

# Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District



## PARKS & RECREATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE UPDATE

Methodology Report

December 12, 2016

**FCS GROUP**

[www.fcsgroup.com](http://www.fcsgroup.com)

**Serving the Western U.S.  
and Canada since 1988**  
Washington | 425.867.1802  
Oregon | 503.841.6543

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

SECTION I: BACKGROUND .....	1
A. Policy .....	1
B. Scope of Services .....	1
C. Calculation Overview .....	2
C.1 Reimbursement Fee .....	2
C.2 Improvement Fee .....	2
C.3 Adjustments .....	2
C.3.a Fund Balance .....	3
C.3.b Compliance Costs .....	3
SECTION II: GROWTH .....	4
A. Growth .....	4
SECTION III: SDC CALCULATION .....	5
A. Project List .....	5
B. Facility Needs .....	5
B.1 Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Open Space and Waterfront Parks, Trails, and Special Use Parks .....	6
B.2 Aquatic Center .....	7
B.3 Capacity Building Capital Improvements to Existing Parks .....	7
C. Improvement Fee Eligibility .....	7
D. Adjustments .....	8
E. SDC Fee Summary .....	8
SECTION IV: IMPLEMENTATION .....	9
A. Calculated SDCs by Use .....	9
B. Annual Adjustment .....	9
C. Existing and Maximum Defensible SDCs .....	10
D. SDC Phase-In Strategies .....	10
APPENDICES .....	11
Appendix A: Population and Growth .....	11
Appendix B: Overnight Visitation Analysis .....	12
Appendix C: Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory (2016) .....	13

Appendix D: Parks and Recreation Improvement Program (2016 to 2035)..... 16

# SECTION I: BACKGROUND

---

This section describes the policy context and project scope upon which the body of this report is based. It concludes with an overview of the calculation approach employed in subsequent report sections.

## A. POLICY

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

ORS 223.299 defines two types of SDC:

- ◆ A reimbursement fee that is designed to recover “costs associated with capital improvements already 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.

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.

## B. SCOPE OF SERVICES

In October, 2014, the Hood River Valley Parks & Recreation District (District) contracted with FCS GROUP (Consultant) to update the District’s SDC methodology for parks. We approached this project in three steps:

- ◆ **Framework for Charges.** In this step, the consultant team worked with the District (staff and District Board members) to discuss the components of SDCs, legal requirements, capital projects and cost assumptions. Direction provided to the Consultant defines the framework of charges described in this report.

- ◆ **Technical Analysis.** In this step, the Consultant and District staff identified the SDC-eligible portion of facility costs and District customer growth assumptions included in this updated SDC methodology.
- ◆ **Methodology Report Preparation.** In this step, the calculation of SDCs are described along with supporting assumptions per 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						
$\frac{\text{Eligible costs of available capacity in existing facilities}}{\text{Units of growth in demand}}$	+	$\frac{\text{Eligible costs of capacity-increasing capital improvements}}{\text{Units of growth in demand}}$	+	$\text{Pro-rata share of costs of complying with Oregon SDC law}$	=	$\text{SDC per unit of growth in demand}$

### 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. **This methodology does not include a reimbursement fee component in the calculation of parks SDCs.**

### 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.

This methodology utilizes the capacity approach to allocate costs to the improvement fee basis.<sup>1</sup> 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

Two cost basis adjustments are applicable to the SDC improvement fee cost basis: current fund balances and SDC compliance costs.

<sup>1</sup> 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 Fund Balance

SDC fund balances that are available to the District are deducted from the SDC improvement fee 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. Special consideration is also given to prior SDC revenues that were collected within the City of Hood River and elsewhere in the District so that current fund balances are deducted for these two locations in accordance with pre-existing intergovernmental agreements.

### C.3.b 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. Parks SDC compliance costs in Oregon typically range from 4% to 12% of total SDC-eligible project capital costs depending upon District size/budget and complexity in administering SDC-funded projects.

## SECTION II: GROWTH

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

### A. GROWTH

Growth is measured in terms of the most applicable unit of demand. The District’s park system serves residents (people) in Hood River County with the exception of Cascade Locks (District boundary currently does not include the City of Cascade Locks) and visitation. One component of this demand is “full time” or “permanent” population. The other component is visitors. The visitation estimates used in this methodology are based estimates and forecasts of average overnight visitation at lodging facilities within the District. When combined, these two units of growth are considered to be parks district “customers.” The planning period for this methodology report extends through 2035. See **Exhibit 2.1** for the current and future customer base.

