



# MEMORANDUM

## CITY OF TUALATIN

**TO:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**FROM:** Sherilyn Lombos, City Manager 

**DATE:** March 15, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Work Session for March 22, 2010

---

**Food:** We will be having the fajita buffet from Baja Fresh (and of course, plenty of cookies).

**5:30 p.m. (30 min) – Evaluation of Land Use Application Fees.** In April 2008 staff was asked to evaluate fees in Engineering & Building and Community Development to understand if we are capturing or recovering the costs associated with accepting and reviewing applications, issuing a decision and where applicable, conducting inspections. In addition, staff was asked to bring back information on adding a surcharge or fee to recoup some portion of the cost of long range planning work. Attached is a memo from Doug and Cindy with the requested information.

**Action requested:** Direction from the Council regarding land use application fees.

**6:00 p.m. (45 min) – Central Urban Renewal District Update.** Since March 8<sup>th</sup> there has been a tremendous amount of activity around modeling various scenarios to see what options the City has for revenue sharing with the overlapping taxing districts while at the same time having enough bonding capacity to do the projects in the plan. Staff and the Mayor will bring the Council up to date on the discussions and options and also discuss timing of approval.

**Action requested:** No specific action is requested.

**6:45 p.m. (10 min) – Council / Commission Meeting Agenda Review, Communications & Roundtable.**

**Action requested:** Council review the agenda for the March 8<sup>th</sup> City Council and Development Commission meetings and take the opportunity to brief the rest of the Council on any issues of mutual interest.

Upcoming Council Meetings & Work Sessions: Attached is a three-month look ahead for upcoming Council meetings and work sessions. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Dates to Note: Attached is the updated community calendar for the next three months.

As always, if you need anything from your staff, please feel free to let me know.



# MEMORANDUM

## CITY OF TUALATIN

**TO:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**THROUGH:** Sherilyn Lombos, City Manager *[Signature]*

**FROM:** Doug Rux, Community Development Director *[Signature]*  
Cindy Hahn, Assistant Planner *[Signature]*

**DATE:** March 22, 2010

**SUBJECT:** EVALUATION OF LAND USE APPLICATION FEES

---

### ISSUE BEFORE THE COUNCIL:

City Council consideration of which methodology is best for updating land use application fees, and whether any new fees or a surcharge to recoup the cost of long range planning work should be adopted.

### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

- Which methodology is best for updating land use application fees:
  - Inflation (Consumer Price Index [CPI]);
  - Cost recovery; or
  - Comparative to other cities?

Historically fees have been updated based on the CPI. Staff still does not have complete information about how much time and materials are spent on certain types of applications due to the continued lack of land development activity in 2009 and into 2010, extension of the expiration date of several Architectural Reviews to December 31, 2012, and as was found during the first tracking period (July 2008 to March 2009), the fact that some types of projects require several years to complete. In addition, as was found previously, there is not a like-for-like comparison to fees in other cities.

- Should the City charge for pre-application meetings?  
One benefit of not charging is that applicants are encouraged to work with staff early to ensure a smooth process when applications are submitted. These meetings provide an opportunity for staff and applicants to communicate about the project, what expectations both parties have in the process, and what is required of the applications. However, these meetings can use considerable staff time, and labor costs could be recouped if a fee is adopted.
- Should the City add a surcharge to land use application fees or employ another method to recoup long range planning work?  
Land use application fees do not cover long range planning work. The City of Lake Oswego charges a surcharge of 14.76% of the subject application fee for all

MEMORANDUM: Evaluation of Land Use Application Fees

March 22, 2010

Page 2 of 5

Land use application fees do not cover long range planning work. The City of Lake Oswego charges a surcharge of 14.76% of the subject application fee for all applications to recoup some of the cost. Long range planning work uses considerable staff time, and labor costs could be recouped if a similar surcharge is adopted.

**BACKGROUND:**

In April 2008, staff was asked to evaluate increasing Engineering & Building Department fees and Community Development Department fees according to a cost recovery method, which is intended to recover all the costs associated with accepting and reviewing applications, issuing a decision, and, where applicable, conducting inspections.

Staff tracked hours worked and materials used per application from July 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009. In May 2009, staff reported on tracking to date, and several issues were identified. An accurate assessment of labor and material costs associated with the applications was difficult to make for several reasons. One reason was due to the general economic climate in 2008 and 2009 and the lack of building, construction and land development activity. For this reason staff was not able to track all types of applications; for example, information was lacking for Architectural Reviews valued under \$5,000, Annexations, Architectural Review Single-family Level II (Discretionary), Conditional Use Permit Renewals, Temporary Uses, Transitional Use, and Variances. In Engineering & Building, information was lacking about Partitions, Subdivisions, and Property Line Adjustments.

The second reason it was difficult to make accurate assessments was due to the varying lengths of time required to complete projects. The completion time of projects that planners and engineers work on can range anywhere from several hours to multiple years. While staff worked on applications that came in before July 1, 2008, when tracking began, labor and material costs were only accumulated during the tracking period, and not all of the projects were finished when the tracking stopped. After the land use decision is issued, planners and engineers often continue working on projects, albeit at a reduced capacity, until the project is finalized. The applications that were tracked and completed in the tracking period required only minimal amounts of time commitments from staff.

In 2009, staff also looked at fees charged by eight (8) other local cities: Beaverton, Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Lake Oswego, Oregon City, Tigard, West Linn and Wilsonville. All of the cities, including Tualatin, have different types of fees and different charging methodologies. For example, Forest Grove often requires deposits and charges hourly for certain applications, and Oregon City will include a percentage of the construction costs in the fee. And no other city but Tualatin charges for an Industrial Master Plan (IMP). Because the fees varied in type and methodology, there was no real like-for-like comparison. Therefore, a table was prepared comparing all fees. It is included as Attachment A. In general, Tualatin's fees are lower than other cities with a few exceptions.

One major difference between Tualatin and other cities (except for Forest Grove and Hillsboro, of those surveyed) is that Tualatin does not charge for pre-application meetings. Typically, these meetings are coordinated by the Development Coordinator and are attended by an Assistant or Associate Planner, an Engineering Associate and the Building Official. The meetings typically take one to one and one-half hours (1-1.5). Depending on the application more staff may be required, including the Community Development Director, other departments may get involved, such as Community Services, and multiple meetings may be required. The other cities' pre-applications fees are included in Attachment A.

In May 2009, Council decided to increase the Engineering & Building Department fees and Community Development Department fees based on the CPI compounded over three years (2006 through 2008). Attachment B shows the current Fee Schedule, as of July 1, 2009, for these fees. Staff was directed to return to Council in the spring of 2010 with additional information on cost recovery and building in a surcharge or fee to recoup some portion of the cost of long range planning work. Therefore, staff continued to track hours worked and materials used for applications from March 31, 2009, when the tracking was initially stopped for the May 2009 evaluation, through February 5, 2010, the cutoff date for this year's City Fee Schedule Update.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

An accurate assessment of labor and material costs associated with land use applications continued to be problematic during the extended tracking period (March 31, 2009 through February 5, 2010) for several reasons:

- The general economic climate throughout 2009 and into 2010 continued to languish, with a consequent lack of building, construction and land development activity. Therefore, staff still was not able to track all types of applications.
- Council approval in August 2009 of Plan Text Amendment 09-06 (PTA0906) resulted in extension of the expiration date of several Architectural Reviews to December 31, 2012. Consequently, these projects are still in review, and it was not possible to determine their total labor and materials cost within the tracking period.
- As was found during the first tracking period, completion time of certain types of projects can require several years. As a result, only a snapshot of the actual labor and materials cost of these projects was obtained, even during the extended tracking period. For example, between July 1, 2008 and February 5, 2010, only three (3) of the Architectural Reviews received – Panda Express (AR0820), Schulz Clearwater (AR0822), and ATT Mobility/Aspen Place (AR0906) – were completed within the tracking period (see Attachment C).

