City of McMinnville
Planning Department
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and Urbanization Study
Public/Semi-Public Lands Work Group
Meeting #3: Agenda
Wednesday, November 13, 2019, 3:30pm-4:30pm
Police Department Training Room, 121 SW Adams Street

Committee Members	Time	Agenda Items
Public/Semi-Public Lands Work Group: ***PAC Members:*** Paul Davis, Chemeketa Susan Muir, Parks Mike Bisset, City Infrastructure John Dietz, MWL Other Interested PAC Members ***Additional Representatives:*** Mary Ann Rodriguez, Linfield Matt Johnson, Churches Laura Syring, SD, Parks Peter Keenan, SD Ryan McIrvin, SD/Athletics Steve Ganzer, Parks Justin Hogue, County **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** Tom Schauer - Lead Heather Richards Chuck Darnell Jamie Fleckenstein Mike Bisset Susan Muir (Parks Director) Angela Carnahan (DLCD) Stephanie Armstrong (Yamhill County)	3:30pm 3:35pm 4:20pm 4:25pm	1. Call to Order/Introductions 2. Estimating Public/Semi-Public Land Needs – ***Exhibit 1: Public Lands Memo*** 3. Next Steps & Comments 4. Adjournment

City of McMinnville
Planning Department
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1-MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 13, 2019
TO: Economic Opportunities Analysis PAC and Public Lands Work Group
FROM: Tom Schauer, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Public & Institutional Lands - ***Update***

This memo provides updated information about land needs presented in a previous memo dated October 9, 2019. It summarizes the public and institutional land needs that aren't addressed through the employment forecast. Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Workgroup for the remaining identified needs which are presented in this memo as "updated" or "new" and summarized in Figure 1. The Workgroup's recommendation will be provided to the Project Advisory Committee, and would complete the Workgroup's work.

Summary – *New*

Public and institutional land needs calculated separately from the employment forecast are summarized in ***Figure 1*** below, and more detailed information follows.

Figure 1. Estimated Public and Institutional Land Needs

Organization/Sector	Add'l Land Need By 2021	Add'l Land Need 2021-2041 (ac)	Add'l Land Need 2041-2067 (ac)	SUM Through 2067 (ac)	Method/Notes
City of McMinnville (non-parks), 1	0	7	4	11	4.5 ac for fire stations plus 0.26 ac/1,000 pop
City of McMinnville (parks), 2	27	365	214	606	Parks Master Plan LOS
McMinnville Water & Light	0	21	0	21	Interview, See Narrative
Chemeketa Community College	0	0	0	0	Interview, See Narrative
Linfield College	0	0	0	0	Interview, See Narrative
McMinnville School District	0	10	30	40	Interview/Memo, See Narrative
Yamhill County	0	6	8	13	Interview, 0.5 ac/1,000 pop
State of Oregon	0	1	1	2	0.08 ac/1,000 pop
Federal Government	0	2	2	4	0.14 ac/1,000 pop
Churches	6	32	44	83	2.88 ac/1,000 pop
Other	0	0	0	0	
SUM	**33**	**444**	**303**	**780**	

Note 1: Site needs for fire stations are inlcuded in 2021-2041 calculation

Note 2: Needs for 2021-2041 include current deficit

General: Figures above don't reflect additional needs if direction of growth absorbs additional sites outside UGB needed/required for services

Background

Certain land uses don't lend themselves to forecasting land needs by use of an employment forecast and employment density assumptions. At a previous meeting, information was presented about public and institutional organizations and lands. Preliminary data was presented about calculations using a ratio of acreage per 1,000 population that can be used to forecast site needs. However, this method isn't always applicable to each of these entities. Following the September 5, 2019 PAC Meeting #2, staff held meetings with representatives of public and institutional organizations to discuss land needs

and methods. This memo summarizes the results of the meetings and summarizes some information discussed at the last PAC meeting.

