

# VOLUME 2: BACKGROUND

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 How to Use Volume II</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Periodic Review Process and Work Program</b>	<b>1</b>
1.2.1 Summary of Periodic Review Products	
Periodic Review Factor #1.	
Periodic Review Factor #2.Periodic Review Factor #3.	
<b>1.3 Physical Environment</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3.1 Physical Features	
1.3.2 Climate	
1.3.3 Soils	
1.3.4 Environmental Quality	
1.3.5 Flood Plains	
<b>1.4 Population Trends and Projections</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.5 Year 2020 Projections</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.6 Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>11</b>
1.6.1 Race and Gender	
1.6.2 Age Distribution	
1.6.3 Income	
1.6.4 Poverty	
1.6.5 Education	
<b>Summary</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Sustainable Economic Growth</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction &amp; Organization</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.2 Employment Projections</b>	<b>17</b>
2.2.1 Data Sources	
2.2.2 Methods	
2.2.3 Projected Population Growth	
2.2.4 Projected Employment Growth 1990-2020	
2.2.5 Jobs-Housing Balance	
<b>2.3 Commercial and Industrial Land Use Needs Projection</b>	<b>20</b>
2.3.1 Employment Trends	
2.3.2 Recent Employment Trends	
2.3.3 Projected Employment by Sector	
2.3.4 Allocation of Employment by Sector to Commercial or Industrial Zones	
2.3.5 Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Projection	
<b>2.4 Commercial and Industrial Land Supply</b>	<b>24</b>
2.4.1 Methods	
2.4.2 Commercial Vacant Buildable Land Supply	
2.4.3 Industrial Vacant Buildable Land Supply	
<b>2.5 Industrial and Commercial Land Demand &amp; Supply Summary Comparison</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>2.6 Options and Policy Choices for Meeting Commercial and Industrial Land Needs</b>	<b>26</b>
2.6.1 Designation of Land to Meet Commercial Land Needs	
2.6.2 Summary of Commercial Land Need Decisions	
2.6.3 Industrial Land Allocation	
<b>Chapter 3: Residential Neighborhoods</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.2 Statutory Provisions Related to Residential Land Needs and Supply</b>	<b>33</b>
3.2.1 Step 1: Determine Actual Density and Mix	
3.2.2 Step 2: Housing Needs Analysis	
3.2.3 Step 3: Needed Housing Units and Residential Land Supply	
<b>3.3 Siting Criteria for Single Family and Multi-Family Housing</b>	<b>38</b>
3.3.1 Single Family Siting Criteria	
3.3.2 Multi-Family Siting Criteria	
<b>3.4 Designation of Land to Meet Multi-Family Housing Needs</b>	<b>40</b>
3.4.1 Mixed Use Nodes	
3.4.2 Master Planning Requirements	
3.4.3 Minimum Densities	
3.4.4 Innovative Techniques	
<b>3.5 Livable Residential Neighborhoods</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Parks, Schools &amp; Open Space</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.2 Existing Parks and Open Space System</b>	<b>45</b>
4.2.1 Existing Parks	
4.2.2 School Facilities	
<b>4.3 Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>4.4 City-Wide Parks and Open Space Service Levels</b>	<b>49</b>
4.4.1 1997 City-Wide Park Level-of-Service	
4.4.2 Year 2020 Projected City-Wide Park System Level-of-Service	
<b>4.5 Neighborhood Levels-of-Service</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>4.6 Proposed Park and Open Space Facilities</b>	<b>51</b>
4.6.1 Master Planning Areas	
4.6.2 Other Proposed Park Facilities	
<b>4.7 Needed Public School Facilities</b>	<b>53</b>
4.7.1 State and Local School Size and Siting Criteria	
4.7.2 Estimated School Facility Needs	
4.7.3 School Siting Opportunities	
<b>Chapter 6: Urban Growth Management</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>6.1 Urban Growth Management Program</b>	<b>55</b>
6.1.1 Economic Effects of New Growth	
6.1.2 Farm Land Preservation	
6.1.3 Purpose of an Urban Growth Program	
<b>6.2 Urban Growth Boundary</b>	<b>57</b>
6.2.1 Locational Considerations	

6.2.2 Implementation Measures	_____	
<b>6.3 Demonstrated long-term Land Needs</b>	_____	<b>58</b>
6.3.1 Commercial and Industrial Land Needs	_____	
6.3.2 Residential Land Needs	_____	
6.3.3 Public and Semi-Public Land Needs	_____	
6.3.4 Summary of Year 2020 Urban Land Needs	_____	
<b>6.4 Buildable land inventory</b>	_____	<b>61</b>
6.4.1 What is a “Buildable land inventory”	_____	
6.4.2 Definitions	_____	
6.4.3 Information Sources	_____	
6.4.4 Methods	_____	
6.4.5 Residential Land Supply	_____	
6.4.6 Commercial Land Supply	_____	
6.4.7 Industrial Land Supply	_____	
6.4.8 Public/Semi-Public Land Supply	_____	
6.4.9 Summary of Buildable Land Within 1996 Dallas UGB	_____	
<b>6.5 Comparison of Year 2020 Land Need, with 1996 Buildable Land Supply</b>	_____	<b>65</b>
<b>6.6 Comparison of 1996 Vacant Buildable Land, with Proposed 1997 Comprehensive Plan Land Allocation</b>	_____	<b>66</b>
<b>6.7 Urban Growth Policies</b>	_____	<b>67</b>
6.8.1 Need for Additional Industrial Land	_____	
6.8.2 Alternatives Considered to Meet Industrial Land Needs	_____	
6.8.3 Selected Alternative Outside the UGB	_____	
<b>Chapter 7: Public Facilities Plan</b>	_____	<b>71</b>
<b>Public Facilities Goal</b>	_____	
<b>7.1 Introduction</b>	_____	
<b>7.2 Existing Conditions</b>	_____	
7.2.1 Sanitary Sewer	_____	
7.2.2 Water System	_____	
7.2.3 Storm Drainage System	_____	
7.2.5 Emergency Services	_____	
Police	_____	
Fire and Ambulance	_____	
7.2.6 Public Library	_____	
<b>7.3 Planned Public Facilities</b>	_____	<b>78</b>
7.3.1 Sanitary Sewer	_____	
7.3.2 Water System	_____	
7.3.3 Storm Drainage System Management	_____	
7.3.5 Summary of Needed Public Facilities Projects, Timing and Costs	_____	
<b>7.5 Sanitary Sewer</b>	_____	<b>90</b>
<b>7.6 Potable Water</b>	_____	<b>90</b>
<b>7.7 Stormwater Management</b>	_____	<b>90</b>
<b>7.9 Geographic Phasing of Key Public Facilities and Services</b>	_____	<b>91</b>
<b>7.10 Educational Facilities</b>	_____	<b>92</b>
<b>7.10.1 Future School Needs</b>	_____	<b>93</b>

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### ***1.1 How to Use Volume II***

Volume II, Background Information, of the 1997 Dallas Comprehensive plan provides background data, mapping and analysis in support of the Comprehensive Plan Volume I, Goals & Policies. Unlike Volume I, Volume II is not a policy document and includes no *standards* for review of legislative or quasi-judicial land use decision. However, Volume II does help explain the reasons for Volume I goals and policies, and may provide some guidance as to how these goals and policies were intended to be applied. In addition, any changes to Volume I must be consistent with the data, maps and analysis found in Volume II, or Volume II must also be changed based on new information or changing circumstances. In this manner, Volume II includes the factual basis and is a part of the “legislative history” that supports Volume I goals, policies and maps.

Volume II parallels the organizational framework of Volume I. Generally, each Chapter in Volume I has a corresponding and supportive chapter in Volume II.

### ***1.2 Periodic Review Process and Work Program***

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan resulted from the Land Conservation and Development Commission’s (LCDC) “Periodic Review” process, which is mandated by ORS 197.610 *et seq.* Pursuant to this statute, City staff worked with *Winterowd Planning Services* (WPS) to prepare a periodic review “work program,” which was approved by LCDC in the Summer of 1996.

The Dallas Periodic Review Work Program considered comments received from Mark Radabaugh, Urban Field Representative for the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and is divided according to the three factors of ORS 197.628. The periodic review program was funded by an LCDC Periodic Review grant.

In the review of draft products produced as a result of the periodic review work program, Dallas coordinated closely with the following agencies:

- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Polk County
- Southwestern Polk County Rural Fire Protection District
- US Natural Resources Service
- Oregon Department of Agriculture
- Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

#### **1.2.1 Summary of Periodic Review Products**

Underlined tasks were completed in Fiscal Year 1996-97, that is, by July 1, 1997. The tasks described below included major revisions to the City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan), the Dallas Subdivision Ordinance (Subdivision Ordinance), Dallas Mobile Home Subdivision Ordinance,

and the Dallas Zoning Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance). These four existing documents have been re-organized into three “volumes” of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan. The three volumes include:

**Volume I**      *Comprehensive Plan Goals, Policies and Implementation Strategies*

Volume I would include the Comprehensive Plan Map #1, general goals, mandatory policies and strategies that the City may follow to carry out these goals and policies.

**Volume II**      *Comprehensive Plan Background Studies and Documents*

Volume II would include studies and background text explaining that support Volume I, but would not itself be a policy document.

**Volume III**      *Dallas Development Code*

Volume III would combine the existing zoning, land division, and other development ordinances into a single “development code,” with procedural and substantive sections. Existing procedures would be updated consistent with recent statutory changes. Existing substantive standards would be updated consistent with the revised Volume I.

**Periodic Review Factor #1.**

“There has been a substantial change in circumstances including but not limited to the conditions, findings or assumptions upon which the comprehensive plan or land use regulations were based, so that the comprehensive plan or land use regulations do not comply with the statewide planning goals.”

**Task #1:**      **Housing Needs Determination & Buildable land inventory**

Considerable residential development has occurred within the Dallas UGB since acknowledgment. Vacant buildable multifamily residential land has become scarce, and few large lots are currently available for development. Expansive soils, new floodplain information and other factors have not been considered in determining which lands are suitable and available for housing. This task was accomplished consistent with the provisions of HB 2709, Statewide Planning Goal 10 - Housing, OAR 660, Division 8, and ORS 197.295-314 (Needed Housing).

**Subtasks:**

1. The amount of buildable (i.e., the pool of land on which urban development can occur) residential land by type and density range necessary to meet housing needs during the 20-year planning period (i.e., the Year 2017 assuming adoption in 1997) has been determined. Based on Goal 10 - Housing and OAR 660 Division 8, the type and density of housing necessary to accommodate housing need for various income levels was also determined, as well as the actual density and average mix of housing types that has occurred during the previous five years. Other Statewide Planning Goals, such as Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and Goal 12 (Transportation) were considered in determining housing needs.
2. The residential buildable land inventory was revised to determine whether there is an adequate pool of land to meet Year 2017 needs for single-family, multiple-family and manufactured housing. The potential for infill and redevelopment was explicitly considered along with suitability constraints such as slope, floodplain, the availability of urban services, accessibility, wet-

lands and soil limitations. Since school and park facilities typically locate on residentially-designated land, adequate buildable land was allocated to meet the needs for school and park facilities. All buildable land has been mapped on the County's GIS system. (See Map #6, Vacant Buildable Land.)

3. Amendments to the Comp Plan and Development Code were drafted to reflect changed housing conditions and to designate sufficient buildable land to meet identified housing needs through the Year 2017. Areas of the UGB needed for school and park facilities have been identified.
4. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan Map necessary to meet the need for multiple family uses were made, consistent with identified needs. Needed residential density (and housing mix) corresponded closely with actual residential densities and housing types observed over the last five years (the best available data). In addition, measures that will demonstrably increase the likelihood that residential development will occur as projected by the City have been included in Volume I.
5. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan have been drafted, including minimum density and master planning requirements to ensure that residential land is used efficiently to meet long-range housing needs.
6. Adopt draft Comp Plan and Development Code and legislatively rezone land consistent with the Comp Plan, where adequate public facilities are available to support increased densities.  
**Projected Completion Date: FY 1996-97.**

#### Task #2: Economic Development & Buildable land inventory

Dallas has experienced industrial and commercial diversification, while losing a major industrial employer. New industrial and commercial land use needs projections were therefore prepared, as well as a revised industrial and commercial buildable land inventory to determine whether sufficient land is available to meet identified needs. This task was completed consistent with Goal 9 - Economy of the State and included an "economic opportunities analysis" as prescribed in OAR 660, Division 9. (See Chapter 2 of this document and Map #6.)

#### Subtasks:

1. The amount of land by land-use category necessary to meet commercial and industrial needs through the Year 2017 has been determined. Local, state and national economic trends were considered to establish both the total acreage and types of sites that likely will be needed during the 20-year planning period. (See Chapter 2 of this document.)
2. The commercial and industrial buildable land inventory was revised to determine adequate buildable land is available to meet Year 2017 needs for projected employment. All potential commercial and industrial sites have been mapped on the County's GIS system. The adequacy of industrial and commercial sites was evaluated, considering their location relative to markets and labor, the availability of needed materials and services, and the available transportation and public facility capacity. (See Chapter 2 of this document and Map #6)
3. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan were prepared to reflect changed economic conditions and to designate sufficient buildable land to meet identified employment needs through the Year

2017. (See Volume I, Chapter 2: The Dallas Economy and the Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.)

4. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan Map were prepared to adjust the amount of land designated for industrial and commercial development consistent with identified needs. Specific consideration was given to locating employment near housing, especially higher density housing, to minimize vehicle miles traveled. (See Volume I, Chapter 2: The Dallas Economy and the Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.)
5. Adopt Comp Plan and Zoning Map amendments and legislatively rezone land consistent with the Comp Plan, where adequate public facilities to support increased densities are available. **(To be completed Fiscal Year 1996-97.)**

### Task #3: Public Facilities & Services

Subtasks listed below recognized that the Dallas Sewage Treatment Plant is nearing capacity and must be improved at substantial cost to the city of Dallas in order to accommodate planned residential and employment growth consistent with DEQ water quality standards. The new STP will be operational by the Year 2000. In the meantime, sewer capacity is limited. (See Task #7.) Recent residential, commercial and industrial development has strained the City's ability to provide public facilities and services. Moreover, Dallas has recognized the benefit of adopting clear and objective standards necessary to ensure that all development is adequately served by sanitary sewer, water, storm drainage, transportation and park facilities.

#### Subtasks:

1. "Adequate public facilities standards" have been included in the Dallas Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance to ensure that new development is provided with pre-defined and objective levels-of-service for sanitary sewer, water, storm drainage, transportation and park facilities. Dallas considered the recommendations of the "Adequate Public Facilities Requirements" study funded by the Transportation and Growth Management Program last year in developing and implementing APFR standards. (See Dallas Development Code.)
2. Inventories of sanitary sewer, water, storm drainage, transportation and park facilities and services have been updated, as well as public facility projects and their location, cost, probable completion date and probable funding source. Areas in the UGB that currently lack adequate public facilities, and steps that need to be followed to provide the full range of public facilities to these areas, have been identified. (See Chapter 7 of this document; Volume I, Chapter 7: Public Facilities Plan; and Maps #7 through 10)
3. The Comp Plan has been revised to reflect updated inventories. (See Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.)

