$8,839	\$11,163	\$9,728
10 or more acres	\$1,509	\$1,699	\$1,593
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$4,756</b>	<b>\$4,885</b>	<b>\$4,810</b>
<b>Outside City Limit</b>			
<1 acre	na	na	\$52,151
1-9 acres	na	na	\$11,179
10 or more acres	na	na	\$2,828
<b>Average</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>\$2,847</b>

Source: Clackamas County Assessment data, analysis by CPW

2. *Assume a distribution of park classifications and sizes.* Chapter 3 presented a range of acres for the three park classifications. To estimate land costs, CPW assumed that different park types would be distributed among the land types and values shown in Table 4-1.

Table 4-2 shows CPW's estimates of how much it would cost if the City were to purchase all of the land needed (137 acres) to meet its parkland standard between 2001 and 2020. Estimated system costs range from a low of \$6.9 million to a high of \$11.0 million.

**Table 4-2. Cost Scenario and Funding Gap**

Scenario	Avg Cost/Acre	Total System Cost
Low	\$50,000	\$6.9 M
Medium	\$65,000	\$8.9 M
High	\$80,000	\$11.0 M

Source: Estimates by CPW

Note: the cost scenarios provide rough estimates using cost per acre assumptions. The City should review the estimates periodically to verify their accuracy.

## Park acquisition cost estimates

Currently, Canby needs an extra 52 acres of parkland to meet the standard of 10 acres per 1,000 residents. In 2020, Canby will need 137

acres and at UGB Buildout, Canby will need 210 acres. Based on the land value estimates above, the cost of acquiring the needed parkland over the next 20 years will be between \$6.9 million and \$11 million.

The funding currently available includes system development charges (SDC). Canby adopted a SDC phasing program in August 2001. Based on the new phasing, by April 2002, the parks SDC for improvement will be \$724 per bedroom. According to population estimates, there will be 410 new residents and 158 new dwelling units each year between 2000 and 2020. The City assumes that there are approximately 2.7 people per household and 3 bedrooms per new dwelling unit. Therefore, according to the phasing, and the expected new population, the Parks Development Fund financed with the phased SDCs will be approximately \$6.5M over the next 20 years.

Given the cost of acquiring the park system and the SDC funding, a funding gap is present. Table 4-3 outlines the cost and funding surplus or gap among different scenarios.

**Table 4-2. Cost Scenario and Funding Gap**

<b>Cost Scenario</b>	<b>Est. Acquisition Cost 2000-2020</b>	<b>Parks Development Fund 2000-2020</b>	<b>Funding Gap</b>
Low	\$ 6.9 M	\$ 6.5 M	\$ 0.4 M
Medium	\$ 8.9 M	\$ 6.5 M	(\$ 2.4 M)
High	\$11.0 M	\$ 6.5 M	(\$ 4.5 M)

Source: Estimates by CPW

In summary, under the most likely scenarios, the City will not generate enough money from the existing SDC to cover land acquisition. This implies new funding sources or acquisition approaches will be necessary to meet the park standard. Moreover, acquiring land for a park system is only the first step in developing a system. Other issues surrounding park acquisition funds include:

- The City has insufficient funding to operate and maintain parks
- Adjustments to the SDC may increase revenue/acquisition
- Other funding sources may increase revenue

## Land acquisition and funding strategies

To implement the 10-acre per 1,000 residents standard, the City needs to be strategic about parkland acquisitions. Given that the dedications ordinance and fees in lieu of dedications may fall somewhat short of the City's minimum standard, what are acceptable and effective methods for parklands acquisition?

This section outlines the most appropriate funding strategies to build Canby's park system. The acquisition strategy includes those methods of funding that are best suited to Canby's needs. The strategies are

classified as either short-term (1-5 years) or long-term (6-20 years). Some strategies should be ongoing and are both short- and long-term.

The long-term strategies are those that require more research and collaboration, such as a park and recreation district.

Each strategy has a brief description and an evaluation. The evaluation describes the pros and cons of each strategy. Contact information for each category is included in Appendix C.

## Short-term strategies

Staff can immediately act upon the strategies in the short-term category. However, before action is taken, staff should consider the time and effort necessary to proceed with each strategy. To provide a framework for proceeding with each strategy, and to help the City assess the strategies' administrative burden, Chapter 5 provides a checklist for implementation measures. This section describes the opportunities and drawbacks of each strategy.

## Partnerships

Partnerships should be the cornerstone of a successful parks acquisition program. Public, private, and non-profit organizations may be willing to fund outright or work with the City to acquire additional parks and recreation facilities and services. This method may be a good way to build cooperation among public and private partners in Canby.

The specific partnering process used depends on who is involved. Potential partners include the State agencies such as the Department of Fish and Wildlife, local organizations such as the Canby Historical Society, land trusts, and national organizations such as the Nature Conservancy.

### Creating Land Acquisition Opportunities Through Partnerships: A Canby Case Study

In October 2001, the Canby City Council unanimously passed an ordinance calling for the \$900,000 purchase of 15.37 acres of the log boom as part of the "Emerald Necklace." The City will pay for the land with a \$250,000 grant from the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department's local grant program and a \$250,000 from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Bonneville Power Authority mitigation funds. Canby will match funds with city funds from the Sewer Construction Reserve Fund and the Parks Development Fund.

Canby also collaborated with the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department, who donated 80 acres of parkland along the Willamette River known as the "Fish Eddy" property. The land is between North Territorial Road and the river. Approximately twenty acres of the "Fish Eddy" property adjacent to the Willamette River will be set aside as valuable river corridor habitat, trails, and open space. Most of the remaining acreage will provide space for the expansion of the waste water treatment plant, and will be used for biosolids reuse and storm water reclamation.

These combined properties will connect to the existing Logging Road Trail property north of Territorial Road that the city purchased last year with a combination of grants and city funds. These properties are essential pieces of the "Emerald Necklace" project highly regarded by Canby residents. Future partnerships can build off these successful and popular acquisitions. Partnerships can also lead to cooperative maintenance, such as clean up days and foster community spirit. Partnerships are a win-win situation.

Although partnerships may not yield monetary benefits, there are other important benefits including:

- Efficiencies involving the removal of service duplication or use of complementary assets to deliver services
- Enhanced stability because future service is more probable when multiple parties make a commitment to it
- Organizational legitimacy of one or more partner
- Ability to pursue projects that the City may not have the resources to complete
- Identification of opportunities through partner organizations

The key problem with partnerships is there is no guarantee of success. Developing projects with partners requires considerable time and energy. Moreover, partnerships, while being a sound land acquisition strategy, should not be mistaken for a stable funding source.

### Donations

Two key motives for donation are philanthropy and tax incentives. These benefits should be emphasized when collaborating with landowners. There are many strategies for courting donations including building public relations, creating a healthy community, boosting

employee morale, and the existing tax structures that have built in incentives for donating land. It is important to note that for some potential donors, tax considerations are the primary reason for contemplating a major land donation.

Soliciting donations, like partnering takes time and effort on the part of City staff, but can be mutually rewarding. Generally, donations are not stable sources of land or finances

The downside of donations is that they can take a fair amount of staff time and effort. Canby should establish a clear set of goals before proceeding. First, Canby should appoint staff to work with landowners. Second, Canby should identify target areas for donations such as lands with high natural resource value or potential view sheds. The City should consider developing process to assess and actively pursue lands for donation.

#### The keys to successful partnerships:

🔑 *Get respected community members on board*

🔑 Create a sense of trust with landowners through outreach.

🔑 Work with Watershed Councils for local contacts and outreach.

🔑 Use a professional facilitator to provide objective advice and assistance during initial meetings

Source: Interview with Ryland Moore, Executive Director, McKenzie River Trust, August 27, 2001.

Finally, pursuing donations through partnerships may provide advantages to all parties involved. For example, working a land transaction through a non-profit organization may provide tax benefits for the donor, can provide flexibility to the City, and can reap financial benefits for the non-profit.

## Grants

Many granting organizations throughout the country fund park acquisition and improvement. Grants are a good strategy to supplement park acquisition funds, although they are not a stable funding source. Most have lengthy processes that will require staff time and effort. Grants usually fund specific acquisition projects that benefit the overall goals of the organization. Appendix C outlines organizations' goals and provides contacts for state, regional, and federal grant opportunities.

