



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2524

Phone: (503) 373-0050

First Floor/Coastal Fax: (503) 378-6033

Second Floor/Director's Office: (503) 378-5518

Web Address: <http://www.oregon.gov/LCD>

NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT



January 26, 2006

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan
or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Mara Ulloa, Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: City of Aurora Plan Amendment
DLCD File Number 003-05

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures*

DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: February 8, 2006

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review 45 days prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS 197.830 (2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

***NOTE: THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAN IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.**

Cc: Doug White, DLCD Community Services Specialist
Gary Fish, DLCD Regional Representative
John Rankin, City of Aurora

<paa> ya/

DLCD NOTICE OF ADOPTION

JAN 19 2006

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision** per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18

LAND CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT

(See reverse side for submittal requirements)

Jurisdiction: City of Aurora Local File No.: _____
(If no number, use none)

Date of Adoption: 1/10/06 (Must be filled in) Date Mailed: 1/17/06 (Date mailed or sent to DLCD)

Date the Notice of Proposed Amendment was mailed to DLCD: 10/20/05

- Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
 - Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
 - Land Use Regulation Amendment
 - Zoning Map Amendment
 - New Land Use Regulation
 - Other: _____
- (Please Specify Type of Action)

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write [See Attached.]

An ordinance adopting the City of Aurora Parks
Master Plan and amending the Aurora
Comprehensive Plan policies for recreation.

Describe how the adopted amendment differs from the proposed amendment. If it is the same, write [Same.] If you did not give notice for the proposed amendment, write [N/A.]

same except SDC methodology was amended
to reflect corrected population count.

Plan Map Changed from: n/a to n/a

Zone Map Changed from: n/a to n/a

Location: n/a Acres Involved: n/a

Specify Density: Previous: n/a New: n/a

Applicable Statewide Planning Goals: Goal 8

Was an Exception Adopted? Yes: _____ No: X

DLCD File No.: 003-05
(14755)

Did the Department of Land Conservation and Development **receive** a notice of Proposed Amendment **FORTY FIVE (45) days prior to the first evidentiary hearing.** Yes: No: If no, do the Statewide Planning Goals apply. Yes: No:

If no, did The Emergency Circumstances Require immediate adoption. Yes: No:
Affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts: City of Aurora

Local Contact: John A. Rankin LLC Area Code + Phone Number: 503-625-9710
Address: 26715 SW Baker Rd City: Sherwood
Zip Code+4: 97140 Email Address: _____

ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision**
per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.

1. Send this Form and TWO (2) Copies of the Adopted Amendment to:
ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540
2. Submit **TWO (2) copies** the adopted material, if copies are bounded please submit **TWO (2) complete copies** of documents and maps.
3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE (5) working days** following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
5. The deadline to appeal will not be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE (21) days** of the date, the [] Notice of Adoption [] is sent to DLCD.
6. In addition to sending the [] Notice of Adoption [] to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
7. **Need More Copies?** You can copy this form on to 8-1/2x11 green paper only ; or call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to:(503) 378-5518; or Email your request to Larry.French@state.or.us - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

ORDINANCE NO. 443**AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE CITY OF AURORA PARKS MASTER PLAN AND AMENDING THE AURORA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The Aurora City Council ordains as follows:

Section 1. Title. This Ordinance shall be known and may be cited as the "Aurora Parks Master Plan Plan". The City of Aurora Parks Master Plan and all exhibits thereto, attached to the original and on file in the City Recorders Office, are incorporated herein.

Section 2. Adoption of Plan. Based on the findings of the staff report dated November 29, 2005; the testimony at the public hearings on December 6, 2005 and December 13, 2005; and the Aurora Planning Commission recommendation dated December 9, 2005; the City of Aurora Parks Master Plan, attached to the original of this ordinance and on file in the City Recorders Office, is hereby adopted.

Section 3. Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

1. The last paragraph of Aurora Comprehensive Plan VI.F, Public Facilities Recreation, is repealed in its entirety and replaced by the following paragraph:

"The City has developed a Parks Master Plan which, among other things, requires that new development pay a systems development charge for parks."

2. Aurora Comprehensive Plan IX.H, Policies Recreation, is repealed in its entirety and replaced by the following:

H. Recreation (Goal 8)

Objective: Provide adequate recreational opportunities for City residents.

Policies:

1. The City will provide additional park and recreational facilities as needed to meet the park and recreational standards of the Aurora Parks Master Plan, subject to economic constraints.
2. The City will seek new sources of revenue to finance the acquisition, development, and maintenance of additional park and recreational facilities.
3. The City will seek to develop a park site in the northeast portion of the urban growth boundary, but this policy does not prohibit development for additional recreation facilities in other locations.

- 4. Where possible, the City will standardize park and recreation amenities for ease of maintenance and aesthetics. All park facilities will comply with ADA requirements.
- 5. The City will strive to improve level of maintenance in the current city park facilities, subject to economic constraints.
- 6. The City will improve park signage including identification of facilities, information regarding use of facilities and directional signage to help users locate facilities.
- 7. The City will continue to support a partnership to develop the entire Mill Creek Greenway pedestrian trail and will continue efforts to develop the portion of the Mill Creek Greenway within the Aurora urban growth boundary as a pedestrian trail.
- 8. The City will strive to develop property already under municipal ownership for recreational purposes where feasible.

Section 4. Effective Date. To provide for the orderly and efficient development and use of land within the City, thereby preserving the natural qualities and value of the land and promoting the health, peace, safety and welfare of the residents and inhabitants of the City, it is necessary that the terms of this ordinance become effective immediately. An emergency is hereby declared to exist, and this ordinance shall be effective on January 11, 2005.

INTRODUCED TO THE AURORA CITY COUNCIL and read for the first time at the December 13, 2005 Council Meeting; ordered posted for not less than five days as provided by the Aurora City Charter; scheduled for second reading and enactment by the City Council at a regular meeting thereof on January 10, 2005.

Adopted by the City Council, after the second reading, on 10th day of January, 2005 by the following vote:

AYES: 4
 NAYES: 0
 ABSTENTION: 0

Signed by the Mayor this 13th day of January, 2005.

CITY OF AURORA, OREGON

Brian Conr
 Mayor

ATTEST:
Jamie Boyce
 City Recorder

City of Aurora



Park Master Plan

October, 2005 Draft

**City of Aurora
Park Master Plan**

Prepared by:

**Laurie Boyce, City Recorder
Pat Fox, Administrative Assistant
Debbie Rose, Parks Committee
Ricky Sellers, Public Works Superintendent
Robert Southard, Public Works Assistant
Leesa Townsend, Citizen
Joseph Schaefer, Councilor
Charles Donald, Councilor
Jonathan Gibson, Past Mayor
Tom Ramsey, Councilor
John Steward, Councilor
John A. Rankin, LLC**

Index

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Socioeconomic and Land Use Trends	3
Chapter 3	Park Facilities Inventory	9
Chapter 4	Mill Creek Greenway Trial	11
Chapter 5	Written Survey Results	13
Chapter 6	Phone Survey Results	14
Chapter 7	Student Meeting Results	18
Chapter 8	Interview Results	20
Chapter 9	Capital Facilities Planning	25
Chapter 10	SDC Methodology and Calculations	30
Chapter 11	Suggested Goals.....	32
Chapter 12	Funding Alternatives.....	34

Chapter 1

Introduction

Location

The City of Aurora is located in the northern end of Marion County, 22 miles from Portland, Oregon and 8 miles from Woodburn, Oregon. Aurora is situated near the confluence of Mill Creek and the Pudding River.

The City is bisected by U.S. 99 E., the old main north/south highway running east of the Willamette River. The Aurora State Airport is about one mile north of town, lying between Airport Road and Hubbard Cut-off Road. Interstate 5 bypasses Aurora about 3 miles to the west.

History

Originally known as the Aurora Colony, founded in 1856 by Dr. William Keil and his followers, the City was incorporated in February 1893. The original colony was one of the most socially and economically successful 19th century experiments in communal Christian living.