#### Task #4: Land, Air & Resource Quality / Natural Hazards

New information regarding floodplain location and water quality impacts from development has been considered in making decisions regarding the siting of new development.

##### ***Subtasks:***

1. Floodplain and water quality impact areas have been mapped. This information has been incorporated into the buildable land inventory under Task #1. (See Chapter 4 of this document and Buildable land inventory, Map #6.)
2. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan to include clear and objective policies regarding the siting of development near floodplains and stream corridors have been drafted. (See Volume I, Chapter 4: Parks & Open Space.)

#### Task #6: Urban Growth Boundary Amendments

Based on the results of Tasks #1-3, amendments to the Dallas UGB were recommended, to provide for alternative industrial sites.

##### Subtasks:

1. Draft amendments to the Comp Plan have been prepared to include sufficient buildable (i.e., vacant or likely to be developed) land to accommodate long-term (20-year) need for urban land, consistent with Factors 1-7 of Goal 14 (Urbanization) and Goal 2, Part II (Exceptions). These amendments also must be consistent with the requirements of HB 2709. (See Chapter 5 of this document; Map #6, Buildable land inventory; and the Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.)
2. Coordinate with Polk County to adopt Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) amendments and implementation measures. (Projected Completion Date: FY 1997-98.)

#### **Periodic Review Factor #2.**

“That implementation decisions, or the effects of implementation decisions, including the application of acknowledged plan and land use regulation provisions, are inconsistent with the goals.”

#### Task #7: Intergovernmental Agreement with Polk County

The City is concerned that the incremental impacts of development decisions on land within and immediately outside the Dallas UGB may adversely affect the City’s ability to provide urban services to ensure that development occurs at densities projected in the Comp Plan.

Therefore, the City proposes to review and revise the existing intergovernmental agreement with Polk County to ensure that unincorporated land within and adjacent to the UGB is effectively managed to facilitate efficient future urban development. (Projected Completion Date: FY 1997-98.)



### **Periodic Review Factor #3.**

“That there are issues of regional or statewide significance, intergovernmental coordination or state agency plans or programs affecting land use which must be addressed in order to bring comprehensive plans and land use regulations into compliance with the provisions of the goals.”

#### **Task #8: Public Facilities Strategy**

Dallas is now operating its STP under DEQ *Stipulation and Final Order No. WQ-WVR-92-085*. Under this DEQ order, the Dallas STP can accommodate about 400 more dwelling units before it reaches capacity. If population continues to increase as it has over the last three years, STP capacity will be used up sometime in 1998. If this happens, the City will be unable to issue additional residential building permits consistent with DEQ requirements.

However, if growth occurs as projected in the *Dallas Comprehensive Plan* and the *Final Waste Water Facility Plan* (CH<sub>2</sub>M Hill, 1994), the City's existing growth management program will be adequate. For this reason, Dallas has adopted and implemented a short-term “public facilities strategy” to ensure that limited sewer capacity is allocated consistent with the policies of the Comp Plan and in a manner that allows for balanced employment and housing development.

(See adopted 1996 Public Facilities Strategy, as amended in 1997.)

## **1.3 Physical Environment**

The following general discussion describes Dallas' physical and social characteristics, and was derived from the 1987 Comprehensive Plan.

### **1.3.1 Physical Features**

The City of Dallas, the County seat of Polk County, Oregon, is situated on the eastern flank of the Coast Range just as it descends to the Willamette Valley. The City is located about mid-valley, 60 miles southwest of Portland, 70 miles northwest of Eugene, and 13 miles west of Salem.

The town site is developed on well-drained terrace gravels and alluviums at an elevation of approximately 325 feet above sea level. The topography for the most part varies from nearly level to gently sloping, but steeper areas do occur in the western fringe of the planning area. The surrounding environs are devoted to agriculture and forestry and offer an abundance of year-round greenery and open space. Picturesque Rickreall Creek winds its way through the center of town and forms the community's most valued natural resource. Smaller and less picturesque Ash Creek drains the southern portion of the City.

### **1.3.2 Climate**

Dallas has a temperate maritime climate dominated year-round by moist, maritime air masses. Summers are usually dry and moderately warm with a mean daily maximum temperature of 82 degrees in July, 1995. Winters are wet and mild with a mean daily minimum temperature of 38 degrees in January, the coldest month of 1995. Most precipitation falls in the form of rain and most comes during

the five-month period November through March. When it does snow, it remains on the ground for only a short time. Less than 10 percent of the total annual precipitation falls during the summer months. Table 3.1 shows important climatic conditions for Dallas.

**Table 1.1 Selected Climatic Data: Salem, Oregon 1995**

Category	Jan.	Feb.	Mar	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual
Average Temperature (°F.)	44.5	46.5	47.5	50	59	62.6	68.5	65.1	64.7	52.4	51.1	42.3	54.5
Mean Daily Maximum Temperature (F.)	51	55.1	57.9	60.6	72	75.7	81.7	78.7	76.9	62.4	57.5	48.2	64.8
Mean Daily Minimum Temperature (F.)	37.9	37.9	37.0	39.3	46	49.5	55.3	51.4	52.4	42.3	44.7	36.3	44.2
Precipitation (in.)	8.63	4.35	4.44	4.41	1.29	1.48	0.36	1.29	1.81	4.07	9.07	7.28	48.48

Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Environmental; Satellite Data and Information Service, National Climatic Data Center.

### 1.3.3 Soils

To help farmers, land developers, government officials and other interested individuals understand the complexity of soil surveys, the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has developed a land-capability classification system based on limitations for specific uses. Soil characteristics such as depth, texture, wetness, slope, erosion hazard, overflow hazard, permeability, structure, water holding capacity, inherent fertility and climatic conditions as they influence the use and management of land are considered in grouping soils into eight broad categories. Class I land has fewer hazards or limitations; Class II, III and IV lands require more careful conservation efforts due to higher erosion or slide hazards, or drainage problems; Class V, VI and VII lands are generally restricted to grazing and urban development; Class VIII land is unsuitable for most agricultural, forestry and urban uses and is used primarily for wildlife habitat and watersheds. The map clearly shows the predominance of Class II and III lands. These lands are well suited to agriculture and generally to urban uses, but they do present some limitations to development.

The Soil Conservation Service has rated soil in Oregon as to its limitations for certain uses. The soils are rated as having either slight, moderate or severe limitations. Slight limitations indicate that the soils do not require any special planning design, or management consideration, or that any restrictions are easily overcome. Moderate limitations have restrictions that can be overcome with careful planning and design, and good management. Severe limitations indicate that a particular use is doubtful and generally unsound.

Among the factors considered when determining soil limitations for building or development sites are: excessive slope, high water table, and soil characteristics such as permeability, bearing strength, shrink-swell potential and depth to bedrock. It should be emphasized, however, that these ratings and their application are suitable only to large scale general planning purposes and must not be used for detailed site or small area planning. More detailed soil information is obtainable at the Soil Conservation Service office in Dallas.

Excluding the wet flood plain soils, few soils in the Dallas urban area have more than moderate restrictions when developed with public facilities. Experience indicates, however, that care must be taken in certain areas. Soils in the area north of Ellendale Avenue in the vicinity of Douglas Street have been shown to have high shrink-swell potential with hazards to building foundations. Locally, especially to the west and south, soils may require that protective measures be taken because of steepness or low bearing strength. Consequently, a potential builder or developer should seek out more detailed soil information.

### **1.3.4 Environmental Quality**

#### ***Air Quality***

The DEQ does not show any major air pollution sources in the City, other than possibly from motor vehicles, wood smoke, and field burning. Two industries hold air quality permits from DEQ: Willamette Industries and Praegitzer Industries, Inc.

#### ***Water Quality***

Rickreall Creek has reasonably good water quality, supporting several species of fish and serving as Dallas' water supply. The Dallas Sewage Treatment Plant has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit to discharge effluent into the creek. Finally, although local occurrences have been reported, groundwater pollution is not a major or widespread problem in the Dallas-Monmouth area (Oregon Department of Water Resources Groundwater Report No. 28, 1983.)

#### ***Noise***

While noise is not generally a problem in Dallas, an inventory completed by the City in March, 1987, indicates the following sources:

- Industrial Noise
- Traffic Noise

Some industrial noise in an urban environment is unavoidable. Industrial land in Dallas is concentrated in the southern part of the city which limits the extent of noise pollution emitted by industrial activities.

The major arterial in and out of Dallas is the Dallas-Rickreall Highway (ORE 223), designated as E. Ellendale Avenue in Dallas. About 37% of the traffic entering or leaving Dallas is on this road. Most of the property along E. Ellendale is residential with the rest commercial. The residents living along this road are subject to moderate traffic noise at most times and heavy noise at peak traffic times.

### **1.3.5 Flood Plains**

Perhaps the most severe limitations to development in the Dallas urban area are the flood plains associated with Rickreall and Ash Creeks. Together they comprise an area of nearly 560 acres. The general extent of the 100-year flood plain is shown on the Natural Features Map #4, but should not be used for detailed site planning. More detailed maps of the Rickreall and Ash Creek floodplains, created by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) are available in City Hall.

## 1.4 Population Trends and Projections

Settlement of Polk County began in the early 1840's. One of the earliest settlements was on the north side of Rickreall Creek near the present site of Dallas. In 1850, Cynthian, or, as some historians claim, Cynthia Ann, was established as the County seat. In 1856, the townsite was moved a mile south. Its name was later changed to Dallas, in honor of George Mifflin Dallas, Vice President of the United States during the Polk Administration. In 1874, Dallas was incorporated and has since grown to become the largest urban area in Polk County with a 1995 population of 11,639 (PSU, Center for Population Research and the Census).

Population analysis is intended to give the City an indication of probable future community needs. The number of people projected to live in the Dallas urban area will determine future land requirements for residential, commercial, industrial and public uses. The characteristics of the population help determine the type and extent of public services that are needed.

The City of Dallas has grown over the years as a result of the establishment of a stable, diversified economic base and its relative attractiveness as a place to live. Table 1.2 shows historical population data for Dallas, Polk County, and the Salem Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which is composed of both Marion and Polk Counties.

Table 1.2 Historic Population Growth—Dallas,

Polk County, Salem MSA

Year	Dallas	Polk County	Dallas %	Salem MSA	Dallas %
1910	2,124	13,469	16%	53,249	4%
1930	2,975	16,858	18%	77,399	4%
1950	4,793	26,317	18%	127,718	4%
1970	6,361	35,349	18%	186,658	3%
1980	8,531	45,203	19%	249,895	3%
1990	9,485	49,541	19%	278,024	3%

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing

The City's population growth has been cyclical but steady. Only minor gains were recorded during the 30's and 50's, but substantial increases occurred in the 40's and 60's. Rapid growth continued into the 70's. The City of Dallas has captured an increasing percentage of Polk County population which has increased from 16 percent in 1910 to 19 percent in 1990. Dallas' share of the total Salem MSA population, however, maintained a slight but continuous decline over the same period.

The population boom of the 1970's slowed in the early 1980's as the recession took its toll on both Oregon and mid-Willamette Valley economics. Between 1981 and 1982, the normal in-migration trend turned around as more people moved out of Oregon than moved in. This out-migration was rapid enough (-25,000) to outweigh natural increases (+20,700) and Oregon sustained its first

recorded year of overall population loss (-4,500). Table 1.3 shows how these larger economic trends directly affected the population of Dallas.

Table 1.3 City of Dallas Urban Area Population, 1975-1995

Year	Dallas Population	Percent Change
1975	7,580	--
1980	8,531	13%
1985	8,781	3%
1990	9,485	8%
1995	11,639 <sup>1</sup>	14%

Source: 1975, 1985, 1995 Portland State University Center for Population Research and the Census; 1980, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

<sup>1</sup>This figure represents the 1995 Population with the Dallas City Limits 10,850, plus an estimated 789 residents living between the city limits and the UGB.

Between the years 1980 and 1994, the population of the Willamette Valley grew considerably. Table 1.4 shows the population increase in selected Willamette Valley communities. During the 14-year period, Dallas' population grew by nearly 24 percent. This rate is less than the rate for Polk County (31.6 percent) but almost 7 percent higher than the state (17 percent).

Table 1.4 Dallas Population Change Compared to Other Areas

Area	1980	1994	Percent Change
Oregon	2,633,156	3,082,000	17.0%
Polk County	55,332	72,800	31.6%
Tualatin	7,483	17,450	133.2%
McMinnville	14,080	20,995	49.1%
Newberg	10,394	14,700	41.4%
Woodburn	11,196	15,235	36.1%
Albany	26,511	35,020	32.1%
Salem	89,233	116,950	31.1%
Forest Grove	11,499	14,295	24.3%
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>8,530</b>	<b>10,545</b>	<b>23.6%</b>
Oregon City	14,673	17,545	19.6%
Lebanon	10,413	11,450	10.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

During the last decade, the population of Dallas has continued to grow and diversify. While this growth has exceeded projections, it is not uncharacteristic of growth that has occurred throughout the Willamette Valley in the last decade.

### 1.5 Year 2020 Projections

Projecting population growth for small geographic areas such as Dallas is not an exact science. In larger areas, such as the state or the nation, the most important factors in determining future populations are birth and death rates. In smaller areas, the net migration rate is more important. The net migration rate, in turn, is most affected by the economic situation. In small areas the establishment or closure of a single industry, or the development of a single subdivision, can have a profound and immediate impact on population, whereas in large geographic areas, the impact of such single events often go unnoticed. However, projections of future growth must be made if the City is to anticipate and plan for its needs prior to their occurrence.

Table 1.5 shows the Portland State University's (PSU) Center for Population Research and the Census' population projection for the Dallas Urban Growth Boundary (City limits plus unincorporated urbanizable area) between 1995 and 2020. **The projections show that the Dallas UGB population will increase by over 7,400 persons by 2020.** This is an overall increase of 61 percent between 1995 and 2020.

Technical Appendix 1.1 contains a detailed description of the methodology used by PSU's Center for Population Research and the Census, to calculate this projection.

Table 1.5 Population Projections for Dallas UGB, 1995-2020

Year	Population Projection	Change	
		Number	Percent
1995	11,639	-	-
2000	13,117	1,478	11.3%
2005	14,593	1,476	10.1%
2010	16,072	1,479	9.2%
2015	17,548	1,476	8.4%
2020	19,043	1,495	7.8%

Source: Portland State University, Center for Population Research and Census

### 1.6 Demographic Characteristics

A comparative analysis of Dallas' demographic characteristics, provides further insights into the community make-up. This section examines the following key demographic elements of the City of Dallas.

- Race and Gender
- Age Distribution
- Income
- Poverty
- Education

Population statistics for Polk County, Salem MSA, and the State of Oregon are included where applicable.

