City of Sherwood, Oregon
Resolution No. 93-553

A RESOLUTION READOPTING A CITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) AMENDED TO REFLECT COSTS INCREASES AND REVISED PROJECT PRIORITIES SINCE INITIAL ADOPTION IN 1991, ADDING NEW PROJECTS, DELETING COMPLETED PROJECTS, INCORPORATING THE NEW CITY STORM WATER MASTER PLAN, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

---

**WHEREAS,** between June and July 1991, the City adopted a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for street, sanitary sewer, water and parks projects based on adopted master plans; and

**WHEREAS,** in 1993 the City adopted a storm water management master plan and the projects recommended by this plan need to be incorporated into the CIP; and

**WHEREAS,** many costs for projects identified in the 1991 CIP need to be amended to reflect inflationary increases and/or refinements to project preliminary plans; and

**WHEREAS,** since 1991 many capital projects have been completed within the City and these changes need to be reflected in the CIP; and

**WHEREAS,** the City recently signed two intergovernmental agreements with the City of Tualatin, Tualatin Valley Water District, and Portland Water Bureau, and the CIP needs to be amended to include those capital improvements necessary to integrate City and regional water systems.

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. CIP Adopted: The revised City Capital Improvement Program (CIP), attached hereto as Exhibit "A", is hereby approved and adopted.

Section 2. SDC Revisions: Staff is hereby directed to utilize this revised CIP in proposing amendments to the City's System Development Charges (SDCs).

Section 3. Effective Date: This Resolution shall become effective upon approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council July 28, 1993.

Walter H. Hitchcock

Walter Hitchcock, Mayor

Attest:

Polly Blankenbaker

Polly Blankenbaker
City Recorder

City of Sherwood, Oregon
LONG RANGE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
July 28, 1993

WATER, SANITARY SEWER & STREETS
(Approved by City Council June 26, 1991)
(Revised by City Council July 28, 1993)
PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
(Approved by City Council July 24, 1991)
Revised by City Council July 28, 1993)
STORMWATER
(Approved by City Council July 28, 1993)

The following capital projects are based on five updates of City long-range plans: Water (1988), Sanitary Sewer (1989), Transportation (1990), Parks and Open Space (1991), and Storm Water (1993). Costs are based on the estimates (if made) in those plans, or on detailed estimates made for other purposes (such as CDBG applications). If such estimates were not available, figures were derived from average linear footage costs contained in the plans. In the case of streets, the "average" costing has been modified case by case based on the degree and condition of existing improvements. All facility estimates include standard design, engineering, and contingency factors, but generally not any property acquisition costs (except for storm water projects and some water projects). All costs reflect full standard improvements as specified by the long-range plans. In some cases, however, existing development may limit improvements.

Under each general infrastructure category, projects are grouped by type (i.e. "Supply Projects", "Rock Creek Basin Lines", "Minor Collectors", etc.). These groups are listed in order of their priority for construction as established by the City Council. Some groups are of generally equal priority. These are so noted. Individual projects could eventually receive a higher prioritization than their group based on funding availability and specific need. Projects within groups are also generally prioritized. Each project group also includes an assignment of funding source(s). These assignments are tentative. For instance, any project could be developer built, although the probability of this happening varies greatly project to project and group to group.

## WATER

Prioritization of water projects into general infrastructure categories are based on the following criteria: projects relating to basic water supply (i.e. new wells, enhanced system pressures, or backup systems) receive highest priority, projects relating to

basic looping of waterlines next, projects replacing older waterlines are third and fourth, and extension of waterlines to new areas are last.

1. Supply Projects

Supply projects are prioritized on the basis of immediate need and whether the enhancement is to existing systems or creates a new system. There is low probability that these projects will be developer built, with the possible exception of Well No. 6.

Primary Source of Funds: Water System Development Charge (SDC) Funds
Other Sources: Water Fund, development, General Obligation Bonds

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Reservoir Booster Pumps | 2-25 hp generators | $ 55,500 |
| B. | Reservoir Standby Power | 35 hp generator | $ 66,050 |
| C. | Greenway | 301AC*** | $ 401,333 |
| D. | "Bull Run" Connection | 18-inch line | $2,500,000 |
| E. | Well No. 3 Standby Power | 75 hp generator | $ 132,000 |
| F. | Well No. 6 (Murdock) | 800' deep | $ 262,500 |
| G. | Well/Reservoir Connects. | 13,000 LF | $ 656,500 |
| H. | Second Water Reservoir | 2.0 MG | $2,595,000 |
| | | Total | $6,668,883 |

2. Loop Projects

Loop projects are prioritized based on whether they serve existing development or future development, and whether needed rights-of-way currently exist or are only planned. There is generally a medium probability that all or portions of the loops would be built by development.