The City's rich past created a sense of pride and continuity that current residents still hold for their community. To strengthen this heritage, the Aurora Colony Historic District was placed on the National Register of Historic Places, in 1974. A significant portion of the local commerce results from antique based business related to the Colony.

Climate¹

The Aurora area has a temperate maritime climate with moderately warm, dry summers and mild, wet winters. Average annual precipitation is approximately 40 inches per year, 60% of which falls between November and February while only 10% occurs between June and September. Snowfall is rare. Prevailing winds are from the west and northwest during the summer and from the south and southwest during the winter. Seasonal temperature variations are relatively small. The average July temperature is 80 degrees while the average January one is 33 degrees. Temperatures below 20 degrees and above 100 degrees are unusual. The frost-free season extends from April through October, approximately 200 days.

Park Planning Background

In 1995, a group of citizens identified a need to more adequately plan for Aurora's future. Specifically, they wanted to improve the Aurora Memorial Park to meet the recreational needs of residents and ensure a continued high quality of life. This group drafted goals related to maintenance and improvement of the existing park. The Parks Committee currently meets once or twice a month to decide on a project that needs attention and they schedule a work crew to accomplish this task.

¹ Aurora Comprehensive Plan
City of Aurora Park Master Plan
Effective January 10, 2006

In 2001, the City updated its Comprehensive Plan adopting the following goals and policies for park, recreation and open space:

1. The City will provide additional park and recreational facilities as needed to meet statewide park and recreational standards subject to economic constraints.
2. The City will seek new sources of revenue to finance the acquisition, development, and maintenance of additional park and recreational facilities.
3. The City will explore the feasibility of acquiring a future park site in the northeast portion of the UGB.

The Aurora Comprehensive Plan states “the City will develop a Parks Master Plan which, among other things, will require that new development either dedicate additional park land or pay a fee in lieu thereof to fund the City’s purchase of additional park land to serve the park and recreation needs of the community.”² The current Systems Development Charge for parks (\$1,511 per single family residence) is generally regarded as “fee in lieu of”.

The process continued in January of 2004, when the City of Aurora conducted a survey to find out what improvements people wanted in the Aurora Memorial Park. When the survey was complete, City staff met with the City Attorney/Planner to review the City of Aurora’s Comprehensive Plan and better understand the City’s adopted goals and objectives.

Staff then began collecting key information regarding population, demographics and land use trends affecting Aurora and its residents, as one element for determining future park and recreation needs. A facilities inventory was performed to determine the quality, condition and scope of park and recreation resources available in the Aurora area. Staff conducted a demand analysis to determine residents’ current recreational activities, and what they desire in terms of parks. The demand analysis consisted of three elements: a community survey, student meetings, and stakeholder interviews.

Aurora’s existing park and recreation resources were compared to nationally recognized standards in order to determine the desired levels of service. Preliminary cost estimate information was collected for park and recreation maintenance, recommended improvements and new developments.

Staff compiled information on potential funding sources to provide alternative mechanisms for funding park and recreation. A list of recommendations, a systems development methodology, and draft ordinances were prepared based on this data.

² Aurora Comprehensive Plan , Public Facilities Inventory, Recreation, page 39
City of Aurora Park Master Plan
Effective January 10, 2006

Chapter 2 Socio Economic and Land Use Analysis

One set of factors used to determine future park needs are the socio economic and land use trends affecting Aurora and its residents. These trends include population, housing, construction, age composition and children and school enrollment.

Data Sources

The City of Aurora used U.S. Census Bureau data as a primary data source. Staff also referenced additional data sources wherever possible because the most recent Census data is from 2000 and Aurora has changed considerably since 2000. Where available, multiple data sources were compared. Additional data sources included:

1. PSU Center for Population Research and Census
2. Oregon Economic Development Department
3. Oregon Bureau of Economic Analysis
4. North Marion School District
5. Aurora Building Permits

Population and Growth

Table 2-1 shows Aurora's population growth between 1980 and 1990 at approximately the same rate metropolitan Portland was experiencing. Between 1990 and 2000, however, Aurora's population grew far more rapidly than either Portland or the State of Oregon overall. With the new sewer system, the growth rate is expected to continue outpacing the Portland metropolitan area and the State of Oregon.

Table 2-1 ³						
Population Growth for Aurora, Portland, and Oregon						
1970-2000						
Year	Aurora	Percent Change Overall	Portland Metro	Percent Change Overall	Oregon	Percent Change Overall
1970	306	33%	824,926		2,091,533	
1980	523	101%	1,242,645	51%	2,633,195	26%
1990	567	17%	1,477,895	19%	2,842,321	8%
2000	655	42%	1,874,449	27%	3,421,399	20%

³ Sources: Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (www.oea.das.state.or.us/econ.htm), PSU Center for Population Research and Census

Portland State University bases its population projections on increases in available housing stock and estimated numbers per household. Building permit records show the number of permits issued for single-family housing development started rising in 2003 (Table 2-2). Aurora issued 80 building permits for new residential construction between January, 2003 and September, 2005. All of the permits issued were for single family residences.

Table 2-2⁴	
Building Permits from 2002-2004	
Year	Number of Permits Issued
2001	0
2002	0
2003	25
2004	26
2005	29⁵

In the summer of 2005, staff conducted a door to door survey to determine the number of persons actually residing in Aurora. The final count was 870 persons. The 2000 census indicated that Aurora had 655 persons. Assuming the population increase is the result of issuing 81 building permits, there are approximately 2.66 persons per household in the City of Aurora.

In their 2015 population forecast, Marion County has projected a 1.4% growth rate for the City of Aurora. For master planning purposes, the City of Aurora uses the historic annual growth rate from 1960 through 2000 of approximately 2.8%. Based on the door to door survey and the building permits issued, the cumulative overall growth rate from 2000 through 2005 was 6%. Using the same data, the growth rate from 2003 through 2005 was 10%. Table 2-3, on page 6, compares population projections at 2.8%, 6% and 10%.

Based on available land due to recent annexations and the approval of several subdivision applications, the number of single-family building permits issued is projected to continue at rate higher than the historic annual growth for the foreseeable future. However, future growth beyond the existing approvals are expected to be limited due to the capacity of existing municipal water and sewer systems.

⁴ Source: Aurora Building Department

⁵ As of 9/27/05

**Table 2-3
Population Projections
Based on 2005 local census/survey and building permits**

	2.80%	6.00%	10.00%
2005	870	870	870
2006	894	922	957
2007	919	978	1,053
2008	945	1,036	1,158
2009	972	1,098	1,274
2010	999	1,164	1,401
2011	1,027	1,234	1,541
2012	1,056	1,308	1,695
2013	1,085	1,387	1,865
2014	1,115	1,470	2,051
2015	1,147	1,558	2,257
2016	1,179	1,652	2,482
2017	1,212	1,751	2,730
2018	1,246	1,856	3,003
2018	1,281	1,967	3,304
2020	1,316	2,085	3,634
2021	1,353	2,210	3,998
2022	1,391	2,343	4,397
2023	1,430	2,483	4,837
2024	1,470	2,632	5,321
2025	1,511	2,790	5,853

Age of Population

According to the Aurora School District Enrollment Projection Update, Aurora will be directly affected by decisions made by Metro, the planning authority for the Portland metropolitan region. Some of the biggest issues Metro is facing include implementing the 2040 Plan and the location of the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). While Aurora lies outside of Metro's current UGB and is beyond its jurisdiction, the City will be affected by Metro's decisions. Aurora is in close proximity to the Portland metropolitan area, and may over time become even more attractive to developers and prospective homeowners.

Table 2-4 shows the need for services for both older and younger populations are increasing. According to the U.S. Census, there is a projected 27 percent increase in the 45 to 54 year old age group which indicates that services for an aging population will continue to be in demand. There is also an increase in of nearly 20 percent in the number of 5 to 19 year olds, which indicates a current need for recreational services for school age citizens as well as a sustained demand for parks and recreational services as this group ages.

Table 2-4 breaks down each age category into its percent of the total population as well as defining the amount of change per category between 1990 and 2000. It also shows the percent change from 1990 to 2000 and the change per category between 1990 and 2000. Information per age category is useful in that it allows the City to plan for recreational demand for programs and parks amenities, and target projects to age-appropriate activities and amenities.