### 1.6.1 Race and Gender

Table 1.6 describes race and gender statistics for Dallas from 1980 to 1990. Census data indicates that there are slightly more women than men. Despite marginal increases in minority populations, Dallas is still predominately Caucasian.

**Table 1.6 Race and Gender, Dallas 1980-1990**

Population Component	1980		1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Sex:				
Male	4,006	47.0%	4,417	46.6%
Female	4,524	53.0%	5,055	53.3%
Race:				
White	8,308	97.4%	9,081	96.4%
Black	10	0.1%	38	.4%
Other <sup>1</sup>	212	2.5%	303	3.2%

Source: 1980, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

<sup>1</sup>The "Other" category in the U.S. Census includes individuals of Hispanic origin. This table also incorporates American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, Asian and Pacific Islander into the "Other" category.

### 1.6.2 Age Distribution

Table 1.7 compares the age distribution of Polk County and the City of Dallas in 1980 and 1990. Dallas' age distribution is typical of most U.S. cities. In 1990 almost 37 percent of Dallas residents were over the age of 45, an increase of 3 percent from the 1980 total. This long term trend is expected to increase as the baby boom generation ages.

**Table 1.7 Age Distribution 1980**

Age Group	1980				1990			
	Polk County		Dallas		Polk County		Dallas	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	3,438	8%	711	8%	3,394	7%	658	7%
5 - 14	7,011	16%	1,359	16%	7,740	16%	1,518	16%
15 - 24	8,155	18%	1,308	15%	7,543	15%	1,135	12%
25 - 34	7,543	17%	1,390	16%	6,616	13%	1,238	13%
35 - 44	5,077	11%	898	11%	7,745	16%	1,393	15%
45 - 54	4,121	9%	712	8%	4,980	10%	967	10%
55 - 64	4,156	9%	827	10%	4,126	8%	798	9%
65 & Over	5,702	13%	1,325	16%	7,397	15%	1,715	18%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>45,203</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8,530</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49,541</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9,422</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: US Census Bureau.

### 1.6.3 Income

Table 1.8 compares household income statistics for Polk County and the City of Dallas in 1980 and 1990. The median household income increased by 57 percent in Polk County and by 30 percent in the City of Dallas during the decade. The number of Dallas households reporting annual incomes *above* \$35,000 increased by more than 525 percent between 1980 and 1990 while the number of households reporting an annual income *less than* \$15,000 also increased by 14 percent over the same period. Overall, Polk County experienced a decrease in low income households and an increase in the number of higher income households between 1980 and 1990. This trend, however, did not hold true for the City of Dallas where there was an increase in the number of both low and higher income households, indicating a growing disparity between household incomes.

Income information will be compared with housing cost information provided in Chapter 3 to assist in projecting long-term housing needs, by density and type.

**Table 1.8 Household Income Distribution, City of Dallas, Polk County, 1980-1990**

Household Income	1980 Polk County		1980 Dallas		1990 Polk County		1990 Dallas		County Change 1980-1990	Dallas Change 1980-1990
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
Less than \$ 5,000	2,169	13%	174	8%	1,015	6%	187	5%	-53%	7%
\$ 5,000 - 9,999	2,612	16%	304	13%	1,861	10%	416	11%	-29%	37%
10,000 - 14,999	2,524	15%	406	18%	1,804	10%	403	11%	-29%	-1%
15,000 - 19,999	2,639	16%	489	21%	1,903	11%	466	12%	-28%	-5%
20,000 - 24,999	2,021	12%	336	15%	1,968	11%	406	11%	-3%	21%
25,000 - 34,999	2,829	17%	389	17%	2,912	16%	599	16%	3%	54%
35,000 - 49,999	1,115	7%	178	8%	3,290	18%	597	16%	195%	235%
50,000 & Over	511	3%	34	1%	3,269	18%	736	19%	540%	2065%
No. of Households	16,420	100%	2,310	100%	18,022	100%	3,810	100%	10%	65%
Median Income	\$16,713		\$17,966		\$26,292		\$23,301		57%	30%
Mean Income	\$18,875		\$19,169		\$29,821		\$26,749		58%	40%

Source: 1987 City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

### 1.6.4 Poverty

Tables 1.9 and 1.10 compare 1980 and 1990 poverty status by family type for Polk County and the City of Dallas respectively. Overall the percentage of families with annual incomes below the poverty level decreased between 1980 and 1990. According to the census, families with children, families headed by females, unrelated individuals, and persons 65 years and older, all decreased in the percent below poverty by a minimum of 3 percent as compared to 1980. The percent of all families below the poverty level remained the same at 10 percent from 1980 to 1990.



**Table 1.9 Poverty Status of Polk County Residents by Family Type, 1980-1990**

Category	Polk County					
	Total Number		Number Below Poverty		% of Total	
	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
Families	12,123	13,056	1,000	1,093	8%	8%
Children in Families	12,328	17,307	1,652	1,145	13%	13%
Families w/Female Head	1,142	1,610	418	521	37%	32%
Unrelated Individuals	5,841	7,129	1,910	2,549	33%	36%
Persons 65 & Over	5,350	6,821	761	560	14%	8%

**Source: 1980, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing**

**Table 1.10 Poverty Status of Dallas Residents by Family Type, 1980-1990**

Category	City of Dallas					
	Total Number		Number Below Poverty		% of Total	
	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
Families	2,310	2,553	231	247	10%	10%
Children in Families	2,422	3,095	436	199	18%	6%
Families w/Female Head	273	637	103	109	38%	17%
Unrelated Individuals	911	1,166	287	341	32%	29%
Persons 65 & Over	1,066	1,715	193	172	18%	10%

**Source: 1980, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing**

### 1.6.5 Education

The level to which a population is educated directly coincides with the income and poverty levels of that community. Table 1.11 compares educational attainment statistics for Dallas and Polk County from 1980-1990. In general the educational level of Dallas residents increased between 1980 and 1990. The number of adults over the age of 25 without a high school diploma dropped from 1,817 in 1980 to 1,689 in 1990. During the same period, the proportion of adults with at least some college increased from 27 percent to 41 percent. The largest change from 1980 was a 47 percent increase in the proportion of adults with bachelor or graduate degrees. Individuals with bachelors and graduate degrees comprise about 14 percent Dallas' total adult population.

**Table 1.11 Education Levels, 1980-1990 -- Dallas, and Polk County**

	Polk County				Dallas			
	1980 Number	Percent	1990 Number	Percent	1980 Number	Percent	1990 Number	Percent
Less than 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade:	3,678	2%	2,458	10%	1,076	2%	704	12%
High School:								
1 to 3 Years	3,229	8%	3,714	16%	741	14%	985	16%
H.S. Diploma	8,927	34%	8,799	37%	1,908	37%	1,904	31%
College:								
1 to 3 years	5,379	20%	9,336	40%	846	16%	1,674	27%
4 years	2,606	10%	4,037	17%	574	11%	490	8%
5 or more years	2,721	10%	2,520	11%	--	--	354	6%
<b>TOTAL, 25 years &amp; over:</b>	<b>26,600</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23,467</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,145</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,111</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: 1987 City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan, 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

*Summary*

*Setting and Environment*

The City of Dallas, located in the middle of the Willamette Valley, is situated on a relatively flat well-drained site with more steeply sloped areas at the western fringe of the City. The agricultural and forest lands surrounding Dallas not only help to define the character of the community, but have historically been the economic and cultural backbone of the City. With the exception of some isolated areas with high shrink-swell potential, soils in Dallas have relatively few restrictions for building and development. Together the floodplains of Rickreall and Ash Creek cover approximately 560 acres of the City, and represent the largest single limitation on urban land uses.

Generally, the City of Dallas enjoys high environmental quality. While there are no major air pollution sources within the city, some airborne pollutants do originate from local industries, field burning, and motor vehicles. Rickreall Creek meanders through the center of the city supporting several species of fish, and serving as both water supply and outlet for the Dallas Sewage Treatment Plant.

*Population*

The City of Dallas has maintained cyclical but consistent population growth since its incorporation in 1874. Significant economic growth in the Willamette Valley over the last 15 years, however, has increased the Dallas Urban Area population to an estimated 11,639 people in 1995. The population of the Dallas Urban Area is projected to increase by more than 61 percent to approximately 19,000 by 2020.

### ***Demographics***

In many ways the City of Dallas is typical of small Willamette Valley communities. Dallas is predominately Caucasian with a small but increasing number of Hispanic and native American residents. More than 37 percent of Dallas residents are over the age of 45, reflecting a national trend toward an older population. The number of households with annual incomes above \$35,000 saw dramatic increase since 1980, however, the number of households with annual incomes of less than \$15,000 also increased, indicating a growing disparity in household incomes. The percentage of all families below the federal poverty level remained the same at 10 percent from 1980 to 1990. In general the educational attainment of all Dallas residents increased between 1980 and 1990. Almost 50 percent more adults possess bachelors and masters degrees than in 1980.

## **Chapter 2: Sustainable Economic Growth**

### **2.1 Introduction & Organization**

This chapter provides the factual basis and analysis to support the economic and commercial/industrial land use policies and map designations found in Volume I of the 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan.

This chapter is divided into six sections, including this one. Section 2.2 describes population and employment trends in Dallas between 1970 and 1990, and sets forth the methods and objectives to be applied in projecting industrial and commercial land needs. Section 2.3 includes Dallas' year 2020 commercial and industrial employment projections. Section 2.4 summarizes the vacant buildable industrial and commercial land available within the 1996 UGB to meet demonstrated need. Section 2.5 translates employment projections into commercial and industrial land needs, and identifies deficiencies. Section 2.6 describes how commercial and industrial land use needs will be met in Dallas, and explains how the master planning process in Dallas will work for three new mixed use "nodes." This section also identifies the need for two large industrial sites at the southeast edge of the Dallas UGB, to be served by the planned Fir Villa Road extension.

### **2.2 Employment Projections**

This section describes the data sources and methods used to project Year 2020 employment.

#### **2.2.1 Data Sources**

The following data sources were used in projecting employment and land use needs in Dallas:

- Office of Economic Analysis, Department of Administrative Services, State of Oregon: county population and employment projections for 2000-2040.
- Center for Population Research and Census-Portland State University: City of Dallas population projections. (see Technical Appendix 1.1)
- Employment and Population Trends-1970, 1980, 1990, U.S. Census of Population and Housing

#### **2.2.2 Methods**

The commercial and industrial land needs projection is based upon (a) population growth, (b) projected employment growth by sector, (c) observed employee-per-acre ratios, and (d) policy considerations, such as redevelopment potential and allocation of new jobs to specific land use designations.

This technique is based on several key assumptions:

- (1) Population and employment projections are accurate.
- (2) Existing employee-per-acre ratios are a reasonable means of projecting future ratios.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Dallas currently has about 30 commercial employees per acre, and 7 industrial employees per acre.

(3) Employment by sector in Dallas will increasingly reflect the proportions by sector of the Yamhill, Polk, and Marion County regional economy.

New jobs were divided into the following primary sectors:

### ***Industrial Uses***

- resource industries (agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining), construction and manufacturing,
- transportation, public utilities, communication
- wholesale trade

### ***Commercial Uses***

- retail trade
- services and FIRE (finance, insurance, real estate)
- public administration

Generalized employee-per-acre ratios for each of these categories were developed and multiplied by projected employment increases to determine the buildable acres needed to accommodate each broad employment sector.

## **2.2.3 Projected Population Growth**

The Dallas population projection for the years 1995-2020 was provided by the Center for Population Research and Census, at Portland State University. The 1990 total population figure was derived from the 1990 US Census of Population and Housing, and adjusted by an additional 750 residents to account for people living outside of the city limits but within the urban growth boundary.

For the purposes of this projection, a household size of 2.5 persons per household (PPH) was used for the City of Dallas; Polk, Yamhill, and Marion Counties. Although current PPH is estimated to be 2.6, 2.5 PPH is a reasonable approximation of household size for this region based on a continuing trend toward smaller household sizes over the planning period.

## **2.2.4 Projected Employment Growth 1990-2020**

Employment projections were calculated in several steps. Baseline employment projections were calculated using employment forecasts for Polk County provided by the State Office of Economic Analysis. Dallas' share of future Polk County employment was calculated as a percentage of total county population. Approximately 21 percent of Polk County's current population resides within the Dallas urban area. Table 2.1 estimates that 750 residents lived in the Dallas UGB, but outside the City Limits, in 1990.

Table 2.1 shows the Dallas Urban Areas (City Limits plus UGB) projected population growth as an increasing percentage of Polk County's 2020 projected population growth. This table shows Dallas' share of County population increasing from 20 percent in 1990, to 24 percent by the Year 2020.

**Table 2.1 2020 Population Projection City of Dallas & Polk County**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Population Projection: Dallas Urban Area</b>	<b>Percent of Polk Population</b>	<b>Population Projection: Polk County</b>
<b>1990</b>	10,235	20%	50,088
<b>1995</b>	11,639	21%	55,400
<b>2000</b>	13,117	22%	60,719
<b>2005</b>	14,593	22%	65,040
<b>2010</b>	16,072	23%	69,402
<b>2015</b>	17,548	24%	73,940
<b>2020</b>	19,049	24%	78,502

Source: Office of Economic Analysis, State of Oregon; Center for Population Research and the Census, PSU; Analysis by Winterowd Planning Services.

### **2.2.5 Jobs-Housing Balance**

Recognizing that Dallas is a relatively small urban area, and that public policy can play a major role in job creation, we applied a jobs-to-household ratio to project employment growth. The job to household ratio compares the number of jobs to the number of households. Since Dallas seeks to achieve a jobs-housing balance (rather than becoming a bedroom community), this ratio is expected to shift towards more jobs per household over time. Several factors were used to calculate the job-to-household ratio.

Table 2.2 shows jobs increasing in relation to the number of households in Dallas. The result is based in part on recent trends in Dallas and in part on Dallas’ policy to avoid bedroom-community status by providing local jobs for its increasing population. Based on recent employment growth in Dallas, it is estimated that the number of jobs in Dallas has increased, relative to Polk County from 1990-95. In particular, Praegitzer Industries and Wal-Mart together added approximately 500 employees between 1990 and 1995. By 1997, these two firms had increased the number of employees to 850, based on telephone interviews.

This trend is expected to continue for a number of reasons. First, Polk County’s natural resource based economy is not expected to produce a large number of new jobs over the next 10 years, while Dallas can expect to accommodate an increasing proportion of service, retail and light manufacturing employment. Second, Dallas has a high quality of life that is valued by many employers. The City’s “small-town” atmosphere, attractive natural setting and relatively low crime rate are all highly desirable attributes. Third, Dallas has access to a well-trained work force and is within easy commuting distance of the Salem area. Fourth, Dallas has an abundant supply of serviced industrial land, which is sufficient to accommodate planned increases in basic employment. Finally, as Dallas grows, it will create much greater demand for retail sales and services; Dallas’ moderate-growth program will ensure that commercial land is made available in appropriate increments over time, to avoid adverse impacts on the Downtown area.