	<b>2015 Est.</b>	<b>2016 Proj.</b>	<b>2035 Proj.</b>	<b>2016-2035 Change</b>
<b>Population in Residences</b>	23,020	23,315	29,697	6,382
<b>Overnight Visitors in Residences</b>		191	244	52
<b>Average Overnight Lodging Visitors per Day</b>		642	818	176
<b>Total District Customers</b>		24,148	30,758	6,610

**Source:** Hood River County Coordinated Population Forecast, Portland State University, and Appendix A.

This methodology utilizes current population estimates for Hood River County less the City of Cascade Locks to derive the District population. The population growth rate, 1.68 percent per year, is based on the locally (City of Hood River and Hood River County) adopted coordinated population forecast for Hood River County for the 2008-2028 time frame (extrapolated to 2035). Average daily overnight visitors are based on assumptions regarding overnight visitors staying in local residences and the total number of lodging beds adjusted for number of people per room and daily room occupancy. This analysis assumes that average overnight visitation grows proportional with population. Please refer to **Appendices A and B** for backup information to these growth assumptions.

## SECTION III: SDC CALCULATION

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

### A. PROJECT LIST

The District provided a list of park capital projects by category type and general location based on planned infrastructure needs, the adopted parks master plan, and current capital cost estimates, which are stated in FY 2016/17 dollar amounts. See **Exhibit 3.1** for a summary of eligible project costs and **Appendix D** for a complete list of project improvements by category and location.

Park Category	Planned Facilities	Units	Total Planned Project Costs	Total HRVPRD Cost Share
Neighborhood Parks	7.5	acres	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000
Community Parks	51.9	acres	\$3,624,000	\$3,624,000
Open Space and Waterfront Parks	4	acres	\$130,000	\$130,000
Trails	55.13	miles	\$2,041,514	\$2,041,514
Special Use Parks	18	acres	\$12,470,000	\$12,470,000
Aquatic Center			\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
Capacity Building Capital Improvements to Existing Parks			\$650,000	\$650,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$26,165,514</b>	<b>\$26,165,514</b>

Source: Appendix D.

### B. FACILITY NEEDS

Facility needs are determined based on the facility type. For purposes of this SDC methodology, each of the District's existing and future park facilities falls into one of the following categories.

- ◆ Neighborhood Parks
- ◆ Community Parks
- ◆ Open Space and Waterfront Parks
- ◆ Trails
- ◆ Special Use Parks
- ◆ Aquatic Center
- ◆ Capacity Building Capital Improvements to Existing Parks

After identifying the existing and planned parks facilities within the District, the next step for determining the SDC eligible capital costs include an estimate of each parks category that is available to accommodate future growth in customer demand. The "capacity share" for each parks category reflects that portion of each parks category that will benefit future users within the defined level of service. If the analysis determines that future investment by the District is curing deficiencies



in the current system, the improvement fee eligibility for that category is downwardly adjusted accordingly.

## B.1 Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Open Space and Waterfront Parks, Trails, and Special Use Parks

Improvement fee eligibility for neighborhood parks, community parks, open space and waterfront parks, trails, and special use parks are determined based on a “realized level of service” which is expressed as a quantity of facility (e.g., acres) per 1,000 customers. In this analysis, we utilize the realized level of service. The realized level of service determines facility needs using the level of service that the District will have at the end of the planning period after constructing all the projects on its project list. That future level of service is then applied to the current customer base to determine any surpluses or deficiencies in the current inventory.

**Exhibit 3.2** shows how the inputs of inventory, growth, and projects come together to determine the proportion of project costs that can be recovered in an improvement fee.