The majority of certain types of projects were completed during the extended tracking period including: Architectural Review – Single-Family Level I, Conditional Use Permit, Historic Landmark Alteration, Industrial Master Plan, Interpretation, Minor Architectural Review, Sign Permit, Sign Variance, and Tree Cutting Permit. As shown in the table in

MEMORANDUM: Evaluation of Land Use Application Fees

March 22, 2010

Page 4 of 5

Attachment C, most of these projects were completed within the fee paid for the application, in many cases with a positive balance remaining.

For example, four (4) Architectural Review – Single-Family Level I reviews were completed within the tracking period. Of these, the first two (2) exceeded the \$50.00 fee by \$51.82 and \$20.88, while the latter two (2) were completed with a positive balance of \$26.44 and \$2.88, leaving an overall deficit of \$43.18.

As another example, six (6) Conditional Use Permit reviews were completed during the tracking period. Of these, one exceeded the fee paid by \$190.36 and another – Norwood Reservoir and Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) – was completed at no charge, since it was a City-initiated project and, therefore, resulted in an expense of \$448.45. Four (4) of the completed projects resulted in a positive total balance of \$2,747.68, when compared to the total fees paid of \$5,040.00. Overall, these six (6) projects resulted in an overall income of \$2,108.87.

A third example is Sign Permit reviews, of which seventeen (17) were tracked and completed within the tracking period. All of these resulted in an overall income of \$1,986.16 compared with total fees paid of \$2,316.00.

Noted exceptions to those applications discussed above, which for the most part were completed within the fee paid for the application, in many cases with a positive balance remaining, are those initiated by the City itself, as is the case for several Plan Text Amendments (PTAs), and applications for which the City does not currently charge a fee, such as Interpretations and Minor Architectural Reviews.

In fact, all PTAs tracked within the evaluation period were City-initiated, with the exception of PTA1001 for Hansen's Corner/Doggie Daycare, and did not incur a fee for service. These PTAs consume a considerable amount of staff time and tend to stretch out over an extended review period. For example, of the fifteen (15) PTAs initiated by the City within the tracking period, only six (6) have been completed, and these six (6) projects incurred \$8,754.52 in labor and materials.

Although Minor Architectural Reviews (MARs) do not generally require substantial staff time to complete – 1.00 to 3.00 hours on average – there can be a significant number of them in any given year – for example, 20 in 2009 – and the City does not charge a fee for this type of review at the present time. Further, the one Interpretation tracked during the evaluation period – INT0901, United Rentals – resulted in a total cost of \$3,063.72, none of which was covered by a fee for service.

Attachment C (last page) also provides information on the cost of pre-application meetings. Each meeting lasted approximately one (1) hour, except for the Powin Pacific Phase II meeting that lasted one and one-half (1.5) hours. Each pre-application meeting included from four to six (4-6) staff from the Community Development and Engineering & Building Departments, again with the exception of the Powin Pacific Phase II meeting,

MEMORANDUM: Evaluation of Land Use Application Fees

March 22, 2010

Page 5 of 5

which included eight (8) individuals. The cost of a typical meeting ranged from \$120 to \$155.

The fees charged for all Community Development Department and Engineering & Building Department applications were increased in 2009 based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) compounded over three (3) years (2006 through 2008). The percent change in the annual average CPI from 2008 to 2009 for the Portland-Salem OR-WA area according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 0.1(Attachment D). Should the Council decide to increase the land use application fees by the CPI again for 2010, the resultant effects on the fee amounts are shown in Attachment E.

As a basis to assess the amount of surcharge or similar fee that would need to be adopted to recoup a portion of the cost of long range planning work, the budgeted salary amount for 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff in long range planning within the Community Development Department for FY 2008/09 was \$95,050 and for FY 2009/10 is \$94,910, the slightly higher amount budgeted in FY 2008/09 being for overtime pay.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that Council discuss potential fee increases and provide direction to staff.

- Attachments:**
- A. Land Use Application Fees of Eight Other Oregon Cities
  - B. City Fee Schedule for Land Use Application Fees
  - C. Labor and Materials Costs for Land Use Applications
  - D. CPI for Portland-Salem OR-WA Area
  - E. CPI Increases for Land Use Application Fees

**Comparative Table of Land Use Application Fees from 8 Other Local Cities  
Compiled in Spring 2009**

Application Type	Tualastin (2009; Before CPI Increase)	Beaverton	Forest Grove	Hillsboro	Lake Oswego	Oregon City	Tigard	West Linn	Wilsonville
Plan Map Amendment (PMA)	\$1,795	\$5,140	\$61 hourly w/ a \$2,600 deposit, plus all incidental costs assoc w/ processing including legal notice, pub, copying and	\$4,200	\$9,461	\$3,960	\$6,885	\$3,000	\$5,920 legis. \$5,120 quasi-judicial
Plan Text Amendment (PTA)	\$1,795	\$5,140	\$61 hourly w/ a \$2,100 deposit, plus all incidental costs assoc w/ processing including legal notice, pub, copying and	\$4,200	\$4,732	\$3,960	\$6,885	n/a	\$5,920
Rezoning	See PMA	\$2,947	n/a	\$2,625	\$9,461	\$2,512	\$3,200	\$3,000	\$5,920 legis. \$1,280 quasi-judicial
Revise land development regs	See PTA	\$4,676	n/a	n/a	\$4,732	\$2,512	\$3,493	n/a	\$5,920
designator or repeal	\$1,795	n/a	\$27	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$4,016	n/a	n/a
alteration / new construction	\$50	\$670	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$50; if new construction add 2.5% of construction costs up to \$1,000.	\$615	alteration is \$500; new construction same as site development review fees.	n/a
demolition	\$50	\$670	n/a	n/a	\$3,599	\$248 if fewer than	\$615	n/a	n/a
relocation	\$50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Annexation (ANN)	\$1,225	n/a	\$61 hourly w/ a \$575 deposit, plus all incidental costs assoc w/ processing inc legal notice, pub, copying, and postage; +\$2,600 for Metro	\$1,260	\$0 + Metro if parcel less than 3x min. lot area for default zoning; \$670 per lot x no. of possible max. lots, plus Metro; \$1,340 for a parcel for which zoning has no min. lot area, plus Metro	\$3,898; plus at least \$150 for Metro	\$2,498	\$2,000	\$2,400 (exc. Metro)
Appeal to CC	\$115	\$250 to \$1,411, depending on Type	\$313	50% of subj app fee	\$514 if appealed to Metro	\$250 if admin; \$3,132 plus City attorney fees if to PC.	\$2,513	\$2,500	\$800
Appeal "Expedited Referee" per ORS	\$300	n/a	\$313	50% of subj app fee	n/a	n/a	\$500	\$2,500	\$960
AR:	Nonexpedited	Expedited	\$1,775 to \$3,905	Commercial design review \$61 hourly w/ \$2,800 deposit and incidental ... Non-res over 1 acre \$61 hourly w/ \$2,800 deposit and incidental ... Non res additions \$889 New res \$270 plus \$95 per unit over 1 res additions or accessory structures \$61	\$180 for SF intill; \$450 for SF or MF as part of PARSUB; \$898 non-res	if minor, \$742; if detailed master plan, see below	\$1,280		
Estimated Project Value	\$100	n/a	n/a	\$315	n/a	\$1,857 plus 0.7% of construction cost	\$4,405	4% of value, up to \$1,000	n/a
Less than \$5,000	\$470	n/a	n/a	\$580	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$5,000 to 24,999.99	\$850	n/a	n/a	\$1,840	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$25,000 to 99,999.99	\$1,415	n/a	n/a	\$2,625	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$100,000 to 499,999.99	\$2,070	n/a	n/a	\$3,940	n/a	if between \$500K and \$3 mil, then \$3,084 plus 0.5% of construction cost; if over \$3 mil, then \$10,520 plus 0.3% of construction cost.	n/a	4% of value, up to \$4,000 plus 4% of value, up to \$20K	n/a
\$500,000 to \$999,999.99	\$2,070	n/a	n/a	\$4,725	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999.99	\$2,070	n/a	n/a	\$5,775	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$5,000,000 or more	\$2,070	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
AR SF Level I (Clear & Objective)	\$50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
AR SF Level II (Discretionary)	\$700	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$320 (for multi-family, \$80 per unit)





