



City of Eugene  
System Development Charge Methodology

## **Appendix E**

**Parks and Recreation  
System Development Charge  
System-Specific Methodology and Details**

**November 21, 2019 Draft**

## Parks and Recreation System Development Charge Detail

### 1.0 Overview of Parks and Recreation SDC Methodology

The parks and recreation system development charge (referred to in this Appendix E as the “parks SDC” or “SDC”) consists of improvement and reimbursement fees, and is charged to both residential and nonresidential development. The SDC is based on the estimated cost of serving growth through future capacity-enhancing improvements listed in the Parks and Recreation SDC Project Plan (Project Plan) and the estimated cost of the available capacity in the existing parks and recreation system to be used by new development. All park and recreation facility types in the parks system are considered in the basis for the charge.

The methodology used to calculate parks and recreation SDCs includes the following elements:

1. Growth Capacity Needs – future growth is projected, along with planned system-wide levels of service in order to determine the capacity requirements of future development in terms of park acreage, trails and recreation facilities.
2. SDC Cost Basis – the costs of serving future development are estimated based on the Project Plan (improvement fee cost basis) and the value of existing system available capacity (reimbursement fee) cost basis.
3. SDC Schedule – the improvement and reimbursement costs are summed to determine the system-wide cost per unit, and the number of units attributable to different types of development are estimated for purposes of assessing the charges. The resulting parks and recreation SDC rate schedule is contained in the Appendix F of the City of Eugene (City) SDC methodology.

Each element of the parks and recreation SDC methodology is discussed in the sections below.

*Note: The calculations contained in this appendix were produced using numbers that extend beyond the decimal places shown in the tables presented, so slight variations exist due to rounding. These variations are not material.*

#### 1.1 Growth Capacity Needs

New development creates demand for parks and facilities by attracting new residents, employees, and overnight visitors to the City. Growth in park and recreation facility users from new development and the associated costs of meeting growth’s park and facility needs are projected over the planning horizon reflected in the 2018 Vision and Implementation Plan for Eugene’s Parks and Recreation System (“System Plan”).

The City – through adoption of the System Plan – is planning for acquisition and development of park land, trails and recreation facilities consistent with the community’s desired level of service (LOS). The planned LOS for a particular park or facility type is defined as the future quantity of acreage (or number of facilities) per 1,000 population served, as shown in the equation below:

$$\frac{\text{Existing}Q + \text{Planned}Q}{\text{FuturePopulationServed}} = \text{PlannedLOS}$$

Where:

*Q* = quantity (acres of parks, miles of trails, or number of recreation facilities) and  
*Future Population Served* = projected 20-year growth in system-wide equivalent population

The planned LOS forms the basis for determining capacity needs for parks and recreation facilities. The capacity requirements of future growth are determined by multiplying the planned LOS for each park and facility type by the projected growth in population for the planning period. The methods used to project future equivalent population and planned LOS are summarized below.

### 1.1.1 Equivalent Population

The concept of “equivalent population” is used to recognize different utilization levels of parks and recreation facilities by residents, nonresidents in association with work, and nonresident overnight visitors, relative to the general population.

Table E-1 provides a summary of population and equivalent population assumptions used in the SDC methodology.

**Table E-1**  
*Service Area Equivalent Population Estimates*

Item	Base Year	2035	Growth	Equivalent Population		
				Factor <sup>4</sup>	Growth	% of Total
Population <sup>1</sup>	184,192	224,712	40,520	1.000	40,520	83.6%
Employment <sup>2</sup>	117,275	153,963	36,688	0.197	7,243	14.9%
Overnight Visitor Accommodations <sup>3</sup>	6,314	7,917	1,604	0.440	706	1.5%
<b>Equivalent Population Total<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>210,124</b>	<b>258,593</b>			<b>48,469</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Base year from 2018 Vision and Implementation Plan for Eugene’s Parks and Recreation System; 2035 from Portland State University Coordinated Population Estimates (Eugene Urban Growth Boundary).

<sup>2</sup> From City of Eugene Economic Opportunity Analysis.

<sup>3</sup> Number of hotel/motel rooms x average occupants per room (2.3) from information provided by Travel Lane County.

