

City of Sherwood



TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT
CHARGE
METHODOLOGY REPORT

October 2016

FCS GROUP

Washington Office

7525 166th Avenue NE, Suite D-215
Redmond, WA 98052
T: 425.867.1802 | F: 425.867.1937

Oregon Office

4000 Kruse Way Place, Bldg 1, Ste 220
Lake Oswego, OR 97035
T: 503.841.6543 | F: 503.841.6573



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| SECTION I: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. System Development Charges | 1 |
| B. Project | 1 |
| C. Calculation Overview..... | 2 |
| C.1 Reimbursement Fee | 2 |
| C.2 Improvement Fee..... | 2 |
| C.3 Adjustments..... | 2 |
| C.3.a Expected TDT Revenues..... | 3 |
| C.3.b Expected MSTIP Revenues..... | 3 |
| C.3.c Fund Balance | 3 |
| C.3.d Compliance Costs | 3 |
| C.4 Geographic Allocation | 3 |
| SECTION II: SDC CALCULATIONS | 5 |
| A. Growth Calculation | 5 |
| B. Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis..... | 5 |
| C. Improvement Fee Cost Basis | 6 |
| C.1 TDT Adjustment | 7 |
| C.2 MSTIP Adjustment | 7 |
| C.3 Fund Balance..... | 7 |
| D. Compliance Cost Basis..... | 8 |
| SECTION III: CONCLUSION | 9 |
| A. Calculated SDC..... | 9 |
| B. Credits, Exemptions, and Discounts | 10 |
| B.1 Credits..... | 10 |
| B.2 Exemptions | 10 |
| C. Indexing | 11 |
| D. Fee Basis..... | 11 |
| E. Comparison..... | 15 |
| APPENDICES..... | 16 |
| Appendix A – Reimbursement Fee Eligible Costs..... | 16 |
| Appendix B – Transportation SDC Project List | 17 |

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

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

A. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

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

ORS 223.299 defines two types of SDCs:

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

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

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

B. PROJECT

The City contracted with FCS GROUP to perform an SDC update. We conducted the study using the following general approach:

- ◆ **Framework for Charges.** In this step, we worked with City staff to identify and agree on the approach to be used and the components to be included in the analysis.

- ◆ **Technical Analysis.** In this step, we worked with City staff to isolate the recoverable portion of facility costs and calculate SDC rates. The technical analysis is provided in **Appendices A and B.**
- ◆ **Methodology Report Preparation.** In this step, we documented the calculation of the SDC rates included in this report.

C. CALCULATION OVERVIEW

In general, SDCs are calculated by adding a reimbursement fee component and an improvement fee component—both with potential adjustments. Each component is calculated by dividing the eligible cost by growth in units of demand. The unit of demand becomes the basis of the charge. Below are details on the components and how they may be adjusted. **Exhibit 1.1** shows this calculation in equation format:

| Exhibit 1.1 – SDC Equation | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| $\frac{\text{Eligible costs of available capacity in existing facilities}}{\text{Units of growth in demand (trips)}}$ | + | $\frac{\text{Eligible costs of capacity-increasing capital improvements}}{\text{Units of growth in demand (trips)}}$ | + | $\frac{\text{Pro-rata share of costs of complying with Oregon SDC law}}{\text{Units of growth in demand (trips)}}$ | = | $\text{SDC per unit of growth in demand (trips)}$ |

C.1 Reimbursement Fee

The reimbursement fee is the cost of available capacity per unit of growth that such available capacity will serve. In order for a reimbursement fee to be calculated, unused capacity must be available to serve future growth. For facility types that do not have excess capacity, no reimbursement fee may be calculated.

C.2 Improvement Fee

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

We have used the capacity approach to allocate costs to the improvement fee basis.¹ Under this approach, the cost of a given project is allocated to growth by the portion of total project capacity that represents capacity for future users. That portion, referred to as the improvement fee eligibility percentage, is multiplied by the total project cost to determine that project's improvement fee cost basis.

C.3 Adjustments

Four cost basis adjustments are applicable to the SDC calculation: expected transportation development tax (TDT) revenues, expected Major Streets Transportation Improvement Project (MSTIP) revenues, fund balance, and compliance costs.

¹ Two alternatives to the capacity approach are the incremental approach and the causation approach. The incremental approach is computationally complicated because it requires the computation of hypothetical project costs to serve existing users. Only the incremental cost of the actual project is included in the improvement fee cost basis. The causation approach, which allocates 100 percent of all growth-related projects to growth, is vulnerable to legal challenge.

C.3.a Expected TDT Revenues

Washington County implemented the TDT, a tax run by the County consistent with SDC law, on all development within the County. The City of Sherwood can use TDT revenues on transportation projects that are included in the TDT project list. This SDC methodology assumes all projects on the SDC project list will be included on the TDT list and can be funded using TDT revenue. Hence, future TDT revenues are deducted from the from the SDC/TDT cost basis to avoid double-charging for projects that could be paid for in whole or in part with TDT revenues.

C.3.b Expected MSTIP Revenues

Washington County also has the MSTIP, a capital improvement program implemented by the County for transportation projects. A portion of total program money is used for the same capacity increasing capital projects funded by the SDC. MSTIP revenues are similarly deducted from the improvement fee cost basis because the City uses MSTIP revenues for capacity-increasing capital improvements.

C.3.c Fund Balance

All SDC and TDT, revenue currently available in fund balance is also deducted from its corresponding cost basis. This practice prevents a jurisdiction from double-charging for projects that were in the previous methodology's improvement fee cost basis but have not yet been constructed. All fund balance deductions will be from the improvement fee cost basis because the TDT and current SDC contain only an improvement fee cost basis.

C.3.d Compliance Costs

ORS 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs for “the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures.” To avoid spending monies for compliance that might otherwise have been spent on growth-related projects, this report includes an estimate of compliance costs in the SDC calculation.

C.4 Geographic Allocation

Transportation SDCs are often calculated and applied uniformly throughout a local government service area, but such uniformity is not a legal requirement. Local governments may also calculate and impose area-specific SDCs. Area-specific SDCs allow a local government to identify and isolate differential costs to serve particular areas within its jurisdiction. SDCs are calculated separately for each area. If used, it is assumed that area-specific SDC revenues will be spent on projects in the area in which the SDCs were collected.

Area-specific SDCs can be implemented in two ways. The first way is to divide the service area into a set of non-overlapping sub-areas. Under this method, the SDCs for a particular sub-area are determined by the assets, projects, and projected growth in that area. The second method is a layered approach. The first layer consists of a citywide SDC based on assets and projects of citywide benefit. The second layer consists of one or more overlays. Each overlay is a separate list of assets and projects that benefit a particular sub-area within the city. For each overlay, the cost bases are divided by projected growth in that particular area. Development within an overlay pays both the citywide SDC and the overlay SDC. Development outside of an overlay pays only the citywide SDC. Citywide SDCs can be spent on any project in the City's project list, but it is assumed that overlay SDCs can be spent only in the area in which they were earned.