**Comparative Table of Land Use Application Fees from 8 Other Local Cities  
Compiled in Spring 2009**

Application Type	Tualatin (2008; Before CPI Increase)	Beaverton	Forest Grove	Hillsboro	Lake Oswego	Oregon City	Tigard	West Linn	Wilsonville
Property Line Adjustmt. * Minor Variance included & primary use is not a single family dwelling in RL or RML	\$370	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Property Line Adjustmt. * Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$115	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Public Works Construction Code	\$40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision:									
Subdivision, * Nonexpedited and Expedited Processes	\$2,320	\$4,123+95/lot preliminary subdivision or fee ownership subdivision; \$1,050 final subdivision, \$6,522 expedited land division	\$61.00/hr, 1,875 deposit +\$62/lot over 3 lots; \$713-Final subdivision; \$300-Expedited, preliminary expedited land division \$1,004	\$4,725 max 1/122 lots; (Final) \$1,575; 4-10 lots; \$158/lot; 11-22 lots; \$3,545; 23 or more lots	\$4,476 +194 per lot; expedited \$8,361 +194 per lot	\$3,713 + 309 per lot	Without Planned Development: \$4,200 +\$200 per lot; Expedited \$4,000 \$240/net acre >2 acres + \$5,095 +\$90/lot; +\$300 + referee costs with planned development: add \$7,127, expedited without: \$5,773 +\$90/lot; expedited with: add \$7,127; Final Plat: \$1,638	\$1,280 Residential; \$240/net acre >2 acres + \$16/lot; (Fees are the same, Commercial >1 acres; Industrial >5 acres; Public >10 acres)	
Subdivision, * Variance included & primary use is a single family dwelling in RL or RML	\$2,550	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Variance included & primary use is not a single family dwelling in RL or RML	\$2,610	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Minor Variance included & primary use is a single family dwelling in RL or RML	\$2,435	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Minor Variance included & primary use is not a single family dwelling in RL or RML	\$2,495	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Nonexpedited, Extension/Modif. by Council	\$530	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Expedited, Extension/Modif. by City Engineer	\$130	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Nonexpedited, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$115	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subdivision, * Expedited Appeal to Referee, Deposit per ORS 197.375	\$300	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Street Name Change	\$115	\$1,658.00	n/a	n/a	\$250.00	n/a	n/a	\$940.00	
Street Vacation Application Deposit	\$290	\$1,980.00	n/a	n/a	\$1,500.00	\$890.00	\$2,198 + Actual costs	\$2,500.00	\$1,920.00
Zone of Benefit Application Fee	\$580	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$500.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Comparative Table of Land Use Application Fees from 8 Other Local Cities  
Compiled in Spring 2009**

Application Type	Tualatin (2009; Before CPI Increase)	Beaverton	Forest Grove	Hillsboro	Lake Oswego	Oregon City	Tigard	West Linn	Wilsonville
Pre-application/ Scoping Meetings	\$0.00	\$237.00	no fee	na	infill design: \$497 pre-application with planning staff; \$1,591 pre-application with infill advisor team; \$300 all other applications; No fee-one follow up meeting to discuss issues at pre-application; 50% of application for any meetings after follow up; \$65/hr- private outside context of pre-application or at the counter services by a planner.	\$494 minor, \$959 Major	\$370	Level I (Planning review only) \$350; Level II (Citywide departmental review) \$1,000	Residential: \$160- <50 lots/units; \$320- <floor> 50 lots/units; Others \$400- Single bldg. <100,000 sq. ft.; \$640- all others

**Notes**

**Lake Oswego:**  
 Note 1: refunds are handled:  
 80% if withdrawal prior to notice of app and legal notices  
 50% if withdrawal prior to start report  
 no refund if staff report begun  
 Note 2: all apps have a long-range planning surcharge of 14.76% of subject app fee  
 Note 3: joint apps allowed; fee is highest of two apps plus 50% of the lower fee app

## CITY OF TUALATIN FEE SCHEDULE- As of July 1, 2009

Service/Materials	Fee Schedule as of July 1, 2009	New Fee Amount Requested by Department
<b>Community Development Department:</b>		
8 Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Map	\$2,000.00	
Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Text/Landmark		
9 Designation/Removal of Landmark Designation	\$2,000.00	
10 Annexation	\$1,365.00	
11 Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	
Appeal Expedited Process to Referee, Deposit per ORS		
12 197.375 (no change to 197.375)	\$300.00	No change
Architectural Review Application, Nonexpedited Process: Estimated Project Value:		
13 Under \$5,000	\$111.00	
14 \$5,000 - \$24,999.99	\$524.00	
15 \$25,000 - \$99,999.99	\$947.00	
16 \$100,000 - \$499,999.99	\$1,576.00	
17 \$500,000 and greater	\$2,306.00	
Architectural Review Application, Expedited Process: Estimated Project Value:		
18 Under \$5,000	\$111.00	
19 \$5,000 - \$24,999.99	\$1,053.00	
20 \$25,000 - \$99,999.99	\$2,094.00	
21 \$100,000 - \$499,999.99	\$3,153.00	
22 \$500,000 and greater	\$4,829.00	
Architectural Review, Single-family Level I (Clear & 23 Objective)	\$50.00	
24 Architectural Review, Single-family Level II (Discretionary)	\$700.00	
25 Conditional Use Permit	\$1,365.00	
26 Conditional Use Permit Renewal	\$1,365.00	
27 Core Area Parking District Tax Appeal	\$128.00	
28 Interpretation of Development Code	No Fee	
29 Industrial Master Plan	\$1,743.00	
30 Landmark Alteration/New Construction Review	\$56.00	
31 Landmark Demolition Review	\$56.00	
32 Landmark Relocation Review	\$56.00	
33 Reinstatement of Nonconforming Use	\$1,365.00	
34 Request for Council Rehearing	\$156.00	
35 Sign Code Interpretation	\$390.00	
36 Sign Ordinance	\$7.00	
37 Sign Code Variance	\$646.00	
Sign Permit: New Sign or Structural Change to Existing		
38 Sign	\$128.00	
Sign Permit: Temporary Sign or Each Face Change to		
39 Existing Sign	\$67.00	
Temporary Uses: 1-		
40 3 days	\$45.00	
41 4-180 days	\$45.00 + 1.50/day	
42 Over 3 days	not to exceed a total of \$189.00	
43 Transitional Use Permit	\$1,465.00	
44 Tree Cutting Permit, 1 tree	\$276.00	
Tree Cutting Permit, each additional tree, \$10.00 not to		
45 exceed a total of	\$300.00	
Variance: When primary use is a single-family dwelling in		
46 RL or RML	\$273.00	
Variance: When primary use is not a single-family dwelling		
47 in RL or RML	\$1,365.00	
Variance, Minor: When primary use is a single-family		
48 dwelling in RL or RML	\$273.00	