<sup>4</sup> Number of units X equivalent population factors; factors based on data from the City of Eugene Parks and Recreation Facilities’ User Survey (2004 )

The equivalent population factors for employment-related development and overnight visitor accommodations are based on data from the City’s Parks and Recreation Facilities’ User Survey<sup>1</sup> (Survey). The Survey indicated that park use attributable to nonresidential land uses (including overnight visitor accommodations) ranged from 13.6 percent to 31.1 percent of total park use, depending on the specific factors considered. Consistent with the City’s 2007 parks SDC methodology, nonresidential development is assumed to represent 16.4 percent of total park use and equivalent population.

The individual equivalent population factors for overnight visitor accommodations (0.44) and employment (0.20), shown in Table E-1 are based on the following:

<sup>1</sup> City of Eugene Parks and Recreation Facilities’ User Survey (Quantec, September 3, 2004).

- Overnight visitor accommodations – Estimated number of population equivalents from the Survey attributable to tourist accommodations (0.5 percent of surveyed park users which equated to 999 population equivalents) divided by the then-existing estimated overnight visitor population (2,296<sup>2</sup>) = equivalent population factor of 0.44.
- Employees – Total assumed nonresidential equivalent population (16.4 percent) minus share attributable to overnight visitors (1.5 percent from Table 1) = 14.9 percent (or 7,243 employee population equivalents); 7,243 divided by 36,688 growth in employees = equivalency factor of approximately 0.20.

As shown in Table E-1, the total projected growth in equivalent population during the 20-year planning period is 48,469.

## 1.1.2 Level of Service Analysis

As discussed previously, the planned LOS forms the basis for determining growth's capacity needs for parks, trails and recreation facilities and how those needs will be met through either planned future improvements or existing system capacity.

The following sections summarize the components of the LOS analysis.

### 1.1.2.1 Existing and Future Parks, Trails and Recreation Facilities

The System Plan identifies the following park classifications which are included in the SDC methodology:

- Neighborhood
- Community
- Metropolitan
- Natural Area
- Urban Plaza
- Linear

Table E-2 provides a summary of existing, planned and future park acreage by park type as well as miles of recreation trails, size (in square feet) of special facilities and number of recreation amenities. As land for parks (and sometimes trails) is often acquired years before development, Table E-2 shows developed park acreage separate from total acreage.

For purposes of determining the SDC, only those planned additions to park acreage, trails and facilities projects that are listed in the Project Plan have been considered. The SDC methodology does not consider projects listed in the broader System Plan that are anticipated beyond the 20-year SDC methodology planning period.

Special recreation facilities and recreation amenities that are itemized separately in the Project Plan are evaluated by facility type, so are also shown separately in Table E-2.

---

<sup>2</sup> Calculated based on 1,934 tourist accommodation rooms X 1.93 occupants per room X 0.62 occupancy rate.

**Table E-2***Existing and Planned Park Acreage, Trails, and Recreation Facilities*

Type	Units	Existing <sup>1</sup>		Planned Additions <sup>2</sup>		Future	
		Total Acquired <sup>3</sup>	Developed	Acquisition	Developed	Total Acquired	Total Developed
<b>Parks</b>	<b>Acres</b>						
Neighborhood		263.7	120.1	33.5	28.8	297.2	148.9
Community		478.0	142.0	32.6	38.1	510.6	180.1
Metropolitan		952.3	207.2	6.5	11.3	958.8	218.5
Natural Area		1,618.6	0.0	260.0	0.0	1,878.6	0.0
Urban Plazas		1.5	1.5	0.5	0.5	2.0	2.0
Linear Parks		272.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	272.1	0.0
<b>Total Parks</b>		<b>3,586.2</b>	<b>470.8</b>	<b>333.1</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>3,919.4</b>	<b>549.4</b>
<b>Recreation Trails<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Miles</b>	39.3	39.3	21.1	23.2	60.4	62.4
<b>Special Facilities</b>	<b>Sq. Ft.</b>						
Community Centers			69,755		89,720		159,475
Pools			67,491		32,080		99,571
<b>Recreation Amenities</b>	<b>Number</b>						
Dog Parks			4		3		7
Community Gardens			7		2		9
Botanical Gardens <sup>5</sup>			5		0		5
Fields			44		16		60
Spray Play			4		3		7