Exhibit 3.2: Inventory and Needs					
	Neighborhood Parks	Community Parks	Open Space and Waterfront Parks	Trails	Special Use Parks
<b>Inventory</b>					
Current Inventory*	18.20 ac.	86.64 ac.	41.31 ac.	601.52 mi.	11.41 ac.
Planned Projects	7.50 ac.	51.90 ac.	4.00 ac.	55.13 mi.	18.00 ac.
Inventory at Completion of Planned Projects	25.70 ac.	138.54 ac.	45.31 ac.	656.65 mi.	29.41 ac.
<b>Level of Service - Realized</b>					
Level of Service per 1,000 Customers	0.84 ac.	4.50 ac.	1.47 ac.	21.35 mi.	0.96 ac.
<b>Required Inventory Based on Level of Service</b>					
Required in 2016	20.18 ac.	108.77 ac.	35.57 ac.	515.54 mi.	23.09 ac.
Required to Accommodate Growth	5.52 ac.	29.77 ac.	9.74 ac.	141.11 mi.	6.32 ac.
Required in 2035	25.70 ac.	138.54 ac.	45.31 ac.	656.65 mi.	29.41 ac.
<b>Analysis of Planned Development</b>					
Curing Deficiency	1.98 ac.	22.13 ac.	0.00 ac.	0.00 mi.	11.68 ac.
Accommodating Growth	5.52 ac.	29.77 ac.	4.00 ac.	55.13 mi.	6.32 ac.
Excess	0.00 ac.	0.00 ac.	0.00 ac.	0.00 mi.	0.00 ac.
Total Development	7.50 ac.	51.90 ac.	4.00 ac.	55.13 mi.	18.00 ac.
<b>Improvement Fee Eligibility</b>					
Percent of HRVPRD Project Costs	73.64%	57.36%	100.00%	100.00%	35.11%

\* Derived from Exhibit 3.1.

**Source:** Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District Master Plan and District staff.

The exhibit above begins analysis of future needs by looking at the current inventory of park facilities by category. In the neighborhood parks category, the District currently has 18.2 acres (see “Current Inventory”) and plans to develop 7.5 additional acres (see “Planned Projects”). This leads to a level of service of 0.83 acres per 1,000 customers (see “Realized Level of Service”). Then, applying that level of service to the current customer base in 2016 leads to a current required inventory of 20.18 acres (see “Required Inventory Based on Realized Level of Service”). Since the District does not currently have 20.18 acres of neighborhood parks, the District’s SDC project list in part cures a deficiency based on the level of service (see “Analysis of Planned Development”). This leads to a calculated improvement fee eligibility of 73.64 percent, or the portion of the project list accommodating growth divided by total development on the project list (see “Analysis of Planned Development” and “Improvement Fee Eligibility”).

For parks capital investments that help to cure an existing deficiency based on the realized level of service (see neighborhood parks, community parks, and special use parks), the improvement fee eligibility is decreased to reflect the share of the investment that will serve the existing customers rather than future growth.

## B.2 Aquatic Center

For the aquatic center, the improvement fee percent eligibility of the project is the level of service measured in terms of months of operating capacity with and without the identified project. The project will allow the aquatic center to operate during the winter months. **Exhibit 3.3** shows the relative increase in capacity resulting from the project in terms of months of available capacity. The growth share, or the percent increase in capacity, serves as the improvement fee eligibility.

	Years Operating at Full Capacity	Years Operating at Limited Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Total Available Capacity (in months)	Gained Capacity	Growth Share
<b>Status Quo</b>	3	17	87	0	0.0%
<b>Completed Project</b>	20	0	240	153	63.75%

Source: District staff.

<sup>1</sup>Limited capacity occurs in no improvement. Assumed to mean aquatic center can only open during the summer months (June, July, and August).

## B.3 Capacity Building Capital Improvements to Existing Parks

Capacity building capital improvements to existing parks are projects which build capacity on existing capital facilities that do not necessarily equate to a level of service standard by park type. Improvements include picnic tables, shelters, restrooms, and other facilities that will increase capacity. These types of projects are eligible based on growth as a percent of the future population, or 21.49% (see **Exhibit 3.4**).

	2016 Proj.	2035 Proj.	2016-2035 Change	Growth Share
<b>Total Customer Base</b>	24,454	31,147	6,694	21.49%

Source: Derived from Exhibit 2.1.

## C. IMPROVEMENT FEE ELIGIBILITY

Now that we have total project costs, we must reduce total project costs by the improvement fee eligibility percentages by park type. **Exhibit 3.5** shows the improvement fee eligible costs by category.