# CITY OF TUALATIN FEE SCHEDULE- As of July 1, 2009

Service/Materials	Fee Schedule as of July 1, 2009	New Fee Amount Requested by Department
Variance, Minor: When primary use is not a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	\$1,008.00	
49 Planning, All Other Actions	\$312.00	
<b>Engineering &amp; Building Department:</b>		
Engineering Copies:		
51 1987 and earlier, aerial/contour maps	\$7.00	
52 36"x48"	\$4.00	
53 24"x36"	\$3.00	
54 18"x24" and 11"x17"	\$2.00	
Geographic Information System:		
55 Citywide aerial photo, 36"x42"	\$28.00	
56 Subdivision street map, 34"x36"	\$13.00	
57 Street map, 22"x22"	\$7.00	
58 Planning Districts, 34"x44"	\$13.00	
59 Planning Districts, 18"x24"	\$7.00	
60 Custom Mapping	50.00/hr, plus materials	
61 Partition, Nonexpedited & Expedited Processes	\$390.00	
Partition, Nonexpedited & Expedited		
62 Extension/Modification	\$128.00	
63 Partition, Nonexpedited, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	
Partition, Expedited, Appeal to Referee, Deposit per ORS		
64 197.375 (no change to ORS 197.375)	\$300.00	No change
Partition, Minor Variance included & primary use is a single-		
65 family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	
Partition, Minor Variance included & primary use is not a		
66 single-family dwelling & not in RL or RML	Add 195.00	
Property Line Adjustment, primary use is a single-family		
67 dwelling in RL or RML	\$67.00	
Property Line Adjustment, Minor Variance included &		
68 primary use is a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	
Property Line Adjustment, primary use is not a single-		
69 family dwelling in RL or RML	\$284.00	
Property Line Adjustment, Minor Variance included &		
70 primary use is not a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	
71 Property Line Adjustment, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	
72 Public Works Construction Code	\$45.00	
73 Subdivision, Nonexpedited and Expedited Processes	\$2,585.00	
Subdivision, Variance included & primary use is a single-		
74 family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 256.00	
Subdivision, Variance included & primary use is not a		
75 single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 323.00	
Subdivision, Minor Variance included & primary use is a		
76 single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	
Subdivision, Minor Variance included & primary use is not		
77 a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 195.00	
Subdivision, Nonexpedited, Extension/Modification by		
78 Council	\$591.00	
Subdivision, Expedited, Extension/Modification by City		
79 Engineer	\$145.00	
80 Subdivision, Nonexpedited, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	
Subdivision, Expedited, Appeal to Referee, Deposit per		
81 ORS 197.375 (no change to ORS 197.375)	\$300.00	No change
82 Street Name Change	\$128.00	
83 Street Vacation Application Deposit	\$323.00	
84 Zone of Benefit Application Fee	\$646.00	

**APPLICATIONS**

application Annexation	Name	Case	Hours	Labor Cost	Material Cost	Total Cost	Fee Paid for app.	Balance	Application Status
Grace Community Church - Horizon HS ANN0606 & PMA0601									
<b>Architectural Review</b>									
12/29/03	Riverhouse	AR0318	8.50	\$ 200.26	\$	\$ 200.26			Complete
12/1/06	City Library Expansion	AR0627	4.25	\$ 121.54	\$	\$ 121.54	\$ 1,785.00	\$ (1,663.46)	Under Construction; Needs Attention
6/15/07	Shoppes at Bridgeport	AR0714	6.25	\$ 206.07	\$	\$ 206.07	no charge	\$ 206.07	Complete
6/20/07	Taco Bell Redesign	AR0717	30.50	\$ 892.74	\$	\$ 892.74	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,177.26)	Hotel Complete; Retail On Hold
8/27/07	Clearwire	AR0723	8.00	\$ 201.47	\$	\$ 201.47	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,868.53)	Complete
2/1/08	Lever Tualatin Pump Station	AR0804	2.25	\$ 53.01	\$	\$ 53.01	\$ 470.00	\$ (416.99)	Complete
2/26/08	Living Savior Lutheran Church	AR0805	0.50	\$ 19.43	\$	\$ 19.43	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (2,050.57)	Under Construction
4/3/08	Pacific Coast Fruit	AR0806	1.25	\$ 36.59	\$	\$ 36.59	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (2,034.41)	Complete
4/14/08	Alexan	AR0809	0.25	\$ 5.89	\$	\$ 5.89	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (2,064.11)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
4/17/08	Tualatin Bus Park (Walgravee)	AR0810	41.75	\$ 1,222.10	\$	\$ 1,222.10	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (847.90)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
5/29/08	Robinson Crossing	AR0812	24.50	\$ 676.81	\$	\$ 676.81	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,393.19)	Under Construction
6/1/08	Mutual Materials	AR0813	101.00	\$ 3,086.72	\$	\$ 3,086.72	\$ 2,070.00	\$ 1,016.72	Under Construction
8/8/08	Western Wood Structures	AR0815	4.50	\$ 125.51	\$	\$ 125.51	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,944.49)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
9/8/08	COT Water Pump Station	AR0816	90.75	\$ 2,185.08	\$ 192.77	\$ 2,377.85	\$ 1,415.00	\$ 962.85	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
9/29/08	Cell Site (Tmobile)	AR0817	17.25	\$ 488.09	\$ 17.00	\$ 505.09	\$ 850.00	\$ (344.91)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
9/15/08	Western Wood Structures II	AR0818	61.50	\$ 1,485.13	\$ 8.52	\$ 1,493.65	\$ 850.00	\$ 643.65	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
10/24/08	Meridian Business Park	AR0819	38.50	\$ 1,001.07	\$ 29.28	\$ 1,030.35	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,039.65)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
10/24/08	Panda Express	AR0820	41.00	\$ 1,177.50	\$ 39.48	\$ 1,216.98	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (853.02)	Complete
10/29/08	COT WCF Co-location	AR0821	24.25	\$ 584.81	\$ 5.92	\$ 590.73	\$ 850.00	\$ (259.27)	Approved; Never started
12/2/08	Schulz Clearwater	AR0822	16.75	\$ 434.06	\$ 46.64	\$ 480.70	\$ 470.00	\$ 10.70	Complete
1/2/09	TV&R Station Expansion	AR0901	27.25	\$ 678.71	\$ 53.29	\$ 732.00	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (1,338.00)	In Review; Extension to 12/31/2012
1/16/09	PacTrust/Koch Corporate	AR0902	45.00	\$ 1,161.31	\$ 1.92	\$ 1,163.23	\$ 2,070.00	\$ (906.77)	Under Construction
5/19/09	Coho Court Profession Bldg	AR0903	1.00	\$ 23.56	\$	\$ 23.56	\$ 850.00	\$ (826.44)	Under Construction; Extended to 9/8/2010
5/29/09	Teton Lot 9/Premier Industrial	AR0904	24.25	\$ 665.92	\$ 26.16	\$ 692.08	\$ 1,415.00	\$ (722.92)	In Review; Expires 8/25/2010
6/8/09	Anderson Forge & Machine	AR0905	50.00	\$ 1,286.56	\$ 72.97	\$ 1,359.53	\$ 1,415.00	\$ (55.47)	In Review; Expires 9/4/2010
7/2/09	ATT Mobility/Aspen Place	AR0906	3.00	\$ 93.03	\$ 27.98	\$ 121.01	\$ 850.00	\$ (728.99)	Complete
9/9/09	Tualatin Heights Apts/Trash	AR0907	32.00	\$ 801.89	\$ 23.89	\$ 825.78	\$ 947.00	\$ (121.22)	Under Construction
9/18/09	Stafford Hills Racquet Club	AR0908	172.00	\$ 5,106.51	\$ 221.08	\$ 5,327.59	\$ 2,306.00	\$ 3,021.59	In Review; Expires 1/25/2011
12/3/09	Wendy's Remodel	AR0910	83.00	\$ 2,387.13	\$ 48.39	\$ 2,435.52	\$ 2,306.00	\$ 129.52	In Review; Expires 2/23/2011
			29.50	\$ 728.40	\$ 285.93	\$ 1,014.33	\$ 1,576.00	\$ (561.67)	In Review; Expires 1/25/2011
<b>Architectural Review - Single Family Level 1</b>									
7/17/08	Graham	ARSF1 0801	4.00	\$ 101.82	\$	\$ 101.82	\$ 50.00	\$ 51.82	Complete
11/1/08	Johnson	ARSF1 0804	3.00	\$ 70.68	\$	\$ 70.68	\$ 50.00	\$ 20.68	Complete
10/9/09	Gertz	ARSF1 0902	1.00	\$ 23.56	\$	\$ 23.56	\$ 50.00	\$ (26.44)	Complete
1/15/10	Zadow	ARSF1 1001	2.00	\$ 47.12	\$	\$ 47.12	\$ 50.00	\$ (2.88)	Complete
<b>Conditional Use Permit</b>									
5/16/08	Mutual Materials	CUP0802	3.00	\$ 103.10	\$	\$ 103.10	\$ 1,225.00	\$ (1,121.90)	Complete
7/24/08	NWRESD Preschool	CUP0803	28.25	\$ 861.52	\$ 6.24	\$ 867.76	\$ 1,225.00	\$ (357.24)	Complete
7/29/08	Norwood Reservoir and WCF	CUP0804	11.50	\$ 306.53	\$ 141.92	\$ 448.45	no charge	\$ 448.45	Complete
2/17/09	Stafford Hills Racquet Club	CUP0901	41.00	\$ 1,337.79	\$ 77.57	\$ 1,415.36	\$ 1,225.00	\$ 190.36	Complete
6/15/09	Tualatin Mini Storage	CUP0902	26.75	\$ 689.66	\$	\$ 689.66	\$ 1,225.00	\$ (535.34)	Complete
5/28/09	Mutual Materials	CUP0903	5.25	\$ 157.64	\$	\$ 157.64	\$ 1,225.00	\$ (1,067.36)	Complete
10/16/09	Glass Doctor	CUP0904	19.50	\$ 577.26	\$	\$ 577.26	\$ 1,365.00	\$ (787.74)	Complete
1/8/10	Hansen's Corner Dog Daycare	CUP1001	5.50	\$ 186.90	\$ 10.06	\$ 196.96	\$ 1,365.00	\$ (1,168.14)	In Review
1/13/10	MITCH Charter School	CUP1002	17.50	\$ 458.13	\$ 7.70	\$ 465.83	\$ 1,365.00	\$ (899.17)	In Review
<b>Historic Landmark Alteration</b>									
11/5/08	Old Tualatin Elem/Marquis	HIST0801	0.50	\$ 47.32	\$	\$ 47.32	no fee	\$	Complete
<b>Industrial Master Plan</b>									
10/1/08	Mittleman	IMP0801	25.00	\$ 750.08	\$ 34.33	\$ 784.41	\$ 1,556.00	\$ (771.59)	Complete
1/1/09	JAE	IMP0901	9.50	\$ 309.60	\$	\$ 309.60	\$ 1,556.00	\$ (1,246.40)	Complete