<sup>1</sup> City owned only.<sup>2</sup> Additions based only on projects Included in Project Plan only; other projects from System Plan are not included.<sup>3</sup> Acreage for existing Metropolitan and Natural Area parks exclude estimated acreage associated with trails, so as not to over-state the current LOS for these parks separate from trails (which are analyzed separately).<sup>4</sup> A small portion of future developed trails will be on property owned by other agencies; however, the City will incur the development costs.<sup>5</sup> While the Project Plan does not include new acreage for Botanical Gardens, the current inventory is provided as it relates to calculation of LOS for the reimbursement fee.

### 1.1.2.2 Existing and Planned LOS

Based on the existing inventory and planned future quantities shown in Table E-2, and the equivalent population estimates shown in Table E-1, the existing and future LOS by park and facility type are shown in Table E-3.

**Table E-3**  
*Existing and Planned LOS (Units/ 1,000 Equivalent Population)*

Category	Unit Measure	Existing <sup>1</sup>		Future <sup>2</sup>	
		Total Acquired	Total Developed	Total Acquired	Total Developed
<b>Parks</b>	<b>Acres</b>				
Neighborhood		1.26	0.57	1.15	0.58
Community		2.27	0.68	1.97	0.70
Metropolitan		4.53	0.99	3.71	0.84
Natural Area		7.70	0.00	7.26	0.00
Urban Plazas		0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Linear Parks		1.29	0.00	1.05	0.00
Total Parks		17.07	2.24	15.16	2.12
<b>Recreation Trails</b>	<b>Miles</b>	0.19	0.19	0.23	0.24
<b>Special Facilities</b>	<b>Sq. Feet</b>				
Community Centers			332		617
Pools			321		385
<b>Recreation Amenities</b>	<b>Number</b>				
Dog Parks			0.019		0.027
Community Gardens			0.033		0.035
Botanical Gardens			0.024		0.019
Fields			0.209		0.232
Spray Play			0.019		0.027

<sup>1</sup>Existing park quantities (Table E-2) divided by base year equivalent population in 1,000's (from Table E-1).

<sup>2</sup>Future park quantities (Table E-2) divided by 2035 equivalent population in 1,000's (from Table E-1).

In carrying out the projects included in the Project Plan, the City intends to acquire new acreage for most park categories and to develop both existing undeveloped acreage and newly acquired acreage (as shown previously in Table E-2). Consistent with the prioritization of projects in the System Plan, the rate of planned park development is higher than the rate of additional land acquisition. This is reflected in the LOS numbers shown in Table E-3. For example, while the future LOS for acquired acreage decreases slightly for neighborhood and community parks, the LOS for developed acreage increases slightly. Similarly, the LOS for trails, special facilities and recreation amenities shown in Table E-3 increases, reflecting the community's desire for these services.

For categories where the future LOS is *higher* than the existing LOS, as is the case in most of the developed park and facility categories shown in Table E-3, the implication for the SDC methodology is that there is no available capacity in the existing system for these categories. Where the reverse is true – primarily land acquisition for all park types, developed acreage for metropolitan parks and botanical gardens – a portion of the existing system inventory will help meet the needs of future development, which has implications for calculation of the reimbursement fee (discussed further under the “SDC Cost Basis” section).

### 1.1.3 Growth Capacity Needs

Table E-4 provides a summary of the growth capacity needs based on the LOS analysis. It begins with a determination of the total units needed to meet future/ growth needs by category, based on the planned LOS (Table E-3) and the growth in equivalent population (Table E-1). Table E-4 also indicates the portion of acreage and facilities that will be provided by projects listed in the Project Plan and by existing system inventory (for those park categories where available capacity exists).