A benefit of grant proposals is that they can foster partnerships between agencies, organizations, and the City. Canby already has relationships with organizations, such as Bonneville Power Administration and the Oregon State Parks. These collaborative efforts in Canby secured grants and fostered partnerships that lead to the acquisition of about 90 acres of property in October 2001; about 20 acres of which is earmarked for the Canby park system. This property will connect to the existing Logging Road Trail north of Territorial Road.

## Long-term strategies

### Park and Recreation District

Canby can pursue the formation of a parks and recreation district to as a long-term park development strategy. ORS Chapter 266 enables the formation of a park and recreation district. According to statute, there are several initial steps required to form a park and recreation district.

Formation of a parks and recreation district in Canby should involve all interested citizens within the city. The City and interested residents should consider the following:

- The area to be served (rough boundaries should be established, specific boundaries will be required with the formal proposal).
- The assessed valuation of the area to be served.
- Sources of potential revenue, such as taxes, user fees, grants, etc.
- The anticipated level of services to be provided.
- The cost to provide these services.

One benefit associated with forming a park and recreation district is that city staff will give control of parks and recreation to another organization. However, this could be a drawback as the city loses control over park acquisition and maintenance.

Another benefit of a park and recreation district is the potential formation of a permanent tax base from property tax assessments. Upon formation of a district, the chief petitioners must complete an economic feasibility statement for the proposed district. That statement will form the basis for any proposed permanent tax rate. The assessment must include:

1. A description of the services and functions to be performed or provided by the proposed district;
2. An analysis of the relationships between those services and functions and other existing or needed government services;
3. A proposed first year line item operating budget and a projected third year line item operating budget for the new district that demonstrates its economic feasibility.<sup>14</sup>

Based on this analysis, the chief petitioners can determine the permanent tax rate for the district. If there is a formation election held, the permanent tax rate, if any, must be included in that election.

Park and recreation districts require a commitment from residents and staff. Outreach and surveying are two important aspects of delivering needed services. If Canby residents are interested in pursuing a park and recreation district, they should also consider who will make up the board and other funding mechanisms such as a park and recreation foundation.

Canby also has the opportunity to collaborate with the Blue Heron Park and Recreation District. Some options to discuss with the District are whether to alter the boundaries of the district, how to fund a potential district, if a new name should be adopted, and establishing a committee to assess these options.

## Land Trusts

Land trusts use many tools to help landowners protect their land's natural or historic qualities. Conservation easements are one such tool used to protect land while still allowing landowners to maintain ownership of their property. However, there are many liabilities accompanying an easement, making this option less useful to Canby. On the other hand, other tools used by Land Trusts will be more useful to Canby, including:

- Outright land acquisition by gift or will
- Purchase at a reduced cost (bargain sales)
- Land and/or property exchanges

A landowner can donate, sell, or exchange part of their land rights to a trust, in cooperation with the City. There is a tax incentive to donate the land as charitable gift, although it is the responsibility of the landowner to pursue the tax deduction.

Collaborating with land trusts and land owners takes considerable time and effort. Steps included in the process are:

1. Determining the public benefit of a landowners property from preservation. This step identifies the natural or historic values of the land.

---

<sup>14</sup> Special Districts Association of Oregon, *Formation, Alteration and Dissolution of Special Districts* p 141.

2. Working with the landowner to develop goals and objectives for the land.
3. Gather information including, title and deed information, maps, photographs, natural resources information, structural features, land management history and mining.
4. Conduct an environmental assessment for evidence of hazardous materials or other contaminants.
5. Determining whether a new survey is needed to establish easement boundaries.
6. Designing the terms of the easement.
7. Approval of the Land Conservancy's board of Directors and legal council.
8. Draft the easement document with legal council.
9. Sign and record the easement.
10. Annual monitoring to ensure compliance with easement requirements.

Currently, there is one land trust—Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust—operating specifically in Canby. As the name implies, this group focuses solely on preserving agricultural lands. Other land trusts operating near Canby include the Northwest Land Conservation Trust, Three Rivers Conservancy, and the Trust for Public Land. The Northwest Land Conservation Trust is based in Salem and has provided services statewide since 1994.

The Land Trust Alliance (LTA) is a nationwide land conservancy that has member organizations such as the Three Rivers Land Conservancy that operate in Oregon. The Three Rivers Land Conservancy's service area is nearby and could potentially be expanded to include Canby. The Conservancy is considering extending their service area.

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is also a nationwide land conservancy that serves Oregon. The TPL assisted with successful open space acquisitions in Canby as recently as October 2001. Contact information for land trusts that operate in Oregon is in Appendix C.

## **Bonds**

To issue long-term debt instruments, a municipality obtains legal authorization from either the voters or its legislative body to borrow money from a qualified lender. Usually, the lender is an established financial institution, such as a bank; an investment service that may purchase bonds as part of its mutual fund portfolio; or, sometimes, an insurance company.

Issuing debt is justified based on several factors:

- Borrowing distributes costs and payments for a project or improvement to those who will benefit from it over its useful

life, rather than requiring today taxpayers or rate payers to pay for future use.

- During times of inflation, debt allows future repayment of borrowed money in cheaper dollars.
- Borrowing can improve a municipality's liquidity to purchase needed equipment or for project construction and improvements. Debt issuance also does not exhaust current cash-on-hand, allowing such general fund revenues to be used for operating expenses.<sup>15</sup>

The longer the maturity term, the higher the interest rate required to borrow for that period of time because borrowers have to compensate investors for locking up their resources for a longer time.

Oregon Law requires that all Unlimited-Tax General Obligation (ULTGO) bonds be authorized by a vote of the people. The *Oregon Bond Manual – 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, recommends municipalities hire a bond counsel prior to the bond election to ensure that all requirements are met for a legal bond election.

The Bond Manual also notes that approval of an ULTGO bond requires considerable effort. Some examples of ways to gain public support include; attitude polls, forming a bond issue citizens' committee, holding public meetings, leaflets, and door-to-door canvassing. Note that under Oregon law, no public resources may be used to advocate a pro or con position regarding a ballot measure. Accordingly, any printed materials must be purely explanatory in nature.

A fundamental rule associated with issuing long-term debt instruments is, do not issue them for maturity longer than the project's useful life. People should not be paying for a major park or recreational facility after it is no longer in use.<sup>16</sup> Further, Canby should be very clear about the specific acquisitions and other actions to be carried out with the bond revenue. This is necessary because the City will be asking residents to pay for park and recreational acquisitions. Working with the community is an important aspect of passing a bond.

The key benefit of bonds for park acquisition is that the City can generate a substantial amount of capital. This capital can then be used to purchase parkland to accommodate needs far into the future.

## Levies

A local option levy for capital improvements provides for a separate property tax levy outside the City's permanent rate limit. This levy may be used to fund a capital project or a group of projects over a specified period of time, up to 10 years. Revenues from these levies may be used

---

<sup>15</sup> *Oregon Bond Manual – 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, 1998, Oregon State Treasury and Municipal Debt Advisory Commission.

<sup>16</sup> Crompton, John L. 1999. *Financing and Acquiring Park and Recreation Resources*. Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics.

to secure bonds for projects, or to complete one or more projects on a “pay as you go” basis.

The advantages of levies included reduced interest, increased flexibility, enhanced debt capacity, improved borrowing terms, and increased fiscal responsibility. The major disadvantages of this approach are insufficient funding, intergenerational inequity (if, for example, long-term facilities are paid for disproportionately by current users), inconsistency of funding requirements, and use of accumulated reserves. There are also legal requirements for Canby, including property tax limitations imposed by Ballot Measure #50.

Local option levies require voter approval and are subject to the double majority requirement of Measure #50 and are not considered to be a good alternative to the use of general obligation bonds for large projects or groups of projects.

Ballot Measure 50 was approved by Oregon voters at the statewide special election ballot on May 20, 1997. Measure 50 repeals a previously approved property tax reduction measure known as Measure 47, replacing it with new ad valorem property tax limitations.

