CITY OF SHERWOOD
Resolution No. 95-604

A RESOLUTION READOPTING A CITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) AMENDED TO REFLECT COSTS INCREASES AND REVISED PROJECT PRIORITIES SINCE PREVIOUS ADOPTION IN 1993, ADDING NEW PROJECTS, DELETING COMPLETED PROJECTS, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, on July 28, 1993, the City adopted a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for street, sanitary sewer, water, storm water, and parks projects based on adopted master plans; and

WHEREAS, many costs for projects identified in the 1993 CIP need to be amended to reflect inflationary increases and/or refinements to project preliminary plans; and

WHEREAS, since 1993 many capital projects have been completed within the City and these changes need to be reflected in the CIP; and

WHEREAS, the City recently developed a study forecasting population and water consumption growth, water supply and storage requirements, and options to convert to the City of Portland Bull Run system.

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 Revision: 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 April 11, 1995.

Walter Hitchcock, Mayor

Attest:

James H. Rapp
City Manager/City Recorder

CITY OF SHERWOOD, OREGON
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
1995

INTRODUCTION

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the City of Sherwood is a long-term planning tool intended to allow for prioritization, financing, coordination, and timely technical design and application of projects and programs to better serve the citizens of Sherwood. Generally, these are major projects and programs which have a significant impact on the City's infrastructure.

This document is a "snap-shot" representing a five-year period of the CIP (1995-2000). Each year, this document is updated to represent the next five-year window. Completed projects, and projects scheduled to be completed before the end of the fiscal year, will drop from the document, new fiscal-year projects will be added, and other projects may be reprioritized.

This CIP is directly linked to the budget process, land-use planning, facility plan implementation, coordination with the state, county, and other local municipalities, and the ongoing direction of the City's leaders.

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 (e.g. "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 generally of 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.

Any questions, comments, or suggestions for the improvement of this document may be directed to the City Manager, City Engineer, or the City Planning Director.

City of Sherwood, Oregon
LONG RANGE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
1995

WATER

Prioritization of water projects into general infrastructure categories is based on the following criteria: Projects relating to basic water supply (e.g. new wells, enhanced system pressures, or backup systems) received 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. The various sources of funds have been evaluated, and the revenue flow during the 1995-2000 period has been estimated. These factors are utilized when programming the projects.

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.

Source of Funds: Water System Development Charge (SDC) Funds, Water Fund, development, General Obligation or Revenue Bonds.

A.	Reservoir Booster Pump	1-25 hp Press Pump	$ 30,000
B.	Well No. 6 (Murdock)	800' deep	$ 350,500
B.	Well No. 3 Emergency Power	150 kw generator	$ 100,000
C.	"Bull Run" Connection	18-inch line	$2,600,000
C.	Seismic Upgrade of Reservoir		$ 75,000
D.	Greenway 90 Ac.		$ 360,000
D.	Second Water Reservoir	2.0 MG	$1,500,000
		TOTAL	$5,015,500

2. Loop Projects

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

Source of Funds: Water SDC Funds, Water Fund, development.

A.	Scholls-Sherwood	2,300 LF	$ 185,000
B.	Adams Extension	2,700 LF	$ 225,000
C.	Miscellaneous Loops		$ 605,000
		TOTAL	$1,015,000

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.

Source of Funds: Water Replacement Fund, Water Fund.

B.	Meinecke/99W (8")	2,000 LF		$ 128,000
			TOTAL	$ 128,000

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.

Source of Funds: Water Replacement Fund, Water Fund.

A.	Lower Lincoln (8")	1,000 LF		$ 65,000
B.	Oregon (8")	1,300 LF		$ 78,000
D.	Lower Roy (8")	1,300 LF		$ 78,000
E.	Gleneagle (8")	3,000 LF		$ 185,000
F.	Upper Roy (8")	900 LF		$ 56,000
			TOTAL	$ 462,000

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 SDCs.