In this report we have calculated a uniform SDC, and the uniform approach has been emphasized throughout our work with the City. In order to evaluate the costs of serving specific high-growth areas, we have also calculated for consideration a layered SDC—with a citywide SDC and overlay SDCs for the Tonquin Employment and Brookman overlay areas. Both the layered “area specific”

SDC and the uniform SDC are equally defensible. The uniform SDC has the additional advantages of continuity with current practice and comparative administrative ease.

SECTION II: SDC CALCULATIONS

This section provides the rationale and calculations supporting the proposed transportation SDCs. As discussed previously, an SDC can include three components: a reimbursement fee, an improvement fee, and compliance cost recovery. Below we provide detailed calculations for each component of the charge.

A. GROWTH CALCULATION

Growth is the denominator in both the improvement and reimbursement fee calculations, measured in units that most directly reflect the source of demand. For transportation SDCs, the most applicable and administratively feasible unit of growth is trips.

Sherwood’s prior transportation SDC growth calculation was based on P.M. peak-hour vehicle trip-ends. The proposed SDC methodology utilizes an average daily person trip-end (ADPT) basis for calculating future trip growth. Whereas P.M. peak-hour trips only include vehicle trips that occurred between 4 and 6 p.m., ADPTs include vehicle trips during the entire day as well as non-motor vehicle trips that utilize bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This appropriately accounts for a balanced transportation system with a mix of motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. **Exhibit 2.1** shows the growth in Sherwood ADPTs during the planning period based on the Sherwood Transportation System Plan, Tonquin Employment Area Concept Plan, and Brookman Addition Concept Plan.

| | 2016 | 2035 | Growth | Growth as a % of Future Customers |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sherwood Excluding Overlays | 168,826 | 250,427 | 81,601 | 32.58% |
| Tonquin Employment Overlay | 249 | 17,780 | 17,532 | 98.60% |
| Brookman Overlay | 679 | 19,988 | 19,310 | 96.61% |
| Sherwood Total (Including Overlays) | 169,753 | 288,196 | 118,443 | 41.10% |

Source: DKS Associates based on Metroscope Gamma 2035 TAZ Forecast, Brookman Addition Concept Plan, May 2009, Tonquin Employment Area Concept Plan, October 2010, and City staff.

The City of Sherwood is expected to grow by a total of 118,443 trips, with a majority of the trips being created outside the overlay areas. The overlay areas are projected to grow such that at least 96 percent of the trips in 2035 for each overlay will be new trips. This growth as a percent of future customers distinguishes the overlay areas from the rest of the City, which will grow such that about 33 percent of the trips in 2035 will be new trips.

B. REIMBURSEMENT FEE COST BASIS

The reimbursement fee cost basis is the cost of capacity available in the existing system. Calculation of the reimbursement fee begins with the historical cost of assets or recently completed projects that have unused capacity to serve future users. For each asset or project, the historical cost is adjusted by that portion of the asset or project that is available to serve future users. To avoid charging growth

for facilities provided at no cost to the City or its ratepayers, the reimbursement fee cost basis may be reduced by any grants or contributions used to fund the assets or projects included in the cost basis. Furthermore, unless a reimbursement fee will be specifically used to pay debt service, the reimbursement fee cost basis should be reduced by any outstanding debt related to the assets or projects included in the cost basis to avoid double charging. These reductions result in the gross reimbursable cost.

The estimated cost of unused capacity in the City transportation system is determined based on previous expenditures for SDC- and TDT-funded projects. Eligible reimbursement costs reflect the amount of current infrastructure capacity that will accommodate future growth. For this analysis, we assume any project built with SDC monies will reach capacity 20 years after construction. **Exhibit 2.2** shows the reimbursement fee basis calculation (see **Appendix A** for SDC fund expenditures).

| Exhibit 2.2: Reimbursement Fee Basis Calculation | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Fiscal Year Ending 6/30: | Cost in Year | Remaining Capacity ¹ |
| 2011 | \$542,925 | \$407,194 |
| 2012 | \$2,338,389 | \$1,870,711 |
| 2013 | \$84,607 | \$71,916 |
| 2014 | \$403,676 | \$363,308 |
| 2015 | \$1,170,630 | \$1,112,099 |
| Total | \$4,540,227 | \$3,825,228 |

Source: Appendix A, City of Sherwood.

Note: Capacity increasing capital expenditures, or TDT and SDC improvement fee expenditures, included in reimbursement fee cost basis.

¹Assume capacity is reached in 20 years.

C. IMPROVEMENT FEE COST BASIS

The improvement fee cost basis is based on a specific list of planned capacity-increasing capital improvements. The portion of each project that can be included in the improvement fee cost basis is determined by the extent to which each new project creates capacity for future users. **Exhibit 2.3** shows the total improvement fee-eligible cost basis (see **Appendix B** for a complete list of the projects and eligibility by project). The eligible portion shown in the exhibit is a weighted average of all project allocations.

| Exhibit 2.3: Improvement Fee Cost Basis Summary | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Tonquin Employment | | | Total |
| | Citywide | Area | Brookman | |
| Total Cost of Projects | \$111,860,417 | \$10,919,535 | \$35,125,852 | \$157,905,804 |
| Total Eligible Portion | 53% | 100% | 95% | 65% |
| SDC-Eligible Cost | \$59,202,940 | \$10,919,535 | \$33,257,397 | \$103,379,871 |
| Number of Projects | 66 | 1 | 5 | 72 |

Source: City staff based on the Sherwood Transportation System Plan and FY 2015-16 to 2019-20 Capital Improvement Plan.

Similar to **Exhibit 2.1**, the potential overlay areas have very high fee-eligible percentages to mirror the expected growth in those areas. The projects in the potential overlay areas are assumed to benefit those areas rather than the City at large.

C.1 TDT Adjustment

After calculating the total SDC-eligible costs, we must calculate the improvement fee deductions. The TDT adjustment is the product of the average TDT per person trip and the number of trips expected to be generated during the planning period. This leads to a total deduction of \$61.78 million in expected TDT revenues. See **Exhibit 2.4** for a detailed accounting of the TDT cost adjustments.

| Exhibit 2.4: Projected TDT Revenue Based on Total Trip Growth | |
|---|---------------------|
| Estimated TDT Revenue | Citywide |
| 1. TDT Single Family Detached Charge per Dwelling Unit | \$8,278 |
| 2. Person Trips per Single Family Detached Dwelling | 15.87 |
| 3. Charge per Trip (1 ÷ 2) | \$522 |
| 4. Total Projected Person Trips | 118,443 |
| 5. Total Projected TDT Revenue (3 x 4) | \$61,776,560 |

Source: Washington County, ITE Manual 9th Edition, DKS Associates.