Table 2-4 ⁶							
Age: Persons and Percent of Population in Aurora							
1990		2000		2010		Change in	
						Percent	
Age Group	No. of Persons	Percent of Pop.	No. of Persons	Percent of Pop.	Amount	Percent	Percent 1990-2000
Under 5	715	8.0	47	7.2%	295	41.3	-0.4
5 to 19			49	19.6%			20%
20-24			40	4.7%			
25-44			39	27.8%			
45-64			31	27.6%			27%
65-84			117	11.9%			
85 Years or more			128	1.2%			

The 1990 U.S. Census reports that 22 percent of Aurora residents between 16 and 64 were mobility limited while 2 percent of residents between 65 and 84, and over were mobility

⁶ Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000
 City of Aurora Park Master Plan
 Effective January 10, 2006

limited. As Aurora's population ages, meeting the needs of increasing numbers of younger people is going to be an increasing challenge.

School Enrollment

The North Marion School District (NMSD) includes students from the communities of Hubbard, Donald, Butteville, Broadacres, and Aurora. The number of children in Aurora and the surrounding areas is increasing due to in-migration of families in Aurora and the surrounding areas and the natural increase. Among school-age children, the NMSD is projecting that there will be an increase in all levels of the school due to new housing.

NMSD predicts increased high school enrollment that may stress the District's capacity for the foreseeable future, although the school district projects that enrollment will not increase as sharply as in 1991. (See Table 2-5). If construction of single family residences continues at current levels, NMSD is predicting, the high school will be over crowded in the next five years.

NMSD projects the states enrollment for 2004/2005 to be 134 in Kindergarten, 1090 in grades 1-8, and 550 in grades 9-12 for a total enrollment of 1,774. As of September 13, 2004, the District had underestimated the enrollment by 129 students. District findings are based on average daily membership, not actual number of students.

Table 2-5⁷
North Marion School District Enrollment by Level of Instruction

Year	Grades K-5		Grades 6-8		Grades 9-12	
	Fall Enrollment	Percent Change	Fall Enrollment	Percent Change	Fall Enrollment	Percent Change
1991	693	7 %	302	9%	362	1%
1992	753	2%	332	5%	363	6%
1993	769	-1%	353	4%	388	2%
1994	761	4%	370	10%	396	-3%
1995	797	0%	396	2%	384	6%
1996	800	2%	408	-4%	411	5%
1997	823	-3%	392	3%	437	8%
1998	799	0%	405	3%	475	2%
1999	803	-8%	419	-1%	486	15%
2000	742	5%	413	4%	575	-8%
2001	782	5%	433	-2%	532	4%
2002	789	1%	422	4%	559	0%
2003	804	4%	444	1%	564	7%
2004	845	-2%	451	1.04%	607	1.03%

⁷ Source: North Marion School District Number 15 Enrollment Projection Update (1999)

Findings

Aurora's landscape and population is changing rapidly, and the recreational services and parks will need to respond to these changes. The City of Aurora is becoming more similar to its metropolitan neighbors to the north in its need for recreation and rate of growth.

Aurora is experiencing a population growth at a significantly higher rate than the statewide average. Should the current 5 year 6.6% growth rate continue, by 2020, Aurora would have 2,500 residents. This influx of residents will increasingly strain Aurora's ability to provide a quality park facility and services.

Single family housing is being developed at a rapid pace, especially on the fringes of the urbanized area. Portland's and Canby's land use policies could increase the demand for additional housing in and around Aurora in the future as people seek homes in less dense urban areas.

Due to the location of existing facilities, the residents currently best served by those facilities live in the south end of the community. There is a need for recreational facilities at the north end of the community.

The number of children in Aurora as a percentage of the overall Aurora population is increasing. Birth rates are rising and families are moving into Aurora with young children. There will be an increase in all age groups for the North Marion School District which will increase the need for the park facilities.

Chapter 3

Park Facilities Inventory

Aurora Public Work's Department's inventoried the quality, condition and scope of Memorial Park, the primary recreation facility in Aurora. This inventory serves as a foundation for analysis of potential sites in which to improve or expand Aurora's park facilities. The inventory includes the location and physical characteristics of Memorial Park and concerns related to that facility.

Approximately seven acres in size, Memorial Park is located between Main and Liberty Streets at the south end of the community. Memorial Park has the following amenities:

- A dumpster
- Play Structure
- Swing Set with a Slide
- Stage Coach
- One bike rack
- Two park benches
- One drinking fountain
- Water and electric outlets
- Two lighted and covered serving areas with concrete floors
- 14 picnic tables
- Seasonal Restroom Facilities
- Bleachers
- Two horse shoe pits
- Mature Douglas Firs and other trees
- Tennis court
- Basketball court
- Baseball diamond

Concerns

The landscape is not neat in appearance. Vegetation is sparse in several areas. Low-maintenance ground cover and plantings may be an effective cosmetic improvement. The current electrical system, although recently upgraded, is still not adequate for some events held in the park. The park only has two park benches throughout the entire whole park for parents to sit on to watch their kids. The City of Aurora does not have any signs on Highway 99E to let people know that the City has a park. The bicycle rack needs to be secure. Some evidence of vandalism exists in and around the park rest rooms. The baseball diamond is in very poor shape. The basketball and tennis courts need to be resurfaced.

Additional Properties

Tax Map Number 41W12CD, Lot 1200 at 21711 Main Street NE, referred to as "the hotel property", is also located at the north end of Aurora and is separated from the downtown area by the rail road right of way. The site contains 23,000 square feet.

Tax Map Number 41W12CD, Lots 200, 299, 300, 400, 1500,1600 and 1700 and Tax Map Number 41W12CA Lot 1800. Referred to as the “old sewer property”, this site is located on the north end of Aurora and is separated from the downtown area by the railroad right of way. The six tax lots contain approximately 1.14 acres of property zoned industrial and 7.52 acres of property zoned flood hazard.

Chapter 4

Mill Creek Greenway Trail

A regional facility identified as the North Mill Creek Trail is proposed to provide opportunities for residents and visitors, both adults and children, to stroll along peaceful Mill Creek, play in the water, explore the history of the area, grab a snack at a local market or lunch at a quaint restaurant, shop for antiques, or rest on a bench and enjoy the scenery. The trail would also provide a safe way for students to ride or walk from Hubbard and Aurora to and from North Marion schools, and would provide a safe and attractive bicycle and pedestrian connection between the fast-growing cities of Woodburn, Hubbard, and Aurora. The proposed trail would be located approximately fifteen minutes from the Portland metro area and twenty minutes from Salem. Approximately one half of the population of Oregon lives within a one hour drive of the trail.

Champoeg State Park, which is seven miles west of Aurora, recently became the starting point for Oregon's first permanently signed and maintained State Scenic Bikeway. The Scenic Bikeway, developed by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, follows along the Willamette River and is designed to link two of American's greatest bicycling cities, Portland and Eugene. The North Mill Creek Trail would offer those cyclists another area to explore and take them off trafficked country roads to the quiet of the trail. This trail could become the centerpiece of a great day trip for cyclists or hikers.

The North Mill Creek Master Plan project seeks to develop a comprehensive plan for the conceptual location of the trail, potential key acquisitions, development, the exploration of the feasibility of a Rails-with-Trails Program on an active rail line and management of a regional eight-mile trail that would connect to Woodburn's Mill Creek Greenway, through Hubbard and end in Aurora where Mill Creek flows into the Pudding River. Hubbard Business and Economic Development Group (HBED), and the cities of Hubbard and Aurora will be partners in implementing this project along with other interested public agencies, such as, the Marion County Parks and Marion County Public Works Departments, the North Marion School District, The Pudding River Watershed Council, private property owners, individuals and special interest groups.