**Table E-4**  
*Growth Capacity Needs*

Type	Unit Measure	Total Units Needed <sup>1</sup>		From Project Plan Additions <sup>2</sup>		From Existing Inventory	
		Total Acquired	Developed	Acquired	Developed	Total Acquired	Total Developed
<b>Parks</b>	<b>Acres</b>						
Neighborhood		55.7	27.9	33.5	27.9	22.2	0.0
Community		95.7	33.8	32.6	33.8	63.1	0.0
Metropolitan		179.7	41.0	6.5	11.3	173.2	29.7
Natural Area		352.1	0.0	260.0	0.0	92.1	0.0
Urban Plazas		0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Linear Parks		51.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.0	0.0
<b>Total Parks</b>		<b>734.6</b>	<b>103.0</b>	<b>333.0</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>401.6</b>	<b>29.7</b>
<b>Recreation Trails</b>	<b>Miles</b>	11.3	11.7	11.3	11.7		0.0
<b>Special Facilities</b>	<b>Sq. Feet</b>						
Community Centers			29,891		29,891		0.0
Pools			18,663		18,663		0.0
<b>Recreation Amenities</b>	<b>Number</b>						
Dog Parks			1.3		1.3		0.0
Community Gardens			1.7		1.7		0.0
Botanical Gardens			0.9		0.0		0.9
Fields			11.2		11.2		0.0
Spray Play			1.3		1.3		0.0

<sup>1</sup> Future LOS (Table E-3) x Growth Equivalent Population/1,000 (Table E-1).

<sup>2</sup> From Table E-2; excludes planned units needed to increase LOS for existing development.

As discussed previously, the Project Plan includes improvements to increase the LOS for future users relative to the current LOS in several categories. The capacity needs for growth shown in Table E-4 are exclusive of the additional parks, trails and facilities that are needed to increase the LOS for existing development.

## 1.2 SDC Cost Basis

The LOS analysis provides a basis for determining the capacity needs of growth by park and facility type in order to determine growth's share of planned future capacity-increasing improvement costs (for purposes of development of the improvement fee cost basis) and existing system available capacity (for purposes of the reimbursement fee cost basis). Each is discussed below.

### 1.2.1 Improvement Fee

#### 1.2.1.1 Growth Share of Planned Improvements

Development of the improvement fee cost basis begins with a determination of growth's share of the planned improvements contained in the Project Plan. Table E-5 shows the planned total quantities added by the improvements included in the Project Plan by park and facility category (from Table E-2), and growth's capacity needs that will be met from the planned additions (from Table 4), in order to establish an equitable allocation of costs between growth and existing development.

**Table E-5**  
*Growth Share of New Parks, Trails and Recreation Facilities*

Type	Units	Planned Additions <sup>1</sup>		Growth Need From Planned Additions <sup>2</sup>		Growth Share Planned Additions%	
		Land Acquisition	Developed Units	Land Acquisition	Developed Units	Land Acquisition	Developed Units
<b>Parks</b>	<b>Acres</b>						
Neighborhood		33.5	28.8	33.5	27.9	100%	97%
Community		32.6	38.1	32.6	33.8	100%	89%
Metropolitan		6.5	11.3	6.5	11.3	100%	100%
Natural Area		260.0	0.0	260.0	0.0	100%	-
Urban Plazas		0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	73%	73%
Linear Parks		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		-
<b>Total Parks</b>		<b>333.1</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>333.0</b>	<b>73.3</b>		
<b>Recreation Trails</b>	<b>Miles</b>	21.1	23.2	11.3	11.7	54%	51%
<b>Special Facilities</b>	<b>Sq. Feet</b>						
Community Centers		0.0	89,720		29,891		33%
Pools		0.0	32,080		18,662		58%
<b>Recreation Amenities</b>	<b>Number</b>						
Dog Parks			3.0		1.3		44%
Community Gardens			2.0		1.7		84%
Botanical Gardens			0.0		0.0		-
Fields			16.0		11.2		70%
Spray Play			3.0		1.3		44%

<sup>1</sup> From Table E-2

<sup>2</sup> From Table E-4

#### 1.2.1.2 Growth Share of Improvement Costs

The growth share percentages from Table E-5 are used to allocate the costs of new land acquisition and development from the Project Plan. The Project Plan includes both



improvements to existing parks and acquisition and development of new parks, trails and facilities. Tables E-6 (parks and trails) and E-7 (recreation facilities and amenities) provide a summary of total project costs from the Project Plan and the growth share of project costs for development of the improvement fee cost basis. For purposes of developing the improvement fee cost basis, rehabilitation costs at existing parks are excluded.