Its provisions include a rollback measure, reducing all property taxes imposed statewide by approximately 17% from fiscal year 1997-1998 levels unless certain exemptions apply. Measure 50 also rolls back the “real market value” of each unit of property for the tax year 1997-98 to its 1995-96 value, less ten percent. This becomes the jurisdiction’s assessed value.

Measure 50 also limits increases in the assessed valuation of each property to three percent per year for tax years after 1997-98, with special exemptions for property that is improved, rezoned, subdivided, or ceases to qualify for exemption. In combination with the fixed permanent rate, the limitation on the growth in assessed value will limit the growth of taxes on individual properties to an average of 3% per year.

Property tax levies can be used for land acquisition and capital improvements, however, they are also frequently used for facility operations and maintenance.

## **Non-residential System Development Charge**

Many Oregon Cities require non-residential System Development Charges (SDCs). They allow the City to require commercial or industrial development to pay a fee, or dedicate land as a condition of building permit approval.

There are different ways to calculate a non-residential SDC. For example, some cities in Oregon base the fee on the number of employees at the facility. Other cities base it on the number of parking lots needed for the facility, the impervious surface area size of the building, or a flat fee. According to the League of Oregon Cities, the average number of employees per office building is 96, the average building size is 20,000

sq. ft., and the average number of parking spaces is 50. The advantage of using the number of employees is that there is a clear rational nexus between the number of employees and the needed park space. Appendix C includes a breakdown of Oregon cities' parks non-residential SDC calculations.

CPW recommends Canby pursue a non-residential SDC or dedications ordinance to increase funds to purchase parkland and to acquire parks and trails adjacent to industrial/commercial areas. Trails and linear parks are best suited for those areas with a large amount of industrial or commercial land (i.e. Neighborhood 4).

There are several legal concerns associated with the adoption of a non residential systems development charge. For example, ORS 223.301, outlines that certain system development charges and methodologies prohibited;

- (1) As used in this section, "employer" means any person who contracts to pay remuneration for, and secures the right to direct and control the services of any person.
- (2) A governmental unit may not establish or impose a system development charge that requires an employer to pay a reimbursement fee or an improvement fee based on: (a) The number of individuals hired by the employer after a specified date; or (b) A methodology that assumes that costs are necessarily incurred for capital improvements when an employer hires an additional employee.
- (3) A methodology set forth in an ordinance or resolution that establishes an improvement fee or a reimbursement fee shall not include or incorporate any method or system under which the payment of the fee or the amount of the fee is determined by the number of employees of an employer without regard to new construction, new development or new use of an existing structure by the employer.

In addition, ORS Section 223.307 covers the authorized expenditure of system development charges, and indicates that repayment of debt for allowable capital improvements is authorized. That debt is often incurred through bonds.

For more specific legal information regarding system development charges, the link to the 1999 SDC statutes is at

<http://www.orcities.org/members/fin-admin/ORS223.297-314.html>

Also, the 2001 revisions to the SDC laws (which have not yet been codified) are at <http://www.leg.state.or.us/01orlaws/0662.pdf>

This is a cursory review of current legal considerations conducted by Community Planning Workshop. It should not be considered an authoritative legal opinion. The City should seek legal counsel prior to adopting any amendments to the subdivision ordinance.

## Summary

The funding approaches discussed here are all viable options for Canby. The City should use various approaches at the same time. Canby should consider the following priorities when deciding which funding approaches to pursue and when to pursue them:

The key questions for Canby are:

- What land do we want to acquire?
- When do we want the land?
- Is there a City infrastructure to pursue parkland acquisitions?
- What do the residents want?

The City needs to consider the funding strategies described in this chapter in the larger context of its parks program. The City faces many financial issues related to the development, operation and maintenance of park and recreation facilities.

The following chapter provides a list specific actions the City should pursue to establish a more formal park acquisition program.



# Chapter 5: Parkland Acquisition Program Implementation Plan

The adoption of new park standards, acquisition policies, and the Acquisition Plan suggest Canby is establishing a more formal park acquisition program. Any program requires time and effort to develop. Key decisions need to be made early on regarding administrative infrastructure, funding, and other issues. Canby has already made many of those decisions and is now ready to begin implementing them.

To assist the City in getting the park acquisition program established, this chapter describes a series of actions the City can implement in the next five years. The implementation plan describes a series of recommended actions over the next five-years. The actions in this section are intended to describe broad activities that Canby staff can use to guide their initial efforts. Each action includes a list of specific tasks. The tasks are checklists to track the progress of implementation.

The activities described in this chapter are not prioritized. Some have specific timelines associated with them. Action 1 provides an opportunity to review and revise the implementation plan.

## **ACTION 1:**

**Administration:** *Develop the administrative infrastructure needed to implement the park acquisition program. Think long term (20 years) and strategically.*

### **Tasks:**

- Appoint a lead staff person to oversee the park acquisition program in six months
- Review and prioritize implementation plan on an annual basis
- Adopt parkland dedication ordinance
- Identify acquisition opportunities for community parks and open space, particularly parcels larger than 5 acres
- Refine review process for donated and dedicated land for parks and open space
- Solicit public input on acquisition priorities on a semi-annual basis
- Pursue a combination of acquisition and funding strategies

## **ACTION 2:**

**Partnerships:** *Pursue partnerships to acquire land now, especially on the UGB fringe. Act before land becomes enticing for development.*

### **Tasks:**

- Identify and contact potential partners in the next six months
- Tap into local groups to volunteer time and expertise
- Collaborate with at least six partner organizations to maintain or acquire parkland by 2006
- Establish a parkland acquisition working group
- Meet with these partners on a continual and regular basis

### **ACTION 3:**

**Evaluate feasibility of bond measure:** *Money up front can provide a boost to the park system but the timing must be appropriate.*

#### **Tasks:**

The Municipal Debt Advisory Commission of the Oregon State Treasury prepared the following checklist for issuing bonds:

- Select and retain recognized bond Counsel.
- Select and retain a financial advisor and/or an investment banker to assist with the planning and authorization of the bond sale.
- Determine the amount of funds needed and the corresponding size of the issue.
- Determine available cash flows and alternative to pay debt service on the bonds.
- Structure the bonds to match needs with cash flow and minimize costs and other considerations.
- Determine the role the public will play in the issuance.
  - Will a citizen advisory committee be formed?
  - Will or could property taxes or public user fees be affected?
  - Will the issue require a public vote?
- Adopt resolutions authorizing the sale of bonds or (if necessary) an election and ballot title:
  - Ensure bond counsel and the financial advisor review the resolution and ballot title before adoption
  - If applicable, determine whether issue is subject to the tax limits imposed by Article 11, Section 11 of the Oregon Constitution (Measures 5 and 50).
- Budget for the bonds
  - Use a Capital Improvement Fund to expend the bond proceeds on the projects and to collect the earnings on the investment of proceeds.
  - Use a Debt Service Fund to pay the principal and interest. Ensure there is a carry-over for the next fiscal year's first payment, since it may occur prior to the collection of taxes.

## **ACTION 4:**

### **Evaluate feasibility of a Canby Park and Recreation District: A guide for implementation**

#### **Tasks:**

- Review Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) that cover the formation of parks and recreation special districts can be found in ORS Chapter 198 – “Special Districts Generally,” ORS Chapter 199 – “Local Government Boundary Commissions; City-County Consolidation,” and ORS Chapter 266 – “Park and Recreation Districts.”
- Meet with the Blue Heron District to determine to discuss opportunities and understand their concerns. Find out if the District is open to a proposal to change it’s service boundary to the Canby UGB and areas immediately adjacent to it. If so, then begin discussions to address important questions with the Blue Heron District and staff. For example:
  - What steps would be required to change the District to one which serves just Canby? How much effort is involved?
  - What should the boundaries of the new district be?
  - Should there be a name change?
  - Who will serve on the committee?
  - Where will the tax base derive?
  - How would the city transfer ownership of currently held park property?
- Make a decision on whether to continue to pursue a District within two years. If the answer is “yes,” then continue with the remaining items in this action.
  - Form a committee of concerned citizens and community leaders approximately 9 to 12 months before March 31<sup>st</sup> that will analyze the need for a district and discuss the steps that will need to be taken. The committee should consider the following:
    - The area to be served (rough boundaries should be established, specific boundaries will be required with the formal proposal).
    - The assessed valuation of the area to be served.
    - Sources of potential revenue, such as taxes, user fees, grants, etc.
    - The anticipated level of services to be provided.
    - The cost to provide these services.