City of McMinnville – *Updated*

- **General, Misc. City Departments: (Administration, Office, Police, Public Works, Fleet, Library, Recreation Buildings, etc.).**

  - Planning staff met from representatives from respective City departments to discuss land needed by the City of McMinnville. Currently, there is no formally adopted plan outlining space needs and plans for existing and future building/facility needs for the planning periods.
  - The City Manager indicated that a ratio of current acreage per 1,000 population would likely over-estimate the City's future land needs. Given existing facilities and site arrangements, there are opportunities to consolidate facilities, redevelop/expand onto existing city sites, use land more efficiently, grow into more recent expansions that retain capacity, etc.
  - With a forecast population of about 48,000 in 2014 and 63,000 in 2067, it is not expected that the City would grow to a size that would necessitate substantial branch facilities or satellite locations during the planning period (such as a library branch etc.).
  - The City Manager and Engineering Staff suggested that base year acres/1,000 population data from cities of approximately 48,000 population and 63,000 population corresponding to the future panning horizon year population for McMinnville might help inform ratios associated with McMinnville's future land needs.
  - ***Update.*** Data for cities of approximately 48,000 and 63,000 population was analyzed for comparison. ***Figure 2*** shows a summary of data for comparison cities – including cities for which data was not available. As noted above, the City Manager and Engineering Staff suggested that a straight-line ratio of acres per 1,000 population might overestimate needs. Therefore, staff used only the portion of City lands with facilities exclusive of the airport, floodplain, and utility sites for estimating additional City land needs. (Parks were calculated separately). Approximately 18 acres of the 83.1 City acres is non-utility facilities. Only that portion was used for calculating future needs. That portion had a 0.51 ac/1000 population ratio. Since it was assumed a straight-line extension would overestimate needs, staff used half of that ratio (0.25 ac/1000 population), and the specific information for fire station sites noted below was added to that estimate.

Figure 2. Ratio Information Available from Other Cities

City	Ratio (acres per 1,000 pop)
Redmond 2005 (total)	110 ac/1000 (calculated) 10 ac/1000 (assumed need)
McMinnville 2019 (less parks, airport, floodplain)	2.38/1000
McMinnville, 2019 (less parks, airport, floodplain, utility sites)	0.51/1000
Corvallis	No additional land need identified, didn't list ratio
Albany	Not readily available
Springfield	Not readily available
Medford (less parks)	1.5/1000

- **Fire:**
  - The Fire Department anticipates transition from a single downtown station to three satellite stations at approximately 1.5 acres each: (1) Baker Creek/Hill Road area, (2) Airport area, (3) Northeast area. The estimated need would be about **4.5 acres for three substations.** There could be opportunities to co-locate police substations at sites. There is potential that they could be co-located on sites with other uses. The NE station may be within the current UGB or may be further to the northeast. There is potential for the current station to be re-used for other municipal or other uses.

- **Police:**
  - **No specific plans for new facilities.** Their needs can be accounted for as part of the overall City need using the same methods.

- **Airport:**
  - **No additional land needs identified.**

- **Sewer:**
  - **Treatment: No additional land needs anticipated.** The City owns 5 tax lots with approximately 70 acres east of the UGB where the sewer treatment plant is sited. No additional land need is anticipated. There is capacity to expand the treatment plan on the existing site. If there is a UGB expansion to east which includes this area, these properties won't be available for buildable land for other uses.

  - **Collection System: No significant additional land demand is assumed outside of the public right-of-way, so no calculation has been added or assumed for this de minimus need.** Minimal needs for future pump stations may be needed for new development. Site needs for small pump stations are similar to or smaller than a residential lot. The land needs for these facilities are relatively small and no additional acres are proposed. Depending on direction of growth, there could be needs for larger pumping facilities.

- **Parks:**
  - The Comprehensive Plan includes the following policies:
    - **159.00.** The City of McMinnville's Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan shall serve to identify future needs of the community, available resources, funding alternatives, and priority projects
    - **163.05.** The City of McMinnville shall locate future community and neighborhood parks above the boundary of the 100-year floodplain
    - **170.05**. For purposes of projecting future park and open space needs, the standards as contained in the adopted McMinnville Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan shall be used
  - The Master Plan level of service (LOS) standard is 14 acres/1,000 persons.
  - The 2017 UGB population was 34,293.
  - The City has approximately 273 acres of developed park land and 76 acres of undeveloped park land, totaling about 349 acres ***(See attached).***

- The 2017 need was approximately 480 acres; there's a deficit of approximately 207 acres of developed park land.
- Need for 665 total acres by 2041 (an additional need of 185 ac, or total of 392 ac with the current deficit
- Need for 879 total acres by 2067 (an additional need of 399 ac, or total of 606 ac with the current deficit. *(**Note:** This was listed as 660 acres in the previous memo, which was a typographical error).*
- Absent joint use agreements with other entities for public use of facilities consistent with the needs identified in the Park Master Plan, park sites and recreational facilities that aren't city-owned aren't assumed to meet the LOS for developed park needs. If there are separate standards for open space, that may be evaluated.