New capacity costs include improvements that increase the level of performance of existing parks (to serve additional users) and new parks and facilities. Most of growth's capacity needs for developed parks and trails will be met through planned land development.

**Table E-6**  
*Growth Share of Planned Improvement Costs - Parks and Trails*

Park Type	Rehabilitation Costs	New Capacity Costs			Total Costs
		Existing Park Performance <sup>1</sup>	New Land Acquisition <sup>2</sup>	New Land Development <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Neighborhood</b>	\$6,025,000	\$4,873,000	\$11,850,000	\$11,850,000	\$34,598,000
Growth Share %	0.0%	1%	100%	97%	68%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$47,103	\$11,850,000	\$11,499,299	\$23,396,402
<b>Community</b>	\$2,760,000	\$3,415,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,625,000	\$15,800,000
Growth Share %	0%	2%	100%	89%	57%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$73,099	\$3,000,000	\$5,865,162	\$8,938,261
<b>Metropolitan<sup>3</sup></b>	\$5,325,000	\$16,735,000	\$1,750,000	\$5,600,000	\$29,410,000
Growth Share %	0%	14%	100%	98%	32%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$2,305,323	\$1,750,000	\$5,484,737	\$9,540,060
<b>Natural Area<sup>3</sup></b>	\$4,087,500	\$5,372,500	\$2,700,000	\$100,000	\$12,260,000
Growth Share %	0%	6%	100%	97%	25%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$324,555	\$2,700,000	\$97,040	\$3,121,595
<b>Urban Plazas</b>			\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000
Growth Share %			73%	73%	73%
Growth Share \$			\$734,739	\$734,739	\$1,469,479
<b>Linear Parks</b>	\$250,000	\$250,000			\$500,000
Growth Share %	0%	19%			9%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$46,858			\$46,859
<b>Recreation Trails</b>	\$112,500	\$12,500	\$12,631,000	\$5,094,000	\$17,850,000
Growth Share %	0%	0%	54%	51%	52%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$0	\$6,767,239	\$2,580,087.01	\$9,347,326
<b>Total Parks and Trails</b>					
Total Costs	\$18,560,000	\$30,658,000	\$32,931,000	\$30,269,000	\$112,418,000
<b>Growth Share</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,796,938</b>	<b>\$26,801,979</b>	<b>\$26,261,065</b>	<b>\$55,859,982</b>

<sup>1</sup>Growth share based on utilization of existing park acreage and facilities.

<sup>2</sup>Growth share from Table E-5.

<sup>3</sup>A portion of new land development provides neighborhood park function, so reflects neighborhood park growth share

Table E-7 shows the total and growth share of Project Plan costs for recreation facility categories and other amenities. The Project Plan includes detailed growth share allocations for individual projects that comprise each category shown in Tables E-7 and E-8.

**Table E-7**

*Growth Share of Planned Improvement Costs - Recreation Facilities and Amenities*