Primary Source of Funds: Water SDC Funds
Other Sources: Water Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Tualatin-Sherwood | 3,800 LF | $ 264,180 |
| B. | Scholls-Sherwood | 2,300 LF | $ 162,748 |
| C. | Adams Extension# | 2,700 LF | $ 198,135 |
| D. | Miscellaneous Loops | | $ 555,000 |
| | | Total | $1,180,063 |

3. 4-Inch Waterline Replacements

Waterline replacements are generally prioritized from oldest line to newest line. There is very low probability these lines will be built by development.

Primary Source of Funds: Water Replacement Fund
Other Sources: Water Fund, Water SDC Funds

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Old Town (8")* | 1,000 LF | $ 48,000 |
| B. | W. Sunset (10")* | 1,500 LF | $ 98,250 |
| C. | Meinecke/99W (8")* | 2,000 LF | $ 106,500 |
| D. | Ladd Hill (12")* | 700 LF | $ 55,167 |
| | | Total | $ 307,917 |

4. 6-Inch Waterline Replacements

Waterline replacements are generally prioritized from oldest line to newest line. There is very low probability these lines will be built by development.

Primary Source of Funds: Water Replacement Fund
Other Sources: Water Fund, Water SDC Funds

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Old Town* | 1,600 LF | $ 85,250 |
| B. | Lower Lincoln* | 1,000 LF | $ 53,280 |
| C. | Oregon* | 1,300 LF | $ 69,250 |
| D. | Upper Washington* | 1,300 LF | $ 69,250 |
| E. | Lower Roy* | 1,300 LF | $ 69,250 |
| F. | Gleneagle* | 3,000 LF | $ 159,850 |
| G. | Upper Roy* | 900 LF | $ 48,150 |
| | | Total | $ 554,280 |

5. Waterline Extensions

Waterline extensions are generally prioritized based on the size of line from largest (12") to smallest (8"). There is generally a high probability these lines will be built by development, in fact 8" lines are assumed to be developer built in the calculation of Water SDC's.

Primary Source of Funds: Water SDC Funds
Other Sources: Water Fund, development (note: for 8" lines, development is a primary source of funding).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | 12 Inch*# | 18,500 LF | $ 1,447,625 |
| B. | 10 Inch*# | 32,800 LF | $ 2,138,888 |
| C. | 8 Inch*# | 25,400 LF | $ 1,545,590 |
| | | Total | $ 5,132,103 |

TOTAL ALL WATER PROJECTS: $13,843,246

## SEWER

The general infrastructure categories for sewer projects are prioritized into two levels: in-city lines servicing new development and parallel trunk lines into the USA system. The parallel trunks receive lower priority because they are not required until the City approaches built-out densities within the UGB.

1. Cedar Creek Basin Sewer Lines (8" except as noted)

In-city sewer service lines are prioritized on a mix of criteria: whether a line is an extension of an existing submain (lower) or hooks directly into a trunk line (higher); an assessment of the probability the line will be developer (lower) or City (higher) built; the size of line (larger lines get higher priority); and the degree of difficulty and level of need to extend the line (for instance, lines requiring out-of-UGB extensions were rated lower priority, as were lines primarily serving limited areas along the fringe of the UGB).

Primary Source of Funds: City Sewer SDC Funds
Other Sources: Sewer Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Scholls-Sherwood W.# | 1,200 LF | $ 62,400 |
| A. | Scholls-Sherwood E.# | 2,000 LF | $ 104,000 |
| B. | Steeplechase N. (12")# | 650 LF | $ 47,450 |
| C. | Steeplechase S. (10")# | 4,100 LF | $ 258,300 |
| C. | Steeplechase N. (10")# | 4,100 LF | $ 258,300 |
| C. | E. Sunset# | 1,300 LF | $ 67,600 |
| D. | W. Sherwood# | 3,500 LF | $ 182,000 |
| E. | BPA# | 3,500 LF | $ 182,000 |
| | | Total | $1,162,050 |

2. Rock Creek Basin Sewer Lines (all 8") - (note: generally same priority as Cedar Creek lines).

In-city sewer service lines are prioritized on a mix of criteria: whether a line is an extension of an existing submain (lower) or hooks directly into a trunk line (higher); an assessment of the probability whether the line will be developer (lower) or City (higher) built; the size of line (larger lines get higher priority); and the degree of difficulty and level of need to extend

the line (for instance, lines requiring out-of-UGB extensions were rated lower priority, as were lines primarily serving limited areas along the fringe of the UGB).