The North Mill Creek trail, would connect North Marion schools to Hubbard and Aurora, Woodburn's parks to Hubbard and Aurora's neighborhoods to schools and parks, as well as, city to city. Within the City of Aurora, the project is identified as the Mill Creek Greenway. The City of Aurora needs to develop a master plan for the portion of the trail within the city limits. This plan would be a comprehensive guide to the acquisition, development, public use and management of the trail between Woodburn and Aurora. With consideration to the surrounding neighborhoods, the plan should consider all the environmental impacts on the watershed including:

1. Recreation
2. Storm Water Management
3. Non-motorized Transportation
4. Fish and Wildlife

5. Outdoor Education
6. Private Property Concerns
7. Scientific Exploration
8. Utility Rights-of-Way
9. Water Quality

This plan should provide a framework to acquire, develop, and operate the greenway as a system. This framework should provide a basis to justify funding from local sources and outside grants to acquire and develop the property. Specific elements of the plan should provide the following:

1. A detailed map that shows the route of an all-weather, non-motorized pathway.
2. Description of levels and types of development and recommended activities for each segment of the Greenway.
3. Strategies for acquisition.
4. Funding Sources.
5. Recommended phasing program.
6. An acquisition and construction cost estimates.

The process of developing the plan is important. Many of the properties currently are owned by private residential property. It is important that the plan promote the values of stewarding this natural resource, recreation, urban wildlife, wise management of storm water, physical fitness and non-motorized transportation. The planning process should build a sense of community ownership that stimulates public involvement in each phase of project development. The City of Aurora will need to work closely with surrounding cities to accomplish these goals.

Chapter 5 Written Survey Results

To measure resident's opinions regarding the existing Aurora park facilities, Aurora City Hall in conjunction with the Aurora Public Works Department distributed 330 surveys via first class mail on March 5, 2004 in conjunction with water billing. The survey was also left at the General Store for the general public to give their input, was distributed at the town hall meeting in January, 2005 and was mailed to customers that use the park on an annual basis.

On September 9, 2004, an additional 340 surveys were distributed via first-class mail to all residents and business owners in the city limits of Aurora. The City of Aurora used the mailing list from the water bill customers. See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

The survey asked respondents to prioritize issues related to the park and identify those most important to them. Table 6-1 shows the highlights of the concerns and safety issues at Memorial Park in order of their importance.

Table 6-1⁸

<u>Item of Concern</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
Replacement of Swing Set	13
General Cleanup	13
Electrical Problems Fixed	11
Old Park Equipment Removed	11
Tennis Courts	11
Existing Play Structures Removed	11
Water Fountain Fixed	10
Concrete Slabs for Picnic Tables	10
Aerial Photo of the Park	10
Removal of Stage Coach	10
Frame around existing play structure	10
Transform tennis courts into a skate park	10
Designated pet area	8
Plastic Benches	8

Additional comments from the Park Survey

- Better maintenance of restroom facilities
- Privacy doors on stalls in restrooms
- Security locks on restroom doors with keys provided to users and a fine for those who don't return the keys within a reasonable amount of time.

⁸A complete file of survey responses is available at City Hall
City of Aurora Park Master Plan
Effective January 10, 2006

Chapter 6 Phone Survey Results

In conjunction with the written survey process, during September, October, and November 2004, approximately 361 households with the Aurora city limits were contacted by telephone. Of these calls, 253 did not wish to participate and 108 responded.

**Table 7-1⁹
Importance of Parks and Recreation**

Importance	Number of Responses	Percentage of Total
Very Important	72	76%
Some What Important	22	23%
Not Important	1	1%
Total	95	100%

Aurora Public Works asked respondents which park and recreation facilities they, or members of their household, use, and how often. The following results include only the Memorial Park in Aurora, Oregon.

Table 7-2 indicates the importance of exercise to area residents. A majority of respondents (70 Percent)) indicate they exercise 2 or more times per week. Only 1 percent of survey respondents exercise at least six times a week.

**Table 7-2
Frequency of Exercise**

Number of Times per Week	Percentage of Total
3 Times a Week	32%
2-3 Times a Week	2%
6 Times a Week	6%
4 Times a Week	4%
3-4 Times a Week	4%
3-5 Times a Week	19%
Use the Park Occasionally	33%

⁹ A complete file of responses to the Aurora Community Phone Survey is available at City Hall.
City of Aurora Park Master Plan
Effective January 10, 2006

Importance of Recreational Activities

Residents were asked how important it is for them, or members of their household, to have access to certain recreational activities. Table 7-3 shows that nature enjoyment, special events, picnicking/barbeque facilities, playground equipment, basketball, designated pet area, more garbage cans, and installing a new drinking fountain are the activities and services respondents are most interested in having access to.

In comparison, respondents are least interested in horseshoe pits, in-line skating, volleyball, tennis courts, volleyball, and soccer. It should be noted that as survey respondents are generally adults. The table is organized with the most popular activities listed first.

**Table 7-3
Importance of Specific Recreational Activities**

Recreational Activity	Number of Responses	Very Important	Very Unimportant	Mean
Nature Enjoyment	46	48%	0	52%
Playground Equipment	31	32%	4	4%
Picnicking/Barbeque Pits	29	31%	8	8%
Install Drinking Fountain	29	31%	12	13%
Designated Pet Area	26	27%	18	19%
More Garbage Cans	25	26%	8	8%
Basketball	20	21%	15	16%
Special Events	19	2%	11	12%
Tennis Courts	19	2%	18	19%
Baseball/Softball	14	15%	12	13%
New Bigger Covered Areas	13	14%	26	27%
Horse shoe Pits	11	11%	28	29%
Volleyball	9	9%	19	2%
Slabs of Cement for Tables	9	9%	34	36%
Football	8	8%	27	28%
Skate boarding	7	7%	39	41%
In-Line Skating	6	6%	44	46%
Soccer	3	3%	34	36%

Note: The higher the mean score, the more that the activity is Not Important

Maintenance of Baseball/Softball Diamond

Currently, the City of Aurora has a baseball/softball diamond, but it is not maintained or updated. The bleachers need repair and the backstop needs new supports and fencing. City staff has received inquiries about renting the baseball/softball diamond to baseball or softball teams. However, after the coaches inspect the facility, they often do not want to rent the

field. Coaches have come back into the office to let the City staff know that they will not be renting the baseball/softball diamond because it is in too poor of condition for their teams to use. If the baseball/softball diamond was updated and maintained, the City of Aurora could anticipate more usage of the facilities.

The phone survey asked respondents how many would like to see the baseball/diamond updated and maintained.

**Table 7-4
Baseball/Softball Diamond Maintained**

Response	Number of Reponses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	58	61%
No	22	23%
Don't Use	1	1%
Not Important Now	1	1%
Don't Know	3	3%

Importance of a New Bathroom

Survey respondents were asked to address the adequacy of the existing restroom facilities which are not ADA compliant.

**Table 7-5
Are Existing Restroom Facilities Adequate?**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	27	28%
No	41	43%
Don't Know	17	18%
Haven't Used	4	4%

Table 7-6 summarizes the response to the question of "Do you think that the City should renovate the restroom facilities to make them appear cleaner and modern?"

**Table 7-6
The Need for Modern Restroom Facilities**

Reply	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	62	65%
No	17	17%
Don't Know	11	11%

Park Maintenance Fee

Table 7-7 summarizes the response to a proposal to add a \$1.00 per month park maintenance fee to the utility bill.

Table 7-7
\$1.00 Per Month Park Maintenance Fee

Reply	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	77	81%
No	16	16%
Don't Know	1	1%

Regulating Pet Usage

City staff has had many complaints about animal droppings in Memorial Park. Respondents were asked about adopting regulations related to pet usage of Memorial Park including requiring that pet owners pick up their pet's dropping and keep animals on leashes.

Table 7-8
Regulate Pet Usage

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	41	47%
No	36	41%
On Leash	2	2%
Don't Know	2	2%
Clean up Dropping	6	6%

Chapter 7

Student Meeting Results

Background

Aurora's youth are important users of the park facilities. Their input is vital for creating a Park Master Plan that best serves the needs of the entire community. While the Aurora Park and Community Survey asked respondents to represent their entire household's views, it was also important to hear directly from Aurora's youth.