- The Committee should hold a public meeting to determine voter interest in forming a parks and recreation district.
- Review estimated costs and boundaries at public meetings.
- Draw up petitions. Submit prospective petition to county clerk. Begin preparing Economic Feasibility Statement.
- Circulate petitions. Obtain resolutions from any affected cities.
- Submit petitions, Economic Feasibility Report, and security deposit 180 days prior to election to County Clerk and Surveyor for review.
- County schedules hearing date and bond posted.
- County holds initial hearing.
- County holds second hearing.
- County enacts formation resolution or schedules election date.
- Formation materials submitted to Department of Revenue.
- Submit formation to Assessor's Office.
- Hold levy and Board election (Permanent tax rate elections may only be held in May or November of even numbered years).

**NOTE:** If there is a formation election held, the permanent tax rate, if any, must be included in that election.

#### **ACTION 5:**

**Prepare a Dedication Ordinance: *the dedication ordinance is the cornerstone of the City's acquisition strategy.***

##### **Tasks:**

- Use the Acquisition Plan to identify areas in need of mini and neighborhood parks (i.e. distribute land acquisitions equitably among sub areas).
- Use the Acquisition Plan to determine evaluation criteria for dedicated land
- Prepare draft language within three months.
- Seek approval of City Council, Planning Commission, and the Park and Recreation Advisory Board in six months.

**ACTION 6:**

**Prepare a Non-residential Systems Development Charge/Dedication Ordinance: *addressing park system demands placed by employers is an important component of the City's strategy.***

**Tasks:**

- Discuss fee calculation methodology with city attorney. Topic to discuss include:
  - How to best create a rational nexus for park need
  - How to interpret ORS 223.301, which outlines prohibited methodologies
  - How to interpret ORS Section 223.307 which outlines the authorized expenditure of system development charges
- Identify target areas for parks and linear parks/trails to be obtained by this ordinance
- Prepare draft language within six months.
- Seek approval of City Council, Planning Commission, and the Park and Recreation Advisory Board in one year.

# Appendix A

## Public Process

### Methods

CPW conducted five public workshops in August 2001 with 31 attendants. Each workshop began with a presentation highlighting Canby parks, future park needs, and examples of amenities. Participants gave the CPW team feedback on future park amenities preferences and issues surrounding park acquisition. Finally, attendants drew on GIS maps; designated by neighborhood, to locate preferable sites for future parks, open space, and connectors.

The dates and locations of each workshop were:

- Saturday August 11, 2001, Neighborhood 1, United Methodist Church, 1520 N. Holly
- Tuesday August 14, 2001, Neighborhood 2, Canby Alliance Church, 900 N. Juniper
- Thursday August 16, 2001, Neighborhoods 3 & 4, Cutsforth Thriftway Old Town Hall, 225 NE 2nd Ave.
- Tuesday August 21, 2001, Neighborhood 5, Casa Verde 718 S. Township Road
- Thursday August 23, 2001, Neighborhood 6, Canby Adult Center, 1250 S. Ivy Street

### Detailed Notes

CPW recorded notes at each workshop. The information gathered is broken down into two processes: brainstorming and mapping. The brainstorming process includes a list of needed amenities, issues with park acquisition, and questions, if any. Next, the mapping notes include locations for future parks or open space. These include both specific and general park locations as well as other needs raised during the mapping process.

#### **Saturday August 11, 2001, Neighborhood 1 (N1)**

##### **Brainstorming process:**

- Trail/open space connectivity
- Dog park
- Signs in Spanish (i.e. restrooms)
- Paved trail with neighborhood connections (i.e. Sherwood)
- Well-signed paths

- Playground equipment for younger kids
- Adopt-a-Park or benches (funding opportunity)
- Good locations for kids (safety and access) plan ahead
- Design parks as hubs –spokes connecting to surrounding neighborhood
- Preserve existing trees
- Sheltered playground
- Smaller parks – connected
- Comfort is important, trees help
- Trails
- Preserve river area
- Trout farm
- Community pond
- Spray park
- Legacy donations (funding opportunity)
- Centrally located parks
- Sports fields – neighborhood parks for informal play, extend to north end of neighborhood 1

### **Mapping process:**

- While siting dog parks, consider space, location (noise, children), and connections to leashed trails. Best place in Neighborhood 1 is the SW ridge.
- The north part of N1 should contain trails all along the western boarder (Molalla River). Preserving trees should be a goal.
- Vacant land on the northern part of N1 should be used for sports fields serving only those neighborhoods or spray parks.
- Neighborhood hubs, centered park connected by trails, are highly desirable.
- Parks in each neighborhood can alleviate neighborhood tensions.
- Public (city owned) vs. private (homeowners association): equity is an issue too
- Maps should have more landmarks and street names.
- A park (13,000 ft<sup>2</sup> to 20,000ft<sup>2</sup>) should be at Territorial and Holly Rd., this should include a water feature (i.e. rock garden with bedallias), no playground, and it should be a relaxing wayside. It should have a sign “You are here” to orient people to Canby’s natural features.
- Possible sports field, spray park, or water feature on agricultural land

- The southwest corner of the neighborhood might include a nature preserve, interactive areas, trails, and wetlands.
- Possible locations for mini parks are 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Hawthorne, 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Holly, 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Aspen, and at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Cul-de-sac.

## **Tuesday August 14, 2001, Neighborhood 2 (N2)**

### **Brainstorming process:**

- Wayside park – recreation corridor
- Fitness stations (along 22<sup>nd</sup>)
- Restrooms, water, benches, playgrounds
- 1 acre parks/pocket parks: places for families, like Locust St. Park, with trees
- Shaded picnic areas
- As population doubles, we'll need more of all amenities
- Open Space parks – Frisbee golf
- Parking at Eco Park
- Trails/connectivity
- Dogs: obeying scoop law, educating residents along Logging Road trail, provide more scoops and places to “dispense”
- Mitigate geese populations and manage wildlife habitat
- Integrate with other governments (i.e. school districts, utility districts, with county)
- Provide opportunities for people outside of Canby (i.e. horse trails in agricultural land, bike trails)
- Connect across river – City of Wilsonville
- Protect Riparian habitat, manage for wildlife and people, maybe some areas without people

### **Mapping Process:**

- Preserve rural feel of the edge of town or along 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue
- Possible wayside or pocket park ( or larger) on 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Locust

## **Thursday August 16, 2001, Neighborhoods 3 & 4 (N3, N4)**

### **Brainstorming process:**

- Picnic shelters, “pole-barn” – community park

- Reservation system for shelters (i.e. “keg fee”)
- Landscaping
- More playground equipment in small parks
- Smaller parks in more locations
- Use existing water features, NW1
- Warm up area for stretching, etc.
- Cost of maintenance
- Public/private partnerships
- Park associations
- Logging Road maintenance
- Landscaping and security issues
- Privacy on logging road
- Landscaping adds to security risk
- Homeowners Assoc. for logging road buffer
- Enforcement around littering, illegal disposal
- Distance to parks depends on subdivision design

#### **Mapping Process:**

- Park on Redwood Street in Subdivision (between Redwood St. and Highway 99)
- Protect wetland between Hwy 99 and Meadow Springs Road

### **Tuesday August 21, 2001, Neighborhood 5 (N5)**

#### **Brainstorming process:**

- More baseball fields, too many basketball courts
- Tennis courts and sports fields in general
- Just green space, not with playgrounds
- Maple street park is good because it’s easy to get there
- But, a park within 3 blocks of Casa Verde would be nice
- Leave green spaces in developed areas
- Being able to walk to the park is important
- Parks should be interconnected, Emerald Necklace
- Places to have picnics
- Amphitheater
- Historical parks celebrating agricultural/pioneer heritage

- Small, relaxing parks with benches for reading
- Slides, climbing bars, see-saws, climbing domes
- Sheltered picnic areas
- Children's' play sets (for all ages, but mostly under 10) are #1 priority
- How close to the Emerald Necklace will other parks be?
- Public/private partnerships
- Naming rights
- Buy a brick, or bench
- Hold fund raising events that emphasize the community value of parks
- The amount of parks in one neighborhood, equity
- Lack of parks in N5

### **Mapping process:**

- The Filbert orchard would be a great park
- Prefer large parks over small parks
- Need a park for BBQ
- Wading pool/lake
- River trail on south end
- Find two lots in valley village, on 10<sup>th</sup> and Lupine, only 2 lots left for open space
- Trails should connect schools, neighborhoods, and parks
- Pine street could connect with trail
- Park and trail area on south end, along the river
- Land swapping would be a great way to acquire river/ag land
- Possible park locations on Southwest 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Southeast 7<sup>th</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Redwood Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue & Lupine, or South Pine Road

## **Thursday August 23, 2001, Neighborhood 6 (N6)**

### **Questions:**

- Need demographic research for determining location of parks – this will help planners be objective in selecting sites  
Answer: More information in the acquisition document
- What is the greatest asset and need in current plan?  
Answer: Pocket parks, “emerald necklace”, equitable distribution of parks, and connections

- On the map, is there a swimming area near 9<sup>th</sup> St. Bridge, or is there anything comparable to it in the UGB?