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

A.	12 Inch	14,300 LF		$1,750,000
B.	10 Inch	26,700 LF		$2,440,000
C.	8 Inch	18,600 LF		$1,800,000
			TOTAL	$5,990,000

TOTAL ALL WATER PROJECTS: $12,610,500

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 are lower priority because they are not required until the City approaches built-out densities within the UGB. The various sources of funds have been evaluated, and the revenue flow during the five-year period has been estimated These factors are utilized when programming the projects.

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; and the size of line (larger lines get higher priority).

   Source of Funds: City Sewer SDC Funds, Sewer Fund, development.

A.	Scholls-Sherwood W.	1,200 LF		$ 75,000
B.	Scholls-Sherwood E.	2,000 LF		$ 120,000
C.	Woodhaven S. (10")	4,100 LF		$ 284,000
C.	E. Sunset	1,300 LF		$ 78,000
D.	W. Sunset	3,500 LF		$ 182,000
			TOTAL	$ 739,000

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 the line will be developer (lower) or City (higher) built; and the size of line (larger lines get higher priority).

   Source of Funds: City Sewer SDC Funds, Sewer Fund, development.

A.	Adams/12th	3,000 LF		$ 173,000
C.	Tonquin	1,400 LF		$ 84,000
			TOTAL	$ 257,000

3. Regional Trunk Lines

   "Parallel" trunks 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 lines is distinct from that for basin service lines.

Source of Funds: USA Sewer SDC Fund, General Obligation or Revenue Bonds.

D.	Cedar Creek Parallel (15" - 30")	12,640 LF		$1,320,000
D.	Rock Creek Parallel (18")	6,750 LF		$ 485,000
E.	BPA	3,500 LF		$ 212,000
E.	Onion Flats W.	5,000 LF		$ 295,000
E.	Onion Flats E.	2,900 LF		$ 192,000
			TOTAL	$2,504,000

4. Replacement of existing lines

Although not covered by a "replacement fund" as with older waterlines, a critical need exists to replace the old lines throughout the city. This category identifies and costs those older lines throughout the city.

D.	Various older existing sewer lines	8,700 LF		$ 652,200
			TOTAL	$ 652,200

TOTAL ALL SEWER PROJECTS: $4,152,500

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 important. 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. The various sources of funds have been evaluated, and the revenue flow during the five year period has been estimated. These factors are utilized when programming the projects.

1. Minor Collectors (existing)

Existing minor collectors are prioritized based on a mix of criteria. Some collectors are already in the budget cycle, and these tend to be higher priority. The collectors farthest from meeting minimum standards were rated higher, as were the collectors most impacted by nearby development.

Source of Funds: City Street SDC Fund, grants in some cases, Street Fund.

B.	Washington(Willamette-Division)	600 LF	$ 125,000
C.	Pine (Division-Sunset)	1,300 LF	$ 345,000
D.	Willamette (Norton-Roy)	650 LF	$ 97,000
E.	Willamette (Washington Norton)	1,500 LF	$ 88,000
		TOTAL	$ 655,000

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 (e.g. an intersection of two arterials was rated higher than the intersection of two collectors, etc.).

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

A.	Murdock/Sunset/Baker	n/a	$ 450,000
A.	Oregon/Murdock	n/a	$ 254,000
B.	Meinecke/99W (inc. realignment)	n/a	$ 325,000
C.	Pine/Division/ Washington	n/a	$ 179,000
D.	Oregon/SPRR	n/a	$ 302,000
E.	Villa/Park/Railroad	n/a	$ 175,000
		TOTAL	$1,685,000

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: Street Fund, development.