Aurora students were invited to a Parks Committee Meeting on April 14, 2004 to discuss the student's request for a skate park.

On September 21, 2004, Debbie Rose, Parks Committee Member went to North Marion Primary School to survey the students on recreations needs. On September 16, 2004, Debbie Rose surveyed students at the North Marion Intermediate School.

Methodology

The student meeting was held during the April 14, 2004 Parks Committee Meeting, which started at 7:00 p.m. The meeting took approximately 50 minutes. The Parks Committee Secretary recorded the student's opinions and included them in the minutes.

Facilitators briefly introduced themselves and the project. The introduction was meant to give the Parks Committee a feel for who these youths were and their cause. The students explained to the Parks Committee why a skateboard park is very important to them. The information gathered from this student meeting is qualitative. Opinions are not meant to be representative of how all Aurora's youth feel about the park and the skateboard park. Nonetheless, these student ideas provide an important piece of the puzzle for help in planning for Aurora's future park needs.

Following discussion, the Parks Committee suggested a skateboard park may be more appropriate in a location other than Memorial Park to avoid disturbing so many neighbors. Further, it was suggested the students put together a list of supports and sponsors and take this information to the Council for further action. The minutes of this meeting are available at City Hall.

Intermediate School Focus Group

On September 16, 2004, Debbie Rose, Parks Committee, surveyed 130 students at the Intermediate School. Students suggested the following:

- Nice Bathrooms
- A Drinking Fountain
- Jogging/Walking Trail around the park
- More stuff for younger brothers and sisters to play with
- Resurfaced Basketball court with new hoops and nets
- New Park Benches to sit on

New Tables
Volleyball area with new net
New Backstop at the baseball diamond
Resurfaced Tennis Courts with new nets
Soccer Field
Fountain
Skate Park
Pool
Merry-Go-Round
Wading Pool
No Skate park
See Saw
Candy Tree
Lizards
Music in summer
Nicer animal areas
Flowers
Four squares
Slide
Butterflies
New swings
New Play Structure
Gym

North Marion Primary School Students

Debbie Rose surveyed 38 students and 14 adults at the North Marion Primary School on September 21, 2004. Results were as follows:

Nice Restrooms
A drinking Fountain
Jogging/Walking trail around the park
More stuff for younger brothers and sisters to play on
New Park benches
Resurfaced basketball court with new hoops and nets
Volleyball area with new net
New tables
New backstop at the baseball diamond
Resurfaced Tennis courts with new nets
New swings
New Slide
Tether Ball
Water Slide
Hop Scotch
Sand and Water area
Football field
Cut a few large trees down
Pay Phone

Chapter 8

Business Owner and Staff Interview Results

Background

The Aurora City Recorder conducted 9 interviews with local business owners and city staff. The interview process served a dual purpose. First, it allowed the City Recorder the opportunity to learn more about the Aurora area in general. Second, it provided insight into stakeholders' perceptions of the current park system.

The interviewees represented a wide range of community perspectives and included:

- Ricky Sellers, Public Works Superintendent
- Robert Southard, Public Works Assistant
- Ed Sigurdson, City Engineer
- Karen Townsend, Citizen and Business Owner
- Debbie Rose, Cub Scouts
Aurora Police Department
- Richard Harrison, former Mayor, currently mows the City Park
- Heidi Torian, Citizen who uses the park with her family
- Aaron Ensign, Citizen who uses the park with his family

Methodology

Interviews were conducted during the months of January and February of 2005. Most interviews were conducted through the mail. In either case, interviewees were asked to respond to approximately twelve questions. These responses were grouped into the seven categories listed below:

1. Perception of current park and recreation conditions;
2. Challenges faced by the park;
3. Perceptions of access and opportunities;
4. Visions for the future;
5. Volunteer opportunities;
6. Funding, acquisition and maintenance: Perceptions and possibilities.

A summary of opinions for each category is presented below. Responses have been edited for clarity, although Aurora Public Works has attempted to maintain responses in their original form wherever feasible. A complete file is available at City Hall.

Perceptions of Current Park and Recreation Conditions

Interviewees found Aurora's Park facilities to be in very poor condition, generally, although not everyone agreed that various improvements were warranted. In particular, almost everyone suggested some sort of physical improvement and/or increased maintenance was necessary in Aurora's Memorial Park. Many cited concern over the character of user groups which frequent the park as a deterrent to park use.

From the interviews, several common concerns were identified including:

1. Poor maintenance and lack of activities at Aurora Memorial Park;
2. General deficiency in maintenance of park amenities including picnic shelters, incorrect installation of drinking fountain, restrooms, deterioration of tennis and basketball courts and the need for at least two new picnic shelters.
3. Safety concerns such as worn equipment, especially the swings and slide.
4. Lighting deficiencies in Aurora Memorial Park.
5. Need for year round access to restroom facilities.
6. Appearance that the large grass area is under utilized.

Changes since Memorial Park was developed

While the responses we received varied, most interviewees felt Aurora's park system is not adequately meeting community needs. The following items were mentioned most frequently:

1. The City of Aurora has just recently seen a population growth for the City of Aurora that is likely to continue for many years. The park and recreation system has been challenged to keep up with population growth.
2. There is going to be an increased demand for utilization of the park. With the increased growth that the City of Aurora is expecting, there is going to be a need for a larger restroom, more picnic tables, and possibly two more covered picnic shelters.
3. Budget cuts and staff decreases have adversely affected the park and recreation, and maintenance and services.
4. Park accessibility must be updated to comply with the American with Disabilities Act.

Challenges Faced by Memorial Park

Interviewees were asked to identify Aurora's biggest challenges in the successful maintenance and development of the park. Responses are summarized as follows:

1. Lack of funding, especially during the times of budget cuts;
2. A lack of personnel to take care of the city park;
3. Update the park to make it more attractive for all ages. Buying and installing new equipment and developing some new interest areas. Developing a consistent program for maintenance, clean-up and funding;

4. Stable revenue to operate and maintain park assets. System Development Charges are bringing in money, to purchase new park land, but not for maintenance and operating costs;
5. Lack of interest, overgrowth of invasion plants, deterioration of tennis courts and basketball courts.

Perceptions of Access and Opportunities

Interviewees were asked if they thought any particular group(s) of people was being underserved by Aurora's current park services. Responses were fairly specific, and quite often reflected concerns for the physical setting of the park. Responses generally fit into the following categories:

1. There are few recreation opportunities for adults, such as walkers, joggers, youth, athletes, families and singles.
2. Have something for every age of youth. Keep what the park has to offer, but just fix it up.
3. Maintain the natural beauty of the park, primarily the mature Douglas firs.
4. Keep the picnic areas.

Visions for the Future

Interviewees were asked what they would ideally like to see happen with Aurora's Memorial Park in the next five to ten years. Included below are the suggestions:

1. Memorial Park needs to have scheduled clean-up, repair, and installation of new equipment. Adding more cement table pads.
2. Improved bathrooms.
3. Install a drinking fountain that meets State code requirements
4. A walking and or jogging trail.
5. Improved tennis courts and basketball courts.
6. Better playground equipment.
7. Acquisition of additional park land before it is all gone.
8. Increased tax revenue to support Memorial Park. The money needs to stay in the parks budgeted line item and be spent in Memorial Park and no where else in the City.

9. More park and recreation facilities and activities for adults (not just seniors).
10. The City needs to be able to hire a seasonal paid person to take care of the City Park.
11. The City Park is going to need to be brought up to the Americans With Disabilities Act's Requirements. The park needs to provide services even for the handicapped people that may want to use the City Park now and in the future. This would include playground equipment, new restrooms, handicapped parking, paved walkway to the restrooms and the playground that people in wheelchairs would be able to use.