TYPE OF CASE	TOTAL PER YEAR		
	2010	2009	2008
ANN	0	0	1
AR	1	2	3
ARSF	2	4	4
CUP	0	0	1
ENFL	0	5	2
ENFN	0	0	1
ENFS	0	0	1
HIST	0	0	1
IMP	0	1	1
INT	0	1	1
LUCS	2	17	23
MAR	6	20	10
MVAR	0	0	0
PMA	0	3	3
PTA	1	10	8
RP	0	2	1
SIGN	14	103	128
SVAR	0	1	0
TCP	0	0	2
TUP	0	7	4

**APPLICATIONS**

application interpretation	Name	Case	Hours	Labor Cost	Material Cost	Total Cost	Fee Paid for app.	Balance	Application Status
6/23/09 Stan Sposilo/United Rentals	INT0901		96.50	\$ 3,015.98	\$ 47.74	\$ 3,063.72	no charge	\$ 3,063.72	Complete
<b>Minor Architectural Review</b>									
11/27/07 Clearwire at McEwan (Landscape)	MAR0730		2.75	\$ 76.67		\$ 76.67	no charge	\$ 76.67	Complete
12/8/08 Sherwood School Dist. Bus	MAR0810		1.00	\$ 37.61		\$ 37.61	no charge	\$ 37.61	Complete
6/9/09 Hansen's Corner/Dry Cleaner	MAR0912		2.25	\$ 58.95		\$ 58.95	no charge	\$ 58.95	Complete
1/27/10 Morrill In-Law	MAR1003		1.75	\$ 53.11		\$ 53.11	no charge	\$ 53.11	Complete
<b>Partition</b>									
2/28/08 Hazelbrook (City-initiated; Parks)	PAR0801		12.25	\$ 381.40		\$ 381.40	\$ 350.00	\$ 31.40	Withdrawn
10/20/08 Itell/IDM	PAR0803		4.50	\$ 145.54		\$ 145.54	\$ 350.00	\$ (204.46)	Complete
8/4/09 Graham Property	PAR0905		26.50	\$ 789.48		\$ 789.48	\$ 390.00	\$ 399.48	In Review
<b>Property Line Adjustment</b>									
6/25/07 Chapman	PLA0705		1.50	\$ 57.73		\$ 57.73	\$ 255.00	\$ (197.27)	Complete
<b>Plan Map Amendment</b>									
3/3/08 McEachern-Parham (withdrawn)	PMA0801		6.00	\$ 168.87		\$ 168.87	\$ 1,795.00	\$ (1,626.13)	Withdrawn
1/17/08 Zupancic-Kozlowski	PMA0803 *		8.50	\$ 353.65		\$ 353.65	\$ 1,795.00	\$ (1,441.35)	Withdrawn
3/30/09 Marquis	PMA0901		13.00	\$ 595.73		\$ 595.73	\$ 1,795.00	\$ (1,199.27)	Complete
6/17/09 Waterman Property	PMA0902		19.50	\$ 537.15	\$ 9.76	\$ 546.91	\$ 1,795.00	\$ (1,248.09)	Complete
9/20/26 Legacy MPH	PMA0903		129.00	\$ 3,856.97		\$ 3,856.97	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,856.97	In Review
<b>Plan Text Amendment</b>									
4/1/05 Town Center Plan	PTA0504		53.00	\$ 1,367.48		\$ 1,367.48	no charge	\$ 1,367.48	Ongoing
7/7/08 Street Trees	PTA0804		195.00	\$ 4,830.67		\$ 4,830.67	no charge	\$ 4,830.67	Complete
7/7/08 Metro 80% Density	PTA0805		15.75	\$ 727.47		\$ 727.47	no charge	\$ 727.47	In Review
Free Standing Sign Design	PTA0806		89.00	\$ 2,749.09	\$ 96.14	\$ 2,845.23	no charge	\$ 2,845.23	In Review
Monument Signs in CO	PTA0807		28.25	\$ 833.74	\$ 30.36	\$ 864.10	no charge	\$ 864.10	Complete
Single Family Res Standards	PTA0808		30.50	\$ 925.64	\$ 30.96	\$ 956.60	no charge	\$ 956.60	Complete
3/19/09 Fence Standards Phase II	PTA0901		14.00	\$ 401.12		\$ 401.12	no charge	\$ 401.12	Complete
6/23/09 For Lease/For Sale Signs	PTA0902		81.75	\$ 2,091.79	\$ 3.15	\$ 2,094.94	no charge	\$ 2,094.94	In Review
5/18/09 Historic Preservation Regulations	PTA0903		40.25	\$ 1,067.09		\$ 1,067.09	no charge	\$ 1,067.09	In Review
5/18/09 Tree Preservation Regulations II	PTA0904		32.50	\$ 860.74		\$ 860.74	no charge	\$ 860.74	In Review
7/22/09 CURD Amendment (Train Horn Noise)	PTA0905		21.00	\$ 972.25	\$ 10.80	\$ 983.05	no charge	\$ 983.05	Complete
8/4/09 AR Approval Extension	PTA0906		26.50	\$ 718.98		\$ 718.98	no charge	\$ 718.98	Complete
10/15/09 Public Hearing/Land Use Notification	PTA0907		44.00	\$ 1,155.44		\$ 1,155.44	no charge	\$ 1,155.44	In Review
10/15/09 Engineering Division/Sewer Storm	PTA0908		4.75	\$ 135.67		\$ 135.67	no charge	\$ 135.67	In Review
10/29/09 Urban Renewal Maximum Indebted	PTA0910		1043.00	\$ 49,280.09	\$ 1,805.52	\$ 51,085.61	no charge	\$ 51,085.61	In Review
1/11/09 South Tualatin	PTA0911		50.00	\$ 1,534.40		\$ 1,534.40	no charge	\$ 1,534.40	In Review
1/8/10 Hansen's Corner/Doggie Daycare	PTA1001		5.00	\$ 163.14	\$ 12.74	\$ 175.88	\$ 2,000.00	\$ (1,824.12)	In Review
<b>Sign Permit</b>									
6/16/09 Providence Bridgeport	S09037		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 115.00	\$ (103.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09059		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09060		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09061		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09062		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09063		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
7/31/09 Taco Bell	S09064		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
9/22/09 Subway; Famous Footwear	S09072-75		1.00	\$ 23.56		\$ 23.56	\$ 512.00	\$ (488.44)	Complete
10/2/09 Huntair	S09078		2.50	\$ 58.90		\$ 58.90	\$ 128.00	\$ (69.10)	Complete
10/8/09 Baja Fresh	S09083		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 67.00	\$ (55.22)	Complete
11/3/09 Bedco Mattress	S09089		1.00	\$ 23.56		\$ 23.56	\$ 128.00	\$ (104.44)	Complete
11/13/09 Village Inn	S09102		2.00	\$ 47.12		\$ 47.12	\$ 67.00	\$ (19.88)	Complete
7/5/36 SC Design	S09102		0.75	\$ 17.67		\$ 17.67	\$ 128.00	\$ (110.33)	Complete
1/7/10 Harris Law	S09103		1.00	\$ 23.56		\$ 23.56	\$ 128.00	\$ (104.44)	Complete
1/14/10 Great Clips	S10001		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 67.00	\$ (55.22)	Complete
2/2/10 Key Bank	S10008		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 128.00	\$ (116.22)	Complete
2/2/10 Providence Bridgeport	S10009		0.50	\$ 11.78		\$ 11.78	\$ 67.00	\$ (55.22)	Complete
2/5/10 FedEx Kinkos	S10010		0.75	\$ 17.67		\$ 17.67	\$ 128.00	\$ (110.33)	Complete