A.	Murdock/Roy to Baker Rd.		$ 550,000
A.	S. Sherwood (Sunset-Division)	1,300 LF	$ 502,000
A.	Oregon(Murdock-TS Rd.)	3,400 LF	$2,750,000
B.	Oregon(SPRR-Murdock)	2,700 LF	$ 605,000
C.	S. Sherwood (Division-SPRR)	600 LF	$ 107,000
C.	Scholls-Sherwood	4,250 LF	$1,403,000
E.	Meinecke (Lee-"Salisbury")	2,000 LF	$ 404,000
F.	Murdock(graveled section)	1,400 LF	$ 530,000
F.	W. Sunset (Ladd Hill-SPRR)	2,300 LF	$ 802,000
G.	E. Sunset (Murdock-Ladd Hill)	2,000 LF	$ 748,000

H.	Murdock(paved section)	2,200 LF		$ 450,000
I.	W. Sunset(SPRR-Middleton)	3,300 LF		$1,176,300
			TOTAL	$10,027,300

4. Signalization

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

Source of Funds: ODOT, County, development, TIF Fund, Street Fund.

A.	Oregon/Tualatin-Sherwood	n/a		$ 155,000
B.	Meinecke/99W	n/a		$ 155,000
C.	Sunset/99W	n/a		$ 155,000
			TOTAL	$ 465,000

5. Major Collectors w/bikelanes

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

Source of Funds: TIF Fund, Street Fund, development in some cases.

A.	Oregon (SPRR-Pine)	1,300 LF		$ 950,000
D.	12th (99W-N. Sherwood)	1,200 LF		$ 102,000
D.	12th Extension (N. Sherwood-TS Rd.)	3,000 LF		$1,009,000
			TOTAL	$2,061,000

6. Minor Arterials w/o bikelanes

Existing roads receive a higher prioritization than planned roads.

Source of Funds: TIF Fund, Street Fund, development in some cases.

A.	Ladd Hill	700 LF		$ 250,000
			TOTAL	$ 250,000

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.

Source of Funds: TIF Fund, Street Fund, development in some cases.

B.	Willamette (Roy-Murdock)	400 LF		$ 95,000
B.	Borcher	2,800 LF		$ 392,000
C.	Edy	3,400 LF		$ 820,000
D.	Adams Extension	1,800 LF		$ 750,000
E.	Baker	700 LF		$ 154,000
			TOTAL	$2,211,000

8. Minor Collectors (new)

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

Sources of Funds: City Street SDC Fund, Street Fund, development.

A.	Adams (OR-Willamette)	800 LF		$ 234,000
B.	Woodhaven (Meinecke-Sunset)	3,300 LF		$ 920,000
C.	West Sherwood	4,400 LF		$1,214,000
			TOTAL	$2,368,000

9. Local Streets

Sources of Funds: Street Fund, General Obligation Bonds.

A.	Various substandard local streets throughout Washington Hill and Old Town area 11,300 LF		$2,600,000
		TOTAL	$2,600,000

TOTAL ALL STREET PROJECTS $22,322,300

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Prioritization of parks and open space projects into general categories is based on the following criteria: land acquisition received highest priority, construction of parks, open space and associated facilities received second priority (with such facilities being sub-prioritized top to bottom: community level, neighborhood level, mini-park level), and "stand alone" recreational facilities received lowest priority. "Stand alone" facilities, when included in community or neighborhood parks, would receive the priority of that park. The various sources of funds have been evaluated, and the revenue flow during the five-year period has been estimated. This factor is utilized when programming the projects.

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 received the next highest ranking, land for other community and neighborhood parks received third priority, greenways outside of UGB fourth, and "significant natural areas" and mini-park land acquisition received lowest priority.

Source of Funds: Parks and Open Space SDC Fund, development.

A.	Greenway	90 ac.	$ 360,000
B.	Greenway Access	32 ac.	$1,280,000
C.	Neighborhood Park (3)	24 ac.	$ 960,000
D.	Sherwood-Scholls Park	15 ac.	$ 600,000
D.	Significant Natural Areas	55 ac.	$2,200,000
D.	Mini-parks (7)	7 ac.	$ 280,000
		TOTAL	$5,680,000

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.