Volunteer Opportunities

Interviewees were asked if they thought the community does, or would, benefit from volunteer help to maintain or improve the park in Aurora and if so, in what way. There is extensive volunteer work already being carried out. Additional suggestions are listed below:

1. Boy Scouts and Eagle scouts could be organized to perform more landscaping and improvement projects.
2. Various organizations are willing to work, but need directions. Creating a list of projects (through the Parks Master Plan) will help. Possibilities include:
 - Litter pickup
 - Brush and storm debris clean-up
 - Pruning of bushes and trees
 - Weeding eating where lawnmowers can't go
 - Pouring cement table pads.
 - Building new picnic shelters
 - Repairing the two existing picnic shelters
3. If volunteer activities were coordinated through the Parks Committee to the City Recorder or something similar, efforts might be easier and more effective.
4. Residents need to be educated on how much of the work at Memorial Park is voluntary. The City must provide constant publicity to attract the volunteer. If local groups are aware of the needs of the City Park, then they will work to take care of it. Efforts should be specific and organized well.

Funding: Acquisition and Maintenance

Interviewees were asked their opinions on how the park should be funded. Summaries of comments and suggestions are as follows:

1. Hire a fundraiser/grant writer. This would be an initial outlay of capital, but bring in much-needed financial support over the long run.
2. User fees will improve things a little, but they'll only go so far. Parents who are able should start contributing more for their children's use of the ball field. Increase the user fees for large groups.

3. The current funding is inadequate. The City provides the only park and recreation services in this City. People outside Aurora use city services, yet little financial support is provided from residents or public agencies outside of the city.
4. The City should use System Development Charges for perhaps some improvements to the park.
5. Require a non-refundable deposit for reserving covered picnic areas.

Findings

Major themes emerging from interviews are as follows:

1. Improvements are needed for almost all of Aurora's Memorial Park facilities.
2. Safety issues are a concern for many. In particular, current conditions in Aurora's Memorial Park are not conducive to safe and comfortable family use. This issue seems to be, at least in part, related to the issue of repair and maintenance.
3. Park funding, maintenance, acquisition and activity offerings are of great concern to all interviewees. Most feel the current park system is not keeping up with the current growth and development issues for the city.
4. The focus of the current park and recreation system should be broadened to include more passive-use recreational opportunities for adults, such as the development of walking and jogging trails.

Chapter 9

Capital Facilities Planning

Standards

The guidelines from the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department were consulted to determine how well Aurora is serving the community's recreational needs.

The NRPA identifies neighborhood parks are considered the basic unit of a park system and serve as the recreational and social focus of a neighborhood. Typically, they are developed for passive and active recreation, and accommodate a large variety of user types. Uses include:

- Sports
- Play Areas
- People Watching
- Picnicking
- Trails

A desirable size for a neighborhood park is one to five acres. Neighborhood parks should be centrally located in a service area one-quarter to one half mile. Community parks are generally 5 to 20 acres and include restrooms and onsite parking as well as diverse uses to serve larger populations. Community parks also serve as neighborhood parks for residences within ¼ to ½ mile. The Oregon State Park and Recreation Division suggests an overall standard of 10 acres of parkland for every 1000 residents.

Analysis

Memorial Park, the City's existing facility, contains 7 acres. Based on acreage, amenities such as restrooms and on-site parking, and current uses, Memorial Park is a community park, which also functions as a neighborhood park for residents in south Aurora. Under the standard recommended by the Oregon State Park and Recreation Division, this is adequate acreage to serve the needs of 700 residents.

Aurora's current population is estimated at 870 residents. Based on cumulative overall growth rate from 2000 through 2005 of 6% growth rate (Table 2-3), Aurora is projected to reach 1,000 persons in approximately 26 months. Because there are no significant changes anticipated in the capacity of the facilities during that time frame and because recreational standards are generally expressed as "per thousand residents", the existing levels of service are shown as current levels of service per thousand residents on Table 9.1. Based on a continued 6 % increase in population, maintaining the current level of service would require the development of 15 acres of additional park land by the year 2023.

The City's adopted Comprehensive Plan indicates a community park would be the most appropriate new facility. A community park is defined as one which serves the whole community and is no more than 30 minutes by foot, 20 minutes by bicycle, or 10 minutes by car from the residences it serves. The portion of Mill Creek flood plain included in the UGB is a likely site for a new park since it is not suitable for other urban development.

The Comprehensive Plan also identifies an interest in developing a downtown park and/or plaza which would enhance the Historic District's tourist appeal. Further, the City's Vision anticipates linear greenway parks and pathways along the river and creek.

**Table 9-1
Level of Service Analysis**

Amenity	Current LOS*	Necessary to maintain current LOS for 3,000 persons¹⁰
Park Acreage	7	21
Dumpster	1	3
Swing Set with Slide	1	3
Stage Coach	1	3
Bike Rack	1	3
Park Benches	2	6
Drinking Fountain	1	3
Lighted Covered Serving Areas	2	6
Picnic Tables	14	42
Restroom Facilities	1	3
Horse Shoe Pits	2	6
Baseball Field	1	3
Tennis Court	1	3
Basketball Court	1	3

LOS - Level of service per 1,000 residents

¹⁰ 2025 population projection is 2,709 persons
City of Aurora Park Master Plan
Effective January 10, 2006

**Table 9-2
Facility Types and Standards**

Type of Facility	Use and Characteristics	Desirable Size	Standard/1000 persons
Community Park	Park facility designed to serve the daily active and passive recreation needs of a neighborhood. Usually includes playground equipment, picnic areas and vegetation. May include areas for field games, court games, etc. Usually includes restrooms and on site parking. May also serve as a neighborhood park for residents within ¼ mile.	5 to 20 acres	7 acres
Linear Park/Trail	Linear strip of land comprising natural or man made resources such as a river or utility right of way. Used for walking, bicycling, horseback riding, etc. May connects parks and other points of interest.	Variable	variable
Athletic/Sport Facilities	Facilities designed for specific uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseball/softball, Basketball Skate boarding Tennis Courts Soccer Fields 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 1 .2 1 1

The facility standards in Table 9-2 provide objective criteria for determining future needs. Using these standards, the City can identify current deficiencies and growth related needs and develop a prioritized list of capital projects.

Cost Estimates

The Aurora Parks Committee along with the help and assistance from the Aurora Public Works Department developed a list of cost estimates for project recommendations. The cost estimates are intended to be used as the City plan and budget for park improvements as population grows. These project estimates are preliminary and are meant to provide a general estimate of costs for budgeting purposes. The Capital Improvement Plan consists of the project description, estimated project cost, and project priority and may be integrated in the overall Aurora Capital Improvement Plan during the City budgeting process.

The Aurora Public Works Department and the Aurora Parks Committee worked along with other communities and public agencies in order to develop comprehensive estimated costs for Aurora's Parks Capital Improvement Plan. Where costs are more than one year old, adjustments were made for inflation. Annually, costs will be adjusted for inflation.

There are a significant number of limitations involved in gathering cost estimates for the park development.

- Because detailed site designs for features such as sidewalk length, feet of irrigation, and so on, will be developed in the future, quantities are highly generalized. Such design details depend on specific plans for specific sites.
- Site preparation, surfacing and irrigation are the most difficult to estimate accurately without site-specific details. Accurate cost estimates are dependent on site-specific variables.

Note: Cost estimates are intended to be general guidelines for establishing priorities, staffing levels and budgeting. Before a project is constructed, detailed site specific cost estimates should be obtained.

Standardized Amenities

When gathering cost estimates, a wide range of prices for different facilities and equipment were found. The Aurora Public Works and the Aurora Parks Committee selected cost estimates for modest equipment from vendors and contractors known for high quality and durable products, preferably in Oregon.

In accordance with the suggested goal to “move towards standardized park and recreation amenities with ease of maintenance and aesthetics,” Table 9.3, on page 30, provides estimates for facilities similar to parks located in other smaller communities like Aurora.