Facility Type	Rehabilitation Costs	New Capacity Costs		Total Costs
		Existing Park Performance <sup>1</sup>	New Facilities <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Community Centers</b>	\$5,910,178		\$37,625,960	\$43,536,138
Growth Share %	0%		33%	29%
Growth Share \$	\$0		\$12,543,310	\$12,543,310
<b>Pools</b>	\$3,967,000		\$12,501,170	\$16,468,170
Growth Share %	0%		58%	44%
Growth Share \$	\$0		\$7,213,446	\$7,213,446
<b>System-Wide Amenities</b>	\$7,965,000	\$5,235,000		\$13,200,000
Growth Share %	0%	12%		5%
Growth Share \$		\$606,347	\$0	\$606,347
<b>Recreation Amenities<sup>2</sup></b>				
<b>Other</b>			\$30,000	\$30,000
Growth Share %	0%		100%	100%
Growth Share \$	\$0		\$30,000	\$30,000
<b>Dog Parks</b>			\$750,000	\$750,000
Growth Share %	0%		44%	44%
Growth Share \$	\$0		\$328,009	\$328,009
<b>Community Garden</b>	\$187,500	\$62,500	\$400,000	\$650,000
Growth Share %	0%	0%	84%	52%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$0	\$337,380	\$337,380
<b>Botanical Gardens</b>	\$72,500	\$102,500		\$175,000
Growth Share %	0%	19%		11%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$19,212		\$19,212
<b>Fields</b>	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$25,100,000	\$25,200,000
Growth Share %	0%	0%	70%	70%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$0	\$17,642,178	\$17,642,178
<b>Spray Play</b>			\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000
Growth Share %	0%		44%	44%
Growth Share \$	\$0		\$481,079	\$481,079
<b>Courts</b>	\$30,000	\$120,000		\$150,000
Growth Share %	0%	19%	33%	15%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$22,492	\$0	\$22,492
<b>Total Facilities &amp; Amenities</b>	<b>\$18,182,178</b>	<b>\$5,570,000</b>	<b>\$77,507,130</b>	<b>\$101,259,308</b>
Growth Share %	<b>0%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>50%</b>	
<b>Growth Share</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$648,051</b>	<b>\$38,575,402</b>	<b>\$39,223,453</b>

<sup>1</sup>Growth share based on utilization of existing park acreage and facilities.

<sup>2</sup>Growth share from Table E-5.

### 1.2.1.3 Improvement Fee Cost Basis

Table E-8 shows the calculation of the improvement fee cost basis. The growth share of project costs from Table ES-6 and ES-7 are summed and the existing SDC fund balance is deducted from the total.

**Table E-8**  
*Improvement Fee Cost Basis*

Park/Facility Type	Rehabilitation Costs	New Capacity Costs			Total Costs
		Existing Park Performance	New Land Acquisition	New Facilities	
<b>Parks &amp; Trails<sup>1</sup></b>	\$18,560,000	\$30,658,000	\$32,931,000	\$30,269,000	\$112,418,000
Growth Share %	0%	9%	81%	87%	50%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$2,796,938	\$26,801,979	\$26,261,065	\$55,859,982
<b>Recreation Facilities &amp; Amenities<sup>2</sup></b>	\$18,182,178	\$5,570,000		\$77,507,130	\$101,259,308
Growth Share %	0%	12%		50%	39%
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$648,051		\$38,575,402	\$39,223,453
<b>Total Improvements</b>	\$36,742,178	\$36,228,000	\$32,931,000	\$107,776,130	\$213,677,308
Growth Share %	0%	10%	81%	60%	
Growth Share \$	\$0	\$3,444,990	\$26,801,979	\$64,836,466	\$95,083,435
<i>Less Existing SDC Fund Balance</i>					<b>-\$7,805,174</b>
<b>Improvement Fee Cost Basis</b>					<b>\$87,278,261</b>

<sup>1</sup> From Table E-6

<sup>2</sup> From Table E-7

## 1.2.2 Reimbursement Fee

### 1.2.2.1 Growth Share of Existing System Capacity

For the reimbursement fee, the cost basis is the sum of the value of the existing system parks and facilities that will serve growth. The units needed to meet growth capacity needs are based on the LOS analysis (shown in Table E-4). The land and development costs reflect historical average unit costs from prior improvements constructed by the City. The reimbursement fee cost basis is shown in Table E-9.