For all of these reasons, employment growth in the Dallas urban area is expected to outpace population growth and employment growth in Polk County. In 1990, we estimate that for each 1.8 house-

holds in Dallas, there is now one job. This ratio is indicative of an economy that exports workers—a bedroom community. By 1995, although conclusive data is not available, recent job growth in Dallas indicates that this ratio has decreased to about 1 job per 1.7 households. **By the Year 2020, this ratio is projected to decrease to 1 job for each 1.3 households. The result is a need for approximately 3,000 new jobs through the Year 2020.**

Table 2.2 Employment Projection & Jobs-to-Household Ratio: Dallas Urban Area 1990-2020

Year	Total Population	Jobs*	Households	Jobs-Housing Ratio
1990	10,235	2,246	4,094	1:1.82
1995	11,639	2,739	4,656	1:1.70
2000	13,117	3,231	5,247	1:1.62
2005	14,593	3,771	5,837	1:1.55
2010	16,072	4,367	6,429	1:1.47
2015	17,548	5,064	7,019	1:1.39
2020	19,049	5,772	7,620	1:1.32

Source: Center for Population Research and the Census, PSU; Analysis by Winterowd Planning Services. \* The 1990 employment estimate assumes that approximately 200, or 25% of the 750 residents who live outside the City Limits but inside the UGB, actually work in Dallas.

### 2.3 Commercial and Industrial Land Use Needs Projection

Section 2.2 projects a need for about 3,000 new jobs in Dallas through the Year 2020. This section translates projected employment increases into the need for commercial and industrial land.

#### 2.3.1 Employment Trends

Table 2.3 shows employment by sector in Dallas as reported by the U.S. Census of Population and Housing for the years 1970, 1980 and 1990. It is important to note that this part of the Census represents responses from Dallas residents about what type of job they have (by sector of the economy) *not* where that job is located. These numbers are still significant, however, because they provide a detailed look at the participation of Dallas residents in the regional economy.

Resource based industries such as agriculture, fishing, forestry and mining experienced a significant decline in the 1980's, while the services and FIRE (finance, insurance and real estate) sectors increased by almost 190% from 1970 to 1990. Trends in manufacturing over this period also have important implications for long-term land use planning. According to the U.S. Census, there was no change in the number of nondurable goods manufacturing jobs between 1980 and 1990. However, despite the closure of the Caterpillar plant in 1988 which resulted in a loss of 360 jobs in the durable goods manufacturing category, Dallas still experienced a 13 percent increase in this sector overall. Some of the increase in durable goods manufacturing can be attributed to the opening of the Praegitzer Industries facility in the late 1980s. Generally the manufacturing of durable goods continues to play an important role in the Dallas economy.

**Table 2.3 Dallas Employment by Sector, 1970 - 1990**

<b>Employment Sector</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>1970-1980 Percent Change</b>	<b>1980-1990 Percent Change</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing**	-	-	84	2.7%	63	1.7%	-	-25%
Mining**	-	-	12	0.4%	9	0.2%	-	-25%
Construction	101	4.4%	227	7.4%	159	4.3%	124.7%	-57%
<b>Other Total:</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-28%</b>
<b>Manufacturing:</b>								
Nondurable goods	60	2.6%	157	5.1%	157	4.2%	161%	0%
Durable goods	702	30.6%	600	19.5%	682	18.4%	-14.5%	13.6%
<b>Manufacturing Total:</b>	<b>762</b>	<b>33.2%</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>.7%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
Transportation, Communication, Public Utilities	81	3.5%	77	2.5%	100	2.7%	4.9%	23%
Wholesale trade**	-	-	72	2.4%	119	3.2%	-	65%
Retail Trade**	-	-	463	15.1%	670	18.1%	-	44.7%
<b>Trade Total:</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>47%</b>
Finance, insurance, real estate*	160	6.9%	174	5.7%	133	3.6%	-	23.5%
<b>Services:</b>								
Business & repair services**	-	-	50	1.6%	124	3.4%	-	148%
Other services**	-	-	96	3.1%	151	4.1%	-	57%
Professional & related services:	364	16%	680	22.1%	1,106	29.8%	86.8%	49%
Health services**	-	-	297	9.7%	356	9.6%	-	19.8%
Educational services	135	5.8%	255	8.3%	371	10.0%	88.8%	45.4%
Other professional***	-	-	128	4.2%	379	10.2%	-	196%
<b>Services &amp; FIRE Total:</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>2,895</b>	<b>41.0%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>189%</b>
Public administration	147	6.4%	378	12.3%	230	6.2%	157%	39%
Other Industries:***	191	8.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL Employment</b>	<b>2,290</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,070</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,703</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

- The 1970 Census data combines finance and insurance with business and repair services. Therefore 1970-1980 percent change was not computed
- \*\* Categories not defined in the 1970 census.
- \*\*\* Categories defined in the 1970 Census but not in the 1980 & 1990

### 2.3.2 Recent Employment Trends

The period between 1990 and 1995 saw significant changes in the employment among Dallas' major employers. Praegitzer Industries and Wal-Mart together added approximately 500 employees, and have increased that number to an estimated 850 employees in 1997. Table 2.4 shows Dallas' major firms by number of employees in 1995.



Table 2.4 Major Employers, Dallas, Oregon 1995

<b>Employer</b>	<b>Number of Employees</b>
Praegitzer Industries	519
Willamette Industries	230
Dallas Public Schools	220
Valley Community Hospital	210
Dallas Nursing Home	180
Polk County	177
Wal-Mart	155
City of Dallas	120
Balderson Industries	120
Safeway Stores	96
Friesen Products	92

Source: City of Dallas

### 2.3.3 Projected Employment by Sector

Table 2.5 shows projected employment by broad sector of the economy within the Dallas UGB through the year 2020.

Table 2.5 Estimated Dallas Employment by Sector, 1990-2020

<b>Employment Sector</b>	<b>1995 Employment</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>2020 Employment</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Change in % of Total</b>
<b>Industrial</b>					
Resource and Construction	156	5.7%	231	4.0%	-2%
Manufacturing	630	23.0%	1,321	23.0%	0%
TCPU <sup>2</sup>	85	3.1%	173	3.0%	0%
<b>Industrial Sub-Total</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>1,725</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>-2%</b>
<b>Commercial</b>					
Wholesale & Retail Trade	575	21.0%	1,304	22.6%	2%
Services & FIRE <sup>3</sup>	1,123	41.0%	2,453	42.5%	2%
Public administration	164	6.0%	289	5.0%	-1%
<b>Commercial Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,863</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>4,047</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Total Estimated Employment</b>	<b>2,739</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2%</b>

Source: WPS, Inc. 1997

<sup>1</sup>includes agriculture, fishing, forestry, and mining;

<sup>2</sup>ransportation, communication, public utilities;

<sup>3</sup>finance, insurance, real estate

### 2.3.4 Allocation of Employment by Sector to Commercial or Industrial Zones

The next step is to determine which zones are likely to accommodate jobs in each major sector of the economy. Although there is no absolute relationship between job sector and appropriate zoning category, it is reasonable to assume that:

- (1) Commercial designations (Central Business District, General Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial) generally provide for jobs in the retail trade, FIRE & services, and public administration.
- (2) The Industrial designation generally provides for resource-based industries, construction, manufacturing, transportation, communications, and public utilities.

The relationship between commercial and industrial jobs, and commercial and industrial zoning, is not always clear. Although the majority of manufacturing jobs occur on land zoned for industrial use, trade and service jobs occur on both commercially- and industrially-zoned land. For example, a trade sector such as an electrical supply store could locate in a commercial zone, in a “business park” or on industrial land. Similarly, corporate office headquarters may seek an industrial location, but provide office jobs. A credit union might choose to locate in an industrial area, near its client base. This probability, coupled with the rise in commercial employment and decline in resource-based industrial activities, has increased the projected use of industrial land for commercial operations.

The commercial/industrial land need projection adjusts for commercial employment in industrial zones by assuming that 20 percent of projected new commercial employees will work on land zoned for industrial use. However, such service and retail uses can be expected to use industrial land more intensively than manufacturing uses. To correct for this discrepancy, the cross-over commercial employees were calculated at 20 employees per acre. Dallas’ industrial firms currently employ five persons per developed acre. Overall, this ratio is projected to increase to an average of seven employees per acre, based on shifts in the economy away from land-extensive industrial uses.

### 2.3.5 Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Projection

Table 2.6 shows the resulting commercial and industrial land need estimates for the period between 1995 and 2020. Dallas will experience an employment increase of 3,033 jobs during the planning period. This equates to a net land need of about 250 acres. Assuming that 20 percent of the buildable land area will be used for public right-of-way and utility easements, there is an overall need for 300 vacant buildable acres. **Seventy (70) vacant buildable acres will need to be zoned commercial and 230 vacant buildable acres will need to be zoned industrial.**

**Table 2.6 Commercial and Industrial Land Need Projections, Dallas 1995-2020**

	Existing Employees	Developed Acres	Projected New Employees	Employees Per/Acre	Net Vacant Buildable Acres Needed	Gross Vacant Buildable Acres Needed
<b>Commercial</b> <sup>1</sup>	1,863	96	1,747	30	58	70
<b>Industrial</b> <sup>2</sup>	876	274	1,286	7 <sup>3</sup>	192	230
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>2739</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>3,033</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>

<sup>1</sup>The Commercial designation generally includes trade, FIRE & services, and public administration.

<sup>2</sup>The Industrial designation generally includes resource-based industries, manufacturing, transportation, communications, and public utilities.

<sup>3</sup>This melded figure includes 849 industrial employees at 5 per acre plus 437 office/service commercial employees at 20 per acre, for an average of 7 employees per acre.

## 2.4 Commercial and Industrial Land Supply

### 2.4.1 Methods

The supply of commercial and industrial land was analyzed using County Assessment & Taxation Data and Polk County's GIS system. The following parameters were established for evaluating the existing supply of commercial and industrial land.

- **Vacant:** Parcels greater than or equal to 4,000 square feet with improvement value of less than \$10,000.
- **Constrained:** Parcels that are landlocked, within the floodplain, or containing slopes greater than 25 percent.
- **Redevelopable:** Parcels greater than or equal to .5 acres where the improvement value is less than \$50,000; and parcels in which the improvement value is less than the land value. In such cases, it is reasonable to conclude that the building will be replaced within the 20-year planning period.

### 2.4.2 Commercial Vacant Buildable Land Supply

**Table 2.7 shows that Dallas has 18 acres of vacant buildable commercial land within the UGB.** There are 40 parcels. This figure includes vacant buildable land designated Central Business District and Commercial on the Comprehensive Plan Map #1.

*Table 2.7 Summary of Vacant Buildable & Constrained Commercial Land Supply, Dallas Urban Growth Boundary, 1996*

Category	Commercial Acres	Commercial Parcels
Vacant	18	-
Constrained	.4	-
<b>Vacant Buildable Acres</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>40</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1997.

### 2.4.3 Industrial Vacant Buildable Land Supply

Dallas has 174 acres of vacant buildable industrial land within the UGB. There are 88 parcels; the average parcel size is 1.8 acres.

**Table 2.8 Summary of Vacant Buildable Industrial Land Supply, Dallas Urban Growth Boundary, 1995**

Category	Vacant Buildable Industrial Acres	Vacant Buildable Industrial Parcels
Vacant	184	-
Constrained	9.6	-
<b>Vacant Buildable Acres</b>	<b>174.4</b>	<b>88</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1995.

As documented above, Dallas has allocated sufficient industrial and commercial land, and has made a commitment to providing urban services to this land, such that this projection can be realized. Thus, from a buildable land perspective, Dallas has provided sufficient land to accommodate about 3,000 new jobs by the Year 2020. If Dallas actually attracts this many new jobs, and if population grows as projected by PSU, then the Dallas urban area will have achieved a jobs-to-household ratio (1:1.3) that is indicative of a more balanced local economy. Moreover, such a shift is quite realistic, given long-term trends towards suburbanization of both jobs and housing and Oregon’s land use program, which concentrates jobs and employment within urban growth boundaries.

### 2.5 Industrial and Commercial Land Demand & Supply Summary Comparison

This chapter has analyzed the Dallas economy and projects the demand for commercial and industrial land for the 23 year planning period. The buildable land inventory provides detailed analyses of the existing commercial and industrial land supply within the Dallas urban growth boundary. The following section summarizes and compares the demand for commercial and industrial land with the supply of buildable commercial and industrial land.

#### *Demand*

Our estimates indicated that Dallas will need 70 additional acres of vacant buildable commercial land and 230 acres of vacant buildable industrial land to accommodate anticipated growth between 1995 and 2020.

#### *Supply*

The vacant buildable land inventory indicates that Dallas has 18 acres of vacant buildable and redevelopable commercial land and 174 acres of vacant buildable and redevelopable industrial land within the UGB. This figure includes both CBD plan designation and all other types of commercial and industrial uses.

Table 2.9 summarizes the commercial and industrial land supply and demand for the planning period. Dallas has a deficit of 52 vacant buildable commercial acres, and a deficit of 56 vacant buildable industrial acres.

Table 2.9 Summary Commercial & Industrial Land Need, Dallas 1995-2020

<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b><u>Supply</u></b> Existing Vacant Buildable Acres	<b><u>Demand</u></b> Needed Vacant Buildable Acres	Surplus (Deficit)
<b>Commercial</b>	18	70	(52)
<b>Industrial</b>	174	230	(56)
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>(108)</b>

Source: WPS Inc., 1997

## **2.6 Options and Policy Choices for Meeting Commercial and Industrial Land Needs**

This section considers options and ultimate policy choices for designating and managing land to meet commercial and industrial land needs.

### **2.6.1 Designation of Land to Meet Commercial Land Needs**

Dallas needs approximately 70 acres of commercial land to meet long-term growth needs. The City currently has 18 acres of vacant, buildable commercial land, in several small parcels. Generally, commercial land requires access to arterial or (at a minimum) major collector streets. Commercial land should also be located near higher density housing, to minimize travel distance and to encourage use of alternative modes (walking, bicycling, transit) of transportation. A review of the 1987 Dallas Comprehensive Plan demonstrates that the City's existing commercial lands are (a) located along major transportation corridors, and (b) have large tracts of adjacent multi-family land.

Bearing in mind the above considerations, there are several options for making up this deficit, including the following:

- (1) Expand the UGB to include additional commercial land along major streets at the urban fringe;
- (2) Rely on infill and redevelopment of existing commercially-designated areas;
- (3) Rely on expansion outward from existing commercial areas, which would require redevelopment of land currently designated for residential use;
- (4) Extend the commercial strip west and east of the existing Ellendale Avenue commercial area; and/or
- (5) Create commercial/multi-family nodes along major streets, that are separated from existing commercial areas by intervening residential land.