	Total HRVPRD Project Costs	Percent Eligible for Improvement Fee	SDC Improvement Fee Eligible Costs
Neighborhood Parks	\$1,250,000	73.64%	\$920,488
Community Parks	\$3,624,000	57.36%	\$2,078,894
Open Space and Waterfront Parks	\$130,000	100.00%	\$130,000
Trails	\$2,041,514	100.00%	\$2,041,514
Special Use Parks	\$12,470,000	35.11%	\$4,378,499
Aquatic Center	\$6,000,000	63.75%	\$3,825,000
Capacity Building Capital Improvements to Existing Parks	\$650,000	21.49%	\$139,685
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26,165,514</b>		<b>\$13,514,079</b>
<b>Customer Growth 2016-2035</b>			<b>6,610</b>
<b>Improvement Fee per Customer</b>			<b>\$2,045</b>

Source: Previous tables.

## D. ADJUSTMENTS

Before calculating the total parks SDC, we must adjust the total SDC cost basis upward for the compliance costs and downward for existing fund balance. After discussions with District staff, the compliance costs are 10.3 percent of improvement fee eligible project costs. The next adjustment is a deduction of current Parks SDC fund balances. Deducting current fund balances ensures that SDC payers are not double-charged for projects planned but not yet built. **Exhibit 3.6** shows total net adjustments.

<b>Exhibit 3.6: SDC Adjustments</b>	
	<b>Amount</b>
Gross Compliance Costs*	\$1,392,449
Less: City SDC Fund Balance	(\$988,661)
Less: County SDC Fund Balance	(\$80,307)
Less: Other SDC Fund Balance	(\$6,351)
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>\$317,130</b>
<i>Customer Growth 2016-2035</i>	<i>6,610</i>
<b>Net Adjustment Per Customer</b>	<b>\$48</b>

\* Assumes 10.3% of SDC eligible costs are for administration and soft costs (planning, consulting studies, legal, permitting, etc.) related to SDC projects.

**Source:** District staff, based on HRVPD actual historic accounting records: \$2,575,000 in SDC revenues with \$265,320 in admin./soft costs related to SDC projects.

## E. SDC FEE SUMMARY

The per customer unit costs in **Exhibit 3.7** are the result of combining the improvement fee and net adjustments including compliance fee and fund balance.

<b>Exhibit 3.7: SDC Component Summary</b>			
	<b>Improvement Fee</b>	<b>Compliance Fee and Adjustments</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>SDC per Customer</b>	\$2,045	\$48	<b>\$2,092</b>

**Source:** Previous tables.

## SECTION IV: IMPLEMENTATION

This section summarizes the calculated SDCs. It also addresses policies related to implementation of the SDC program.

### A. CALCULATED SDCS BY USE

The SDC by use takes into account the total SDC per customer (\$2,092) multiplied by the average number of customers per unit of development, as shown in **Exhibit 4.1**. The charge per lodging unit is based on the rounded number of occupancy and people per room as shown in **Appendix B**. The charge per farm worker dwelling unit is based on the U.S. Department of Labor Survey. It is assumed that farm workers are reflected in the District population.

<b>Charges</b>	<b>Number of Avg. Daily Customers</b>	<b>SDC Per Unit</b>
<b>Single Family per Unit*</b>	2.74	\$5,725
<b>Multifamily per Unit</b>	1.93	\$4,036
<b>Lodging Unit**</b>	1.59	\$3,327
<b>Farm Worker Dwelling Unit***</b>	1.12	\$2,344

\*Includes single family and manufactured housing units.

\*\*Includes hotel, motel, bed and breakfast, rental cabins, cottages, and RV sites.

\*\* Farm worker dwelling units defined based on Hood River County land use classification system. Assumes 4.84 persons per dwelling unit and 3 month occupancy, based on U.S. Dept. of Labor survey.

**Source:** U.S. Census American Community Survey; U.S. Department of Labor National Agriculture Workers Survey, Northwest Region, 2010-2012. Charges shown are in FY 2016/17 dollars.

### B. ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT

ORS 223.304 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.

The methodology for SDC index adjustments going forward shall be based on the *Engineering News Record* Construction Cost Index 20-city average, using annual (12 month) index adjustments. There is no other comparable Oregon-specific index.

## C. EXISTING AND MAXIMUM DEFENSIBLE SDCS

**Exhibit 4.2** compares the calculated maximum defensible SDCs to the current SDCs in the District. Overall, the current District SDCs are below the maximum defensible amounts for each land use type that is to be charged. The farm worker unit charge is a new category to help clarify what the District will charge for approved farm worker dwelling units.