Note: *The committee made a recommendation on park needs at the October meeting. Following the last meeting, Mark Davis submitted a memo and asked that it be distributed to the committee. The memo is attached for the record.* ***Attachment 2***

- **Other (stormwater):** While no specific need was identified, there was a sense that stormwater detention and water quality standards would likely increase the amount of land that will need to be dedicated for on-site stormwater management (detention and treatment) as best practices seek to manage stormwater close to "where the rain hits the ground" to reduce peaking of down stream flows and conveyance of sediment and/or contaminants in runoff. These sites may be privately or publicly owned and maintained, but should be accounted for.

- **Other (transit related):** There was a sense that, as the community grows and the transit system expands and matures, it expected that there will be a more robust transit system with some additional land needs.

Planning Staff met with representatives of the following organizations regarding their future land needs.

<u>McMinnville Water & Light (MWL):</u>
Estimated need of 21-24 acres for the 20- and 46-year periods, plus additional location/development specific needs

- General: It is estimated that in addition to sites already owned by MWL, they will need approximately 21 additional acres for power and water, and may have additional needs that are dependent on specific growth characteristics and developments. Some users require an on-site substation that requires a site and land. If growth occurs to the west further upslope into the west hills, that might include the 3-acre reservoir site needed to serve water pressure Zone 2, and could necessitate an additional reservoir/site if growth continues far enough upslope to result in a Zone 3 service area.

- The additional 21-acre need includes 16 acres for a treatment plant and pumping facilities which could co-locate with a power substation in the easterly portion of the UGB; an additional 2 acres in the easterly UGB area for power, and an additional 3 acres in the westerly UGB for additional storage for fire flow.

Yamhill County - *Updated*

- Currently, there is no formally adopted plan outlining space needs and plans for existing and future building/facility needs for the planning periods.
- The acreage per 1,000 population estimate is a reasonable method, first deducting the fairgrounds property before calculating the ratios. The Fairgrounds is approximately 36 acres of a 44-acre site.
- Current county-owned sites don't allow for much incremental on-site expansion, so additional capacity would likely require redevelopment or expansion onto additional land.
- Transit may have a need for expanded bus parking/storage area that doesn't require new structures
- Locational analysis: The County Parks Master Plan identifies potential lands for parks at key locations in proximity to McMinnville near confluence areas shown on vision map in the Master Plan)
- ***Update.*** The County owns approximately 44 acres in the UGB, including the Fairgrounds. The 36-acre Fairgrounds site includes other uses including County Public Works, which occupies about 7 acres. Therefore, approximately 29 acres of County-owned land was deducted for the Fairgrounds before calculating the ratio of acres per 1,000 population, leaving 16 acres remaining, which is approximately 0.5 acre/1000 population.

Chemeketa Community College

No new land needs. Chemeketa Community College sold the property they previously owned, the former campus site, on Hill Road. Their McMinnville campus on Norton Lane houses their facilities as well as commercial and office tenants. For planning purposes, Chemeketa doesn't anticipate new land needs beyond their current ownership, and doesn't anticipate displacement of tenants.

Linfield College

No new land needs. Linfield College doesn't anticipate new land needs beyond current their ownership during the planning period. They recently sold a portion of the property to MV Advancements. For planning purposes, the City should not assume non-college use or sale of further property during the planning period.

McMinnville School District - *Updated*

In addition to existing schools, the School District owns three reserve sites for future schools. Below is a summary of needs in addition to existing schools and reserve sites. In addition to these sites, the School District estimates it will need 40 additional acres for future school sites, with 10 of those additional acres needed between 2021 and 2041, and 30 of those acres needed between 2041 and 2067. ***See Attachment 1***.

2021-2041

- The need is for one additional 10-acre early learning center site.

2041-2067

- The need includes one additional 12-acre elementary school site.
- The need includes an additional 18 acres for a new high school, in addition to the 42-acre site on Hill Road, whether that site could be added to for a total of 60 acres or whether that site would be sold and a new 60-acre site acquired.