Option #1: The results of the 1997 Buildable land inventory make it clear that Dallas has a surplus of land designated Single Family Residential and a shortage of land designated Commercial (General Commercial, Central Business District, Neighborhood Commercial) and Multi-Family. Statewide Planning Goals 14 (Urbanization) and 2 (Land Use Planning) require that cities first look inside their UGBs to meet land use needs, before considering UGB expansion. Because Dallas has an over-supply of Single-Family land that meets the siting criteria for commercial land discussed above, Dallas cannot justify UGB expansion to meet commercial land use needs at this time. Therefore, Option #1 was rejected.

Option #2: Since its adoption over 20 years ago, the Dallas Comprehensive Plan has intentionally focused commercial development in the CBD or on land immediately adjacent to the CBD along Main Street and Ellendale Road. In part for this reason, the City currently has only 18 vacant acres planned for commercial use within the CBD or adjacent General Commercial area. This analysis assumes that all of this commercial "infill" land will develop by the Year 2020, which may be optimistic. Although some redevelopment of existing, "under-utilized" commercial land will likely occur during the planning period, redevelopment cannot be relied upon to meet a significant portion of commercial land needs.

The Vacant Buildable Land Map #6 identifies parcels that are candidates for redevelopment over the next 20 years. For purposes of this analysis, it is reasonable to conclude that infill and redevelopment together will provide about 20 acres of land (about 480 employees) towards meeting the City's long-term commercial need.

Option #3: Dallas has chosen to rely extensively on Option #3 to meet long-term commercial land needs. The Vacant Buildable Land Map #6 shows about 30 acres of vacant buildable commercial land located east of N.E. Polk Station Road, north of E. Ellendale Avenue and west of the planned LaCreole Drive extension. A traffic signal is proposed at the E. Ellendale Ave./S.E. LaCreole Drive intersection to accommodate anticipated traffic demand in this mixed commercial/multi-family area. In addition to a large Multi-Family area that already exists immediately south of the LaCreole Commercial Node, new Multi-Family land has been designated to the north and east, to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to encourage alternate transportation modes.

Master planning is intended to allow the developer and/or the City a great deal of flexibility in the design and layout of the required commercial, residential and open space areas. For this reason, the plan designations are intentionally drawn so as not to correspond with property lines, and to allow adjustments in actual zoning boundaries, once the land is annexed and assigned city zoning. However, the master plan must incorporate and plan for all of the land within the "Master Planning Area" shown on the Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.

Required master planning for the LaCreole Node may occur in one of two ways:

- (1) First, it may occur in conjunction with an actual development proposal. Under this master planning approach, the developer would be required to prepare a plan that meets all of the applicable policies of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume I. Although all affected property owners must be consulted in the master planning process and their interests must be considered, unanimous consent is not a requirement. The City will use the developer's master plan as the starting point, and may modify this plan through the Planning Commission and City Council review processes. The City will make the ultimate rezoning decision consistent with the master plan that it ultimately approves.
- (2) Second, the master planning process may be initiated by the City prior to annexation and rezoning of property. The City intends to request a TGM (Transportation and Growth Management) grant from DLCD/ODOT to prepare a "special area plan" for the LaCreole area in the next biennium. (Fiscal Years 1997-99.) If Dallas is successful, this grant would be designed to ensure ODOT coordination on the major transportation issues that are present in this area, to meet the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), and to meet the objectives described below.

Master planning will be required prior to annexation and rezoning of this mixed-use area, to ensure that the following objectives are met:

- (a) multiple-family development precedes, or occurs at the same time as, commercial development;
- (b) piecemeal development (one or two properties at a time) does not occur in a manner that detracts from the objectives of the mixed use node;
- (c) transportation impacts are fully considered and coordinated with ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation);

- (d) adequate public facilities, including transportation, are provided for in a timely and efficient manner;
- (e) required park and open space areas are provided in a timely manner;
- (f) the design and layout of the internal circulation system, buildings and parking areas fosters, rather than deters, pedestrian and bicycle access; and
- (g) the new commercial area extends at least as far in an north-south direction (away from Ellendale Ave.) as it does in an east-west direction (along Ellendale Ave.).

Option #4: “Strip commercial development,” is explicitly rejected in both the 1987 and the 1997 Comprehensive Plans. Although all three new commercial areas are located along Ellendale Ave. (Dallas’ primary transportation corridor), each of these is required to be at least as “deep” (back from Ellendale Ave.) as it is “wide” (frontage along Ellendale Ave.) to avoid a strip commercial effect. In fact, one of the principal reasons for requiring “master planning” is to avoid the appearance and function of auto-orientated, strip commercial development. (See discussion of Option #5, below.) Therefore, this option was rejected.

Option #5: This is Dallas’ preferred method of meeting most of the remainder of the City’s long-term commercial land needs. Two new mixed neighborhood commercial/multi-family nodes are provided for: one 5-acre neighborhood commercial district at the west end of the City (SW Wyatt Street and W. Ellendale Ave.) and one 15-acre neighborhood commercial district towards the east end (the extension of SE Barberry Ave. and E. Ellendale Ave.).

As with the LaCreole Commercial Node, master planning is intended to allow the developer and/or the City a great deal of flexibility in the design and layout of the required commercial, residential and open space areas. Plan designations are intentionally drawn so as not to correspond with property lines. Adjustments in actual zoning boundaries are allowed consistent with the approved master plan, once the land is annexed to the City.

Required master planning for the Barberry Node may occur in one of two ways:

- (a) First, it may occur in conjunction with an actual development proposal, as described under Option #3, above.
- (b) Second, the master planning process may be initiated by the City prior to annexation and rezoning of property, as described in Option #3, above.

Required master planning for the Wyatt Street Node is much simpler, because this property is currently under one ownership, and therefore can be master planned through the City’s Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. However, this area would also be eligible to participate in a TGM “special area plan” grant request.

Master planning will be required prior to annexation and rezoning (in the case of the Barberry Node), or prior to planned development approval (in the case of the Wyatt Node) for these mixed-use areas, to ensure that the following objectives are met:

- (a) multiple-family development precedes, or occurs at the same time as, commercial development;

- (b) piecemeal development (one or two properties at a time, or a portion of a large property) does not occur in a manner that detracts from the objectives of the mixed use node;
- (c) transportation impacts are fully considered and coordinated with ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation);
- (d) adequate public facilities, including transportation, parks and schools, are provided for in a timely and efficient manner;
- (e) required park and open space areas are provided in a timely manner;
- (f) the design and layout of the internal circulation system, buildings and parking areas fosters, rather than deters, pedestrian and bicycle access; and
- (g) the new commercial area extends at least as far in an north-south direction (away from Ellendale Ave.) as it does in an east-west direction (along Ellendale Ave.).

**2.6.2 Summary of Commercial Land Need Decisions**

Table 2.10 provides a summary of commercial land allocation to meet estimated 2020 land needs.

**Table 2.10 Summary of Commercial Land Designation, Option #3 & Option #5**

Demand	Commercial Land Allocation			
Total Commercial Acres Needed	Infill & Redevelopment	LaCreole Node	Barberry Node	Wyatt Street Node
	Existing Parcels	General Commercial	Neighborhood Commercial	
<b>52</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

Source: WPS Inc., 1997

**2.6.3 Industrial Land Allocation**

As noted in section 2.6.1, above, Dallas needs approximately 230 acres of vacant buildable industrial land to meet Year 2020 growth needs, and has about 174 vacant buildable industrial acres within the 1996 UGB. Therefore, there is a long-term deficit of approximately 54 vacant buildable industrial acres.

There are several factors to consider when allocating industrial land for a 23 year planning period: (1) parcel size; (2) ownership patterns; and (3) redevelopment potential. First, in order to facilitate industrial growth, an adequate amount of buildable industrial land must be available at parcel sizes large enough to make industrial development feasible. OAR 660-09-015(3) requires that local governments inventory commercial and industrial land:

*Comprehensive plans for all areas within urban growth boundaries shall include an inventory of vacant and significantly underutilized land within the planning area which are designated for commercial or industrial use.*



The Vacant Buildable Land Map #6 shows the vacant buildable, and underutilized parcels contained within the current UGB. In addition, Table 2.11 at the end of this section summarizes parcel size and ownership data for industrial sites within the UGB.

In addition to parcel size, it is important to maintain a choice among industrial sites, to avoid a monopoly situation. Statewide Planning Goal 9 (Economy of the State) states that communities must provide suitable industrial sites sufficient to meet the specific needs of anticipated industrial users. OAR 660-09-015 requires each city to determine the types of sites needed to meet long-term industrial demand. This needs analysis should be based on an Economic Opportunities Analysis that identifies:

- (1) the major categories of industrial and commercial uses that could reasonably be expected to locate or expand in the planning area; and
- (2) the types of sites that are likely to be needed by industrial and commercial uses which might expand or locate in the planning area.

OAR 660-09-025(1) establishes specific provisions for identification of needed sites:

*The plan shall identify the approximate number and acreage of sites needed to accommodate industrial and commercial uses to implement plan policies. The need for sites should be specified in several broad "site categories", (e.g., light industrial, heavy industrial, commercial office, commercial retail, highway commercial, etc.) combining compatible uses with similar site requirements. It is not necessary to provide a different type of site for each industrial or commercial use which may locate in the planning area. Several broad site categories will provide for industrial and commercial uses likely to occur in most planning areas.*

Dallas has determined that at least four large light industrial sites (20 acres or greater) that are suitable for (a) master-planned industrial park development, or (b) large industrial firms should be provided within the UGB. These four large parcels should be under separate ownership to allow for long-term choice in the market place. From a location standpoint, these four large sites should meet the following criteria:

- (1) 20 acres or more of buildable land;
- (2) Adjacent to an industrial sanctuary to minimize conflicts with residential areas.
- (3) Served by a existing or planned arterial or major collector street, that minimizes truck traffic through residential neighborhoods.
- (4) Gentle terrain (no more than five percent slope);
- (5) Availability of water and sewer services, and with access to fire and police protection.

OAR 660-09-025(2) addresses the long-term supply of land. This section requires communities to designate land suitable to meet the site needs identified as a result of the above analysis:

*The total acreage of land designated in each site category shall at least equal the projected land needs for each category during the 20-year planning period.*

It has already been determined that Dallas needs an additional 54 acres, in the aggregate, to meet demonstrated need for industrial land. Table 2.11 summarizes vacant, buildable parcel size and ownership information for industrially-designated sites within the 1996 Dallas UGB. According to the

Dallas GIS data base, approximately 67 percent of all vacant industrial land within the current UGB is owned by three companies. There are five vacant industrial parcels within the UGB larger than five acres and they are all currently owned by Praegitzer Industries. Moreover, Praegitzer alone owns approximately 61 percent of the total vacant industrial land. Willamette Industries owns approximately 6.7 acres, and Caterpillar Corporation owns another 4.5 acres.

Underutilized industrial land ownership is divided among 18 landowners, Praegitzer Industries owns the two largest parcels, which total approximately 10.6 acres, and constitute 26 percent of the total underutilized industrial acres within the current UGB.

**Table 2.11 Summary of Vacant Industrial Land Parcel Size and Ownership, Dallas, 1997**

<b>Industrial Land Owner</b>	<b>Tax Lot Number</b>	<b>Parcel Size (Acres)</b>	<b>Percent of Total Vacant Buildable Acres</b>
<b>Vacant</b>			
Praegitzer	7.5.34C 2500	34.81	20%
Praegitzer	8.5.4AA 1300	15.45	9%
Praegitzer	7.5.34CC 100	8.10	5%
Praegitzer	7.5.33D 900	8.03	5%
Praegitzer	7.5.33D 1121	6.40	4%
42 Additional Parcels: Ave. Size 1.1ac.		31.40	18%
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>104.19</b>	<b>61%</b>
Willamette Industries, Inc.	7.5.33C 2300	0.16	0%
Willamette Industries, Inc.	7.5.33C 2300	0.60	0%
Willamette Industries, Inc.	7.5.33C 2300	1.63	1%
Willamette Industries, Inc.	8.5.4BA 701	4.28	2%
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>6.67</b>	<b>4%</b>
Towmotor Corporation	7.5.33DC 1400	0.25	0%
Towmotor Corporation	7.5.33DC 1200	0.26	0%
Towmotor Corporation	7.5.33DC 1200	0.74	0%
Towmotor Corporation	7.5.33DC 1400	0.90	1%
Towmotor Corporation	7.5.33CA 6900	2.32	1%
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>4.47</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>22 Additional Land Owners: Ave. Size 1.2 ac.</b>		<b>26.00</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Total Vacant Industrial Acres</b>		<b>174.00</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Underutilized</b>			
Praegitzer	7.5.33D 1000	6.1	15%
Praegitzer	7.5.33D 1000	4.5	11%
10 additional Parcels totaling 4.5 acres		4.5	11%
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>15.00</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>17 Additional Land Owners: Ave. Parcel Size 1.2 ac</b>		<b>25.00</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>Total Underutilized Industrial Acres</b>		<b>40.00</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Assessment & Taxation Data, City of Dallas GIS Data Base, 1997

Based on the above, and the identified need for at least four 20-acre industrial parcels under separate ownership, amendment of the UGB is necessary. The City has examined the 1997 Dallas Buildable land inventory which identifies 40 potentially redevelopable industrial acres. Parcels were considered viable candidates for redevelopment if they were greater than or equal to .5 acres where the improvement value is less than \$50,000; also parcels in which the improvement value is less than the land value.

Historically, there is very little evidence to support the hypothesis that redevelopment of industrial land will actually occur. For purposes of this analysis, it is reasonable to assume that limited land ownership in Dallas will restrict industrial land availability more than redevelopment is likely to provide additional opportunities for industrial development. Therefore, redevelopment potential is effectively “canceled out” by restricted availability of vacant buildable parcels in Dallas.

## Chapter 3: Residential Neighborhoods

### 3.1 Introduction

Residential neighborhoods are a vital element of every community. Consuming the majority of available land and transportation facilities, residential development largely determines the character of a community. Parcels designated for residential use occupy almost 70 percent of the land area within the Dallas UGB. Chapter 3 examines the supply and demand of residential land, and establishes policies to provide needed housing through the planning period.

### 3.2 Statutory Provisions Related to Residential Land Needs and Supply

In Oregon, the provision of adequate buildable land for residential growth is mandated by law. Statewide Planning Goals 10 and 14, as well as ORS 197.295-197.312, and OAR 660-07 and 660-08 detail the requirements for residential land use planning. In 1995 the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2709 (ORS 197.296) which supplements existing state requirements for the analysis and provision of residential land. HB 2709 added the following provisions:

- HB 2709 redefined the definition of buildable land to include “developed land likely to be redeveloped.” The definition of buildable land now reads, “Land in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available and necessary for residential uses. Buildable land include both vacant land and developed land likely to be redeveloped.”
- HB 2709 requires the coordination of population forecasts by a region’s coordinating body. In Dallas’ case, Polk County is to establish and maintain population forecasts, and coordinate the forecast with local governments within its jurisdiction.
- HB 2709 sets criteria for prioritizing land for UGB Expansions. Since UGB amendments are not proposed to accommodate needed housing, these provisions are considered in Chapter 5, Urban Growth Management.