	<b>Single Family Dwelling</b>	<b>Multi-Family Unit</b>	<b>Lodging Unit</b>	<b>Farm Worker Unit</b>
<b>Current 2016 SDC</b>	\$3,072	\$2,216	\$478	\$2,216
<b>Expected 2017 SDC*</b>	<b>\$3,256</b>	<b>\$2,349</b>	<b>\$507</b>	<b>\$2,349</b>
<b>Maximum Defensible SDC</b>	<b>\$5,725</b>	<b>\$4,036</b>	<b>\$3,327</b>	<b>\$2,344</b>
<b>Amount of SDC Increase/Decrease</b>	<b>\$2,468</b>	<b>\$1,687</b>	<b>\$2,820</b>	<b>-\$5</b>

**Source:** Previous tables. \* Assumes 6% increase allowed under current SDC policy.

## D. SDC PHASE-IN STRATEGIES

This methodology report calculates the maximum defensible parks SDC. The District can adopt a policy to phase-in the maximum defensible SDC amount by deciding to charge a percentage of the maximum defensible SDC amount each year. It should be noted that doing so will decrease total SDC revenue and require additional funding sources for the District to complete the SDC project list. Additional funding sources to supplant revenues lost from foregone SDCs could include user fees, federal/state grants, voter-approved General Obligation bonds and/or operating levy.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A: Population and Growth

<b>Growth Rate Derivation</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2028</b>	<b>Growth</b>	<b>AGR</b>
<b>Population - Hood River County</b>	21,469	27,696	6,227	<b>1.28%</b>

**Source:** Hood River County Coordinated Population Forecast, 2008-2028.  
**Abbreviation:** AGR - Annual Average Growth Rate

<b>Population Estimate, 2015</b>	
	<b>2015</b>
<b>Hood River County</b>	24,245
<b>Less: Cascade Locks</b>	-1,225
<b>Hood River Parks District</b>	23,020

**Source:** Portland State University Population Research Center, July 2015 estimates.

Appendix B: Overnight Visitation Analysis

<b>Lodging Rooms</b>	
	<b>Rooms</b>
Best Western Plus Hood River Inn	194
Columbia Cliff Villas Hotel	37
Columbia Gorge Hotel & Spa	40
Columbia Gorge Vacation Rentals	21
Comfort Suites	64
Cooper Spur Mountain Resort	16
Hampton Inn & Suites Hood River	88
Hood River Hostel	6
Hood River Hotel	40
Hood River Suites	9
Lost Lake Resort Cabins	14
Mt. Hood B&B, LLC.	3
Oak Street Hotel	9
Old Parkdale Inn B&B	3
Panorama Lodge	5
Riverview Lodge	22
Seven Oaks B&B	2
Sunset Motel Hood River	14
Westcliff Lodge	57
Villa Columbia B&B	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>649</b>
<b>Source:</b> Business websites and the American Automobile Association, accessed 7-5-16 and 7-6-16.	

<b>Lodging to Overnight Visitor Conversion</b>	
Total lodging rooms, 2016	649
Average Annual Occupancy*	62.2%
People per Room*	1.59
Occupancy/People per Room Adjustment	0.99
<b>Average Overnight Lodging Visitors (per Day)</b>	<b>642</b>
<b>Source:</b> American Hotel & Lodging Association 2014 Lodging Industry Profile.	

Appendix C: Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory (2016)