**APPLICATIONS**

Date of application Subdivision	Name	Case	Hours	Labor Cost	Material Cost	Total Cost	Fee Paid for app.	Balance	Application Status
11/20/06	Amberstone	SB0602	3.00	\$ 92.61		\$ 92.61	\$ 2,320.00	\$ (2,227.39) ?	
6/19/97	Franklin Business Park	SB9703	14.50	\$ 429.21		\$ 429.21		\$ 429.21	Complete
<b>Sign Variance</b>									
8/13/09	Dick's Sporting Goods	SVAR0901	21.25	\$ 630.16	\$ 76.81	\$ 706.97	\$ 646.00	\$ 60.97	Complete
<b>Tree Cutting Permit</b>									
7/1/08	20843 SW Willapa Way	TCP0801	8.75	\$ 216.90	\$ 5.99	\$ 222.89	\$ 300.00	\$ (77.11)	Complete

**PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS**

Date	Name	Subsequent Case Number	Hours	Labor Cost	Total Cost
7/10/09	Dick's Sporting Goods	MAR0916:	4.25	\$ 120.91	\$ 120.91
10/8/09	Powin Pacific Phase II	SVAR0901	12.00	\$ 391.44	\$ 391.44
10/12/09	Public Utilities PMA	No App Yet	4.50	\$ 151.82	\$ 151.82
7/31/09	Wendy's Remodel	PTA0908	5.00	\$ 155.10	\$ 155.10
10/7/09	Zone Change Scoping	AR0910	4.00	\$ 134.84	\$ 134.84
		Hwy 99W; No App			

**Table 16A. Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U): Selected areas, by expenditure category and commodity and service group-Continued**

(1982-84=100, unless otherwise noted)

Item and Group	Portland-Salem, OR-WA		St. Louis, MO-IL		San Diego, CA		San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA		
	Annual average 2009	Percent change from 2008 to 2009	Annual average 2009	Percent change from 2008 to 2009	Annual average 2009	Percent change from 2008 to 2009	Annual average 2009	Percent change from 2008 to 2009	
<b>Expenditure category</b>									
All items <sup>3</sup> .....	215.647	0.1	198.472	-0.1	242.270	0.0	224.395	0.7	
All items (1967=100) <sup>4</sup> .....	631.324	-	589.494	-	819.189	-	689.852	-	
Food and beverages <sup>3</sup> .....	203.224	2.6	210.179	2.8	224.040	1.0	228.016	1.4	
Food <sup>3</sup> .....	204.188	2.6	208.983	2.9	220.977	.7	227.533	1.4	
Food at home .....	196.079	-5	200.534	2.1	206.359	-.2	224.520	-1.3	
Food away from home <sup>5</sup> .....	217.435	5.7	224.040	4.2	238.763	1.5	230.037	4.0	
Alcoholic beverages <sup>5</sup> .....	194.518	1.6	210.040	2.2	250.083	3.6	238.571	1.2	
Housing <sup>3</sup> .....	212.421	2.1	189.988	.6	275.649	1.7	246.168	1.5	
Shelter .....	242.720	1.8	213.872	.7	308.985	.9	276.658	1.3	
Rent of primary residence <sup>3</sup> .....	233.069	2.8	193.370	1.3	298.517	2.4	298.154	3.2	
Owners' equivalent rent of primary residence <sup>6</sup> .....	252.597	2.5	222.881	1.4	328.806	1.5	300.060	2.1	
<sup>7</sup> .....	227.864	3.5	184.801	-.4	232.325	13.4	260.789	.8	
Fuels and utilities .....	196.883	3.0	170.072	-2.2	201.231	15.9	274.397	-.5	
Household energy .....	245.536	5.5	174.198	-1.3	198.648	17.3	274.547	-.1	
Gas (piped) and electricity .....	258.422	4.5	148.151	6.5	186.124	23.1	297.068	9.8	
Electricity .....	215.740	8.1	194.320	-10.8	162.992	-24.3	210.801	-24.5	
Utility (piped) gas service .....	113.322	2.0	136.959	.4	183.428	.3	132.541	2.6	
Household furnishings and operations .....	110.750	-5.6	131.634	3.9	125.723	.2	109.140	3.6	
Apparel <sup>3</sup> .....	202.837	-7.5	171.446	-7.1	184.717	-8.0	166.663	-5.5	
Transportation <sup>3</sup> .....	202.240	-7.6	172.327	-7.2	179.005	-8.0	157.868	-5.9	
Private transportation .....	213.824	-26.5	211.607	-28.7	211.098	-23.9	203.130	-25.2	
Motor fuel .....	216.117	-26.0	209.063	-28.4	212.124	-23.6	203.181	-24.6	
Gasoline (all types) .....	213.774	-26.3	202.134	-28.8	219.950	-23.9	203.343	-24.8	
Gasoline, unleaded regular <sup>8</sup> .....	184.830	-25.2	242.675	-27.9	183.205	-23.1	189.363	-24.2	
Gasoline, unleaded midgrade <sup>8 9</sup> .....	203.777	-24.4	208.589	-26.6	217.348	-22.7	191.876	-24.0	
Gasoline, unleaded premium <sup>8</sup> .....	428.971	7.4	360.931	4.5	377.166	2.1	380.776	4.2	
Medical care <sup>3</sup> .....	108.122	-4.0	115.253	-6.3	140.299	-1.4	106.743	1.1	
Recreation <sup>10</sup> .....	110.927	2.0	133.992	3.3	125.701	5.4	138.587	4.0	
Education and communication <sup>10</sup> .....	420.049	6.2	289.582	6.7	363.261	5.5	386.173	4.8	
Other goods and services <sup>3</sup> .....	<b>Commodity and service group</b>								
All items <sup>3</sup> .....	215.647	.1	198.472	-.1	242.270	.0	224.395	.7	
Commodities .....	165.022	-2.6	169.969	-1.8	182.042	-2.9	166.937	-2.0	
Commodities less food and beverages .....	146.165	-5.5	148.512	-4.4	159.979	-5.0	132.451	-4.2	
Nondurables less food and beverages .....	171.106	-8.9	188.568	-7.4	172.646	-9.1	161.752	-7.3	
Durables .....	115.492	-1.1	111.330	.0	149.842	-.1	104.041	.2	
Services .....	266.894	2.1	228.585	1.1	295.548	1.6	272.559	2.3	
<b>Special aggregate indexes</b>									
All items less medical care <sup>3</sup> .....	205.941	-.3	190.421	-.4	235.802	-.2	217.933	.5	
All items less shelter .....	206.298	-.7	194.853	-.5	215.905	-.5	204.246	.3	
Commodities less food .....	147.786	-5.1	151.326	-4.0	163.910	-4.6	137.159	-3.9	
Nondurables .....	186.235	-3.2	199.576	-2.4	199.004	-4.0	195.844	-2.8	
Nondurables less food .....	172.003	-8.1	190.798	-6.6	179.227	-7.9	167.542	-6.6	
Services less rent of shelter <sup>6</sup> .....	304.126	2.3	249.713	1.4	292.589	2.9	281.726	3.6	
Services less medical care services .....	255.061	1.6	216.452	.8	287.289	1.7	265.177	2.1	
Energy <sup>3</sup> .....	202.109	-16.0	187.624	-17.4	204.916	-12.2	229.384	-17.1	
All items less energy .....	219.486	1.7	202.179	1.8	247.399	1.1	227.004	2.1	
All items less food and energy <sup>3</sup> .....	223.998	1.5	201.301	1.5	253.363	1.2	227.588	2.3	