Primary Source of Funds: City Sewer SDC Funds
Other Sources: Sewer Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Adams/12th# | 3,000 LF | $ 156,000 |
| A. | Tualatin-Sherwood# | 2,300 LF | $ 119,600 |
| C. | Tonquin# | 1,400 LF | $ 72,800 |
| E. | Onion Flats W.# | 5,000 LF | $ 260,000 |
| E. | Onion Flats E.# | 2,900 LF | $ 150,800 |
| | | Total | $ 759,200 |

3. Sewer Trunk Lines

Rated lower in priority than "basin" sewer lines as these trunks are not required until City approaches UGB build-out. Please note that the funding source for these parallel trunks is district from that for basin service lines.

Primary Source of Funds: USA Sewer SDC Fund,
Other Source: General Obligation Bonds

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| F. | Cedar Creek Parallel (15" - 30") | 12,640 LF | $ 991,000 |
| F. | Rock Creek Parallel (18") | 6,750 LF | $ 378,000 |
| | | Total | $1,369,000 |
| | TOTAL ALL SEWER PROJECTS: | | $3,290,250 |

## STREETS

The infrastructure categories of streets are generally prioritized based on the conventional "functional classification" hierarchy: minor arterials, major collectors, minor collectors. There are exceptions: existing minor collectors are given a very high priority as there is low probability that these streets will be developer built and these streets tend to be deteriorated and significantly substandard. Major intersections are also given high priority, as intersection improvements are deemed to be the most cost effective means to improve traffic flow and safety. A couple of minor arterials are also rated lower than their functional classification due to their "fringe" location with respect to the UGB. There is a significant unaccounted for "wild card" in this prioritization: right-of-way acquisition.

1. Minor Collectors (existing)

Existing minor collectors are prioritized based on a mix of criteria: some collectors are already in the budget cycle, these tended towards higher priority; the collectors farthest from meeting minimum standards were rated up as were collectors being highly impacted by nearby development.

Primary Source of Funds: City Street SDC Fund, grants in some cases
Other Sources: Street Fund

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Willamette/Park/Division@ | 900 LF | $ 227,780 |
| B. | Washington (Willamette-Div)**@ | 600 LF | $ 109,000 |
| C. | Pine (Division-Sunset)*@ | 1,300 LF | $ 314,500 |
| D. | Willamette (Norton-Roy)**@ | 650 LF | $ 78,680 |
| E. | Willamette (Wash-Norton)** | 1,500 LF | $ 72,600 |
| | | Total | $ 802,560 |

2. Major Intersection Improvements - (note: same general priority as existing Minor Collectors)

Intersections were prioritized based on the functional classification of the intersecting roads plus consideration of the severity of existing intersection geometry problems (i.e. an intersection of two arterials was rated higher than the intersection of two collectors, etc.).

Primary Source of Funds: TIF Fund, grants in some cases
Other Sources: City Street SDC Fund, Street Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Murdock/Sunset/Baker | n/a | $ 335,000 |
| A. | Meinecke (inc. realignment)/99W | n/a | $ 253,575 |
| B. | Oregon/Murdock | n/a | $ 213,500 |
| C. | Pine/Division/Washington | n/a | $ 152,000 |
| D. | Oregon/SPRR | n/a | $ 268,000 |
| E. | Villa/Park/Railroad | n/a | $ 144,900 |
| | | Total | $1,366,975 |

3. Minor Arterials w/bikelanes

This list is large, the projects are the most diverse, and include the most extensive improvements and costs. Therefore the prioritization is very general. Prioritization criteria included: arterials in more developed neighborhoods received higher ratings, as did those existing arterials most divergent from current City standards. Arterials leading out into rural areas and arterials with a higher probability of being developer built were rated lower.

Primary Source of Funds: TIF Fund
Other Sources of Funds: Street Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | S. Sherwood (Sunset-Division)*@ | 1,300 LF | $ 463,390 |
| B. | S. Sherwood (Division-SPRR)**@ | 600 LF | $ 96,200 |
| C. | Oregon (Murdock-TS Rd.)* | 3,400 LF | $1,212,000 |
| D. | Oregon (SPRR-Murdock)**@ | 2,700 LF | $ 570,325 |
| E. | Meinecke (Lee-"Salisbury")**@ | 2,000 LF | $ 356,450 |
| F. | Murdock (graveled section)* | 1,400 LF | $ 499,035 |
| F. | W. Sunset (Ladd Hill-SPRR)**# | 2,300 LF | $ 818,100 |
| G. | E. Sunset (Murdock-Ladd Hill)*# | 3,000 LF | $1,176,300 |
| H. | Murdock (paved section)**# | 2,200 LF | $ 433,100 |
| I. | W. Sunset (SPRR-Middleton)*# | 3,300 LF | $1,176,300 |
| J. | Middleton Extension*# | 1,400 LF | $ 547,500 |
| K. | Scholls-Sherwood**# | 4,250 LF | $1,203,100 |
| | | Total | $8,551,800 |

4. Signalization

Signalization projects are prioritized thus: intersection built and functioning, intersection budgeted for building, intersection planned only.