Other Land Needs - *Updated*

Other public and semi-public land needs presented in ***Figure 1*** which aren't part of the employment forecast were calculated using the ratios in ***Figure 3.***

Figure 3. Other Existing Ratios for McMinnville, 2019

Public/Semi-Public Use	Tax Lots	Acres	Acres/1000 persons	Percent of Acres
State	**4**	**2.92**	**0.08**	**0%**
State	4	2.92	0.08	0%
Federal	**5**	**4.96**	**0.14**	**0%**
Federal	5	4.96	0.14	0%
Religous/Cemetary	**76**	**104.23**	**2.98**	**6%**
Church	64	100.53	2.88	6%

MCMINNVILLE PARKS SYSTEM

COMMUNITY PARKS		ACRES
City Park		16.79
	R4420AD 09800	15.51
	R4420AD 05101	0.56
	R4420AD 06900	0.13
	R4420AD 07000	0.13
	R4420AD 07100	0.07
	R4420AD 07200	0.08
	R4420AD 07300	0.11
	R4420AD 07400	0.19
Joe Dancer Park		107.62
	R4422 02300	79.52
	R4421 00400*	23.90
	R4422 WATER*	4.20
Discovery Meadows Park		20.97
	R4429 00300	17.07
	R4429BB 02600	3.90
Kiwanis Marine Park		4.63
	R4421 00800	1.30
	R4421DB 04200	2.79
	E4421DB ROADS*	0.54
Riverside Dog Park	R4421 00100*	3.80
Wortman Park	R4416AD00100	21.66
COMMUNITY PARKS TOTAL		175.47

*Notes partial taxlot

MINI-PARKS/PLAYLOTS		ACRES
Bend-o-River	R4422CD 00128	0.33
Chegwyn Farms Park	R4409CD 00100*	3.94
Greenbriar	R4417BC 00100	0.23
Heather Hollow	R4429BC 00100	3.22
Jay Pearson Park	R4418 00202*	2.94
Kingwood	R4422DD06000	0.58
North Evans	R4416BC03300	0.34
Taylor	R4420DC04900	0.31
Thompson	R4428BA04300	2.28
Village Mill		0.49
	R4428BA00111	0.22
	R4428BA00105	0.27
West Hills Park	R452400803	7.77
MINI-PARKS/PLAYLOTS TOTAL		22.43

*Notes partial taxlot

LINEAR/TRAIL PARKS		ACRES
Airport Park		18.82
	R442600203*	2.74
	R4426 ROADS*	0.62
	R442600500*	1.28
	R442600201*	14.18
Ash Meadows	R4420CC00239	1.29
BPA Pathway		2.84
	R4419AD02100	0.98
	R4419AC00200	0.08
	R4419AC00101	0.30
	R441901200*	0.32
	R4419AA11700	0.35
	R4419AA11800	0.45
	R4418DC04100	0.36
BPA II Pathway		4.23
	R4418DC00100	0.83
	R4418DC04400	0.14
	R4418DC07100	0.32
	R4418DC06600	0.32
	R4418DB12200	0.66
	R4418DB12000	1.04
	R441800202*	0.63
	R4418AD10800	0.29
Goucher St. Pathway		1.95
	R4420CC ROADS*	1.01
	R4420CC NONTL	0.02
	R4420CB ROADS*	0.92
James Addition		1.54
	R4420CC00124	1.27
	R4419DD00390	0.27
Jandina	R4419DD02790	2.25
Jandina III		2.78
	R4419DA13200	1.99
	R4419DA13300	0.79
Roma Sitton	R4418AD10900	1.69
Tice Rotary		33.82
	R441700101	32.82
	R441700100	1.00
Westvale	R4419DB02400	3.70
LINEAR/TRAIL PARKS TOTAL		74.91

TOTAL DEVELOPED PARK LANDS	272.81

OPEN SPACE/UNDEVELOPED		ACRES
Angella	R4428BD02100	2.21
Ashwood/Derby	R4420DB02401	0.29
Barber Property	R442901201	11.76
Bennett	R4416AA05800	0.19
Brookview	R4420BA00500	0.72
Carlson	R4420DB00300	1.53
Creekside Cozine	R4430DD00200	3.69
Creekside #3 Cozine	R4430DC03500	15.31
Crestwood		2.08
	R4420BA00300	1.10
	R4420BA00301	0.60
	R4420BA ROADS*	0.38
Davis St. Fill		1.57
	R4421CC00900	0.91
	R4421CC02601	0.66