C.2 MSTIP Adjustment

The next deduction is for expected MSTIP funds. Per City staff, a portion of MSTIP funds is allocated to the incorporated cities based on population. The estimated MSTIP allocation for this program is \$28.00 million annually, of which Sherwood is expected to receive approximately 5.76 percent based on population. Totaled over the planning period, Sherwood expects to receive \$32.25 million in MSTIP revenues to use for capacity increasing improvements.

| Exhibit 2.5: Projected MSTIP Revenue Based on Annual Average | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Total Incorporated County Population - 2014 | 329,115 |
| 2. Total Sherwood Population - 2014 | 18,955 |
| 3. Sherwood Population as a Percent of Total Incorporated Population in Washington County (1 ÷ 2) | 5.76% |
| 4. Annual County MSTIP Allocation | \$28,000,000 |
| 5. Proportional Annual Sherwood Share of MSTIP (3 x 4) | \$1,612,627 |
| 6. Expected MSTIP Revenue During Planning Period | \$32,252,548 |

Source: Washington County, Portland State University Population Research Center.

C.3 Fund Balance

The final deduction is for the available SDC and TDT fund balances. We deduct three fund balances: the Street City Improvement Fund, which contains City SDC revenue; the Street Transportation Development Tax Fund, which contains the City TDT revenue; and the Street County Traffic Impact Fee Fund, which contains revenues from the Traffic Impact Fee, a County-wide SDC program that preceded the TDT. **Exhibit 2.6** shows the total fund balance deduction of \$2.25 million.

| Exhibit 2.6: Ending Fund Balance Adjustments | |
|--|---------------------|
| Street City Improvement Fund | \$ 456,371 |
| Street Transportation Development Tax Fund | 1,550,246 |
| Street County Traffic Impact Fee Fund | 247,843 |
| Total | \$ 2,254,460 |

Source: City of Sherwood.

D. COMPLIANCE COST BASIS

ORS 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs on “the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures.” This SDC methodology assumes compliance costs of one percent of the improvement and reimbursement cost bases. See **Exhibit 2.7** for the total compliance cost estimate.

| Exhibit 2.7: Compliance Cost Estimates | |
|--|--------------------|
| | Estimate |
| Total Compliance Costs | \$1,072,051 |

Calculated as one percent of SDC eligible costs by area.

SECTION III: CONCLUSION

A. CALCULATED SDC

Dividing the sum of the net cost bases described above by the projected ADPT growth produces the proposed transportation SDC, to be applied uniformly to growth throughout the City. **Exhibit 3.1** summarizes the SDC component calculations. Expected TDT and MSTIP revenues are deducted from the improvement fee basis, as are SDC fund balances.

| Exhibit 3.1: Transportation SDC - Uniform | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------|------------------------|
| Reimbursement Fee | | | |
| SDC Funded Infrastructure | \$ | 3,825,228 | |
| Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis | \$ | 3,825,228 | |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | | 118,443 | Person Trip |
| Reimbursement Fee | \$ | 32.30 | per Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | | | |
| Capacity Expanding CIP | \$ | 103,379,871 | |
| Less: Expected MSTIP Revenues | | (32,252,548) | |
| Less: Expected TDT Revenues | | (61,776,560) | |
| Less: SDC Fund Balances | | (2,254,460) | |
| Improvement Fee Cost Basis | \$ | 7,096,303 | |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | | 118,443 | Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | \$ | 59.91 | per Person Trip |
| Compliance Fee | | | |
| Costs of Compliance | \$ | 1,072,051 | |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | | 118,443 | Person Trip |
| Compliance | \$ | 9.05 | per Person Trip |
| Total System Development Charge | | | |
| Reimbursement Fee | \$ | 32.30 | per Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | \$ | 59.91 | per Person Trip |
| Compliance Fee | \$ | 9.05 | per Person Trip |
| Total SDC per Person Trip | \$ | 101 | per Person Trip |

Exhibit 3.2 summarizes the components of the SDC with overlays. In this case, the citywide SDC also applies to the potential overlay areas, so the total charge in each overlay area would be the sum of the citywide and overlay charges. Expected TDT and MSTIP revenues are deducted first from the citywide improvement fee in this calculation. These deductions result in no citywide improvement fee because the City would have sufficient money to fund all improvement fee eligible project costs using TDT and MSTIP revenue along with current fund balances. Remaining MSTIP and TDT revenues are proportionally allocated to the improvement fee cost bases in the overlay areas.

| Exhibit 3.2: Transportation SDC - Overlays | Citywide SDC | Tonquin Employment Overlay | Brookman Overlay |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Reimbursement Fee | | | |
| SDC Funded Infrastructure | \$ 3,825,228 | \$ - | \$ - |
| Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis | \$ 3,825,228 | \$ - | \$ - |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | 118,443 Person Trip | 17,532 Person Trip | 19,310 Person Trip |
| Reimbursement Fee | \$ 32.30 per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | | | |
| Capacity Expanding CIP | \$ 59,202,940 | \$ 10,919,535 | \$ 33,257,397 |
| Less: Expected MSTIP Revenues | (19,533,670) | (3,143,818) | (9,575,060) |
| Less: Expected TDT Revenues | (37,414,810) | (6,021,672) | (18,340,079) |
| Less: SDC Fund Balances | (2,254,460) | - | - |
| Improvement Fee Cost Basis | \$ - | \$ 1,754,045 | \$ 5,342,258 |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | 118,443 Person Trip | 17,532 Person Trip | 19,310 Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ 100.05 per Person Trip | \$ 276.66 per Person Trip |
| Compliance Fee | | | |
| Costs of Compliance | \$ 1,072,051 | \$ - | \$ - |
| Growth to End of Planning Period | 118,443 Person Trip | 17,532 Person Trip | 19,310 Person Trip |
| Compliance | \$ 9.05 per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip |
| Total System Development Charge | | | |
| Reimbursement Fee | \$ 32.30 per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip |
| Improvement Fee | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ 100.05 per Person Trip | \$ 276.66 per Person Trip |
| Compliance Fee | \$ 9.05 per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip | \$ - per Person Trip |
| Total SDC per Person Trip | \$ 41 per Person Trip | \$ 100 per Person Trip | \$ 277 per Person Trip |

B. CREDITS, EXEMPTIONS, AND DISCOUNTS

The City of Sherwood will continue to establish local policies for issuing credits, exemptions, annual adjustments, and other administrative procedures.