All jurisdictions are required to comply with the provisions of ORS 197.296 at periodic review or any other legislative review of an urban growth boundary. ORS 197.296 contains two key objectives:

- (1) **Housing:** Ensure that development occurs at the densities and mix necessary to meet a community’s housing needs over the next 20 years.
- (2) **Land:** Ensure there is enough buildable land to accommodate the 20-year housing need inside the urban growth boundary.

The residential land need and supply element compares the housing needs analysis with the buildable land inventory to determine residential land need in Dallas for the planning period.

This is accomplished in three steps as follows:

- (1) Determine the actual density and mix of housing.
- (2) Conduct a housing needs analysis.

- (3) Compare the housing needs analysis with the results of the buildable land inventory to determine surplus or deficit residential land and establish housing goals and policies.

**3.2.1 Step 1: Determine Actual Density and Mix**

This step determines the actual density and mix of housing development since the last periodic review or five years whichever is greater. This analysis considers residential development in the Dallas urban area for the last five years. (Information for the years prior to 1991 was not readily available, and probably is not representative of current development trends, which have resulted in higher density housing and more multi-family housing over the last five years.)

Building permit and land use approval data provided by the City was used to determine the actual density and mix of residential development by housing type for the period 1992-1996. Data sources used for each housing type are described below.

- **Single Family and Manufactured Housing:** Most new conventional and manufactured homes in Dallas are built on lots approved through the subdivision process. Because manufactured houses are an allowed outright use in single family zones, they are permitted to develop at the same density as single family houses. Therefore, subdivision lots approved between 1992 and 1996 were used to determine the actual density of single family houses.
- **Duplexes:** A 20% sample of building permits provided by the City was used to determine the average density of duplexes between 1992 and 1996.
- **Multi-Family Housing:** City building permit data was used to determine the average density of multi-family housing units in Dallas between 1992 and 1996.

Table 3.1 summarizes the actual housing density and mix by type for 1992-1996.

**Table 3.1 Actual Developed Housing Density<sup>1</sup> and Mix by Type 1992-1996**

	<b>Manufactured Homes<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Duplex</b>	<b>Multi-Family</b>	<b>Totals</b>
<b>Total Number of Housing Units by Type 1992-1996:</b>	160	385	72	169	786
<b>Actual Density:</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Percent by Type:</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: City of Dallas land use and building permit data, 1992-96**

<sup>1</sup> A “Net Buildable Acre” as defined by OAR 660-07-005 (1) includes “43,560 square feet of residentially designated buildable land, after excluding present and future rights-of-way, restricted hazard areas, public open spaces and restricted resource protection areas.”

<sup>2</sup> No manufactured home parks were approved in Dallas from 1992-96.

### 3.2.2 Step 2: Housing Needs Analysis

This step analyzes housing needs by type and density to determine the amount of land needed in the urban growth boundary for each needed housing type for the next 20 years.

This analysis begins by examining historic trends in the housing mix. Table 3.2 summarizes Dallas' housing stock as reported by the US Census of Population and Housing in 1980 and 1990. Several notable trends occurred during this period. First, detached single family homes experienced only a 3 percent increase, while multi-family units gained over 20 percent during the same period. Manufactured and mobile homes increased by 44 percent—more than twice the increase of any other housing type. Finally, the percentage of single family units, relative to other housing types, decreased from 72 percent in 1980 to 67 percent in 1990. The occupancy rate in Dallas increased from 95 percent in 1980 to 97.5 percent in 1990, which indicates a “tight” housing market..

Table 3.2 Dallas Housing Stock, 1980 and 1990

Housing Type	1980		1990		Change	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% Change
Single Family	2,382	71.8%	2,452	67.4%	+70	+2.9%
Multi-Family	695	20.9%	838	23.0%	+143	+20.6%
Manufactured	243	7.3%	350	9.6%	+107	+44.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,320</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,640</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>+320</b>	<b>+9.6%</b>

Source: U.S. Census

The trends identified in Table 3.2 may be attributed to a national shift toward smaller household sizes, and a regional rise in single family home prices. Traditional single family homes are becoming less desirable to an aging population, and less affordable to young families. Over the last 17 years apartments and manufactured homes have provided a steadily increasing share of the housing needed by Dallas residents. This trend is projected to continue into the future.

Table 3.3 shows the increase in average home sale prices and mean income for Polk County and the City of Dallas from 1990 to 1996. Average home sale prices increased almost 45 percent while mean income increased only 19 percent for the same period. This indicates that Dallas should continue to provide for more affordable housing opportunities, such as manufactured homes, duplexes and apartments.

**Table 3.3 Average Home Sale Price and Mean Income, Polk County, Dallas 1990-1996**

	<b>Polk County</b>	<b>Dallas</b>
	<b>Average Home Sale Price</b>	<b>Mean Income</b>
<b>1990</b>	\$84,634	\$19,169
<b>1991</b>	\$87,252	\$19,744
<b>1992</b>	\$89,950	\$20,336
<b>1993</b>	\$92,732	\$20,946
<b>1994</b>	\$102,310	\$21,575
<b>1995</b>	\$113,556	\$22,222
<b>1996</b>	\$122,481	\$22,889
<b>Percent Change 1990-1996</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>

Source: Mean Income- 1990 US Census of Population and Housing, 1991-1996 disaggregated from Polk County income data. Average Home Sale Price were provided by Willamette Valley Multiple Listing Service.

The Center for Population Research and the Census, Portland State University, prepared population and housing unit forecasts for the City of Dallas, 1995-2020. Table 3.4 summarizes these projections. According to PSU, Dallas will need approximately 2,967 new housing units by the Year 2020.

**Table 3.4 Population and Housing Unit Forecasts, City of Dallas 1995-2020**

	<b>New People</b>	<b>Average House- hold Size</b>	<b>New Units Needed</b>
<b>Forecast</b>	<b>7,407</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2,967</b>

Source: Center for Population Research and the Census, Portland State University, see Appendix 1.1 for detailed methodology.

Table 3.5 applies recent housing density and mix trends to project housing need by type and density. Because the Dallas housing market has been responsive to demand for more affordable housing (small lot single family, manufactured homes on individual lots, duplexes and apartments), the City concludes that recent experience provides an excellent indicator of the housing types and densities that will be needed to accommodate Dallas' growing population through the Year 2020.

**Table 3.5 Dallas Housing Needs Projection: New Housing Units Needed by Year 2020 by Type & Density**

Housing Type	New People	Projected DU/Acre	Projected Housing Mix	Average Household Size	New Units Needed
Total Forecast	7,407		-	2.6	<b>2,967</b>
Single Family/ Manufactured Home	5,474	<b>4.3</b>	<b>69%</b>	2.7	<b>2,047</b>
Multi-Family/ Duplex	1,932	<b>14.3<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>31%</b>	2.1	<b>920</b>

Source: Center for Population Research and the Census, Portland State University, Analysis by Winterowd Planning Services. <sup>1</sup> 14.3 units per acre represents a weighted average of duplex and multi-family density.

### 3.2.3 Step 3: Needed Housing Units and Residential Land Supply

Step 3 determines whether there is adequate vacant residential land within the current UGB to accommodate the projected housing needs from Step 2. This step consists of two tasks. First, the amount of buildable land needed within each plan designation based on Table 3.5, above. Second, needed residential acres is compared with the vacant buildable residential acres within the 1996 urban growth boundary.

#### *Task 1: Vacant Residential Acres Needed*

To determine the number of acres necessary to accommodate Dallas' housing needs through 2020, the actual housing density and mix is multiplied by projected housing needs. As shown in Table 3.6, Dallas needs 659 vacant buildable residential acres -- 581 acres for single family/manufactured homes and 78 acres for multi-family/duplex housing.

**Table 3.6 Summary of Residential Land Needs in Dallas, Oregon 1995-2020**

	New People	New Units	Percent Housing Mix by Type	Expected Net DU/Acre	Buildable Acres Needed	Less Public ROW <sup>1</sup>	Less Public/Semi-Public <sup>2</sup>	Total Designated Acres Needed
<b>Single Family/ Manufactured Housing</b>	5,474	2,047	69%	4.3	476	95	10	<b>581</b>
<b>Multi-Family/ Duplexes</b>	1,932	920	31%	14.3 <sup>3</sup>	63	13	2	<b>78</b>
<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>7,407</b>	<b>2,967</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>659</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services.

<sup>1</sup> Street rights-of-way are estimated at 20%.

<sup>2</sup> Public and semi-public land needs (churches, fire stations, etc.) is estimated at 2%. Park and school needs are considered in Chapter 4, Parks and Open Space.

<sup>3</sup> 14.3 units per acre represents a weighted average of duplex and multi-family density.

The Polk County GIS (Geographic Information System) system, using Assessment & Taxation data, was applied to conduct the Dallas Buildable land inventory. The result of the inventory documents



the buildable residential land supply within the 1996 UGB. This buildable land supply was then compared to the projected residential land need and serves as the basis for land use allocations, comprehensive plan map designations and growth management policies.

The Dallas Buildable land inventory applies the following definitions:

- **Vacant:** Parcels greater than or equal to 4,000 square feet with improvement value of less than \$10,000.
- **Constrained:** Parcels that are landlocked, within the floodplain, or containing slopes greater than 25 percent.
- **Under-utilized:** Parcels greater than or equal to 0.75 acres with only one single family residence; one-half acre is subtracted for the residence (and considered “developed”); the remainder is considered vacant.

Table 3.7 determines the surplus or deficit of buildable residential land within the 1996 Dallas UGB for each needed housing type. Based on the actual housing mix and density observed over last five years, and the supply of vacant buildable residential land in the Single Family and Multi-Family plan designations, Dallas has a 523-acre surplus of vacant buildable Single Family land, and a 54-acre deficit of vacant buildable Multi-Family land. The Dallas Buildable land inventory (Map #6) shows the location of vacant buildable and under-utilized parcels designated for Single Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential use.

**Table 3.7 Summary of Dallas Housing Need and 1996 Residential Land Supply within 1996 Dallas UGB**

Plan Designation	Demand Designated Acres Needed						Supply Vacant Buildable Acres	Difference Surplus (Deficit)
		Plan Acres	Developed Acres	Vacant <sup>1</sup> Acres	Constrained Acres	Less 22% <sup>2</sup>		
Single-Family	581	2,369	910	1,460	44	312	1,104	523
Multi-Family	78	262	213	35	4	7	24	(54)
<b>Total:</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>2,631</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>1,495</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>1,128</b>	<b>469</b>

Source: Assessment & Taxation data; Polk County GIS; analysis by Winterowd Planning Services.

<sup>1</sup> Includes under-utilized portions of parcels greater than or equal to .75 acres with only one single family residence; each residence is estimated to use one-half acre, and is accounted for in the “Developed Acres” column.

<sup>2</sup> Based on 20% for public right-of-way and 2% for public and semi-public land uses (churches, fire stations, etc.) Park and school needs are considered separately in Chapter 4: Parks and Open Space.

### 3.3 Siting Criteria for Single Family and Multi-Family Housing

In Section 3.2, it was determined that the 1996 Dallas UGB has a surplus of 523 vacant buildable Single Family Residential acres, and a deficit of 54 vacant buildable Multi-Family acres. This section

considers the siting needs of single family and multi-family development and makes ultimate policy choices on the location and siting standards for these needed housing types.

### **3.3.1 Single Family Siting Criteria**

Of all land uses, single family residential development is probably the easiest to site. Unlike commercial, industrial or multi-family uses, single family development does not require direct access to major streets and can be constructed on moderately-sloped land. In fact, single family development benefits from a location adjacent to parks, open space and elementary schools, away from major traffic corridors. Through the planned unit development process, single-family development adapts well to constrained sites, through clustering of housing units, zero lot line development, and other means.

For purposes of this analysis, manufactured homes on individual lots and manufactured home parks are considered “single-family development,” because densities do not exceed 8 units per acre. However, manufactured home parks and duplex subdivision generally have higher densities than typical single family development, and therefore should have access directly to arterial or collector streets, to avoid undue traffic impacts on established single family neighborhoods.

Therefore, single family residential siting criteria include the following:

Generally, single family residences (conventional and manufactured homes on individual lots) should be located in areas:

- that do not have direct access to arterial or major collector streets (where direct access is unavoidable, individual access to the arterial street should be strictly controlled);
- within a half-mile of neighborhood parks, elementary school playgrounds, public or private greenways or community parks or middle/high school recreation areas;
- separate or buffered from industrial areas and major shopping areas

Generally, duplex subdivisions and manufactured home parks should be located in areas:

- with direct but limited access to arterial or collector streets; and
- within a half-mile of neighborhood parks, elementary school playgrounds, public or private greenways or community parks or middle/high school recreation areas.

### **3.3.2 Multi-Family Siting Criteria**

Dallas currently allows duplexes as a “conditional use” in its Single-Family Residential zones, because duplexes have siting requirements that are similar to single family residences in most cases. With appropriate conditions, duplexes can be sited in single family residential neighborhoods with relatively little impact. However, ORS 197.295 (Needed Housing) requires that “needed housing” be provided under clear and objective standards; therefore, identified need for duplexes must be provided for on land designated Multi-Family, or it must be allowed outright in the Single-Family zone. Dallas has chosen the former approach.

Higher density multi-family development (apartments and government-assisted housing) has more demanding siting requirements:

Generally, multi-family development should be located with direct access to major streets, to:

- minimize traffic impacts on single family residential neighborhoods;

- provide direct pedestrian access to transit routes; and
- provide direct bicycle access to designated bike routes.

Generally, multi-family development should be located adjacent to or near (within a quarter mile) employment, retail and service centers:

- location adjacent to or near commercial and service areas (the CBD or shopping centers) minimizes travel distance for everyday shopping and service needs, and encourages use of alternative modes of travel;
- location near industrial areas minimizes home-to-work travel; and
- location near hospitals, police and fire services minimizes response times in cases of emergency.

If possible, multi-family development should be located adjacent to or near (within a half mile) park and recreational areas, to “make up” for relatively dense living conditions.

Multi-family areas should be retained in large parcels (preferably an acre or more) to allow effective buffering from adjacent single-family uses and major streets, on-site open space, and parking that is located behind or to the side of buildings (i.e., does not directly abut the street).

### ***3.4 Designation of Land to Meet Multi-Family Housing Needs***

The 1996 Dallas UGB had a large surplus of vacant buildable Single Family Residential land, but had very little vacant buildable multi-family residential land. Although 268 Multi-Family acres were designated in 1996, 213 of these acres were fully developed. The Existing Land Use Map (Map #3) shows that most developed land designated for Multi-Family Residential use has, in fact, developed as single family residential. In large part because Multi-Family land has been used, inefficiently, for single-family housing, only 24 vacant or under-utilized acres remained within the 1996 UGB, and this remaining land is distributed in small parcels throughout the community.