**Table 9.3
Common Park Amenities Price List**

Basic Park Furnishings	Description	Price Range	Source
Benches	Recycled plastic with metal support	\$450.00 +sh	Summit Supply
Picnic Tables	Recycled plastic with metal support	\$550.00-\$900.00 + sh	Summit Supply
Park Signs (Welcome Sign)	Cost varies widely depending on size	\$550.00-\$650.00	Local Sign Company
Structures			
Restroom Facility		\$50,000-\$75,000	
Upgrade Horseshoe Pits		\$300-\$450.00	Canby Builders Supply
Disk, Plow, and Reseeding of the Park		\$700-800.00	Tractor owner
Protective curtain on pump house.		\$500.00-1,500.00	Canby Builders Supply

**CITY OF AURORA PARKS MASTER PLAN
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN**

#	Project Description	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Project Cost	Project Implementation Schedule			SDC	Other
					0-5 years	6-10 Years	11-20 Years		
1.0 Existing Facilities									
1.1	Restroom Facility			\$75,000	\$75,000			\$51,750	\$23,250
1.2	Replace Picnic Tables	12		\$1,500		\$1,500		\$0	\$1,500
1.3	Replace Picnic Shelters	2		\$20,000		\$20,000		\$0	\$20,000
1.4	Replacement of swing set	1	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500		\$0	\$2,500
1.5	Repair electrical problems			\$20,000	\$20,000			\$0	\$20,000
1.6	Remove teeter totter assembly & bouncy animal foundations.			\$2,000		\$2,000		\$0	\$2,000
1.7	Rehabilitate tennis courts			\$10,000		\$10,000		\$0	\$10,000
1.8	Repair water fountain	1	\$500	\$500	\$500			\$0	\$500
1.9	Concrete slabs for picnic tables			\$6,000			\$6,000	\$4,140	\$1,860
1.10	Frame play structure			\$5,000		\$5,000		\$3,450	\$1,550
1.11	Install plastic benches	8	\$450	\$3,600		\$3,600		\$2,484	\$1,116
1.12	Fencing the whole park			\$6,000	\$6,000			\$4,140	\$1,860
1.13	Irrigation System			\$5,000	\$5,000			\$3,450	\$1,550
1.14	Preparing & Seeding lawn area			\$3,000	\$3,000			\$0	\$3,000
1.15	Dog Waste Disposal System	2	\$120	\$240	\$240			\$166	\$74
1.16	Basketball Equipment-Hoops	2	\$753	\$1,505	\$1,505			\$0	\$1,505
1.17	Tennis Court-Net	1		\$138	\$138			\$0	\$138
1.18	Gopher Control		\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000				\$4,000
	Sub Total			\$165,983	\$117,883	\$44,600	\$6,000	\$69,580	\$92,427
2.0 Additional Facilities									
2.1	Land acquisition (acres)	14	\$25,000	\$350,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$350,000	\$0
2.2	Park Master Plan	1	\$20,000	\$20,000		\$20,000		\$20,000	\$0
2.3	Grade & seed park area	1	\$60,000	\$60,000		\$60,000		\$60,000	\$0
2.4	Purchase & install play equipment	1	\$70,000	\$70,000			\$70,000	\$70,000	\$0
2.5	Site Development		\$372,500	\$372,500	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$172,500	\$372,500	\$0
	Sub Total			\$872,500			\$342,500	\$872,500	\$0
3.0 Mill Creek Greenway									
3.1	Concept plan of Aurora greenway	1	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000			\$13,800	\$6,200
3.2	Develop trail map	1	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000			\$3,450	\$1,550
3.3	Land for greenway		\$500,000	\$500,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$200,000	\$345,000	\$155,000
3.4	Construct Trail	1	\$200,000	\$200,000		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$138,000	\$62,000
3.5	Benches & exercise stations	12	\$1,000	\$12,000			\$12,000	\$8,280	\$3,720
	Sub Total			\$737,000			\$312,000	\$508,530	\$228,470
	TOTAL			\$1,775,483				\$1,450,610	\$320,897

Chapter 10 SDC Methodology and Calculations

The methodology for developing the Aurora Parks SDC utilizes a combination of level of service (LOS) and capital projects. LOS standards have been used to determine facility needs, identify deficiencies, and develop a list of capital improvement projects. These projects have then been used as the basis for an improvement fee based SDC. No excess capacity exists in the Aurora Parks system. Therefore, a reimbursement fee component is not utilized.

The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) has been designed to increase the LOS provided to all Aurora residents during the next 15 years (2005 to 2020). SDC's cannot be utilized to pay for eliminating deficiencies in the current LOS or providing a higher LOS than currently exist. The CIP identifies alternative revenue sources where necessary. Project costs which are attributable to growth are identified as funded by SDC's.

The growth related portion of the CIP totals \$1,402,704. These are capacity increasing improvements required to maintain the existing LOS for future Aurora residents. The CIP indicates that 100% SDC's will be utilized to fund growth related costs and provides a reasonable connection between the need for new parks and recreation facilities resulting from SDC paying development and the expenditure of SDC revenues received from SDC paying development.

Estimated Population Increase

Projected 2025 Population	Estimated 2005 Population	Estimated Increase in Population 1920
2,790	870	

When compared with the number of building permits issued from 2000 to 2005, the population increase from the 2000 census number of 655 and the 2005 population of 870 resulting from a door to door census conducted by staff, supports an average of 2.66 persons per household.

The Aurora Parks and Recreation SDC is calculated using a series of formulas as follows:

1. Growth related facilities costs

Total Facilities Costs	Funded from other sources	Growth-related facilities costs
\$1,898,983	\$398,373	\$1,500,610

2. Growth related facilities cost per capita

Growth-related Facilities costs	/	Population Increase	=	Facilities Cost per Capita
\$1,500,610		1920		\$790

3. Compliance and administrative cost per capita pursuant to ORS 223.307 estimated at 5% of collected SDC revenues

Total Compliance/ Administration Cost	/	Population Increase	=	Compliance/Admin Cost per Capita
\$75,031		1920		\$39

4. Standard cost per capita

Facilities Cost Per Capita	+	Compliance/Admin Cost per Capita	=	Standard Cost per Capita
\$790		\$39		\$829

5. The SDC rate for each type of dwelling unit

Type of Dwelling Unit	Persons per Dwelling Unit	X	Standard Cost per Capita	=	SDC per Dwelling Unit
Single Family	2.66		\$829		\$2,205
Multi Family	2.14		\$829		\$1,774
Unit in Manufactured Home Park	2.28		\$829		\$1,890

Chapter 11

Suggested Goals

As previously discussed, the Aurora Comprehensive Plan includes the following goals and policies for park, recreation and open space:

1. The City will provide additional park and recreational facilities as needed to meet statewide park and recreational standards subject to economic constraints.
2. The City will seek new sources of revenue to finance the acquisition, development, and maintenance of additional park and recreational facilities.
3. The City will explore the feasibility of acquiring a future park site in the northeast portion of the UGB.

The Aurora Public Works Department and the Aurora Parks Committee suggests the following additional goals to improve Aurora's Park System.

1. Standardize park and recreation amenities for ease of maintenance and aesthetics

While the design of any park facility should take advantage of unique site characteristics and particular needs, high-quality standardized amenities should be used whenever appropriate. Standardized amenities, such as the recycled plastic benches, could make purchase and maintenance easier and more cost effective. Other potentially standardized amenities include picnic tables and covered tables, rest room facilities, some segments of irrigation systems, and play equipment that meets the ADA requirements.

2. Improve level of maintenance in the current city park facilities

A well-maintained park facility system reflects positively on the City's image and promotes respect for public amenities. The Aurora Parks Committee is striving to improve the current level of maintenance that is now provided. Delayed, inadequate maintenance can also result in safety issues and injury to the public.

3. Improve park signage for identification and direction

Improved park signage is an easy way to increase awareness, and possibly use, of Memorial Park. Signage should be improved so that the visitors from out of town can find the city park easier. "Closed at dusk" signs should be installed to remind people to finish their activity before total darkness.

4. Improve universal access

Aurora's parks facilities are meant for the enjoyment of everyone in the entire community. While Aurora needs to strive more and more to meet this goal, the bathrooms in the park still need to be brought into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Currently, the restrooms in Memorial Park do not meet the ADA requirements.

5. Improve perception of safety in the park

The Aurora Parks Committee has been striving towards making the city park a safer place to visit and play. The Aurora Parks Committee has removed a number of potential hazardous that could cause injury to children. The increased public uses of the park will likely limit vandalism and increase safety.