B.1 Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC for a specific development. ORS 223.304 requires that credit be allowed for the construction of a qualified public improvement which: is required as a condition of development approval; is identified in the City’s capital improvements program; and either is “not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval,” or is located “on or contiguous to such property and is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project....”

Additionally, a credit must be granted “only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity needed to serve” the particular project up to the amount of the improvement fee. For multi-phase projects, any “excess credit may be applied against SDCs that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.”

In addition to these credit policies required by state law, the City may adopt credit policies that: provide a greater credit amount than required by state law; establish a system providing for the transferability of credits; provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the City’s SDC Capital Improvements Plan; or provide a share of the cost of an improvement by other means (i.e., partnerships, other City revenues, etc.).

In the event a developer is entitled to SDC and TDT credits for the same improvement, SDC credits and TDT credits must be accounted for separately. Furthermore, SDC credits may not be used to meet TDT payment obligations. Please refer to the Washington County TDT Procedures Manual for policies regarding TDT credits.

B.2 Exemptions

The City may exempt specific classifications of development, such as minor additions, from the requirement to pay transportation SDCs. The City may not arbitrarily exempt customers or customer types from SDCs. It must have a cost or demand-based justification.

C. INDEXING

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

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

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

D. FEE BASIS

The transportation SDC is based on the number of person trips that a land use generates. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* contains vehicle trip rates based on studies conducted nationwide and provides the base data of unadjusted counts of trips generated by various types of land use. The trip rates include all traffic entering or leaving a location but do not account for traffic that passes by or interrupts a primary trip between origin and destination. We have taken the step of removing pass-by and diverted-linked trips because they would occur regardless of development activity. We have also converted ITE average daily vehicle trips to ADPT using a factor of 1.68 based on information from DKS Associates and Metro.

We calculate the number of net new ADPTs generated per day for each type of land use with the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{ITE Vehicle Trip Rate} \times (1 - \% \text{ Pass-by Trips and Diverted- Linked Trips}) \\
 & \times \text{ADPT Conversion Factor} = \text{New ADPT}
 \end{aligned}$$

The SDC per unit of development is calculated for each type of land use by multiplying the new ADPT for each land use by the SDC per ADPT.

$$\text{SDC per ADPT} \times \text{New ADPT by Land Use} = \text{SDC by Land Use}$$

Exhibit 3.3 shows the SDC by cost basis. These fee bases are multiplied by the ADPT by land use to derive the total SDC obligation.

| Exhibit 3.3: Transportation SDC Comparison by Fee Component | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|--|
| Land Use | Reimbursement Fee | Improvement Fee | Compliance Fee | Total | |
| Citywide - Uniform | \$32 | \$60 | \$9 | \$101 | |
| Citywide - With Overlays | \$32 | \$0 | \$9 | \$41 | |
| Tonquin Employment Overlay | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$100 | |
| Brookman Overlay | \$0 | \$277 | \$0 | \$277 | |

Source: Previous tables.

Exhibit 3.4 shows the trips per land use for the transportation SDC. It is important to note that the

Trip Generation Manual may not contain some land use categories or may not include trip rates or number of net new trips generated. For such land use categories without data, the City SDC Administrator shall use her/his judgment to calculate the transportation SDC.

| Exhibit 3.4: Transportation SDC by Land Use | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ITE Code | Land Use | Unit | Average Daily Person Trips | Primary Trip Adjustments as a Percent of Total ¹ | Adjusted Average Daily Trips | Number of Person Trips ¹ |
| 30 | Intermodal Truck Terminal | Acre | 62.51 | 100% | 62.51 | 105.02 |
| 90 | Parking Lot with Bus Service | Parking Spaces | 4.50 | 100% | 4.50 | 7.56 |
| 93 | Light Rail Transit Station with Parking | Parking Spaces | 2.51 | 100% | 2.51 | 4.22 |
| 110 | General Light Industrial | 1,000 SFGFA | 5.26 | 100% | 5.26 | 8.84 |
| 120 | General Heavy Industrial | 1,000 SFGFA | 1.50 | 100% | 1.50 | 2.52 |
| 130 | Industrial Park | 1,000 SFGFA | 5.34 | 100% | 5.34 | 8.97 |
| 140 | Manufacturing | 1,000 SFGFA | 3.03 | 100% | 3.03 | 5.09 |
| 150 | Warehouse | 1,000 SFGFA | 2.83 | 100% | 2.83 | 4.75 |
| 151 | Mini-Warehouse | 1,000 SFGFA | 2.37 | 100% | 2.37 | 3.99 |
| 160 | Data Center | 1,000 SFGFA | 0.99 | 100% | 0.99 | 1.66 |
| 210 | Single-Family Detached Housing | Dwelling unit | 9.45 | 100% | 9.45 | 15.87 |
| 220 | Apartment | Dwelling unit | 6.50 | 100% | 6.50 | 10.92 |
| 230 | Residential Condominium/Townhouse | Dwelling unit | 5.65 | 100% | 5.65 | 9.49 |
| 240 | Mobile Home Park | ODU | 4.90 | 100% | 4.90 | 8.23 |
| 254 | Assisted Living | Bed | 2.56 | 100% | 2.56 | 4.31 |
| 255 | Continuing Care Retirement Community | Unit | 2.28 | 100% | 2.28 | 3.84 |
| 260 | Recreational Homes | Dwelling unit | 3.11 | 100% | 3.11 | 5.23 |
| 310 | Hotel | Room | 7.86 | 100% | 7.86 | 13.20 |
| 320 | Motel | Room | 5.63 | 100% | 5.63 | 9.46 |
| 411 | City Park | Acre | 6.13 | 100% | 6.13 | 10.30 |
| 417 | Regional Park | Acre | 4.99 | 100% | 4.99 | 8.39 |
| 430 | Golf Course | Hole | 36.98 | 100% | 36.98 | 62.13 |
| 443 | Movie Theater without Matinee | Movie screen | 255.71 | 100% | 255.71 | 429.60 |
| 444 | Movie Theater with Matinee | Movie screen | 387.03 | 100% | 387.03 | 650.21 |
| 480 | Amusement Park | Acre | 104.29 | 100% | 104.29 | 175.20 |
| 488 | Soccer Complex | Field | 71.33 | 100% | 71.33 | 119.83 |
| 491 | Racquet/Tennis Club | Court | 35.65 | 100% | 35.65 | 59.90 |
| 492 | Health/Fitness Club | 1,000 SFGFA | 30.32 | 100% | 30.32 | 50.94 |