Therefore, in 1996 Dallas had an unmet need for at least 54 vacant buildable Multi-Family Residential acres. Because of (a) the large Single Family Residential surplus, (b) the need for on-site recreational areas in apartment developments, and (c) to allow some market choice in Multi-Family sites, it was determined appropriate to designate approximately 10 acres of additional Multi-Family Residential land, beyond the minimum demonstrated need.

For the above reasons, a major task of the 1997 Periodic Review work program has been to re-designate Single Family Residential vacant buildable land for Multi-Family Residential use. Several undeveloped Single Family Residential areas that met the siting criteria for the Multi-Family Residential plan designation were available to meet the need for multi-family housing. This is due in no small part to Dallas’ effective growth management program, which has preserved land along major streets in large, vacant parcels that are suitable for master planned mixed commercial and multi-family residential development.

#### **3.4.1 Mixed Use Nodes**

The principal means that Dallas has selected to allocate vacant buildable land to meet multi-family housing needs is the “mixed use node.” Three large areas, with a minimum of 65 buildable acres, were selected along Ellendale Road as mixed use nodes, including:

La Creole Drive North of E Ellendale (a minimum of 30 buildable Multi-Family acres adjacent to a new General Commercial plan designation);

South of E Ellendale, between Fir Villa and Hawthorne Avenue (a minimum of 20 buildable Multi-Family acres adjacent to a new Neighborhood Commercial plan designation); and

North of the intersection of W Ellendale and Wyatt Street (a minimum of 15 buildable Multi-Family acres adjacent to a new Neighborhood Commercial plan designation).

### **3.4.2 Master Planning Requirements**

The effective implementation of the mixed use node concept depends upon master planning. In every mixed use node, multi-family development must precede commercial development, for several reasons:

- to recognize the importance Dallas places on providing affordable housing opportunities;
- to ensure that new commercial development is designed to serve and is oriented towards adjacent multi-family development;
- to meet Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements relative to efficient circulation and designing for bicycle and pedestrian access; and
- to minimize adverse impacts on the Central Business District and other existing commercial areas, by establishing an immediately-accessible market for new commercial development, in advance of, or in conjunction with, new commercial development.

The master planning process is described in more detail in Chapter 2 of this document, and is summarized here. Master planning is intended to allow the developer and/or the City a great deal of flexibility in the design and layout of the required commercial, residential and open space areas. For this reason, the plan designations are intentionally drawn so as not to correspond with property lines, and to allow adjustments in actual zoning boundaries, once the land is annexed and assigned city zoning. However, the master plan must incorporate and plan for all of the land within the “Master Planning Area” shown on the Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map #1.

Required master planning may occur in one of three ways, depending on the location of the mixed use node, ownership patterns, and the availability of grant funds:

First, it may occur in conjunction with an actual development proposal. Under this master planning approach, the developer would be required to prepare a plan that meets all of the applicable policies of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume I. Although all affected property owners must be consulted in the master planning process and their interests must be considered, unanimous consent is not a requirement. The City will use the developer’s master plan as the starting point, and may modify this plan through the Planning Commission and City Council review processes. The City will make the ultimate rezoning decision consistent with the master plan that it ultimately approves.

Second, the master planning process may be initiated by the City prior to annexation and rezoning of property. The City intends to request a TGM (Transportation and Growth Management) grant from DLCD/ODOT to prepare a “special area plan” for the LaCreole area in the next biennium. (Fiscal Years 1997-99.) If Dallas is successful, this grant would be designed to ensure ODOT coordination on the major transportation issues that are present in this area, to meet the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), and to meet the objectives described below.

Third, in situations where the property within the Master Planning is under one or a few ownerships, the Planned Unit Development approach may be used.

Master planning will be required prior to annexation and rezoning of this mixed-use area. In the case of land already in the City Limits, master planning must occur prior to development approval. In any case, the following objectives must be met:

- a) multiple-family development must precede, or occur at the same time as, commercial development;
- b) piecemeal development (one or two properties at a time) must not occur in a manner that detracts from the objectives of the mixed use node;
- c) transportation impacts must be fully considered and coordinated with ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation);
- d) adequate public facilities, including transportation, must be provided for in a timely and efficient manner;
- e) required parks, open space areas and schools must also be provided in a timely manner, in accordance with Volume I, Chapter 4, Parks, Open Space and Schools;
- f) the design and layout of the internal circulation system, buildings and parking areas must foster, rather than discourage, pedestrian and bicycle access; and
- g) the new commercial area must extend at least as far in an north-south direction (away from Ellendale Ave.) as it does in an east-west direction (along Ellendale Ave.).

### **3.4.3 Minimum Densities**

Over the years, land designated Multi-Family Residential has been used, inefficiently, for single family uses. This should not continue in the future for several reasons:

- To provide continued opportunities for more affordable multi-family housing;
- to ensure against a shortage of Multi-Family Residential land;
- to maximize density near commercial and employment centers, thus reducing vehicle miles traveled and fostering alternative transportation modes;
- to ensure that vacant buildable land in Dallas is used efficiently, and that the public costs of providing services is minimized;
- to avoid the need to redesignate additional Multi-Family land in the near future;
- to avoid having to site multi-family development in or near established single family residential neighborhoods in the future.

For the above reasons, Dallas has established density minimums as well as density maximums, per net buildable acre (i.e., 43,560 square feet of buildable area, exclusive of streets, recreational areas, designated open space, and public utilities) as follows:

- 04 units per net buildable acre in the RA, RS, and RLD zones;
- 16 units per net buildable acre in the RMD zone; and

- 20 units per net buildable acre in the RHD zone.

#### **3.4.4 Innovative Techniques**

Dallas supports use of a variety of innovative housing development techniques that provide more affordable housing opportunities, without sacrificing the quality of Dallas' residential neighborhoods.

Included among these techniques are the following:

- Regulate housing by density, rather than housing type (for this reason, manufactured home parks are now allowed in the Single Family Residential designation, subject to siting standards);
- Publicly-assisted housing is allowed on par with market-financed housing, and will not receive special treatment;
- Attached housing opportunities are provided, including row housing, zero lot line dwellings, accessory dwelling units, and the like;
- minimum as well as maximum densities will ensure that land is reserved for its intended use under the Plan;
- the master planning process will ensure that higher density housing is designed to support neighborhood commercial nodes, and forms the nucleus, rather than the unattractive edge, of Dallas' future neighborhoods.

The following section contains residential neighborhood goals and policies that will ensure that the residential land supply in Dallas is developed efficiently and in a manner that will provide for the changing housing needs of Dallas residents.

#### **3.5 Livable Residential Neighborhoods**

Dallas' primary residential goals are to:

- Maintain and enhance the quality of existing residential neighborhoods and, through master planning, to ensure that new development is integrated into the community and results in new, high quality residential neighborhoods, while at the same time
- Encouraging the development of a variety of housing types and densities to meet the needs and desires of the community, and assuring that existing and future residents of the community have the opportunity to acquire safe and sanitary housing at reasonable cost.

These important goals may be viewed as conflicting as Dallas continues to grow, and buildable land becomes relatively scarce. To minimize these conflicts, it is critical to apply urban design principles, so that higher density will augment, rather than detract from, quality of life in Dallas residential neighborhoods.

Therefore, Dallas has adopted residential neighborhood location and design policies to:

- ensure that each residential neighborhood has an identifiable and accessible commercial center, to provide a focal point and gathering place for the neighborhood, and to minimize travel distance for everyday shopping and service needs;
- provide for a grid system of streets, to ensure that traffic is evenly distributed among neighborhoods and to minimize reliance on automobiles as the sole method of transportation;
- distribute multi-family and government-assisted housing throughout the community, by designating three new Multi-Family Residential nodes;

- locate planned multi-family development adjacent to commercial development, to create a more traditional, “village-like” atmosphere, which is more like the original Dallas town center and less like suburban sprawl;
- require pedestrian and bicycle connections from all residential areas to common destination points, such as commercial and service areas, parks and open space, schools and employment centers; and
- require that all new residential development be accessible to usable recreational areas and open space, based on adopted “level-of-service” standards (see Chapter 4) and mandatory master planning requirements.

## Chapter 4: Parks, Schools & Open Space

### 4.1 Introduction

The parks and opens space element is divided into four sections. The first section looks at existing parks and open space in Dallas. The second section identifies areas deficient in park land and estimates Dallas' park needs over the planning period. The third section outlines the park and open space facilities proposed to meet the needs of Dallas residents over the planning period. The fourth section identifies school siting needs. The Parks, Open Space and Schools Map (Map #5), shows existing and planned parks, schools and open spaces.

### 4.2 Existing Parks and Open Space System

There are two parts to this discussion of existing parks and open space in Dallas. Section 4.2.1 describes the five park categories and standards, and examines existing park facilities in each category. Section 4.2.2 describes the contribution of school facilities to the Dallas open space and recreation system.

#### 4.2.1 Existing Parks

Dallas has five different types of parks, based on park size, service area, and improvement characteristics.

##### 1. Community Parks

Community parks serve a number of neighborhoods or, in some cases, an entire town. The typical community park varies from 20 to 80 acres in size but at a minimum should contain 2.5 acres/1,000 population served. The community park offers a wide range of facilities, which usually include:

- organized play fields for baseball, soccer, and football;
- tennis courts; multi-use play areas; picnic tables and cooking facilities; and/or
- trails, paths, and natural areas.

In addition, community parks usually serves the function of neighborhood parks to adjacent residential areas. Community parks are considered to be accessible if they are located within a half-mile of a residential area.

The City of Dallas currently has four community parks:

- **The City Park** (40.7 acres)

The City Park is a large community park, which is divided by Rickreall Creek, with approximately one-half mile of creek frontage. Three acres of this 40.7 acre park have been retained as a natural area; a trail meanders through open space. Squirrels are found in large numbers, with food available from the English walnut trees located in the park adjacent to this area. Deer are seen throughout the park during the fall and winter. Coveys of quail and other birds utilize this natural area for food and shelter.

- **East Dallas Community Park** (14.5 acres)

The East Dallas Community Park is located in the eastern portion of the City, along Rickreall Creek. This park's unique proximity to three schools, Rickreall Creek, and numerous other civic facilities makes it a valuable addition to Dallas' park system.



- **LaCreole Sports Complex** (8.5 acres)  
The LaCreole Sports Complex is accessed from SE LaCreole Drive. This facility is developed with lighted ball fields, and other recreational facilities and serves as a community-wide center for sporting activities.
- **Whitworth Sports Complex** (5.0 acres)  
The Whitworth Sports Complex is located adjacent to Whitworth School and is developed with soccer, softball, and concessions facilities.

## 2. Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks offer a wide range of recreational facilities and open space opportunity. Neighborhood park sites should be centrally located and consist of 5 to 20 acres of flat-to-gently sloping land. Wooded groves and lakes and streams are desirable, if available. Ideally, neighborhood parks should be developed in conjunction with school sites. Park facilities are usually determined by the needs and desires of the neighborhood, but generally include:

- multi-purpose courts (tennis, basketball, volleyball);
- turf-covered playgrounds for informal field games;
- tables, small shelters, areas for sitting, playground equipment, paths, and trails.

Neighborhood parks should be located within a half-mile of new residential development, unless private park facilities are provided in association with new development.

Dallas has five neighborhood parks:

- **Kingsborough Park** (8.7 acres)  
Kingsborough Park is located in west Dallas at the corner of Wyatt Street and Ellendale Avenue. This park serves the neighborhoods at the westernmost edge of the City.
- **Lyle School** (6.4 acres)  
Lyle School is located at the corner of W Ellendale Avenue and SW Levens Street, abuts Dallas City Park to the south and provides additional recreation amenities to the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
- **Oakdale Heights School** (approximately 20 acres)  
Oakdale Heights serves as the primary developed recreational facility for the residential neighborhoods in West Dallas.
- **Walnut Street Park** (1.8 acres)  
Walnut Street Park is located along the banks of Rickreall Creek and is accessed from SE Walnut Street.
- **Dallas High School** (5.5 acres)  
The Dallas High School, located at SE Holman Avenue and SE Ash Street, provides soccer, running track, tennis, and sand volleyball facilities to the surrounding residential areas.

## 3. Mini Parks

Mini parks vary in size from 2,500 square feet to several acres and are usually developed to serve sub-neighborhood areas or to supplement neighborhood parks in high density residential districts. The most common use of mini parks is for the development of “tot lots,” but they are also effective as residential green space (landscaped areas) and as rest areas in the commercial district. Gala Park is an example of the former and the Courthouse and Museum lawns are examples of the latter.

Mini parks developed for children should include: play apparatus, drinking fountain, park furniture, waste receptacles, and, in certain cases, wading pool, lighting, landscaping, and a small shelter.

Adult parks in residential areas should include: extensive landscaping, park furniture, lighting, and drinking fountain. In areas with a high proportion of senior citizens, the park may also include such special facilities as outdoor chess and checkers tables, croquet, horseshoe pits, and shuffleboard courts. In commercial areas, parks should include: park furniture, water fountain, landscaping, and lighting.

Dallas currently has four developed mini parks:

- **Birch Park** (0.6 acres)  
Birch Park, located at the corner of SW Birch and SW Stump Streets, is developed with a skateboard track and other recreational facilities.
- **Rotary Park** (0.85 acres)  
Rotary Park, located between NE Polk Station Road and Orchard Drive, is developed with exercise fitness stations.
- **Gala Park** (1.4 acres)  
Gala Park is located between SE Hankel Street and East Ellendale Avenue.
- **The Academy Building** (1.5 acres)  
The area around the Academy Building, located on SE Academy Street provides additional recreational opportunities for residents of the surrounding area.

#### 4. *Greenways*

Greenways are linear parks intended for passive recreation and conserve identified natural resource sites, such as river or stream corridors. Greenways typically include adequate parking, handicapped-accessible trails, park benches, and shelters. Typically, greenways are provided through the planned development or subdivision process, and may be maintained by the public, a homeowners’ association, or a trust.

- **Park Creek Trail**  
Rickreall Creek is one of Dallas’ most valuable natural resources. With a minimum year-round required flow of 5 cubic feet per second, Rickreall Creek has several species of anadromous fish, including steelhead, salmon, and native cut throat trout. The Department of Fish and Wildlife annually releases 1,000 rainbow trout in and near the City Park in time for opening day of fishing season.

In an effort to preserve these resources for the continued enjoyment of Dallas residents, the City plans on developing the Park Creek Trail, a 4.2 mile greenway that will stretch the width of the current UGB. The City has acquired or retained easements over approximately 5,600 linear feet

of land along the banks of the creek. Another 2,200 linear feet of trail have been improved along the creek at Walnut Street Park, the City Park, and Kingsborough Park. The Park Creek Trail is of such importance to the City that it has a separate plan designation, indicating areas that have been and will eventually be acquired by the City.

## 5. *Viewpoints*

Viewpoints are small landscaped areas, usually located next to arterial streets or scenic drives, which provide a scenic vista of the City and the region. Desirable improvements include: adequate parking, landscaped open space, and benches. Viewpoints may also be accompanied by an information display such as a map or local history plaque.