**Table E-9**  
*Preliminary Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis*

Park Type	Units Needed For Growth <sup>1</sup>		Unit Costs (\$/Unit) <sup>2</sup>		Growth Costs		
	Total Acreage	Developed Units	Acquisition (\$/acre)	Development (\$/unit)	Acquisition	Development	Total
<b>Parks</b>		Acres					
Neighborhood	22.2	-	\$125,000	\$400,000	\$2,776,591	\$0	\$2,776,591
Community	63.1	-	\$55,000		\$3,469,251	\$0	\$3,469,251
Metropolitan	173.2	29.7	\$80,000	\$250,000	\$13,857,049	\$7,425,117	\$21,282,166
Natural Area	92.1	-	\$10,000		\$921,186	\$0	\$921,186
Urban Plazas	-	-			\$0	\$0	\$0
Linear Parks	51.0	-	\$23,161		\$1,181,214	\$0	\$1,181,214
Subtotal Parks	401.6	29.7			\$22,205,291	\$7,425,117	\$29,630,408
<b>Facilities</b>							
Botanical Gardens		0.9		\$500,000	\$0	\$468,584	\$468,584
<b>Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis</b>					<b>\$22,205,291</b>	<b>\$7,893,701</b>	<b>\$30,098,992</b>

<sup>1</sup> From Table E-4

<sup>2</sup> Based on historical 10-year average cost of prior acquisition and development.

## 1.3 SDC Schedule

Once the aggregate growth cost basis has been determined, the next step in the methodology is to determine how the SDCs will be assessed to individual developments.

The SDC for an individual development is based on the cost per unit for each development type and the number of units attributable to a particular development. This section presents the unit costs and assumed units by development type.

### 1.3.1 Unit Costs

The improvement and reimbursement fee cost bases are allocated to each development category based on share of equivalent population (from Table E-1). The costs are then divided by the number of growth units over the planning period (also from Table E-1) to determine the costs per unit, as shown in Table E-10.

**Table E-10**  
*SDC Unit Costs by Development Category*

	<b>Growth Costs<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$/Unit</b>
<b>Improvement Fee</b>			
Residential	\$72,964,626	40,520	\$1,801
Overnight Visitors	\$1,270,535	1,604	\$792
Employees	\$13,043,099	36,688	\$356
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$87,278,261</b>		
<b>Reimbursement Fee</b>			
Growth Costs			
Residential	\$25,162,757	40,520	\$621
Overnight Visitors	\$438,160	1,604	\$273
Employees	\$4,498,075	36,688	\$123
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,098,992</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$117,377,253</b>		
Residential			\$2,422
Overnight Visitors			\$1,066
Employees			\$478

<sup>1</sup> Allocations reflect share of equivalent population (Table E-1).

### 1.3.2 Development Unit Assumptions

SDCs are assessed to different development types based on the estimated number of people (residents, employees, or overnight visitors) per unit. This section summarizes occupancy assumptions for each category. The SDC schedule is presented in Appendix F of the City's SDC methodology documents.

#### 1.3.2.1 Single Family Residential

Local and regional data show that the typical household size (i.e., people per dwelling unit) varies by the size of the housing unit (as measured by number of bedrooms and quantity of living space). To develop single family occupancy assumptions by house size for the SDC methodology, a logarithmic regression analysis was used<sup>3</sup>. First, U.S. Census data, specifically,

<sup>3</sup> A logarithmic relationship assumes that the rate of change (or number of people) increases initially, but then levels off once the dwelling reaches a certain size.

from the American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) for Lane County were used to establish the average household size by number of bedrooms. The Lane Council of Governments then provided the average total finished square feet (SQ FT) by number of bedrooms based on tax lot data from the Lane County Assessor’s Office (2017). Finally, using the variable in common between these two sets (number of bedrooms) a logarithmic regression was used to estimate SQ FT and number of people.

The detailed occupants per household estimated by the regression model were used to develop averages occupancy within four SQ FT tiers, as shown in Table E-11. Based on the regression analysis, the persons per household range from 1.25 for tier 1 (8000 SQ FT) to 3.37 for tier 4 (over 3,000 SQ FT).

**Table E-11**  
*Single-Family Dwelling Unit Occupancy*

Category	Avg. People per Dwelling Unit
<b>4-Tier Structure<sup>1</sup></b>	
800 SQFT or less	1.25
801-1500 SQFT	1.96
1501-3000 SQFT	2.71
>3,000 SQFT	3.37

<sup>1</sup>Based on 2017 ACS Public Use Microdata Area 00400 PUMS for Lane County and tax lot data from the Lane County Assessor’s Office (2017).