| Exhibit 3.4: Transportation SDC by Land Use | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ITE Code | Land Use | Unit | Average Daily Person Trips | Primary Trip Adjustments as a Percent of Total ¹ | Adjusted Average Daily Trips | Number of Person Trips ¹ |
| 495 | Recreational Community Center | 1,000 SFGFA | 27.40 | 100% | 27.40 | 46.03 |
| 520 | Elementary School | Student | 1.29 | 59% | 0.76 | 1.28 |
| 522 | Middle School/Junior High School | Student | 1.62 | 59% | 0.96 | 1.61 |
| 530 | High School | Student | 1.71 | 59% | 1.01 | 1.69 |
| 536 | Private School (K-12) | Student | 2.48 | 59% | 1.46 | 2.46 |
| 540 | Junior/Community College | 1,000 SFGFA | 21.41 | 100% | 21.41 | 35.97 |
| 550 | University/College | Student | 1.71 | 100% | 1.71 | 2.87 |
| 560 | Church | 1,000 SFGFA | 13.22 | 100% | 13.22 | 22.21 |
| 565 | Day Care Center | Student | 3.24 | 33% | 1.07 | 1.79 |
| 590 | Library | 1,000 SFGFA | 50.46 | 100% | 50.46 | 84.78 |
| 610 | Hospital | Bed | 11.43 | 100% | 11.43 | 19.21 |
| 620 | Nursing Home | Bed | 2.60 | 100% | 2.60 | 4.37 |
| 710 | General Office Building | 1,000 SFGFA | 8.38 | 100% | 8.38 | 14.08 |
| 714 | Corporate Headquarters Building | 1,000 SFGFA | 7.98 | 100% | 7.98 | 13.41 |
| 715 | Single Tenant Office Building | 1,000 SFGFA | 11.65 | 100% | 11.65 | 19.57 |
| 720 | Medical-Dental Office Building | 1,000 SFGFA | 27.31 | 100% | 27.31 | 45.88 |
| 730 | Government Office Building | 1,000 SFGFA | 68.93 | 100% | 68.93 | 115.80 |
| 731 | State Motor Vehicles Department | 1,000 SFGFA | 120.90 | 100% | 120.90 | 203.11 |
| 732 | United States Post Office | 1,000 SFGFA | 88.35 | 100% | 88.35 | 148.43 |
| 750 | Office Park | 1,000 SFGFA | 8.50 | 100% | 8.50 | 14.28 |
| 760 | Research and Development Center | 1,000 SFGFA | 6.22 | 100% | 6.22 | 10.45 |
| 770 | Business Park | 1,000 SFGFA | 9.44 | 100% | 9.44 | 15.85 |
| 812 | Building Materials and Lumber Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 43.13 | 100% | 43.13 | 72.46 |
| 813 | Free-Standing Discount Superstore | 1,000 SFGFA | 53.42 | 72% | 38.46 | 64.62 |
| 814 | Variety Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 64.03 | 48% | 30.57 | 51.36 |
| 815 | Free-Standing Discount Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 59.09 | 48% | 28.22 | 47.40 |
| 816 | Hardware/Paint Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 58.23 | 45% | 25.91 | 43.53 |
| 817 | Nursery (Garden Center) | 1,000 SFGFA | 82.86 | 100% | 82.86 | 139.20 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 1,000 SFGLA | 41.24 | 50% | 20.68 | 34.74 |
| 823 | Factory Outlet Center | 1,000 SFGFA | 28.58 | 100% | 28.58 | 48.02 |

| Exhibit 3.4: Transportation SDC by Land Use | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ITE Code | Land Use | Unit | Average Daily Person Trips | Primary Trip Adjustments as a Percent of Total ¹ | Adjusted Average Daily Trips | Number of Person Trips ¹ |
| 826 | Specialty Retail Center | 1,000 SFGLA | 40.58 | 100% | 40.58 | 68.18 |
| 841 | Automobile Sales | 1,000 SFGFA | 29.27 | 100% | 29.27 | 49.17 |
| 843 | Automobile Parts Sales | 1,000 SFGFA | 61.91 | 44% | 27.24 | 45.76 |
| 848 | Tire Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 24.87 | 69% | 17.08 | 28.69 |
| 849 | Tire Superstore | 1,000 SFGFA | 19.98 | 69% | 13.72 | 23.05 |
| 850 | Supermarket | 1,000 SFGFA | 122.18 | 39% | 47.34 | 79.54 |
| 851 | Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours) | 1,000 SFGFA | 758.79 | 33% | 246.81 | 414.63 |
| 853 | Convenience Market with Gasoline Pumps | VFP | 440.62 | 33% | 143.32 | 240.77 |
| 857 | Discount Club | 1,000 SFGFA | 42.35 | 100% | 42.35 | 71.14 |
| 862 | Home Improvement Superstore | 1,000 SFGFA | 38.03 | 44% | 16.73 | 28.11 |
| 863 | Electronics Superstore | 1,000 SFGFA | 45.04 | 100% | 45.04 | 75.67 |
| 880 | Pharmacy/Drugstore without Drive-Through | 1,000 SFGFA | 90.06 | 42% | 38.13 | 64.05 |
| 881 | Pharmacy/Drugstore with Drive-Through | 1,000 SFGFA | 96.91 | 38% | 36.83 | 61.87 |
| 890 | Furniture Store | 1,000 SFGFA | 4.98 | 37% | 1.83 | 3.07 |
| 912 | Drive-in Bank | 1,000 SFGFA | 122.71 | 27% | 33.54 | 56.35 |
| 931 | Quality Restaurant | 1,000 SFGFA | 88.04 | 43% | 37.42 | 62.86 |
| 932 | High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | 1,000 SFGFA | 132.28 | 40% | 52.58 | 88.34 |
| 934 | Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through | 1,000 SFGFA | 535.05 | 41% | 219.07 | 368.04 |
| 937 | Coffee/Donut Shop with Drive-Through | 1,000 SFGFA | 818.58 | 41% | 335.16 | 563.07 |
| 938 | Coffee/Donut Kiosk | 1,000 SFGFA | 1,800.00 | 17% | 306.00 | 514.08 |
| 944 | Gasoline/Service Station | VFP | 168.56 | 35% | 59.00 | 99.11 |
| 945 | Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market | VFP | 162.78 | 13% | 20.80 | 34.94 |
| 946 | Gasoline/Service Station with Car Wash | VFP | 152.84 | 24% | 36.51 | 61.34 |

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, compiled by FCS GROUP

¹Person trips calculated with 1.68 person trips per average daily trip.

Abbreviations

CFD - commercial flights per day

ODU - occupied dwelling unit

SFGFA - square feet of gross floor area

SFGLA - square feet of gross leasable area

VFP - vehicle fueling position

E. COMPARISON

We have calculated the maximum defensible SDCs in this methodology. The City can choose to implement lower SDCs, but this will result in a funding deficit for the SDC-eligible project list.