Parks Inventory in Master Plan						
Facility	Park Type	Size	Units	Ownership	Improved?	Amenities
Barrett Park	Community	32.16	acres	District	Yes	Radio Controlled Flyer Field and Indian Creek Trail
Children's Park	Community	1.24	acres	City	Yes	Parking, picnic tables, picnic shelter, restrooms, open space, play structure, covered full basketball
Collins Fields	Community	2.60	acres	City	Yes	Baseball fields
Jackson Park	Community	2.50	acres	City	Yes	Parking, picnic tables, restrooms, open space, play structure, tennis courts, bbq pit, amphitheater
Marina Park, Marina Green	Community	19.00	acres	Port	Yes	Picnic shelter, restrooms, waterfront access, parking, boat launch, open space
Mount Hood Town Hall Playground	Community	0.47	acres	County	Yes	Play Structure, Swings, Nature Play area, Picnic Tables
Oak Grove Park	Community	2.50	acres	County	Yes	Parking, picnic table, benches, restroom, play structure, tennis courts, barbeque pit, natural area, Two playstructures, covered basketball court, trail, picnic tables, exercise equipment
Odell Community Park	Community	1.84	acres	District	Yes	Picnic tables, picnic shelter, benches, restroom,
Panorama Point	Community	11.50	acres	County	Yes	Softball fields, little league ball fields, soccer field, fee
St. Mary's Catholic Church	Community	11.73	acres	Other	Yes	Tennis courts, adjacent to the aquatic center
Tsuruta Tennis Courts	Community	1.10	acres	City	Yes	Play structure, open space
Bowe Addition	Neighborhood	0.40	acres	Other	Yes	Half basketball court
Coe Park	Neighborhood	0.33	acres	City	Yes	Picnic tables, benches, play structures, half basketball court
Culbertson Park	Neighborhood	0.72	acres	District	Yes	Picnic table, open space, helicopter landing pad for medical transport
Friendship Park	Neighborhood	0.90	acres	City	Yes	Benches, overlook
Georgiana Smith Park	Neighborhood	0.50	acres	Other	Yes	Picnic tables and open space
Hazelview Park	Neighborhood	0.43	acres	District	Yes	Soccer fields, open space for informal play, play structures. Fee based public use.
Horizon Christian School	Neighborhood	8.39	acres	Other	Yes	Play structures
Mann Park	Neighborhood	0.86	acres	City	Yes	Benches, play structure, half basketball court, picnic area
Montello Park	Neighborhood	0.28	acres	City	Yes	Development is in progress. Play structures, paths and plantings are in place
Odell Park	Neighborhood	1.83	acres	District	Yes	Picnic tables, overlook, river view
Ruthton Park	Neighborhood	1.50	acres	County	Yes	Picnic tables, play structure
Tsuruta Park	Neighborhood	1.01	acres	City	Yes	Picnic tables, play structure
Wilson Park	Neighborhood	1.05	acres	City	Yes	Play structure and open space



Appendix C: Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory (continued)

Parks Inventory in Master Plan						
Facility	Park Type	Size	Units	Ownership	Improved?	Amenities
Event Site	Open Space and Waterfront	5.50	acres	Port	Yes	Windsurfing and kiting, rigging yard, restroom, kayaking, waterfront access
Hook	Open Space and Waterfront	3.80	acres	Port	Yes	Gravel road, parking, seasonal portable toilets (4), waterfront access used for fishing, windsurfing, and kite boarding, walking trail connects to Waterfront
Marina/Boat Basin	Open Space and Waterfront	26.60	acres	Port	Yes	Much of acreage is water, moorage slips, boat launch, restroom, fuel service, docks
Spit	Open Space and Waterfront	4.70	acres	Port	Yes	Portable toilets, fishing, waterfront access, kiteboarding and wind surfing
Waucoma Park	Open Space and Waterfront	0.71	acres	City	Yes	Natural area, replanted in 2009
Badger Creek Wilderness Area	Regional	14,490.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	
Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area	Regional	33,856.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	Trails, river access, camping, scenic views, trails
Kingsley Reservoir	Regional	320.00	acres	County	Yes	Parking, restrooms, waterfront, campsites, natural Campground (12 sites) is 5 acres of total area, fishing and boating access on Laurance Lake, no
Kinnikinnick Campground	Regional	104.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	Camping, picnic area, hiking trails, fishing, boating
Lost Lake	Regional	290.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	
Mark O. Hatfield Wilderness Area	Regional	46,437.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	
Mt Hood Wilderness Area	Regional	27,554.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	
Nottingham Campground	Regional	10.00	acres	State/Fed	Yes	Campsites (20), waterfront access
Routson Park	Regional	168.00	acres	County	Yes	Parking, restrooms, campsites, natural area, Hood Picnic sites (4), campsite (14), hiking trails, ADA access, waterfront access
Sherwood Campground	Regional	3.50	acres	State/Fed	Yes	
Tollbridge Park	Regional	84.00	acres	County	Yes	Parking, picnic tables, picnic shelter, benches, restroom, waterfront, play structure, camp sites,
Tucker Park	Regional	35.50	acres	County	Yes	Parking, picnic tables, picnic shelter, benches, restrooms, waterfront, play structure, campsites,
Waterfront Park	Regional	6.40	acres	City	Yes	Picnic tables, benches restrooms, waterfront, play

Appendix C: Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory (continued)