Answer: Old Hickory, utility board property

- Improve public access at swimming holes for tubing

Answer: Private property is an issue, owners don't want trespassers

- Funding for sports complexes could come from naming rights (i.e. Pepsi in Wilsonville or Nike in Hillsboro)

### **Brainstorming process:**

- Places for teenagers and multi-use areas
- More and larger swimming area for events, etc
- Spray park for multiple ages (i.e. Wilsonville)
- Development of swimming holes
- Need amenities for early teens (kiddy parks aren't appealing)
- Canby Utility property development
- Wetland protected areas (for multi use development including field trips, after school programs, and community use)
- Day camp approach as a way to develop & use the property
- Safety seats for small children (cost and CPSC rules apply)
- Separate age group play areas in same park
- More swings
- Multi-use park (with playground) for sports events (baseball, football, soccer) – especially for events involving teams from outside of Canby, with concessions, lights, and bathrooms
- Signage for parks and bathrooms
- Bathroom design with young children in mind (i.e. parental accompaniment)
- Mileage markers both ways on multi-use paths
- More wildlife parks
- Lighted walking paths (none at Trost)
- More bike paths/walking paths to connect parks
- Any major road should be paved

### **Mapping process:**

- Canby Utility Board property could be used as a soccer field
- Access – crossing Hwy 99 is dangerous

- Need clear connectors - 13<sup>th</sup> and Logging Rd need access
- Multi-use bike paths
- Park on the corner of Hope Village
- Spray park in existing park (Maple, Locust or Wait Park)
- Improve play field on high school property
- There may be potential for parks at the end of cul-de-sacs
- Bathrooms needed in community parks (not neighborhood or mini)
- Elm and 13<sup>th</sup> could be a picnic area with a small pond
- Connect on the south end of N6 to wildlife park – get conservation easements with UGMA
- Fir Street is a possible location for a park or sports fields

## Summary Table

The table below shows the frequency of each park and open space amenity. According to the 2001 public workshops, the most frequently suggested park attributes are 1) trail/open space connectivity, 2) playgrounds, and 3) and more pocket parks (mini parks) and neighborhood parks.

**Table A- 1: Community Park Concerns**

<b>Amenity/Issue</b>	<b>N1</b>	<b>N2</b>	<b>N3 &amp; N4</b>	<b>N5</b>	<b>N6</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>Trail/open space connectivity</b>	1	1		1	1	4
<b>Playgrounds in general</b>		1	1	1	1	4
<b>More pocket/neighborhood parks</b>	1	1	1	1		4
<b>Playground equipment for younger kids (safety)</b>	1			1	1	3
<b>Preserve river area</b>	1		1		1	3
<b>Restrooms</b>	1	1			1	3
<b>Sheltered picnic areas</b>		1	1	1		3
<b>Sports fields</b>	1			1	1	3
<b>Paved trails w/ neighborhood connections (I.e. Sherwood)</b>	1	1		1		3
Hub design for parks	1		1			2
Trees	1	1				2
Community pond	1			1		2
Spray park	1				1	2
Swimming areas				1	1	2
Fitness stations	1		1			2
Dog parks	1	1				2
Signs	1				1	2
Signs in Spanish	1					1
Sheltered playground	1					1
Lighted walking paths					1	1
Amphitheater				1		1
Amenities for early teens					1	1
History parks, "heritage"				1		1
Safety	1					1
Provide opportunities for non-residents (horse trails, bike trails)		1				1
Trout farm	1					1
Frisbee golf in open spaces		1				1
Baseball fields				1		1
Tennis Courts	1					1



# Appendix B

## Resources and References

### References/Resource directory

#### Local

**City of Canby Park and Recreation Master Plan Update.**  
September 1997. Prepared by Community Planning Workshop.

**Blue Heron Draft Plan.** May 1996. Prepared by the Blue Heron Recreation District (formerly South Clackamas Recreation District) Board and Strategy Group.

#### State

##### **Oregon Grants Manual**

Provided by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
Available on the Park and Recreation Department website at  
<http://www.prd.state.or.us/publications.php> Or, request a copy by mail  
order, call 1-800-551-6949, Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

#### Regional

**City of McMinnville Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan.** June 1999. Prepared by MIG, Inc. in association with Don Ganer & Associates.

#### National

##### **National Recreation and Park Association**

22377 Belmont Ridge Road  
Ashburn, VA 20148-4501  
Phone: 703-858-0784 Fax: 703-858-0794  
E-mail: [info@nrpa.org](mailto:info@nrpa.org)  
Website: <http://www.nrpa.org/>

##### **Trust for Public Land Oregon Field Office**

1211 SW Sixth Ave.  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 228-6620  
FAX (503) 228-4529  
Email: [sophie.rahman@tpl.org](mailto:sophie.rahman@tpl.org)

##### **USDA Forest Service**

Pacific Northwest Region

PO Box 3623, 333 SW First Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97208-3623  
(503) 808-2971

## **Helpful Books and Publications**

Brown, Warren. 1993. Land Conservation Through Public-Private Partnerships. Washington DC, Island Press.

Crompton, John L. 1999. Financing and Acquiring Park and Recreation Resources. Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics.

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. 1996. Annual report. Washington, DC: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Environmental Grantmakers Association. 1997. Environmental Grantmakers association directory. New York: Environmental Grantmakers Association.

Trust for Public Land. 2001. Creating a Greenprint for Growth. Online at [www.tpl.org](http://www.tpl.org) or contact Wendy Muzzy at 617-367-6200 for more information.

McKenzie River Trust. Land Trusts: What Are They? Prepared by McKenzie River Trust. Contact 541-345-2799 for more information.

# Appendix C

## Funding Information

Chapter 3 discussed funding strategies to compliment current park funding sources. The following list provides brief descriptions and contacts for those funding strategies that had more detailed information.

### Short-term strategies

#### Partnerships

Two types of partnerships used by other cities in the United States are public sector partnerships and public/private partnerships. Public sector partnerships use intergovernmental agreements (contracts between governmental agencies) to deal with a variety of open space issues. These agreements may be useful in giving the parks departments a degree of protection over properties owned by other governmental agencies. Public/private partnerships between cities and private sector interests can be mutually beneficial. Private developers may be receptive to providing open space, linkages, and access through proposed developments. The city can achieve resource protection and greenway linkages, while the developer may find greater value for new projects based on an environmentally sensitive project design.