The maximum defensible transportation SDCs calculated in this methodology are higher than the current SDCs being charged. **Exhibit 3.5** shows the current and maximum defensible transportation SDCs for common land use development types. The exhibit shows the SDC both with and without overlays. The overlay SDCs include the citywide SDC in the fee calculation, as would be charged by the City.

| ITE Code | Land Use | Current | Citywide - Uniform | Citywide - With Overlays | Tonquin Employment Overlay | Brookman Overlay |
|----------|---|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 210 | Single-Family Detached Housing per Dwelling | \$1,506 | \$1,607 | \$656 | \$2,244 | \$5,047 |
| 110 | General Light Industrial per 1,000 SFGFA | \$1,288 | \$896 | \$366 | \$1,251 | \$2,812 |
| 710 | General Office Building per 1,000 SFGFA | \$2,250 | \$1,426 | \$582 | \$1,991 | \$4,477 |
| 820 | Shopping Center per 1,000 SFGFA | \$3,907 | \$3,518 | \$1,436 | \$4,912 | \$11,048 |

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Reimbursement Fee Eligible Costs

| SDC/TDT/TIF Expenditures | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Fiscal Year Ending 6/30: | Street City Improvement | TIF/TDT | Total |
| 2011 | \$34,326 | \$508,599 | \$542,925 |
| 2012 | \$472,481 | \$1,865,908 | \$2,338,389 |
| 2013 | \$54,651 | \$29,956 | \$84,607 |
| 2014 | \$382,151 | \$21,525 | \$403,676 |
| 2015 | \$1,005,458 | \$165,172 | \$1,170,630 |
| Total | \$1,949,067 | \$2,591,160 | \$4,540,227 |

Source: City of Sherwood.