Primary Source of Funds: ODOT, County, or development, depending on project
Other Sources: TIF Fund, Street Fund

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Meinecke/99W | n/a | $ 140,000 |
| B. | Oregon/Tualatin-Sherwood | n/a | $ 140,000 |
| C. | Middleton Extension/99W | n/a | $ 140,000 |
| | | Total | $ 420,000 |

5. Major Collectors w/bikelanes

Major collectors w/bikelanes are prioritized with existing, deficient collectors rated highest and planned collectors lowest.

Primary Source of Funds: TIF Fund
Other Sources: Street Fund, development in some cases

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Oregon (SPRR-Pine)**@ | 1,300 LF | | $ 267,000 |
| B. | 12th (99W-N. Sherwood)** | 1,200 LF | | $ 65,780 |
| C. | 12th Extension (N. Sherwood-TS Rd.)*# | 5,000 LF | | $1,369,300 |
| | | | Total | $1,702,080 |

6. Minor Arterials w/o bikelanes

Existing roads receive a higher prioritization than planned roads.

Primary Source of Funds: TIF Fund
Other Sources: Street Fund, development in some cases

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Ladd Hill** | 1,400 LF | | $ 325,590 |
| B. | W. Sunset Extension (Middleton-99W)* | 1,000 LF | | $ 310,000 |
| | | | Total | $ 635,590 |

7. Major Collectors w/o bikelanes

Existing roads subject to the most intense traffic pressures rated highest, future roads or roads leading to rural areas were prioritized lower, as were roads with a higher probability of being developer built.

Primary Source of Funds: TIF Fund
Other Sources: Street Fund, development in some cases

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Willamette (Roy-Murdock)** | 400 LF | | $ 105,000 |
| B. | Borcher** | 2,800 LF | | $ 338,755 |
| C. | Edy**# | 3,400 LF | | $ 617,125 |
| D. | Adams Extension*# | 1,800 LF | | $ 435,510 |
| E. | Baker** | 700 LF | | $ 127,000 |
| | | | Total | $ 1,623,390 |

8. Minor Collectors (new)

Prioritized based on probability of being developer built (the higher the probability, the lower the priority).

Primary Sources of Funds: City Street SDC Fund
Other Sources: Street Fund, development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Adams (Or-Willamette)*@ | 800 LF | $ 193,600 |
| B. | Steeplechase (Meinecke-Sunset)*# | 3,300 LF | $ 798,550 |
| C. | West Sherwood*# | 4,400 LF | $ 1,064,725 |
| | | Total | $ 2,056,875 |
| | TOTAL ALL STREET PROJECTS | | $17,159,270 |

## PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Prioritization of parks and open space projects into general categories are based on the following criteria: land acquisition receives highest priority, construction of parks and open space associated facilities receive second priority (with such facilities being sub-prioritized top to bottom: community level, neighborhood level, mini-park level), and "stand alone" recreational facilities receive lowest priority. "Stand alone" facilities, when included in community or neighborhood parks, would receive the priority of that park.

1. Land Acquisition

Land acquisitions are prioritized with Stella Olsen Park receiving highest priority consistent with prior Parks Advisory Board and City Council direction. Greenways and upland greenway corridors within the UGB receive the next highest ranking, land for other community and neighborhood parks receive third priority, greenways outside of UGB fourth, and "significant natural areas" and mini-park land acquisition receive lowest priority.

Primary Source of Funds: Parks and Open Space SDC Fund
Other Sources: development

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Greenway (inside UGB)*** | 231 ac. | $ 308,000 |
| B. | Greenway Access (inside UGB) | 22 ac. | $ 550,000 |
| C. | Neighborhood Park (3) | 24 ac. | $ 600,000 |
| D. | Sherwood-Scholls Park | 15 ac. | $ 375,000 |
| E. | Greenway (outside UGB)*** | 70 ac. | $ 93,333 |
| F. | Greenway Access (outside UGB) | 10 ac. | $ 250,000 |
| G. | Significant Natural Areas | 64 ac. | $ 1,264,000 |
| H. | Mini-Parks (7) | 7 ac. | $ 175,000 |
| | | TotaL | $ 3,615,333 |

## 2. Park Facilities

Development of park facilities are prioritized in roughly the same order as with land acquisition, with the exception that pathway development is not subdivided into "outside" and "inside" UGB. Park facility development can and should be done in conjunction with land acquisition in many cases.