See footnotes at end of table.

# CPI INCREASES

Service/Materials	Fee Schedule as of 1-Jul-09	CPI Increase
		2009 0.001
<b>Community Development Department:</b>		
8 Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Map	\$2,000.00	\$2,002.00
9 Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Text/Landmark Designation/Removal of Landmark Designation	\$2,000.00	\$2,002.00
10 Annexation	\$1,365.00	\$1,366.37
11 Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	\$128.13
12 Appeal Expedited Process to Referee, Deposit per ORS 197.375 (no change to 197.375)	\$300.00	\$300.30
Architectural Review Application, Nonexpedited Process: Estimated Project Value:		
13 Under \$5,000	\$111.00	\$111.11
14 \$5,000 - \$24,999.99	\$524.00	\$524.52
15 \$25,000 - \$99,999.99	\$947.00	\$947.95
16 \$100,000 - \$499,999.99	\$1,576.00	\$1,577.58
17 \$500,000 and greater	\$2,306.00	\$2,308.31
Architectural Review Application, Expedited Process: Estimated Project Value:		
18 Under \$5,000	\$111.00	\$111.11
19 \$5,000 - \$24,999.99	\$1,053.00	\$1,054.05
20 \$25,000 - \$99,999.99	\$2,094.00	\$2,096.09
21 \$100,000 - \$499,999.99	\$3,153.00	\$3,156.15
22 \$500,000 and greater	\$4,829.00	\$4,833.83
23 Architectural Review, Single-family Level I (Clear & Objective)	\$50.00	\$50.05
24 Architectural Review, Single-family Level II (Discretionary)	\$700.00	\$700.70
25 Conditional Use Permit	\$1,365.00	\$1,366.37
26 Conditional Use Permit Renewal	\$1,365.00	\$1,366.37
27 Core Area Parking District Tax Appeal	\$128.00	\$128.13
28 Interpretation of Development Code	No Fee	No Fee
29 Industrial Master Plan	\$1,743.00	\$1,744.74
30 Landmark Alteration/New Construction Review	\$56.00	\$56.06
31 Landmark Demolition Review	\$56.00	\$56.06
32 Landmark Relocation Review	\$56.00	\$56.06
33 Reinstatement of Nonconforming Use	\$1,365.00	\$1,366.37
34 Request for Council Rehearing	\$156.00	\$156.16
35 Sign Code Interpretation	\$390.00	\$390.39
36 Sign Ordinance	\$7.00	\$7.01
37 Sign Code Variance	\$646.00	\$646.65
38 Sign Permit: New Sign or Structural Change to Existing Sign	\$128.00	\$128.13
39 Sign Permit: Temporary Sign or Each Face Change to Existing Sign	\$67.00	\$67.07
Temporary Uses:		
40 1-3 days	\$45.00	\$45.05
41 4-180 days	\$45.00 + 1.50/day	\$45.05 \$0.00
42 Over 3 days	not to exceed a total of \$189.00	\$189.19
43 Transitional Use Permit	\$1,465.00	\$1,466.47

# CPI INCREASES

Service/Materials	Fee Schedule as of 1-Jul-09	CPI Increase
		2009 0.001
44 Tree Cutting Permit, 1 tree	\$276.00	\$276.28
Tree Cutting Permit, each additional tree, \$10.00 not to		
45 exceed a total of	\$300.00	\$300.30
Variance: When primary use is a single-family dwelling in		
46 RL or RML	\$273.00	\$273.27
Variance: When primary use is not a single-family dwelling		
47 in RL or RML	\$1,365.00	\$1,366.37
Variance, Minor: When primary use is a single-family		
48 dwelling in RL or RML	\$273.00	\$273.27
Variance, Minor: When primary use is not a single-family		
49 dwelling in RL or RML	\$1,008.00	\$1,009.01
50 Planning, All Other Actions	\$312.00	\$312.31
<b>Engineering &amp; Building Department:</b>		
Engineering Copies:		
51 1987 and ealier, aerial/contour maps	\$7.00	\$7.01
52 36"x48"	\$4.00	\$4.00
53 24"x36"	\$3.00	\$3.00
54 18"x24" and 11"x17"	\$2.00	\$2.00
Geographic Information System:		
55 Citywide aerial photo, 36"x42"	\$28.00	\$28.03
56 Subdivision street map, 34"x36"	\$13.00	\$13.01
57 Street map, 22"x22"	\$7.00	\$7.01
58 Planning Districts, 34"x44"	\$13.00	\$13.01
59 Planning Districts, 18"x24"	\$7.00	\$7.01
60 Custom Mapping	50.00/hr, plus materials	\$50.05
61 Partition, Nonexpedited & Expedited Processes	\$390.00	\$390.39
Partition, Nonexpedited & Expedited		
62 Extension/Modification	\$128.00	\$128.13
63 Partition, Nonexpedited, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	\$128.13
Partition, Expedited, Appeal to Referee, Deposit per ORS		
64 197.375 (no change to ORS 197.375)	\$300.00	\$300.00
Partition, Minor Variance included & primary use is a single-		
65 family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	\$128.13
Partition, Minor Variance included & primary use is not a		
66 single-family dwelling & not in RL or RML	Add 195.00	\$195.20
Property Line Adjustment, primary use is a single-family		
67 dwelling in RL or RML	\$67.00	\$67.07
Property Line Adjustment, Minor Variance included &		
68 primary use is a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	\$128.13
Property Line Adjustment, primary use is not a single-		
69 family dwelling in RL or RML	\$284.00	\$284.28
Property Line Adjustment, Minor Variance included &		
70 primary use is not a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	\$128.13
71 Property Line Adjustment, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	\$128.13
72 Public Works Construction Code	\$45.00	\$45.05