Appendix B – Transportation SDC Project List

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| D3 | Oregon Street Intersections Improvements at Murdock Road and Tonquin Road | Install a roundabout at the Tonquin Road/Oregon street intersection with dual westbound through lanes and a single eastbound through/right lane. Consider creating a "Dumbbell Roundabout" with the Oregon street/Murdock Road roundabout by disallowing the west circulating lane at Oregon street/Tonquin Road and disallowing the east circulating lane at Oregon street/Murdock Road. Add a second westbound approach lane to the Murdock Road/Oregon Street roundabout for separated westbound left and westbound through lanes. Keep three lanes on the bridge structure | \$2,623,413 | \$ - | 27% | \$702,510 | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| D5 | Brookman Road Improvements (Three Lane Collector) | Improve Brookman Road from Middleton Road to Ladd Hill Road. Improvements include: rebuild road to a three lane collector facility, and a shared-use path along the north side. The Concept Plan identifies Brookman Road as a collector with the intended function of also providing access to neighborhoods to the north. In addition, reserve right-of-way for the potential widening to five lanes in the future. | 13,775,908 | - | 100% | 13,775,908 | 15-25 Years | Brookman |
| D6 | Edy Road Improvements | Upgrade Edy Road (from Borchers Drive to City Limits) to a three lane collector with bike lanes and sidewalks. | 8,454,093 | - | 52% | 4,438,212 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D7 | Ladd Hill Road Improvements | Upgrade Ladd Hill Road (from Sunset Boulevard to the Urban Growth Boundary) to a three arterial with bike lanes and sidewalks. | 5,532,749 | - | 66% | 3,664,294 | 15-25 Years | Brookman |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| D8 | Oregon Street Improvements | Upgrade Oregon Street (from Murdock Road to the railroad crossing) to a three lane collector with sidewalks on south side and a shared-use path on the north side (part of the Ice Age Tonquin Trail). | 6,155,470 | - | 42% | 2,556,498 | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| D9 | Baler to Herman Connection | Build a collector roadway, connecting Baler Way at Tualatin-Sherwood Road to the future terminus of the Herman Road at Langer Farms Parkway. | 4,547,377 | - | 100% | 4,547,377 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D11 | Cedar Brook Way Extension Segment 2 | Extend Cedar Brook Way from its existing terminus at Handley Street south to Elwert Road as a two lane collector | 8,532,750 | - | 100% | 8,532,750 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D12 | Extension of Langer Farms Parkway at Highway 99W | Extend Langer Farms Parkway from Highway 99W west as a collector road. | 4,257,125 | - | 100% | 4,257,125 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D14 | Highway 99W/Brookman Traffic Signal and Realignment | Realign Brookman Road to intersect with Highway 99W approximately 1/4 mile north of its existing intersection; this improvement includes a traffic signal at the realigned intersection with a westbound left and southbound right turn lane, and a grade separated railroad crossing. | 15,451,784 | - | 100% | 15,451,784 | 15-25 Years | Brookman |
| D15 | Sunset Boulevard Improvements | Upgrade Sunset Boulevard (from Aldergrove Avenue to Eucalyptus Terrace) to a three lane arterial with sidewalks and bike lanes. Address vertical crest sight distance issues near Pine Street. | 6,812,674 | - | 47% | 3,192,805 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| D16 | Edy/Highway 99W Intersection Improvements | Restripe the westbound Sherwood Boulevard approach to have a single left turn lane, a single through lane, and a single right turn lane. Eliminate the split phase timing for the side streets, and maintain the existing green time on OR 99W for the northbound and southbound through movements. Add the missing crosswalk to the south approach. Consider implementing P3 alongside this project. | 215,906 | - | 14% | 29,667 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D17 | Meinecke/Highway 99W Intersection Improvements | Change the eastbound and westbound left turn phasing on Meinecke Road from permitted to permitted/protected and maintaining the existing green time on OR 99W for the northbound and southbound through movements. Consider implementing P3 alongside this project. | 102,813 | - | 16% | 16,107 | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| D18 | Langer Drive Improvements | Construct improvements to Langer Drive between Baler Way and Sherwood Boulevard that are consistent with the Sherwood Town Center Plan. Major improvements include: buffered bike lanes, on-street parking, wider sidewalks, narrower travel lanes, removal of the center turn lane, and landscaping. | 4,259,374 | - | 29% | 1,229,182 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D20 | Tonquin Employment Area East-West Collector | Build an east-west collector facility between Oregon Street and the 124th Avenue extension in the Tonquin Employment Area; improvement includes a roundabout at the Oregon Street intersection. | 10,919,535 | - | 100% | 10,919,535 | 15-25 Years | Tonquin |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| D21 | Herman Road Extension | Extend Herman Road from its existing terminus at Cipole Road west to either Highway 99W or Langer Farms Parkway as a two to three lane collector facility. | 13,943,186 | - | 100% | 13,943,186 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D23 | Edy/Borchers Right-In/Right-Out and Eastbound Lefts | Convert the Edy Road/Borchers Drive intersection to only allow right-in/right-out and eastbound left in; build a roundabout on Edy Road to the west at the south property's existing driveway. | 2,328,256 | - | 35% | 819,854 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D24 | Sherwood Boulevard Intersection Modifications | Remove the Sherwood Boulevard/Langer Drive traffic signal (allow right-in, right-out, and left-in movements only), and install a traffic signal at the Sherwood Boulevard/Century Drive intersection (add eastbound and westbound left turn lanes). | 937,193 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D26 | Sunset/Main Traffic Control Enhancement | Install a traffic signal at the Sunset Boulevard/Main Street intersection | 605,936 | - | 54% | 325,399 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D27 | Baker Road Improvements | Upgrade Baker Road (from Sunset Boulevard to the urban growth boundary) to a two lane arterial with bike lanes and sidewalks. | 1,702,588 | - | 56% | 949,837 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D28 | Sunset/Timbrel Traffic Control Enhancement | Install a single lane roundabout at the Sunset Boulevard/Timbrel Lane intersection. | 1,999,932 | - | 54% | 1,087,138 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D29 | Edy to Roy Rogers Collector Roadway | Build a collector roadway from Edy Road to Roy Rogers Road, between Cedarview Way and Lynly Way. | 3,202,650 | - | 41% | 1,316,224 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D31 | Highway 99W/Sunset Improvements | Add westbound and eastbound left turn lanes at Highway 99W/Sunset Boulevard with protective-permissive phasing. Consider implementing D22 and P3 alongside this project. | 906,755 | - | 30% | 267,542 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| D32 | Ladd Hill/Brookman Improvements | Add a southbound right turn lane at the Ladd Hill Road/Brookman Road intersection. | 226,466 | - | 100% | 226,466 | 15-25 Years | Brookman |
| D33 | Sunset/Murdock Turn Lanes | Add a southbound right turn lane and a northbound left turn lane at the Sunset Boulevard/Murdock Road intersection. | 508,322 | - | 55% | 278,960 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| D34 | Brookman/Middleton Traffic Control Enhancements | Move the stop signs to the north and south approaches, and add a southbound left turn lane at the Brookman Road/Middleton Road intersection. | 138,945 | - | 100% | 138,945 | 15-25 Years | Brookman |
| D35 | Area 59 Neighborhood Route | Build a neighborhood roadway, connecting Elwert Road and Copper Terrace as identified in the Area 59 concept plan. | 3,160,297 | - | 100% | 3,160,297 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| B1 | Murdock Shared-Use Path | Build a shared-use path along the west side of Murdock Road from Oregon Street to Upper Roy Street. | 1,172,367 | - | 41% | 481,819 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| B10 | Century Drive Shared-Use Path | Widen the sidewalk on the south/east side of Century Drive between Tualatin-Sherwood Road and the existing terminus to provide a shared-use path | 1,021,013 | - | 41% | 419,616 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| B12 | Old Highway 99W Shared-Use Path | Widen the sidewalk along the west side of Old Highway 99W between Timbrel Lane and Crooked River Lane to provide a shared-use path | 170,353 | - | 41% | 70,012 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P6 | Sherwood Boulevard Improvements | Construct improvements to Sherwood Boulevard between Langer Drive and 3rd Street that are consistent with the Sherwood Town Center Plan. Major improvements include: a shared-use path on the east side, wider sidewalks on the west side, narrower travel lanes, and landscaping. | 1,273,618 | - | 41% | 523,431 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P7 | Langer to Trumpeter Shared | Construct a shared use path connecting Langer Drive and Trumpeter Drive. | 435,976 | - | 41% | 179,177 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P8 | Hopkins Elementary School North Shared Use Path | Construct a shared-use path on the north side of Hopkins Elementary School, connecting Sherwood Boulevard to the existing trail south of Baler Way. | 303,946 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P9 | Hopkins Elementary School East Shared Use Path | Construct a shared use path on the east side of Hopkins Elementary School, connecting the existing trail south of Baler Way to the St Francis south access road. | 495,319 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P10 | Sherwood Middle School Shared Use Path | Construct a shared use path on the east side of Sherwood Middle School, connecting the Hopkins Elementary School East Shared Use Path to the roundabout at the Oregon Street/Ash Street intersection. | 529,091 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P14 | Ice Age Tonquin Trail Segment 9 | Implement Tonquin Trail Segment 9 improvements from immediately south of Highway 99W to Roy Rogers Road (including Roy Rogers intersection) | 1,347,898 | - | 41% | 553,959 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P16 | Ice Age Tonquin Trail Segment 11 | Implement Tonquin Trail Segment 11 improvements from immediately east of the Tonquin Road/Oregon Street intersection to immediately west of Cipole Road. | 2,372,653 | - | 41% | 975,112 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P20 | Division Street Sidewalk Infill | Construct sidewalk along both sides of Division Street from Main Street to Cuthill Place. | 1,287,891 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P24 | Willamette Street Sidewalk Infill Segment 1 | Construct sidewalk along the south side of Willamette Street from Division Street to Upper Roy Street. | 929,411 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P26 | Highway 99W Grade Separated Crossing | Build a grade-separated crossing of Highway 99W for pedestrians and bicyclists, providing a direct connection for the Ice Age Tonquin Trail east and west of the highway. | 6,412,057 | 5,753,539 | 41% | 658,518 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P36 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 1 | Construct an off-street trail from the existing trail on Seely Lane to the Highway 99W/Home Depot Access intersection. | 1,350,200 | - | 100% | 1,350,200 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P37 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 2 | Construct an off-street trail from the Highway 99W/Home Depot Access intersection to Tualatin-Sherwood Road, approximately 150 feet east of the Century Drive intersection. | 1,191,593 | - | 41% | 489,720 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P38 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 3 | Construct an off-street trail from Tualatin-Sherwood Road, approximately 150 feet east of the Century Drive intersection, to the Oregon Street/Tonquin Road intersection. | 932,281 | - | 41% | 383,148 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P39 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 4 | Construct an off-street trail from Highway 99W to Woodhaven Drive, approximately 150 feet west of Dewey Drive. | 337,550 | - | 41% | 138,726 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P40 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 5 | Construct an off-street trail from the Stellar Drive trail to Sunset Boulevard at the Galewood Drive pedestrian access, and on off-street trail connecting the Richen Park Terrace pedestrian access to Pinehurst Drive along the back of Woodhaven City Park. | 514,362 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P41 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 6 | Construct an off-street trail from Sunset Boulevard, just west of Redfern Place, to the Saint Charles Way trail. | 273,037 | - | 41% | 112,213 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P42 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 7 | Construct an off-street trail from the north end of the Saint Charles Way trail to Villa Road at the existing trail head. | 218,430 | - | 41% | 89,770 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P43 | Local Off-Street Trail Segment 9 | Construct an off-street trail from Sunset Boulevard to Inkster Drive (approximately 3,500 feet). | 1,125,166 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P46 | Murdock Road Sidewalk Infill Segment 2 | Construct sidewalk along the east side of Murdock Road from Sunset Boulevard to the existing sidewalk terminus approximately 600 feet north of Upper Roy Street. | 588,596 | - | 100% | 588,596 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| D10 CIP | Cerdar Brook Way Extension | This project constructs a neighborhood road from the existing terminus to Meinecke Road, including bike lanes, sidewalks, and planter strips. Project is being constructed as part of adjacent private site development. | 596,000 | 596,000 | 100% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| D25 CIP | Sunset Boulevard/Pine Street Intersection Improvements | This project includes restriping Sunset Boulevard at Pine Street to add eastbound and westbound left turn lanes. | 6,000 | - | 53% | 3,156 | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| D36 CIP | Sherwood System Monitoring Program | Establish and maintain a program involving monitoring system performance measures semiannually. Program will monitor growth, performance targets, and identify when improvements are needed. | 400,000 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| X8 CIP | Willamette Street (Pine Street to Division Street) | This project reconstructs Willamette Street between Pine Street and Division Street, approximately 850 linear feet. This project upgrades the current road section to meet the City's TSP standards for a neighborhood route. Also included is the acquisition of right-of-way, the installation/upgrade of utility infrastructure (sanitary, storm, and water) to meet current standards, undergrounding of franchise utilities, and street lighting improvement. Project funding has not been identified, nor has a project design/construction schedule been established. The expectation is that funding will consist of a combination of City SDC's and County TDT monies. | 2,250,000 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| X9 CIP | Villa Road/First Street Connection | This project consists of connecting Villa Street to First Street. Project funding has not been identified, nor has a project design/construction schedule been established. The expectation is that funding will consist of City SDC's. | 2,885,000 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P1 CIP | Handley Street Sidewalk Infill | This project includes construction of sidewalk along the north side of Handley Street from Elwert Road to the existing sidewalk terminus, approximately 250 feet east of Elwert Road. Funding for this project has not been identified. Design and construction schedule has not been established. | 15,000 | - | 41% | 6,165 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P5 CIP | 10Th Street Neighborhood Greenway | This project includes construction of sidewalks and shared lane markings to 10th Street and Gleneagle Drive from Sherwood Boulevard to the planned Cedar Creek / Tonquin Trail connection. Funding for this project has not been identified. Design and construction schedule has not been established. | 10,500 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P13 CIP | Ice Age Tonquin Trail Segment 8 | This project includes constructing Ice Age Tonquin Trail Segment 8 from immediately north of Park Street to immediately south of Hwy 99W, and the Hwy 99W crossing at Meinecke Road. | 4,677,000 | 5,395,770 | 41% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| P18 CIP | Cipole Road Sidewalk Infill | This project includes constructing approximately 800 feet of sidewalk along the east side of Cipole Road from approximately 1,250 feet north of Tualatin-Sherwood Road to the existing sidewalk terminus located approximately 450 feet north of Tualatin-Sherwood Road. | 51,000 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P19 CIP | 12Th Street Sidewalk Infill | This project includes constructing sidewalk along the south side of 12th Street from Highway 99W to Sherwood Boulevard. Design items include obtaining right-of-way and access easements. | 70,000 | - | 0% | - | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P21 CIP | Meinecke Road Sidewalk Infill | This project includes constructing sidewalk along the north side of Meinecke Road from Lee Drive to the existing sidewalk terminus to the east (approximately 400 feet). | 23,500 | - | 41% | 9,658 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P22 CIP | Pine Street Sidewalk Infill Segment 1 | This project includes constructing sidewalk along the west side of Pine Street from Willamette Street to Columbia Street. | 12,000 | - | 41% | 4,932 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P23 CIP | Pine Street Sidewalk Infill Segment 2 | This project includes constructing sidewalks along the east side of Pine Street from Division Street to Sunset Boulevard, and the fill the sidewalk gap along the west side of Pine just north of Sunset Boulevard. | 68,500 | - | 41% | 28,152 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P25 CIP | Willamette Street Sidewalk Infill Segment 2 | This project includes constructing sidewalk along the north side of Willamette Street from Cochran Drive to Murdock Road. | 8,500 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P27 CIP | Washington Street Sidewalk Infill | This project includes constructing sidewalk along both sides of Washington Street from Division Street to Tualatin Street. | 46,500 | - | 0% | - | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P28 CIP | Pine Street / Division Street Crossing Improvements | This project includes installing crosswalk markings at the Pine Street/Division Street intersection. | 1,000 | - | 0% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| P29 CIP | Pine Street / Sunset Boulevard Crossing Improvements | This project includes installation of crosswalk striping at the Pine Street/Sunset Boulevard intersection. | 6,000 | - | 0% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| P30 CIP | Sunset Boulevard/St. Charles Way Crossing Improvements | This project includes installation of crosswalk striping at the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and St. Charles Way. | 1,000 | - | 0% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |
| P31 CIP | Sunset Boulevard / Redfern Drive Crossing Improvement | This project includes installation of pedestrian crossing at the Sunset Boulevard / Redfern Drive intersection. | 10,000 | - | 0% | - | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P35 CIP | Sunset Boulevard / Existing Trail Crossing Improvements | This project includes installation of pedestrian crossing across Sunset Boulevard at the existing trail located west of Heatherwood Lane. | 1,000 | - | 0% | - | 1-5 Years | Citywide |