6. Acquire and develop new parks to serve the growing population

The Aurora Parks Committee recognizes that continued growth of the city will create demand for new parks, including the Mill Creek Trail.

Planning Staff recommends the Aurora Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for park, recreation and open space be amended to read as follows:

1. The City will provide additional park and recreational facilities as needed to meet the park and recreational standards of the Aurora Parks Master Plan, subject to economic constraints.
2. The City will seek new sources of revenue to finance the acquisition, development, and maintenance of additional park and recreational facilities.
3. The City will acquire and develop a park site in the northeast portion of the urban growth boundary.
4. Where possible, the City will standardize park and recreation amenities for ease of maintenance and aesthetics. All park facilities will comply with ADA requirements.
5. The City will strive to improve level of maintenance in the current city park facilities, subject to economic constraints.
6. The City will improve park signage including identification of facilities, information regarding use of facilities and directional signage to help users locate facilities.
7. The City will continue to support a partnership to develop the entire Mill Creek Greenway and will continue efforts to develop the portion within the Aurora urban growth boundary.

Chapter 12

Funding Alternatives

Background

Aurora Public Works and the City Recorder collected information from a number of potential park and recreation funding sources to provide Aurora with additional mechanisms for funding park and recreation. Research focused on areas where the City is not currently receiving funding; mainly public and private grant sources. The alternatives listed below provide a starting point for the City's funding search. State and federal programs are subject to termination in the absence of legislative funding commitments, and private foundations operate in finite annual budgets. Where possible, contact names, phone numbers and addresses have been included for each source.

Public Grants Land and Water Conservation Trust Fund Grant

The (Land and Water Conservation Fund) LWCF was established by Congress in 1965 to "assist in preserving, developing and assuring accessibility to all citizens of the United States of America of present and future generations...such quantity and quality of outdoor recreational resources as may be available each year for the acquisition and development of park land. In Oregon, the fund is administered by the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department. Grant funds are available for up to 50 percent of total project costs. Cities, counties and park and recreation districts are eligible applicants. Eligible projects and facilities include sports fields, picnic facilities, swimming pools, boating facilities and playgrounds, rest rooms, parking lots, landscaping and maintenance of facilities. With the exception of swimming pools and skate rinks, indoor projects are ineligible.

Oregon has totaled more than \$47 million. A number of individual projects have been awarded funding in excess of \$500,000. Individual projects are ranked at the state level using a scoring criteria system with the highest rating projects being forwarded to the National Park Service for final approval. Additional information can be requested by writing to the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department, Grants Section, 525 Trade Street S.E., Salem, Oregon 97310.

Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program

Established in 1978, UPARR, provides grants to local governments to rehabilitate existing indoor and outdoor recreation facilities; to demonstrate innovative ways to enhance park and recreation opportunities in the neighborhood level and to develop local Recovery Action Programs that identify community needs, objectives and strategies for revitalization of recreation systems. Rehabilitation grants are matching grants (70% federal / 30% local) to eligible local governments for remodeling, rebuilding, expanding or developing outdoor or indoor recreation areas and facilities. Innovation grants are also matching grants (70% federal / 30 % local) designed to help communities demonstrate innovative and cost-effective ways to enhance park and recreation opportunities at the local level. In Oregon, these grants are coordinated through the National Park Service regional office in Seattle. An application or additional information may be requested from the National Park Service, Recreation

Programs Division, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-1060. Phone number is (206) 220-4083.

Oregon Youth Conservation Corps

The Oregon Youth Conservation Corps (OYCC) program consists of grants of labor and partial capital financing. OYCC grants generally support conservation or environment-related projects by non profit organizations. OYCC funding is distributed in equal amounts to each county in Oregon in every summer. The program funds individual projects ranging from \$5,000 to \$10,000. Parties interested in applying for OYCC funding can either contact their county park and recreation department, or contact the OYCC directly at (503) 373-1570 Ext. 228. Mimi Swartz is the contact person.

American Greenway Grants

The American Greenways Dupont awards, a partnership between Dupont, the Conservation Fund, and the National Geographic Society, provide small grants to stimulate the planning and design of greenways in the country. Grant recipients are selected based on criteria that include: importance of projects to local greenway development efforts; demonstrated community support for the project; extent to which the grants will result in matching funds or other support from the public or private sources; likelihood of tangible results in capacity of the organization to complete the project; and how well the project serves as a model for planning and developing greenways. The maximum grant award is for \$2,500.00.

Applications must be submitted between September 1 and December 31 each year. Local organizations receiving preference for grant awards through governmental agencies may also apply. More information may be obtained by writing to American Greenways, The Conservation Fund, 1800 North Kent Street, Suite 1120, Arlington, Virginia 22209. Telephone number is (703) 525-6300.

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department awards cities, state, and county parks yearly for major rehabilitation projects. Eligible projects include acquisition, development, and major rehabilitation of park and recreation areas and facilities. Projects must be consistent with the outdoor recreation goals and objectives contained in the SCORP and elements of your local comprehensive land use plans and park master plans. For more information, write to The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, 1115 Commercial Street N.E., Salem, Oregon 97301-1002. Telephone number (503) 378-6305. Email address is marilyn.Lippincott@state.or.us

Creating a local Adopt-a-Park program

Such a program could relieve the city of part of the financial burden associated with parks maintenance and improvements while also generating citizen pride in their parks. The scope would depend on the city's needs. For instance, the program could consist of having an organized group take responsibility for trash pick-up on weekly basis in the park. A small plaque recognizing the group for its contribution could be placed somewhere near the park. On a somewhat larger scale, the city could also encourage local businesses to sponsor park improvements such as renovation of the swing sets in the park, or provisions of accessible playground equipment in the park.

Adopt-a-park programs obviously contain a strong element of citizen involvement and often stem from public initiative. The option of the adopt-a-park program seems viable in Aurora considering the high level of volunteerism and community that already exists.

Private Foundations

Private foundations often offer funding for projects related to community development and improving your development, recreation, leisure, sports, athletics, and the environment. Funding amounts can range anywhere from a few hundred dollars to tens of thousands. In a search of the Oregon Foundation Data Base, the Aurora Public Works Department identified over a dozen potential funding sources. The most promising of these are listed below for further investigation by the City:

Canby Rotary Foundation

- Contributions to local charities, recreation, sports, leisure and athletics
- Fund Balance: \$216,695
- Grant Range: \$100-\$2,000
- Contact: Donald Peterson, Trustee
- (503) 266-3456

Clark Foundation

- Grants for general charitable purposes, community improvement and development
- Fund Balance: \$141,777
- Grant Range: \$500-\$50,000
- Contact: Jean Amelee
- (503) 223-5290

Collins Foundation

Grants for community improvement and development, recreation, sports, and youth development

- Fund Balance: \$109,582,365
- Grant Range: \$1,500-\$250,000
- Contact: William Pine
- (503) 227-7171

Anne A. Berni Foundation

- Grants for educational, social welfare and cultural enrichment programs for children in the Pacific Northwest
- Fund Balance: \$558,196
- Grant Range: Not Available
- Contact: Marilyn Norquist
- (503) 275-5929

Ford Family Foundation

- Grants for community improvement and development, sports, leisure and recreation

- Fund Balance: \$113,564,991
- Grant Range: \$400-\$350,000
- Contact: Kenneth Ford, President
- (503) 679-3311

First Interstate Bank of Oregon Charitable Foundation

- Grants for community improvement and development, recreation, sports and leisure
- Fund Balance: \$49,593
- Grant Range: \$100-\$25,000
- Contact: Harleen Katke
- (503) 225-2167

Oregon Community Foundation

- Grants for community improvement and development, recreation, sports and leisure
- Fund Balance: \$103,021,996
- Grant Range: \$1,000-\$400,000
- Contact: Gregory Chaille
- (503) 227-6846

The Oregon Foundation Data Book is updated annually. Foundation guides generally list the types of activities particular foundations tend to fund as well as projects which have received funding in the last year. Most foundations operate on limited budgets and tight timelines and some fund “members” only. Thus, it is important to establish contacts well ahead of an anticipated project’s start date.