Parks Inventory in Master Plan						
Facility	Park Type	Size	Units	Ownership	Improved?	Amenities
Aquatic Center	Special Use	1.35	acres	District	Yes	Parking, restrooms, locker rooms, 25 yd recreation pool, therapy pool, slide, rope swing
Memorial Overlook Park & Stratton Gardens	Special Use	0.20	acres	City	Yes	Benches, overlook, fountain, gardens
Morrison Disc Golf Park	Special Use	4.78	acres	District	Yes	Picnic tables, natural area, disc golf course, adjacent to skate park w/bathroom facilities
Parkdale Hutson Museum	Special Use	3.50	acres	Other	Yes	Parking, picnic tables, picnic shelter, museum
Rotary Skatepark (Jaymar)	Special Use	2.93	acres	District	Yes	Picnic Shelter, benches, restroom, play structure, natural area, skate park, BMX park
2 <sup>nd</sup> St. Steps Right-of-way	Trail	0.16	miles	City	Yes	Overlook, natural area
County Trail System (Including Post Canyon)	Trail	60.60	miles	County	Yes	Trails located between Kingsley Reservoir and Wygant State Natural Area Restroom, Mtn. Bike Skill
Devon Court Trail	Trail	0.11	miles	District	Yes	Soft Surface Multi-use Trail
Historic Hwy	Trail	8.50	miles	State/Fed	Yes	Various sections are accessed along Columbia River
Indian Creek Trail System	Trail	4.05	miles	District	Yes	Soft Surface Multi-use Trail
Southside Indian Creek Trail	Trail	0.45	miles	District	Yes	Soft Surface Trail, Construction projected to begin
USFS Trail System	Trail	526.90	miles	State/Fed	Yes	Campsites, access to Mt. Hood Timberline Trail, NFS cabins, Elliot Glacier, views
Westside Community Trail	Trail	0.75	miles	District	Yes	Soft Surface Multi-use Trail
<b>Summary Statistics of Parks Inventory</b>						
	<b>Number of Parks</b>	<b>Total Area</b>	<b>District-Owned Units</b>			
Neighborhood	13	18.20	2.98 acres			
Community	11	86.64	34.00 acres			
Open Space and Waterfront	5	41.31	0.00 acres			
Trail	8	601.52	5.36 miles			
Special Use	5	11.41	9.06 acres			
Aquatic Center	1	1.35	1.35 acres			

Appendix D: Parks and Recreation Improvement Program (2016 to 2035)

Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District Capital Improvement Program							
Parks Category	Project Name/Description	Project Location	Planned Facilities	Units	Total Planned Project Costs	Percent Funded by District	District Project Costs
Neighborhood Parks	New neighborhood park 1	UGB Area	1.5	acres	\$250,000	100%	\$250,000
Neighborhood Parks	New neighborhood park 2	UGB Area	1.5	acres	250,000	100%	250,000
Neighborhood Parks	New neighborhood park 3	UGB Area	1.5	acres	250,000	100%	250,000
Neighborhood Parks	New neighborhood park 4	District	1.5	acres	250,000	100%	250,000
Neighborhood Parks	New neighborhood park 5	District	1.5	acres	250,000	100%	250,000
Community Parks	Golden Eagle Park	District	4.9	acres	1,208,000	100%	1,208,000
Community Parks	New community park 2	UGB Area	31	acres	1,208,000	100%	1,208,000
Community Parks	New community park 3	District	16	acres	1,208,000	100%	1,208,000
Open Space and Waterfront Parks	Hood Park	UGB Area	2	acres	65,000	100%	65,000
Open Space and Waterfront Parks	Boat Dock	UGB Area	2	acres	65,000	100%	65,000
Trails	Multiuse trails to connect major destinations for recreation	District	55.13	miles	2,041,514	100%	2,041,514
Special Use Parks	Indoor Athletic Facility	UGB Area	8	acres	12,000,000	100%	12,000,000
Special Use Parks	Disc Golf	UGB Area	10	acres	470,000	100%	470,000
Aquatic Center	Aquatic Center Reconstruction	UGB Area			6,000,000	100%	6,000,000
Capital Improvements to existing parks	Picnic tables, shelters, rest rooms, play equipment	District			400,000	100%	400,000
Capital Improvements to existing parks	Children's Park Reconstruction	UGB Area			250,000	100%	250,000
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$26,165,514</b>		<b>\$26,165,514</b>

Source: HRVPRD staff estimates based on adopted parks master plan. Projects shown in 2016 dollar amounts.

Abbreviation: UGB - Hood River Urban Growth Boundary