*Notes partial taxlot

OPEN SPACE/UNDEVELOPED		ACRES
Elmwood		3.07
	R4420DB00200	1.79
	R4420DA04300	1.28
Fir Ridge	R4420AC02600	0.69
Irvine St.		6.68
	R4421CA03200	4.00
	R4421CA03901	0.66
	R4421CA03401	1.63
	R4421CA ROADS*	0.39
Jay Pearson-East	R4418 00202*	1.16
Meadowridge	R4420BA00409	0.69
Quarry	R4419AD00700	11.54
Tall Oaks		12.58
	R442903200	9.60
	R4429BA14190	1.55
	R442900108	1.43

TOTAL UNDEVELOPED PARK LANDS	75.76
TOTAL PARK LANDS	348.57

ATTACHMENT 1

McMinnville
School District No. 40

800 NE Lafayette Avenue McMinnville, Oregon 97128 Phone: (503) 565-4000 Fax: (503) 565-4030

MEMO

DATE: November 14, 2019
TO: City of McMinnville Public Lands Work Group
From: Susan Escure, McMinnville School District Finance Director
Subject: Land Needs Assessment - Public Schools

Introduction

Currently the District does not have an adopted plan for school facility needs for the periods going out the 50 years needed by the urbanization study. The District is in the process of updating our Long-Range Facilities Plan which will not be formally adopted until next year. In 2017, The District contracted with Flo Analytics to prepare a 5 year and 10 year enrollment forecast with a more in depth study of enrollment within our elementary boundaries. This study provided information for our most recent boundary changes adopted for the 2019-20 school year. The following land needs assessment is based upon a combination of the demographer report, our internal enrollment projections and decisions made as part of our 2016 capital bond project.

Flo Analytics Enrollment Forecast

Our demographer's forecast was limited to 10 years. However, it did take into account planned developments within the District. The District is projected to capture 84.4% of the District population of all school-age children. Overall average student yield factors applied to new housing development are 0.45 students/Single Family Unit and 0.20 students per Multi-family Unit. The following is a summary of their 5-year and 10-year forecast:

October 1	**2017**	**2022**	**2027**
Elementary	3,047	2,969	3,103
Middle School	1,541	1,587	1,550
High School	2,176	2,347	2,159
Total	**6,764**	**6,902**	**6,813**
% increase over 2017		2.0%	.7%

Internal Projections

The District uses a 3 year or 8 year average cohort survival rate to forecast increases in enrollment for grades 1-12. The increase in these grades are due to in-migration and enrollment of students from private schools and home school as they age. This cohort survival rate across all grades = 2% increase in enrollment annually. Kindergarten enrollment is based on a historic average capture rate of 40% of the county births five years prior. For 2025 and after, the kindergarten enrollment increase is projected at 1%. Student enrollment counts are attendance-based not residence-based. Enrollment includes intra-district transfers from neighboring districts. Additionally, the enrollment projection includes attendance of all District students, not just those located within the City of McMinnville.

October 1 Enrollment Projection	2017	2019	2021	2041	2067
Elementary	3,047	2,885	2,883	3,281	4,252
Middle School	1,541	1,686	1,596	1,650	2,138
High School	2,176	2,130	2,251	2,263	2,934
Total	**6,764**	**6,701**	**6,730**	**7,194**	**9,324**
(Decrease) Increase over 2017		(63)	(34)	430	2,560
% (decrease) increase over 2017		(0.9%)	(0.5%)	6.4%	37.8%
Average Annual Growth Rate		(0.5%)	(0.1%)	0.3%	0.8%

Capacity
The following capacity estimates are based on current class size and programs. If future funding allows the District to substantially decrease class size or increase programs, these capacities would be less. Additionally, classroom modulars are used at some school sites and they are included in the calculation of our current capacity. The District foresees the need to add on to the current school sites to increase classroom space for additional programs and replacement of classroom modular before adding schools for enrollment growth, especially at the elementary level.

Property held for future school sites:

Hill Road & Cottonwood Drive	11 acres	Future Elementary Site
McDonald Lane, next to Grandhaven	26 acres	Future Middle School Site
Hill Road property	42 acres	Future High School Site

Elementary School Capacity
Elementary schools are configured for grades K through 5 with a capacity of 600 each. Currently there are six elementary schools which totals a maximum capacity of 3,600. For purposes of this land needs assessment, we are assuming a per school capacity ranging from 550 to 600 to account for pre-school and/or additional program needs.

Elementary school sites are on average 10 to 12 acres. The District currently holds property at Cottonwood and Hill Road for a future elementary site. The District would need to purchase one more 8-10 acre site by end of 2067 according to this projection.