Source of Funds: Parks and Open Space SDC Fund, development, grants.

A.	Stella Olsen Park		$ 410,000
A.	Recreational Fields		$ 200,000
B.	"Off-Street" Pathways	40,150 LF	$ 722,700
C.	Neighborhood Parks (3)		$1,179,000

D. Sherwood-Scholls Park		$ 505,000
E. Mini-Parks (7)		$ 287,000
F. "Stand-alone" Court Facilities		$ 472,000
	TOTAL	$3,775,700
TOTAL ALL PARKS PROJECTS		**$9,445,700**

STORM WATER

Prioritization of storm water projects is based on the conclusions of the 1993 Storm Water Master Plan, which identified projects in 0-5 year, 5-10 year, 10-15 year, 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 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. We have determined the most effective method of programming would be to purchase all the required land first with the design and construction to follow.

1. Piping/Culverting

Source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees, USA, general obligation bonds, development.

A.	Old Town	$ 25,000
A.	Scholls-Sherwood	$ 60,000
A.	Sunset Blvd.	$ 115,000
B.	North of Oregon St.	$ 150,000
B.	Oregon Street	$ 30,000
B.	Rock Creek	$ 75,000
B.	Edy Road	$ 55,000
B.	Tualatin-Sherwood	$ 115,000
C.	Chicken Creek	$ 55,000
	TOTAL	$ 680,000

2. Local Treatment Facilities/Erosion Control

Source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees, USA, General obligation bonds, development.

A.	Greenway (90 ac.)	$ 360,000
A.	Park Street/Cedar Creek	$ 7,500
A.	Stella Olsen Park	$ 240,000
A.	Gleneagle	$ 245,000
A.	South Sherwood Blvd.	$ 380,000
A.	Edy Road	$ 245,000
A.	Sunset Blvd.	$ 230,000
B.	Murdock Road	$ 450,000
B.	North of Oregon Street	$ 380,000
B.	Tualatin-Sherwood Road	$ 225,000
	TOTAL	$2,762,500

3. Detention Facilities

Source of Funds: Regional and City Storm Water SDCs, user fees, USA, General obligation bonds, development.

B. Cedar Creek/SPRR		$ 95,000
	TOTAL	$ 95,000
TOTAL ALL STORM WATER PROJECTS		**$3,537,500**

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

WATER

	95-96		96-97	
BEGINNING BALANCE		$1,005,000		$1,434,850
INCOME		855,500		858,600
PROJECTS				
	Reservoir Booster Pump	30,000	Seismic Upgrade Reservoir	75,000
	Well No. 6 (Murdock)	295,650	Design for Bull Rull connection	164,160
	Emergency Power (Well No. 3)	100,000		
BALANCE		$1,434,850		$2,054,290

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

WATER (cont.)

	97-98		98-99	
BEGINNING BALANCE		$2,054,290		<$ 851,845>
INCOME		760,105		858,600
PROJECTS	Bull Run Connection	3,666,240	No projects scheduled	
BALANCE		<$ 851,845>		$ 6,755

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

WATER (cont.)

	99-00
BEGINNING BALANCE	$ 6,755
INCOME	604,361
PROJECTS	
Second Reservoir 5.0 mg	1,820,000
BALANCE	<$1,208,884>

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

SEWER

		95-96		96-97	
BEGINNING BALANCE					
	Regional Sewer	$ 175,000		$ 241,000	
	City Sewer		364,000		479,434
INCOME					
	Regional Sewer	66,000		66,000	
	City Sewer		115,434		115,434
PROJECTS					
BALANCE	Regional Sewer	$ 241,000		$ 307,000	
	City Sewer		479,434		594,868

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

SEWER (cont.)