*Some federal, state, and local partnership opportunities include:*

#### **Federal**

##### The United States Forest Service

###### **Contact**

Leo Corona, Group Leader, Grants and Agreements  
USDA Forest Service - Pacific Northwest Region  
333 SW First Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204-3440  
Phone: (503) 808-2371  
Website: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/>

##### Bureau of Land Management

###### **Contact**

Oregon State Office  
Bureau of Land Management  
1515 S.W. 5th Ave., Portland, Oregon 97201  
P.O. Box 2965, Portland, Oregon 97208  
Phone: (503) 952-6002  
Fax: (503) 952-6308  
Website: <http://www.or.blm.gov/>

### **American Farmland Trust**

(For agricultural lands only)

#### **Contact**

American Farmland Trust  
1200 18<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 331-7300  
(202) 659-8339  
Website: <http://www.farmland.org/>

### **Land and Water Conservation Fund**

#### **Contact**

Recreation Programs Division  
National Park Service (LWCF)  
1849 C Street, N.W., Room 3624  
Washington, DC 20240  
(202) 565-1200 or 1203  
Website: [www.ncrc.nps.gov/lwcf](http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/lwcf)

## **State**

### **Land and Water Conservation Fund**

OR Parks and Recreation Department  
1115 Commercial Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301-1002  
(503) 378-4168  
Website: [www.ncrc.nps.gov/lwcf](http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/lwcf)

### **Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board**

#### **Contact**

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board  
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360  
Salem, OR 97301-1290  
Phone: (503) 986-0178  
Fax: (503) 986-0199  
Website: <http://www.oweb.state.or.us/>

### **Division of State Lands, Wetland Mitigation Banking**

#### **Contact**

Division of State Lands  
Larry Devroy, Wetland mitigation specialist

775 Summer Street NE Suite 100  
Salem, OR 97301-1279  
(503) 378-3805, ext. 285  
Website: <http://statelands.dsl.state.or.us/>

## **Oregon Fish and Wildlife Department**

### **Contact**

2501 SW 1st Ave  
PO Box 59  
Portland, OR 97207  
Information: (503) 872-5268  
Website: <http://www.dfw.state.or.us/>

## **The Nature Conservancy**

### **Contact**

The Nature Conservancy of Oregon  
821 S.E. 14th Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97214  
Phone: (503) 230-1221  
Fax: (503) 230-9639  
Website: <http://nature.org/>

## **Local**

Public, private, and non-profit organizations may be willing to fund outright or join together with the City to provide additional parks and recreation facilities and services. This method may be a good way to build cooperation among public and private partners in Canby. A list of potential partners besides police and fire departments, utility providers, and the school district include:

### **Local Organizations**

Some local examples from [www.Canby.com](http://www.Canby.com)

- American Mothers Inc., Canby Chapter 263-6747
- Boy Scouts of America - Tom Brandt 266-4305
- Girl Scouts - Columbia River Girl Scout Council 620-4567
- Kiwanis Club - Pres. Maggie Hubbard 266-1509
- Lions Club - Laurie Bergstrom 263-6295
- Oregon Trail Pitchpipers, Canby Chapter, Duane Redfield 266-3111
- 4 H - Linda Erickson & Janet Nagele 655-8635

### **Local Businesses**

#### **Contact**

Canby Area Chamber of Commerce  
140 NE 2nd Ave.  
PO Box 35  
Canby, OR 97013  
Phone: (503) 266-4600  
Fax: (503) 266-4338  
E-mail: [chamber@canby.com](mailto:chamber@canby.com)

## **Grants**

### **Private Grantmaking Organizations: Nation-wide**

#### **American Greenways Dupont Awards**

This program is a partnership between DuPont, The Conservation Fund, and the National Geographic Society. The Conservation Fund forges partnerships to protect America's legacy of land and water resources. Through land acquisition, community initiatives, and leadership training, the Fund and its partners demonstrate sustainable conservation solutions emphasizing the integration of economic and environmental goals.

#### **Contact**

The Conservation Fund  
1800 N. Kent Street, Suite 1120  
Arlington, VA 22209-2156  
Tel: (703) 525-6300  
Fax: (703) 525-4610  
Website: <http://www.conservationfund.org/conservation/>

### **Private Grantmaking Organizations: Regional**

#### **Paul G. Allen Forest Protection Fund**

The foundation focuses its grant making on the acquisition of old growth and other critical forest lands. Priority is given to projects that protect forest lands with a strategic biological value that extend or preserve wildlife habitat, and, where possible, offer opportunities for public recreation and education. The foundation is particularly interested in landscape-scale projects that provide optimal potential for protection of ecological integrity, functional and intact ecosystems, connectivity and biodiversity conservation.

An application form can be downloaded from the Paul G. Allen Foundations website;  
<http://www.pgafoundations.com/PGAOnlineApplication.pdf>.

#### **Contact**

Grants Administrator

PGA Foundations  
505 5th Ave South Suite 900  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Email: [info@pgafoundations.com](mailto:info@pgafoundations.com)  
Website: <http://www.pgafoundations.com>

### **Bonneville Environmental Foundation**

BEF watershed project grants to date have ranged from \$5,000 to \$40,000. Any private person, organization, local or tribal government, located in the Pacific Northwest (OR, WA, ID, MT) may submit a proposal to BEF. Proposals will only be considered, however, from applicants proposing to complete a watershed biological assessment or applicants operating within the context of a previously completed watershed biological assessment.

#### **Contact**

Bonneville Environmental Foundation  
133 SW 2nd Avenue, Suite 410  
Portland, OR 97204  
Phone: 503-248-1905  
FAX: 503-248-1908  
Website: <http://www.bonenvfdn.org/about/index.shtm>

## **Private Grantmaking Organizations: State-wide**

### **Oregon Community Foundation Grants**

Proposals to the Oregon Community Foundation are prioritized for funding based on their fit with a set of basic guiding principles and four specific funding objectives.

- To nurture children, strengthen families and foster the self-sufficiency of Oregonians (40-50% of OCF Grants)
- To enhance the educational experience of Oregonians (15-20% of OCF grants)
- To increase cultural opportunities for Oregonians (15-20% of OCF grants)
- To preserve and improve Oregon's livability through citizen involvement (10-15% of OCF grants)

Only about 5 percent of Community Grants are above \$50,000. Larger grants tend to be made only for projects that are an exceptionally good fit with OCF priorities, have a broad scope of impact, and address an area to which OCF's board has decided to give special attention.

#### **Contact**

US Bancorp Tower  
111 SW Fifth Avenue  
Suite 3600

Portland, OR 97204  
Phone: (503) 227-6846  
Fax: (503) 274-7771  
Website: <http://www.ocfl.org/>

### **The Collins Foundation**

The Collins Foundation endeavors to serve people throughout Oregon. Despite this commitment, the Foundation is unable to support every request received. Denial of a grant should not necessarily be considered a reflection on the quality of a project or the worthiness of its sponsor.

#### **Contact**

Cynthia Addams  
Director of Programs  
The Collins Foundation  
1618 SW First Avenue, Suite 505  
Portland, OR 97201  
Phone: (503) 227-7171  
Website: <http://www.collinsfoundation.org/>

## **Public Grantmaking Organizations: Federal**

### **National Park Service**

#### **Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program**

The Park Service provides recreation grants for economically distressed urban cities. The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program was established in November 1978 by Public Law 95-625, authorizing \$725 million to provide matching grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities. The purpose of the program was to provide direct Federal assistance to urban localities for rehabilitation of critically needed recreation facilities. The law also encouraged systematic local planning and commitment to continuing operation and maintenance of recreation programs, sites, and facilities. Only cities and urban counties meeting established criteria are eligible for assistance.

#### **Contact**

National Park Service  
Pacific West Region (AK, ID, OR, WA)  
Columbia Cascade Support Office  
909 First Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104-1060  
Telephone: (206) 220-4126  
Website: <http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/uparr/>

## **U.S. Department of Transportation**

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century was enacted June 9, 1998 as Public Law 105-178. TEA-21 authorizes the Federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 6-year period 1998-2003. The TEA 21 Restoration Act, enacted July 22, 1998, provided technical corrections to the original law.<sup>1</sup> TEA-21 funding for parks and connections includes:

- Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways
- Recreational Trails Program
- National Scenic Byways Program
- Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot

### **Contact**

U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 7th Street, S.W.  
Washington D.C. 20590  
Phone: (202) 366-4000  
Website: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tea21/index.htm> and  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tea21/sumenvir.htm#btapw>

## **Public Grantmaking Organizations: State**

### **Oregon Youth Conservation Corps**

Communities receive needed services not otherwise available, and unemployed youth are placed in gainful activities. The program can provide an opportunity for youth to serve as role models for others, which instills a growing commitment to community. OYCC funding is distributed in equal amounts to each county in Oregon every summer. The program funds individual projects ranging from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