Middle School Capacity
We currently have two middles schools with a maximum capacity of 900 each configured for grades 6-8 for a total capacity of 1,800. There is a wave of larger cohort classes in middle school currently, however, future cohorts entering middle school are expected to decrease and remain lower until 2041 – 2067.

The desired middle school is approximately 20 acres. The District currently holds 26 acres on McDonald Lane adjacent to Grandhaven Elementary for a future middle school site. No additional acreage is needed for a middle school site before 2067.

High School Capacity
Our current high school configuration after the 2019 Addition has a maximum capacity of 2,800 students. Approximately 160 students are served off site at the alternative program at Cook School and the online program at Adams Campus Based on this projection, the high school would not reach maximum capacity until 2060-65.

In 2015, the Long Range Facilities Task Force recommended to the School Board to continue the High School Master Plan proposed in 2006 to the voters which included a plan to rebuild the high school at the current site over three phases. The first phase was completed in 2010, the second phase was just completed in 2019 with the addition of a Career Technical Center. Although many constituents desire two small high school versus one large high school, current school funding does not cover the cost of operating two high schools. (Operating costs include costs such as: utilities, maintenance, administration and support staff). The high school enrollment would need to grow to almost 3,000 in order for the District to afford the operation costs of two comprehensive high schools (1,500 each).

During this planning period, the committee also looked at building a new high school at the Hill Road location and repurposing the current high school property. The committee decided against this for several reasons: 1) the District would need to ask voters for a significant increase over the current school capital bond rate, 2) the Hill Road site is only large enough for a high school of 2,300-2,500, which could be outgrown before the District could afford a second high school, and 3) the Committee felt that the District should continue with the plan that the voters had already approved in 2006.

The District currently holds 42 acres on Hill Road as a future high school site. A larger site of closer to 60 acres may be more desirable in order to include additional space for career technical programs. In addition, satellite sites may be needed for increased professional technical classes such as home construction or HVAC certification.

Summary
Based on our enrollment projections as described, the District projects the need for the following additional school buildings during the periods 2021-41 and 2041-2067.

Number of Schools	**Current**	**2021-2041**	**2041-2067**
Elementary & Early Learning Center	6	+1	+ 2
Middle School	2	0	+ 1
High School	1	0	+ 1
Total	**9**	**+1**	**+ 4**

After taking into account current property held for future use, the District projects the following land needs:

- **An additional site of 10 – 12 acres for an Elementary School.**
- **A larger 60 acre high school site for a second high school.**
- **An additional 8-10 acre site for an Early Learning Center.**

ATTACHMENT 2

Memo

Date: October 28, 2019

To: Public/Semi-Public Lands Work Group

From: Mark Davis

Subject: Park Land Needs

McMinnville is in the process of projecting its future land needs. These plans must have an adequate factual basis. The projections must be supported by evidence that establishes some likelihood that the projections will be realized and that the plans will be implemented.

At the last meeting I raised objections to the proposed addition of 392 acres of land for City parks over the next 20 years because there was no plan for funding or implementation. The acreage calculation is based on a recommendation in the outdated Parks Plan that the City should have 14 acres of parks per thousand residents, a number we failed to reach by 1999, so in addition to building parks for new residents we were supposed to have built additional parks over the last 20 years to erase this deficit. Due to the chaotic nature of the discussion that followed my comments and the fact that not all members of the Work Group were present, I would like to clarify the points I was trying to make at that time.

The Parks Plan: The McMinnville Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan (commonly referred to as the Parks Plan) was adopted in 1999. It explicitly covered a 20-year period that ended in 2019 and therefore cannot be relied upon to justify land needs through either 2041 or 2067. At the public gathering that preceded its adoption, where citizens were asked to brainstorm their ideas for the Parks Plan and put dots next to the ones they liked, several persons asked, "How is this going to be paid for?" We were repeatedly told that we did not need to worry about cost because the City Council had the job of figuring out how to pay for it. As a result the so-called "plan" reads more like a "wish list." It carried an estimated price tag in 1999 dollars of over $52 million. The actual park funding over the past 20 years came from a $9 million bond measure and a relatively small amount of SDC dollars.