		97-98		98-99	
BEGINNING BALANCE	Regional Sewer	$ 307,000		$ 362,000	
	City Sewer		597,868		694,063
INCOME	Regional Sewer	55,000		44,000	
	City Sewer		96,195		76,956
PROJECTS					
BALANCE	Regional Sewer	$ 362,000		$ 406,000	
	City Sewer		694,063		771,019

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

SEWER (cont.)

		99-00	
BEGINNING BALANCE			
	Regional Sewer	$ 406,000	
	City Sewer		771,019
INCOME			
	Regional Sewer	44,000	
	City Sewer		76,956
PROJECTS			
BALANCE	Regional Sewer	$ 450,000	
	City Sewer		847,975

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STREETS

	95-96		96-97	
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 875,000		$ 385,660
INCOME		510,660		510,660
PROJECTS				
	Murdock (Roy-Baker) Sunset/Murdock Inter.	925,000		
			Oregon Street (G&T-SPRR)	750,000
	Misc Sidewalks	75,000		
BALANCE		$ 385,660		$ 146,320

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STREETS (cont.)

		97-98		98-99
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 146,320		$ 269 870
INCOME		425,550		340,440
PROJECTS	Oregon/SPRR Inter.	302,000	No projects scheduled	
BALANCE		$ 269,870		$ 610,310

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STREETS (cont.)

		99-00
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 610,310
INCOME		340,440
PROJECTS	Oregon Street (SPRR-Pine)	950,000
BALANCE		$ 750

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

PARKS

		95-96	96-97
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 100,000	$ 77,300
INCOME		252,300	252,300
PROJECTS	Land Acquistion	75,000	200,000
	Park Improvements		55,000
	Recreational Fields	200,000	
BALANCE		$ 77,300	$ 74,600

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

PARKS (cont.)

		97-98	98-99
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 74,600	$ 19,850
INCOME		210,250	168,200
PROJECTS			
	Land Acquistion	200,000	85,000
	Parks Improvements	65,000	95,000
BALANCE		$ 19,850	$ 8,050

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

PARKS (cont.)

		99-00
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 8,050
INCOME		168,200
PROJECTS		
	Land Acquistion	50,000
	Parks Improvements	120,000
BALANCE		$ 6,250

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STORMWATER

		95-96	96-97
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 90,000	$ 44,000
INCOME		84,000	84,000
PROJECTS	Land Acquistion	130,000	100,000
BALANCE		$ 44,000	$ 28,000

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STORM WATER (cont.)

		97-98	98-99
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 28,000	$ 8,000
INCOME		70,000	56,000
PROJECTS	Land Acquistion	90,000	
BALANCE		$ 8,000	$ 64,000

FIVE YEAR PROJECT PLAN

STORM WATER (cont.)

		99-00
BEGINNING BALANCE		$ 64,000
INCOME		56,000
PROJECTS		
	Facility Construction (to be determined)	110,000
BALANCE		$ 10,000

ASSUMPTIONS

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

Water
12" = $92 LF
10" = $85 LF
8" = $75 LF

Sewer
12" = $89 LF
10" = $75 LF
8" = $65 LF

Streets
Minor Arterial w/bikelanes = $320 LF
Minor Arterial w/o bikelanes = $385 LF
Major Collector w/bikelanes = $243 LF
Major Collector w/o bikelanes= $230 LF
Minor Collector = $230 LF

2. Income is based upon the following residential construction activity with commercial fees utilized for any SDC credits. The SDCs are assumed to be stable at this time.

Year	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Residential Housing Units	300	300	250	200	200

3. Greenway acquistion is assumed to benefit open space, groundwater supply and storm water/quality/quantity plans. Therefore the cost of acquiring 270 acres of greenway (at $4,000. an acre) is allocated among Storm Water, Water, and Parks CIPs.

4. Parks: In the first part of the plan the primary focus is on land acquistion. It is assumed funds for maintenance will become available later so that park improvements can be made. Park improvements will consist of playground equipment, irrigation, trails and signage.