Primary Source of Funds: Parks and Open Space SDC Fund
Other Sources: development, grants

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Stella Olsen Park | | $ 410,000 |
| B. | "Off-Street" Pathways | 40,150 L.F. | $ 722,700 |
| C. | Neighborhood Parks (3) | 8 ac./each | $ 1,179,000 |
| D. | Sherwood-Scholls Park | | $ 505,000 |
| E. | Mini-Parks (7) | 1 ac./each | $ 287,000 |
| F. | "Stand-alone" Court Facilities | | $ 572,000 |
| | | Total | $ 3,675,700 |
| | TOTAL ALL PARKS PROJECTS | | $ 7,291,033 |

## STORMWATER

Prioritization of stormwater projects is based on the conclusions of the 1993 stormwater master plan, which identified projects in 0-5 years, 5-10 years, 10-15 years, and 15-20 year increments. The plan also sorted and prioritized projects as "high", "medium" and "low" based on various criteria, see plan for details. For the purposes of this CIP, projects are listed by three general types: Piping/Culverting, Local Treatment/Erosion Control, and Detention. Regional Treatment Facilities are also listed in the master plan, but are assumed to be constructed on a regional basis utilizing regional SDCs and other funding sources.

### 1. Piping/Culverting

Primary source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees.
Other Sources: USA, general obligation bonds, development.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Old Town | $ 20,000 |
| A. | Oregon Street | $ 25,000 |
| A. | Rock Creek | $ 60,000 |
| B. | Scholls-Sherwood | $ 50,000 |
| B. | Edy Road | $ 45,000 |
| C. | Tualatin/Sherwood | $ 90,000 |
| C. | Sunset Boulevard | $ 90,000 |
| D. | North of Oregon Street | $ 130,000 |
| D. | Chicken Creek | $ 45,000 |
| | Total | $ 555,000 |

### 2. Local Treatment Facilities/Erosion Control

Primary source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees.
Other Sources: USA, general obligation bonds, development.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Greenway*** | $ 401,333 |
| A. | Park Street/Cedar Creek | $ 5,000 |
| A. | Stella Olsen Park | $ 200,000 |
| A. | Gleneagle | $ 205,000 |
| A. | Murdock Road | $ 400,000 |
| A. | North of Oregon Street | $ 350,000 |
| B. | South Sherwood Boulevard | $ 230,000 |
| B. | Edy Road | $ 225,000 |
| B. | Tualatin-Sherwood Road | $ 250,000 |
| B. | Sunset Boulevard | $ 200,000 |
| | Total | $2,466,333 |

3. Detention Facilities

Primary source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees.
Other Sources: USA, general obligation bonds, development.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Roy Street Park | $ 100,000 |
| B. | Cedar Creek/SPRR | $ 75,000 |
| | Total | $ 175,000 |
| | TOTAL ALL STORMWATER PROJECTS | $3,196,333 |

LINEAR FOOTAGE MULTIPLIERS
(Adjusted for inflation from figures in original plans)

Water

12" = $78 LF
10" = $65 LF
8" = $61 LF

Sewer

12" = $73 LF
10" = $63 LF
8" = $52 LF

Streets

| | |
|---|---|
| Minor Arterial w/bikelanes = | $292 LF |
| Minor Arterial w/o Bikelanes = | $257 LF |
| Major Collector w/bikelanes = | $221 LF |
| Major Collector w/o bikelanes = | $196 LF |
| Minor Collector = | $196 LF |

NOTATIONS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| * | = | Estimate based on complete rebuild at full linear footage average |
| ** | = | Estimate based on reduction in linear footage average resulting from probable reuse of existing public improvements |
| *** | = | Greenway acquisition is assumed to benefit open space, groundwater quality (i.e., aquifer recharge), and stormwater quality and quantity plans. Therefore the cost of acquiring 301 acres of greenway (at $4,000 an acre) is allocated evenly among Water, Stormwater, and Parks CIPs |
| @ | = | Improvements may be limited (and costs further reduced) due to probable interference with existing development |
| # | = | Improvements generally needed only as a result of new development and cost may be borne by that development |