What Got Built: Since 1999, the city added only about 50 acres of parks.[1] About 10,000 persons were added to the City's population in the last 20 years. Per the Parks Plan 14 acres per

[1] The 1999 Plan showed 273.66 acres of existing parks in Tables A-1 and A-2. The total acreage today as shown on the staff memo dated 10/10/19 is 348.57 acres, suggesting that we added about 75 acres in parks. However, it appears that some corrections were made to the 1999 data, as City Park then was 13 acres but today is shown as 16.79 acres, and Joe Dancer Park was formerly 85.38 acres but now counts as 107.62 acres. Correcting for these changes implies about 50 acres were added, and when we look at what was actually developed (Discovery Meadows, Riverside Dog Park, Chegwyn Farms, Heather Hollow, Jay Pearson, Thompson and West Hills), those new parks total about 45 acres, suggesting 50 acres is about right.

thousand standard, we should have added 140 acres of parks. We achieved only about one-third of the goal, to say nothing of making up the deficit because we were far under the 14 acres/1000 for the existing residents and were proposing to make up that deficit also. So, when we look at the 392 acres proposed this time, only about 180 acres is for the projected population increase. The balance is to make up a purported deficit that grows every year. Based on the evidence of what actually happened in the past 20 years, there is no reasonable basis to expect that the additional 392 acres the city proposes to urbanize will actually develop as parks over the planning period.

How the Schools Fit In: Table A-3 in the Parks Plan is a Facility Inventory: School Facilities. The Plan repeatedly calls for creating joint use agreements with the School District to share lands, thus reducing the need for the City to develop more park land. The School District representative at our meeting acknowledged that they do not lock their facilities and accept public use of the school grounds when school activities are not ongoing. This is not a complete solution to the clear need for more park land, but even without a formal joint use agreement (a high priority 20 years ago that never got done) it is obvious that some portion of school grounds will be used for park-type activities, much like it has for the past 50 years. This needs to be accounted for in the city's projection.

The Comp Plan Policies: All three of the Comprehensive Plan Policies cited in the 10/10/19 staff memo regarding the need for park land were adopted after I made similar objections to the unrealistic park land projections in the last UGB expansion attempt. At this point declaring a Parks Plan that has expired and was not implemented as the basis for an even bigger ask for park land makes no logical sense. Further, policy 163.05 excluding waterways that may flood from any community or neighborhood park would preclude including a creek in the park like we now have at City Park and Wortman Park. Is it really good park planning policy to keep all water features out of our bigger parks? Sure, we don't want our bathrooms and permanent park facilities to get flooded, but having a mixture of natural features surely makes a park more inviting.

Financial Reality: At present the City is considering building a new combined Aquatic/Community Center at a price tag that could exceed $50 million based on a recent consultant's report to the City Council. The reason the Council is considering the new facility is that making repairs to the existing pool and community center buildings cost almost as much as a new facility. So, regardless of how this process works out over the next few years, the Parks and Recreation Department is looking at tens of millions of expenditures on facilities. Looking at the estimates in the Parks Plan and adjusting them for current costs suggests that adding 392 acres of parks is going to cost over $100 million.

McMinnville voters are responsive to reasonable requests for public facilities and voted for a 20-year, $9 million parks bond that has financed most of the improvements in park lands we have seen since 2000. Based on the Council conversation it appears that when the parks bond expires

in 2021 the City will be considering using that bonding capacity for the new Aquatic/Community Center. If so, where is the money going to come from to develop 392 acres of parks, to say nothing of paying for the ongoing maintenance of that much land?

City Responsibility: This park land figure is the one area in the upcoming UGB expansion proposal that the City actually controls. We can make our best estimate of how many housing units, commercial buildings and industrial sites we need over 20 years, but there is no way to know how the private sector will respond. On parks the people finally approving the UGB expansion (i.e. the City Council) are also the body that will authorize the development of all City parks, presumably after getting public approval of a bond measure. Our history with the expired Parks Plan does not suggest that passing the buck to the future will result in the parks getting built. We need a realistic plan for funding also.

Conclusion: I am not opposed to adding lands for parks. I support that goal. However, it takes more than simply increasing the number of acres of land inside the UGB or pointing to an aspirational standard. It takes a real plan that describes the types of parks to be built including their cost and the sources of funding to get that many acres of park land developed. I do oppose an unrealistic increase in overall land need based on a purely aspirational projection of park land that lacks any historical evidence.

I also want to make clear that my statements are not a criticism of Susan Muir, Jay Pearson or any of the hardworking park staff members. I am confident that were the financial resources made available to develop more parks that our Parks and Recreation Department would eagerly expand our inventory of parks.