# CPI INCREASES

Service/Materials	Fee Schedule as of 1-Jul-09	CPI Increase
		2009 0.001
73 Subdivision, Nonexpedited and Expedited Processes	\$2,585.00	\$2,587.59
74 Subdivision, Variance included & primary use is a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 256.00	\$256.26
75 Subdivision, Variance included & primary use is not a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 323.00	\$323.32
76 Subdivision, Minor Variance included & primary use is a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 128.00	\$128.13
77 Subdivision, Minor Variance included & primary use is not a single-family dwelling in RL or RML	Add 195.00	\$195.20
78 Subdivision, Nonexpedited, Extension/Modification by Council	\$591.00	\$591.59
79 Subdivision, Expedited, Extension/Modification by City Engineer	\$145.00	\$145.15
80 Subdivision, Nonexpedited, Appeal Proceeding to Council	\$128.00	\$128.13
81 Subdivision, Expedited, Appeal to Referee, Deposit per ORS 197.375 (no change to ORS 197.375)	\$300.00	\$300.00
82 Street Name Change	\$128.00	\$128.13
83 Street Vacation Application Deposit	\$323.00	\$323.32
84 Zone of Benefit Application Fee	\$646.00	\$646.65



# MEMORANDUM

## CITY OF TUALATIN

**TO:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**THROUGH:** Sherilyn Lombos, City Manager

**FROM:** Doug Rux, Community Development Director 

**DATE:** March 22, 2010

**SUBJECT:** CENTRAL URBAN RENEWAL DISTRICT UPDATE

---

### ISSUE BEFORE THE COUNCIL:

Update on the progress of discussions with overlapping taxing districts to obtain 75% concurrence and scenario modeling efforts for revenue sharing.

### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:

- What are the options to obtaining 75% concurrence with the overlapping taxing districts on the Central Urban Renewal District (CURD) maximum indebtedness proposal?
- Should the City consider utilizing General Fund revenues from the closure of the Leveton Tax Increment District (LTID) and CURD underlevy to backfill the CURD maximum indebtedness proposal?
- What are the consequences of shifting project time horizons for the Commons Landmark, East Commons and SW Boones Ferry Road – SW Martinazzi to SW Upper Boones Ferry Road?
- Should the maximum indebtedness amount be lower than the initial \$120 proposed by the Tualatin Development Commission?

### DISCUSSION:

- The following overlapping taxing districts have provided written concurrence on the proposed \$120 million increase to the maximum indebtedness and to forgo revenue sharing: Metro, Port of Portland, TriMet, NW Regional Education Service District, Tigard-Tualatin School District and City of Tualatin. This totals 66% of the required 75%.
- Washington County and Portland Community College have not taken action on the proposal. Both of these entities have inquired about a revenue-sharing model.
- The Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Board of Directors voted in opposition to the proposal but is open to talking about a revenue sharing model.
- A series of revenue sharing models have or are being evaluated. This includes:

MEMORANDUM: CURD Project Update

March 22, 2010

Page 2 of 4

1. Revenue sharing under the statutory model (ORS 457 formula). This option adds an estimated additional nine years to the time horizon (34 years rather than 25 years) and does not provide adequate revenues to bond against for the proposed projects.
2. \$400 million or \$500 million assessed value trigger for revenue sharing. This model was questioned by Washington County, as it delays revenue sharing out until the 2022 time horizon. Comments were to look at a model that provides revenue sharing earlier.
3. Adjustment of the frozen base to a value of 75%, 50% or 25% of the current assessed value or a flat \$100 million. These models were evaluated and showed a fund deficit. In the 50% adjustment to frozen base model by the time fiscal year 22/23 is reached revenues are deficient in the \$30 million range annually for a seven year period to bond against to construct the projects proposed. In the next four years, revenue and bonding capacity is deficient roughly \$15 million annually. Overall, the revenue stream is deficient for an 11 year period.
4. 25% frozen base adjustment model. As was found in the 50% model a financial deficit starts in fiscal year 22/23. The deficit averages approximately \$12 million a year over a seven year period with a high of \$17.7 million and a low of \$10.6 million. Over the subsequent three year period, the deficit averages approximately \$3 million annually with a high of \$5.3 million to a low of \$1.4 million.
5. 25% underlevy model. Instead of a permanent adjustment to the frozen base, we evaluated an annual underlevy. This is similar to a rolling thaw concept. The starting point was to look at an underlevy of 25% over a 10-11 year period and then to not underlevy for some time period in order to have enough revenue to bond against for the projects. We also looked at what point the underlevy could be reinitiated. The goal was create a system where there are no deficit values. Based on what we learned from that information, we looked at using the revenue from the Leveton Tax Increment District that will be released back to the City and the dollar amounts under the Central underlevy that would be released back to the City as an additional revenue stream into the Central District to bridge any deficit numbers that are found in the evaluation. There are policy issues for the City Council at play under this approach. Based on what we found in the evaluation, we then looked to see if it is feasible to adjust the timing of any of the public projects that are currently scheduled to coincide with private development. Moving project(s) out in time could have the consequence of increasing costs requiring a larger bond or could mean extending time beyond 25 years which could mean a higher maximum indebtedness amount. The final option was to look at shaving some public project costs. Possible consequences are the reductions don't leverage the

level of density we initially modeled and reduce revenue necessary to bond against to construct the public projects.

6. What we found through the 25% underlevy evaluation:

- 25% Underlevy (roughly equal to a \$49.786 million frozen base) for 11 years (2011-2021) and again from 2029-2035 (seven years). Between 2022 and 2028 there is no underlevy.
- There would be a General Fund contribution to CURD in all years. In 2011 the amount is only the CURD underlevy amount from the City. From 2012 to 2021 it would be the CURD underlevy amount from the City plus \$450,082 we estimated from the LTID (Leveton) close down back to the City. From 2022 - 2035 it is only the \$450,082 from Leveton. Appreciation in Leveton assessed value to generate the \$450,082 for all years would be captured by the City and directed into the General Fund for allocation as the Council deems appropriate. That's to say we flat lined the dollars from Leveton back to CURD. Policy consideration by Council is if they would agree to commit \$450,082 to CURD annually from the Leveton close down.
- Without adjusting project timing, we are still deficient in three of the year horizons (2023, 2026 & 2027).
- Shifting three projects (Commons Landmark, East Commons and Boones Ferry Road from Martinazzi to Upper Boones) out from their initial 2019, 2019 & 2023 year horizons out to 2029 puts CURD in a positive cash flow situation. The cost for these three projects increases (Landmark goes from \$1,537,553 up to \$2,268,870; East Commons goes from \$5,642,395 up to \$7,959,155; Boones Ferry Road goes from \$12,269,704 up to \$15,082,600).
- The maximum indebtedness amount goes down from \$120 million to \$107,495,000. This is due to the contribution from the General Fund.
- A portion of the East Commons does have a relationship to the Eastside Downtown redevelopment (K-Mart) with improvements along SW Martinazzi Avenue (roadway widening for bike lanes, streetscape improvements on the east side of the roadway between Nyberg and Boones, streetscape improvements along Nyberg). Council would need to take this into consideration in adjusting the time horizon.
- The Pac Trust roadway value of \$21.9 million was not adjusted and the time horizon of 2022 remains the same. It is possible that reducing the amount by roughly \$8-10 million, it may be possible to reduce or eliminate the Leveton contribution in the horizon of 2023-

2035. This would also impact the maximum indebtedness amount. If the Leveton amount is retained in all years and with a reduction in the Pac Trust roadway amount, it may allow an increase, slightly, in the underlevy amount above the 25% underlevy. One positive to retaining the \$21.9 million is to have funds to address a transportation solution of some type to move traffic in and around the downtown area.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that Council consider this information and provide direction.