The Oregon Youth Conservation Corps (OYCC) program consists of grants of labor and capital financing. OYCC grants generally support conservation or environment-related projects proposed by non-profit organizations. Youth corps members work on projects such as:

- Construction of trails, boat docks, disability access ramps, fences and picnic tables
- Restoration/Preservation of wetlands, stream banks, endangered species and other wildlife habitat, and historical and cultural sites
- Maintaining all of the above after wind, floods, fire or normal use
- Plus plantings, water quality testing, removing non-native plants and weeds, watershed work, managing nurseries, landscaping, mapping, surveying and recycling and community service projects

## **Contact**

1201 Court Street NE, Suite 302  
Salem, OR 97301  
Phone (503) 373-1570 Ext. 228.  
Web: <http://www.oycc.state.or.us/oyccmain.htm>

## **Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)**

OWEB provides funding to watershed councils in Oregon. Some examples of types of projects carried out by OWEB funds are:<sup>ii</sup>

- Watershed Restoration
- Land and Water Acquisition
- Assessment and Action Plan
- Watershed Monitoring
- Watershed Education and Outreach
- Watershed Council Support

## **Contact**

Geoff Huntington, Executive Director  
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360  
Salem, OR 97301-1290  
Phone: (503) 986-0180  
Fax: (503) 986-0199  
Website: <http://www.oweb.state.or.us/grants/index.shtml>

## **Oregon Department of Transportation**

### **State Pedestrian and Bicycle Grants**

ODOT provides grants to cities and counties for pedestrian or bicycle improvements on state highways or local streets. Grants amount up to \$200,000, with a local match encouraged. Requires applicant to administer project. Projects must be situated in road, street or highway right-of-way. Project types include sidewalk infill, ADA upgrades, street crossings, intersection improvements, minor widening for bike lanes. These grants are offered every two years.

**Contact person:** Michael Ronkin, (503) 986-3555

### **Transportation Enhancement Program**

Funds are available for projects that enhance the cultural, aesthetic and environmental value of the state's transportation system. Eligible activities include bicycle/ pedestrian projects, historic preservation, landscaping and scenic beautification, mitigation of pollution due to highway runoff, and preservation of

abandoned railway corridors. 10.27% minimum match required. (\$3 million annual funding for FY 2002 through 2005). The application cycle is every two years.

**Contact person:** Pat Rogers (503) 986-3528

### **Transportation Safety Grants**

This program promotes transportation safety such as programs in impaired driving, occupant protection, youth, pedestrian, speed, enforcement, bicycle, and motorcycle safety. (Over \$1.25 million is awarded annually). There is not an application process. Projects are chosen by problem identification.

**Contact person:** Sandi Bertolani (503) 986-4193

More funding information can be found on Oregon's Community Solutions Team website. This information includes a detailed table of available funding, program contacts, application cycles, and a description of who can apply.

Specific Department of Transportation funds can be found at the Community Solutions Team's website;

<http://communitysolutions.state.or.us/funding/transpor.html>

## **Oregon Economic and Community Development Department**

### **Oregon Tourism Commission, Matching Grants \$100,000**

These funds are coordinated with department's Needs and Issues process in order to give applicants more exposure to a greater number of potential funders; focus is on tourism-related projects within a larger economic development strategy. Funds are for tourism projects such as marketing materials, market analyses, sign age, visitor center development planning, etc., but not for construction. The funding cycle varies

**Contact:** Mandy Cole, (503) 986-0004

Specific Economic and Community Development funds can be found at the Community Solutions Team's website;

<http://communitysolutions.state.or.us/funding/ecdd.html>

## **Oregon Department of Environmental Quality**

### **Water Quality Nonpoint Source Grants (319 Grants)**

Approximately \$2.7M available each year in grants for nonpoint source water quality and watershed enhancement projects that address the priorities in the Oregon Water Quality Nonpoint Source Management Plan. Requires a minimum 40% match of non-federal funds and a partnership with other entities. Applications generally due about June 15. Contact the program for specific deadline. Funds are awarded February of the following year.

**Contact:** Ivan Camacho, (503) 229-5088

For more information see

<http://waterquality.deq.state.or.us/wq/nonpoint/wq319gt.htm>

Specific Department of Environmental Quality funds can be found at the Community Solutions Team's website:

<http://communitysolutions.state.or.us/funding/deq.html>

## **Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development**

### **Transportation and Growth Management Program**

Since the 1993-95 biennium, the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) program has distributed \$21.6 million in planning grants to local governments to accomplish transportation-efficient planning.

#### **Contact**

Cindy Lesmeister, Grants/Contracts

TGM Salem Office

635 Capitol St. NE Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301

Phone: (503) 373-0050, Extension 228

Fax: (503) 378-2687

Email: [Cindy.Lesmeister@state.or.us](mailto:Cindy.Lesmeister@state.or.us)

Website: <http://www.lcd.state.or.us/tgm/grants.htm>

## **Division of State Lands**

The Division grants easements for the use of state-owned land managed by the agency. An easement allows the user to have the right to use state-owned land for a specific purpose and length of time, and does not convey any proprietary or other rights of use other than those specifically granted in the easement authorization. Uses of state-owned land subject to an easement include, but are not limited to gas, electric and communication lines (including fiber optic cables), water supply pipelines, ditches, canal, and flumes; innerducts and conduits for cables; sewer, storm and cooling water lines; bridges, skylines and logging lines; roads and trails; and railroad and light rail track.

#### **Canby's regional Property Management contact is:**

Tami Hubert, Property Manager for Clackamas, Marion, Multnomah,  
and Polk Counties

775 Summer Street, NE Suite 100

Salem, OR 97301

Phone: (503) 378-3805 ext. 272

Fax: (503) 378-4844

Email: [tami.Hubert@dsl.state.or.us](mailto:tami.Hubert@dsl.state.or.us)

## **Wetlands Program**

The Division of State Land's Wetlands Program staff implement the wetland program elements contained in the 1989 Wetlands Conservation Act, and also help implement the Removal-Fill Law. The program has close ties with local wetland planning conducted by cities, providing both technical and planning assistance.

### **Contact**

Division of State Lands  
Larry Devroy, Wetland mitigation specialist  
775 Summer Street NE Suite 100  
Salem, OR 97301-1279  
(503) 378-3805, ext. 285  
Website: <http://statelands.dsl.state.or.us/>

## **Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department**

### **Land and Water Conservation Trust Fund Grant<sup>iii</sup>**

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department accepts applications for projects that will be funded from the Local Government Grant Program. This program uses lottery dollars to fund the program and provides funding assistance for the acquisition, development and rehabilitation of park and recreation areas and facilities. Eligible agencies include city and County Park and recreation departments, METRO, park and recreation districts, and port districts.

### **Contact**

Marilyn Lippincott  
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
Local Government Grants  
1115 Commercial St. NE Suite 1  
Salem, OR 97301-1002  
Website: <http://www.prd.state.or.us/grants-localgov.html>  
Email: [marilyn.lippincott@state.or.us](mailto:marilyn.lippincott@state.or.us)  
Voice: 503-378-4168 x241  
Fax: 503-378-6447  
or  
Glennys Lindsay  
[glennys.lindsay@state.or.us](mailto:glennys.lindsay@state.or.us)  
Voice: 503-378-4168 x477  
Fax: 503-378-6447

## **Oregon State Marine Board**

### **Facility Grant Program**

Cities, counties, park and recreation districts, port districts, and state agencies. Funds are awarded each fiscal year to priority projects. Matching fund program: 75% state and 25% by local or state agencies.

Eligible projects include acquisition and construction of public recreational motorized boating facilities, such as: boat ramps, boarding floats, restrooms, access roads, parking areas, transient tie-up docks, dredging and signs.

**Contact**

Janine Belleque, Grants/Contracts Coordinator  
Phone: (503) 373-1405 Extension 251  
Email: Janine.Belleque@state.or.us  
Web: <http://www.boatoregon.com/Facilities/FundSource.html>

**Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife**

**Sport Fish and Restoration Program Funds**

Cities, counties, park and recreation districts, port districts, and state agencies. Funds are awarded at the start of each federal fiscal year to priority projects. Matching fund program 75% federal and 25% by the State Marine Board. Eligible projects include acquisition and construction of public recreational motorized boating facilities, such as: boat ramps, boarding floats, restrooms, access roads, parking areas, transient tie-up docks, dredging and signs.