| Improvement Fee Project List | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Project | Project Name | Description | Total Cost | Grants or Other Agencies | Portion of Project Providing Capacity for New Users | SDC-Eligible Costs | Timing | Area of Benefit |
| P45 CIP | Murdock Road Sidewalk Infill Segment 1 | This project includes construction of sidewalk along the east side of Murdock Road between Willamette Street and the Murdock Road/Oregon Street intersection. | 77,000 | - | 41% | 31,645 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P47 CIP | Roy Rogers Road Crossing Improvements | This project includes installation of a pedestrian crossing on Roy Rogers Road between Lynnly Way and Lavender Avenue (e.g. at the Seely Lane alignment). | 50,000 | - | 41% | 20,549 | 5-15 Years | Citywide |
| P49 CIP | Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan Phase 3 (Old Town Secondary Streets) | This project includes completing Phase 3 (Old Town Secondary Streets) of the Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan. | 528,000 | - | 41% | 216,997 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| P50 CIP | Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan Phase 4 (Old Town Residential Streets) | This project includes completing Phase 4 (Old Town Residential Neighborhoods) of the Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan. | 528,000 | - | 41% | 216,997 | 15-25 Years | Citywide |
| Total | | | \$157,905,804 | \$11,745,309 | | \$103,379,871 | | |

Source: City staff based on the Sherwood Transportation System Plan and FY 2015-16 to 2019-20 Capital Improvement Plan.