### 1.3.2.2 Multifamily Residential

As with single-family residential, U.S. Census data were used to estimate occupancy for multifamily residential dwelling units based on dwelling size, but in the case of multifamily, each tier is based on the number of bedrooms. Table E-12 provides the average people per dwelling unit for each bedroom category. The bedroom data were calculated from the ACS PUMS 2017 Lane County sample.

**Table E-12**  
*Multifamily Dwelling Unit Occupancy*

Category	Avg. People per Dwelling Unit
<b>All Multifamily Dwelling Sizes<sup>1</sup></b>	1.76
<b>Number of Bedrooms Category<sup>2</sup></b>	
0 Bedrooms	1.09
1 Bedrooms	1.20
2 Bedrooms	1.99
3+ Bedrooms	2.51

<sup>1</sup> 2017 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS PUMS) for Lane County, weighted average for all multifamily households

<sup>2</sup> 2017 ACS PUMS for Lane County; buildings with >2 apartments.

### 1.3.2.3 Other Housing

Table E-13 presents occupancy assumptions for other types of housing. Occupancy for mobile homes is based on 2017 ACS data for Lane County for all multifamily dwelling units. Accessory Dwelling Units will be assessed based on the same occupancy as the smallest single family residential category (800 SQ FT and below).

**Table E-13**  
*Occupancy Assumptions - Other Housing*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Avg. People per Unit</b>
Mobile homes (per home) <sup>1</sup>	1.76
Accessory Dwelling Units (per unit) <sup>2</sup>	1.25

<sup>1</sup> 2017 ACS Lane County for Multifamily dwellings.

<sup>2</sup> Based on single family Tier 1 (Table E-11)

### 1.3.2.4 Group Housing

The nature of the group housing will establish whether, for purposes of assessing a parks and recreation SDC, development is classified as residential or nonresidential development. Group housing developed for those that reside independently and freely will be assessed as residential development, whereas group housing developed to incarcerate individuals or to provide housing for those wholly dependent upon care by others, such as nursing homes or residential care facilities, will be assessed as nonresidential development. Occupancy will be determined as follows:

- **Group Housing – Residential Parks and Recreation SDC Assessment.** The parks and recreation SDC for residential land uses is based on persons per unit; at the time of development, the proposed number of residents for which the group housing is designed will form the basis of the fee.
- **Group Housing – Nonresidential Parks and Recreation SDC Assessment.** The parks and recreation SDC for nonresidential land uses is based on categories defined by similar employee densities (noted below). Since institutional group housing is developed for individuals who are unable to use the City park system, but supports employees and visitors who do use parks, the parks and recreation SDC for such development is assessed using the category B nonresidential rate schedule (discussed below), which contains comparable institutions.

### 1.3.2.5 Nonresidential

As explained above, employees working in Eugene use the parks and recreation system. For this reason, the parks SDC is assessed on all nonresidential development types (industrial, commercial, office use, institutional, etc.). Nonresidential developments are classified into five categories (A to E), as shown in Table E-14.

Occupancy assumptions for overnight visitor accommodations (Category A) are based on estimated average persons per room of 2.3<sup>4</sup>.

**Table E-14**  
*Nonresidential Assumptions*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Person per Room<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Employees per TGSF<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Business Types</b>
A	2.30		Hotels, motels, B&Bs, & other tourist accommodations
B		3.34	Office (financial, investment, real estate, government, medical, legal & other business/professional services), institutional, grocery, eating & drinking establishments
C		2.06	Industrial, wholesale, manufacturing, transportation, agriculture
D		1.21	General retail & services, recreation
E		0.49	Commercial warehousing & storage

<sup>1</sup>Travel Lane County (based on data from Dean Runyan)

<sup>2</sup> Based on 2007 SDC Methodology; TGSF = Thousand Gross Square Feet

As there is not local data on the total number of visitors to the City (or visitors by land use, apart from tourist accommodation), employee density (number of employees per Thousand Gross SQ FT of building space) per land use is used to determine SDCs for the other categories of nonresidential development. The employee density assumptions were developed in the prior SDC methodology based on local employment and building area data by standard industrial classification building area.

<sup>4</sup> Information provided by Travel Lane County (based on data from Dean Runyan).