**Contact**

Realty Manager, Department of Fish and Wildlife  
P.O.Box 59  
Portland, OR 97207  
Phone: (503) 872-5310, ext 5385  
Website: <http://www.boatoregon.com/Facilities/FundSource.html>

**Public Grantmaking Organizations: Local**

**Metro's Greenspace Program**

**Types of Grants**

***Environmental Education:*** In 2001, Environmental Education grants will continue to be offered with relatively few changes. The maximum award has been increased to \$10,000. Approximately \$80,000 is available. Applications are due to Metro by 5 p.m. Sept. 25, 2001. The goal of this grant money is to build comprehensive environmental education programs around urban natural areas that encourage field and hands-on learning experiences for citizens of all ages. We encourage learning focused on ecological systems and watersheds with a strong emphasis on fostering community involvement in the stewardship of urban natural areas.

***Conservation and Restoration Program:*** The Habitat Restoration Grant Program will be replaced with a new program called the Conservation and Restoration Program. Under this new program, funding awards of up to \$40,000 will be offered for a wider array of

projects and programs. The goal of this grant money is to restore and enhance fish and wildlife habitat, wetland, streams riparian corridors and upland sites. In addition, eligible projects have been expanded to include research, monitoring and other methods of building on current information about local fish and wildlife and their habitats. We encourage projects that would build community partnerships and increase public awareness of the value of urban open spaces.

Download the .pdf or Microsoft Word files above or request a printed copy from [metroparks@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:metroparks@metro.dst.or.us) or by calling (503) 797-1850 option 5.

More information can be found at Metro's Greenspace website; <http://www.multnomah.lib.or.us/metro/parks/parkgrants.html>

### **Contacts**

#### **Environmental Education Grant Program**

Deb Scrivens  
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department  
600 NE Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97232  
(503) 797-1852  
Fax (503) 797-1849  
E-mail: [scrivensd@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:scrivensd@metro.dst.or.us)

#### **Restoration and Conservation Program**

Jennifer Thompson  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Oregon State Office  
2600 SE 98th Avenue, Suite 100  
Portland, Oregon 97266  
(503) 231\_6179  
Fax (503) 231-6195  
E-mail: [Jennifer\\_Thompson@fws.gov](mailto:Jennifer_Thompson@fws.gov)  
<http://www.r1.fws.gov/oregon/hcr/gs-program.htm>

# Long term strategies

## Park and Recreation District

Special Districts are financed through property taxes or fees for services, or some combination thereof. All districts are directed by a governing body elected by the voters. A good source for information is the Special District Association of Oregon.

The Special Districts Association of Oregon was established in 1977 to pursue the common interests and concerns of special districts. SDAO's has outlined how to form a special district. This document, given to Canby staff, provides all the details Canby should consider before forming a park and recreation district.

### Contact

Greg Baker, Executive Director  
Special Districts Association of Oregon  
PO Box 12613  
Salem 97309-0613  
Phone: 503-371-8667; Toll-free: 1-800-285-5461  
Fax: 503-371-4781  
E-mail: [sdao@sdao.com](mailto:sdao@sdao.com)  
Web: [www.sdao.com](http://www.sdao.com)

## Land Trusts

### Three Rivers Land Conservancy

Three Rivers Land Conservancy is dedicated to promoting and preserving open space, scenic areas, wildlife habitat, and other natural and historic resources in the greater metropolitan area of Portland.

### Contact

Jayne R. Cronlund, Executive Director  
PO Box 1116  
Lake Oswego, OR 97035  
(503) 699-9825  
<http://www.trlc.org/>  
[trlc@teleport.com](mailto:trlc@teleport.com)

### The Wetlands Conservancy

The Wetlands Conservancy (TWC) is a non-profit land trust. Founded in 1981 by Althea Pratt-Broome and Jack Broome, it is the first organization in Oregon to dedicate itself to preserving, protecting, and promoting the wildlife, water quality and open space values of wetlands.

### Contact

Phil Lamb, Executive Director  
PO Box 1195  
Tualatin, OR 97062  
(503) 691-1394  
[wetlands@teleport.com](mailto:wetlands@teleport.com)

### **Land Trust Alliance**

#### **Contact**

Dale Bonar  
Program Director  
3517 NE 45th St  
Seattle, WA 98105-5640  
206-522-3134  
206-522-3024 (fax)  
Email: [ltanw@lta.org](mailto:ltanw@lta.org)  
Website: [www.lta.org](http://www.lta.org)

### **Trust for Public Land**

#### **Contact**

Oregon Field Office  
1211 SW Sixth Ave.  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 228-6620  
FAX (503) 228-4529  
Website: [www.tpl.org](http://www.tpl.org)

### **Northwest Land Conservation Trust**

#### **Contact**

P O Box 18302  
Salem, OR 97305-8302  
Email: [nwlct@open.org](mailto:nwlct@open.org)  
Website: <http://www.open.org/~nwlct/>

### **Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust**

#### **Contact**

Will Newman II, Research Director  
Erica Frenay, Outreach Coordinator  
P.O. Box 1106  
Canby, Oregon 97013-1106  
Phone: 503-263-8392; fax: 503-266-8082  
E-mail: [osalt@teleport.com](mailto:osalt@teleport.com)  
Website: <http://www.osalt.org>

## Other Funding Strategies

### Non-Residential SDC

Cities in Oregon use a variety of methods to calculate non-residential system development charges. The League of Oregon Cities, in response to an inquiry, created the following table. It shows the broad spectrum of calculation methods used in Oregon.

**Table C-1. Parks SDCs for Nonresidential Development**

City	2000 Population	Type of Fee	SDC Methodology	Avg. fee for office blg
Ashland	20,085	Development & reimbursement	Only "non residential" use charged a SDC is tourist accommodations, and based per unit	\$487.76
Aumsville	3,045	Development	\$0.72 per square foot for non residential structures	\$14,400
Beaverton	70,230	Development & reimbursement	Based upon number of employees	\$3,538
Dayton	2,015	Development & reimbursement	Based on water meter size	\$266
Durham	1,570	Development & reimbursement	\$165 per employee	\$15,840
Harrisburg	2,935	Development	EDU's at build out calculated from the 1994 ODOT study	\$9,980
Hillsboro	72,630	Development & reimbursement	Determined by number of parking spaces	\$14,650
Hubbard	2,285	Development & reimbursement	Depends on impervious surface area size of building	\$2,419
Jacksonville	2,270	Development	Equivalent to residential units	
Lafayette	2,240	Development & reimbursement	Equivalent to dwelling units	
Mt. Angel	3,030		\$55 * I.E.R.U.	\$2,112
Rogue River	2,000		Called a "park dedication fee"	\$200

Seaside	6,220	Development	Tourist accommodations \$230 per unit, RV/Tent Spaces \$140 per required parking space	\$7,000
Tangent	1,080	Development	\$128.75/parking space	\$6,438
Tigard	38,835	Development	\$49/employee	\$4,704
Veneta	2,940	Development	Flat fee	\$366 plus 4% admin. Charge
Vernonia	2,460	Development	Calculated by dividing the costs of eligible improvements by the anticipated 20 year pop. Growth and multiplying that number by 2.35 to convert it to EDUs	\$2,996
Wilsonville	13,615	Development & reimbursement	Per employee	\$5,280

Source: League of Oregon Cities, April 2001

In addition to this table, the League of Oregon Cities also provided a detailed methodology for Oregon City. They use the following methodologies for a non-residential SDC.

The charge was set at \$154/employee, based on the following formulas:

1. the non-residential facilities cost per employee (growth related facilities cost/increase from development = facilities cost per employee).
2. the compliance/administration cost per employee (non-residential facilities cost per employee X 5% = compliance/admin cost per employee)
3. the credit per employee (present value of tax payments per employee = credit per employee).
4. the non-residential SDC per employee (non-residential facilities cost per employee + compliance/admin cost per employee – credit per employee = non-residential SDC per employee).

Oregon City is also negotiating with Clackamas County to have them collect a city parks SDC for any county-approved development inside their UGB.

---

iii Oregon Grants Manual for LWCF. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service.