At present, Dallas has two designated viewpoints:

- **Applegate Trail Marker**

A plaque at the entrance to the Brandvold section of the Dallas City Park marks where the Applegate Trail passed through the area. The Applegate Trail was established around 1846 as a route between California and the Willamette Valley. The Plaque was donated by the Oregon California Trails Association (OCTA) in 1995.

- **Kingsborough Viewpoint**

A designated viewpoint is located in the southwest corner of Kingsborough Park. This viewpoint overlooks Rickreall Creek and adjacent wetlands.

## 6. **Cultural Facilities**

The Dallas park and recreation system also provides a unique setting for community cultural activities. The Rotary Performing Arts Stage is located in the center of town in close proximity to other park and civic facilities. The stage includes an electrically serviced bandstand and is the site of the Summer Concert Series activities each summer.

### 4.2.2 School Facilities

The playgrounds and field equipment of the Dallas public schools are also available to the public, contributing over 100 acres to neighborhood park, open space, and recreational facilities. The following section examines the role existing school facilities play in the City's park and open space system.

- Morrison School is owned by the Dallas School District and currently houses the District offices. While this facility is available to other community groups for indoor activities, the site offers little opportunity for outdoor recreation.
- The East Dallas Community Park has been established north of Rickreall Creek, between LaCreole Middle School and Whitworth Elementary School. This park serves the East Dallas area and complements recreational facilities associated with area schools. A paved bike/pedestrian path system should be constructed to connect the two schools.
- Lyle School, located at the corner of W Ellendale Avenue and SW Levens Street, abuts Dallas City Park to the south and provides additional recreation amenities to the community's largest park facility.

- Oakdale Heights School is a 20-acre site in west Dallas which serves at the primary developed recreational facility for the area.
- Dallas High School located at SE Holman Avenue and SE Ash Street, adds 5.5 acres of developed recreational facilities to the neighborhood park inventory.

**4.3 Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards**

Volume I, Goals and Policies, of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan establishes park and open space levels-of-service (LOS) standards for community parks, neighborhood parks, mini-parks and view-points.

Park and Open Space LOS standards must be met in order for new residential development to be approved in Dallas. If an area is park-deficient, the developer has several choices:

- wait until the City or another public agency acquires and develops a park within the required distance;
- dedicate sufficient park land to the City to meet the standard; or
- provide and improve private open space to meet the standard;

If the land is within a master planning area as shown on the Dallas Comprehensive Plan map, the approved master plan must show the location of required park land and include a mechanism to fund improvements to the required park, prior to annexation or development approval, as appropriate.

A summary of level-of-service (LOS) standards for community and neighborhood parks is provided below.

**Table 4.1 Summary of Park Facility Classifications and LOS Standards**

<b>Classifications</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Acres Per 1,000 Population</b>	<b>Minimum Residential Area Distance</b>
<b>Community Parks</b>	20-80 Acres	2.5 ac.	0.5 mi. from New Residential
<b>Neighborhood Parks</b>	5-20 Acres	2.5 ac.	0.5 mi. from New Residential

In addition to the above, multi-family development is required to provide at least 20% on-site recreational area to meet the specific needs of children and adults living in the multi-family complex.

**4.4 City-Wide Parks and Open Space Service Levels**

**4.4.1 1997 City-Wide Park Level-of-Service**

Table 4.2 compares Dallas’ existing park and open space facilities with the adopted level-of-service (LOS) standard. Dallas currently maintains 5.9 acres of community parks per 1,000 residents, and 3.7 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents. When this existing LOS is compared to the adopted LOS, (2.5 acres per 1,000 residents) the result indicates a system-wide surplus or deficit of park land by type. Table 4.2 shows that Dallas currently has a surplus of 3.4 acres per 1,000 residents, or 39.5

acres of community park land, and a surplus of 1.2 acres per 1,000 residents or 13.9 acres of neighborhood park land.

Table 4.2 Adequacy of City-Wide Park System, 1997

Park Classification	Existing Parks	Existing Population	Existing Level-of Service	Level-of Service Standard	System-Wide Surplus or Deficit
Community Parks	68.7 ac	11,639	5.9 ac./1,000 pop.	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	+3.4 ac./1,000 pop. 39.5 ac.
Neighborhood Parks	42.4 ac	11,639	3.7 ac./1,000 pop.	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	+1.2 ac./1,000 pop. 13.9 ac.

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1997

#### 4.4.2 Year 2020 Projected City-Wide Park System Level-of-Service

Table 4.3 combines the projected 2020 population increase with the system-wide surplus or deficit calculated in Table 4.2 above, to determine Dallas' park needs for the planning period. The estimated population increase of 7,400 residents, and the adopted LOS, will create the need for approximately 18.5 acres of both community and neighborhood parks. The existing 39.5 acre surplus of community parks, however, outweighs the estimated increase in demand, and results in a 2020 **surplus** of 21 acres. The current 13.9 acre surplus of neighborhood parks, however, does not absorb the estimated increase in demand resulting in a 2020 **deficit** of 4.6 acres. Therefore, future park development efforts should be concentrated on establishing more neighborhood parks throughout the city.

Table 4.3 Projected Adequacy of City-Wide Park System without New Parks, 2020

Park Classification	Estimated Increase in Population 1995-2020 <sup>1</sup>	Level-of Service Standard	Estimated Increase in Park Land Demand	Current System-Wide Surplus or Deficit	2020 System-Wide Surplus or Deficit
Community Parks	7,400	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	18.5 ac.	+3.4 ac./1,000 pop. 39.5 ac.	<b>+21 ac.</b>
Neighborhood Parks	7,400	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	18.5 ac.	+1.2 ac./1,000 pop. 13.9 ac.	<b>-4.6 ac.</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services

<sup>1</sup> Based on 2020 population projection of 19,049

#### 4.5 Neighborhood Levels-of-Service

In light of the estimated need for neighborhood park facilities (Section 4.3.2) over the planning period, this section examines the park land LOS for each neighborhood to identify deficient areas in the City.

- **Southwest**

Park needs in the southwest portion of the city are served only by the Oakdale Heights School site and some private open space in the Bridlewood subdivision. While the majority of this area is currently undeveloped, future residential development in the area will further exacerbate the need

for public park land. This area is determined to be deficient in neighborhood park facilities. However, these additional neighborhood park needs may be served through further development of Oakdale Heights School.

- **South**

The closest city park to the southern portion of the City, east of Fairview Avenue and north of Ash Creek, is the Birch Street mini-park at the corner of Birch and Stump Streets. This area currently contains a significant amount of undeveloped residential land, and a neighborhood park should be considered as development occurs from the north and east.

- **Southeast**

The southeastern portion of the City, east of Uglow Avenue and south of Rickreall Creek, is well served by the East Dallas Community Park and adjacent public school facilities. This area is dominated by industrial land uses and is not anticipated to require additional park facilities during the planning period.

- **East**

The SE La Creole Drive area is well served by the East Dallas Community Park, the La Creole Sports Complex, and several school facilities. Further east, however, between SE Hawthorne Avenue and SE Fir Villa Road there is a significant amount of undeveloped land that will provide much of the needed residential land throughout the planning period. This area is currently deficient in neighborhood park facilities and will require a neighborhood park to maintain the adopted level-of-service standards.

- **Northeast**

The area north of E Ellendale Avenue and east of NE Polk Station Road is well over one-half mile from the nearest park or open space. This area is generally undeveloped residential land and will need a neighborhood park as it is developed during the planning period.

- **North**

Much like the Northeastern portion of the City, the area north of E Ellendale Avenue between NW Douglas Street and Orchard Drive lies just outside of existing community or neighborhood park service areas. This area will require a small neighborhood park during the planning period to maintain the adopted level-of-service standards.

- **Northwest**

The northwest corner of the UGB has relatively good access to Kingsborough Park south of SW Ellendale Avenue. However, as multi-family, single family, and commercial land uses are established, this area should be reviewed for open space to maintain the adopted LOS standards.

#### ***4.6 Proposed Park and Open Space Facilities***

This section outlines specific proposed park and open space facilities that will meet Dallas' projected park need through 2020.

##### **4.6.1 Master Planning Areas**

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan establishes three master planning areas designed to coordinate park and open space development with residential and commercial, land uses over the planning period.

- Wyatt Street/Ellendale Master Planning Area

This Master Plan Area is located north of the intersection of Wyatt Street and W Ellendale, and encompasses about 100 acres of land under a single ownership. Prior to adoption of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan, this area was designated entirely for Single Family Residential use. The Wyatt Street mixed-use node includes a five-acre neighborhood commercial area, which is intended to include a central plaza, to serve as a neighborhood meeting place. Therefore, the master development plan should show at least an acre of open space, in the form of a public plaza and landscape buffering for proposed neighborhood commercial uses. A 15-acre area is reserved for multi-family use. To provide open space and recreational facilities for higher density housing and neighboring single family housing in this area, a six-acre public or private park is required (40 percent of the newly-designated Multi-Family area).

- **Barberry Avenue/Ellendale Master Planning Area**

This Master Plan Area is located south of the intersection of the Barberry Avenue extension and E Ellendale, and encompasses several hundred acres under many ownerships. Prior to adoption of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan, this area was designated almost entirely for Single Family Residential use (except for a small “conditional commercial” area along Ellendale).

The Barberry Drive mixed-use node now includes a 15-acre neighborhood commercial area, which is intended to include a central plaza, and to serve as a neighborhood meeting place. Therefore, the master development plan should show at least three acres of landscaping and open space (20 percent of the commercial area), in the form of a public plaza and landscape buffering for proposed neighborhood commercial uses.

A 20-acre area is reserved for multi-family use. To provide open space, buffering and recreational facilities for higher density housing and neighboring single family housing in this area, 40 percent of the multi-family land should be reserved for open space, recreation and buffered landscape use.

The master plan also allocates approximately 30 acres for a joint middle/elementary school. This facility, in conjunction with the proposed neighborhood park to the west, will provide needed open space and recreational amenities to east Dallas residents. Additional park and open space land must also be provided to meet LOS standards for Single Family Residential land as this area develops. This may occur as public or private open space.

- **La Creole Master Planning Area**

This Master Plan Area is located north of the intersection of LaCreole Drive and E Ellendale, and encompasses about 150 acres of land under many ownerships. Prior to adoption of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan, this area was designated entirely for Single Family Residential use. The LaCreole Drive mixed-use node includes a 30-acre general commercial area, which is intended to include a central plaza, to serve as a neighborhood meeting place. Therefore, the master development plan should show at least an acre of open space, in the form of a public plaza and landscape buffering for proposed neighborhood commercial uses. A 15-acre area is reserved for multi-family use. To provide open space and recreational facilities for higher density housing and neighboring single family housing in this area, a six-acre public or private park is required (40 percent of the newly-designated Multi-Family area).

The master plan shall include at least 15 percent open space for buffering of commercial uses and 30 percent open space recreational areas and buffering for multi-family uses.

#### **4.6.2 Other Proposed Park Facilities**

In order to meet passive recreation needs (the opportunity to picnic, stroll, or simply sit and enjoy pleasant surroundings), the plan proposes the establishment of a Park Creek Trail connecting (at a minimum) the City park to the proposed East Dallas Community Park. As discussed above, the City has already improved 2,200 linear feet of trail, and acquired an additional 5,600 linear feet for the development of the Park Creek Trail. Eventually, the trail might form a segment of a regional trail system connecting the Coast Range to the Willamette River.

- **Oakdale Avenue**

A neighborhood park should be considered for the area south of Oakdale Avenue and north of Bridlewood. This area is presently undeveloped, overlooks the Ash Creek waterway, and has been identified as deficient in meeting neighborhood park standards.

- **NW Douglas Street Pond**

A neighborhood park is also proposed for the pond west of NW Douglas Street and immediately north of the Wyatt Street Master Planning Area. This proposed open space will preserve the pond as habitat for wildlife.

In addition to proposed facilities, golf courses may be approved as a result of a comprehensive plan amendment from the existing plan designation to “Parks & Open Space.”

#### **4.7 Needed Public School Facilities**

This portion of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan examines the issues involved with providing additional public school facilities to serve Dallas’ projected increase in population. The first section outlines state and local capacity and siting policies. The second section calculates the size of the facility that will be needed. The final section examines viable siting alternatives.

##### **4.7.1 State and Local School Size and Siting Criteria**

###### Size

The State Board of Education school site size criteria is as follows:

- Elementary schools: Minimum of 5 acres plus one additional acre for each 100 students of predicted ultimate enrollment.
- Junior and senior high schools: Minimum of 10 acres plus one additional acre for each 100 students.

###### Siting

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan, page 31, states:

- School sites should be located to provide the best possible access to the student population served;
- School sites should not be located in existing or potential commercial or industrial areas; and
- Junior and Senior high schools should have adequate and safe access from the community’s major street network.



#### 4.7.2 Estimated School Facility Needs

Based on the Dallas 2020 population forecast of 19,043, Dallas School District No. 2 estimates the need for an additional elementary school to hold 450 students, and an additional middle school to hold 800 students.

Utilizing the State Board of Education school site size criteria above it is estimated that 9.5 acres will be needed to accommodate the elementary school and another 18 acres will be needed for the middle school. The calculation for each is shown below and summarized in Table 4.4:

- Elementary School - 5 acre minimum + 4.5 acres (1 acre per 100 students) = 9.5 acres
- Middle School - 10 acre minimum + 8 acres (1 acre per 100 students) = 18 acres

**Table 4.4 Summary of School Land Needs For 2020**

School Type	Estimated Students	Minimum Site Size (Acres)	Additional acre per 100 students	Total Acres Needed
Middle	800	10	8	<b>18</b>
Elementary	450	5	4.5	<b>9.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>27.5</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1997

#### 4.7.3 School Siting Opportunities

In addition to the siting criteria above, Dallas School District Number 2 would prefer that both the elementary and the middle school are located on one site. In order to fulfill both projected elementary and middle school land needs on one site, approximately 27.5 (9.5 ac. plus 18 ac.) contiguous, developable acres, will need to be identified.

An analysis of vacant properties that meet the above criteria indicates that a joint elementary and middle school site may be located in the area south of East Ellendale Avenue, east of SE Hawthorne Avenue, north of Rickreall Creek, and west of SE Fir Villa Road. This area contains several large undeveloped parcels, and is designated to contain a significant portion of Dallas' future residential growth.

While the School District does own land north of E Ellendale Road outside the eastern edge of the UGB, this site is not considered to be a viable candidate for a joint elementary and middle school. This site's location north of E Ellendale (a major arterial) poses potential safety problems for children attempting to get to and from school. Moreover, its location outside the eastern edge of the UGB does not provide the best possible access for students that will be living in future east side neighborhoods much closer to the city center.

## **Chapter 6: Urban Growth Management**

### **6.1 Urban Growth Management Program**

The outward growth of a City is a natural phenomenon, a necessary result of providing space for more people and their activities. The manner in which a community grows, however, is of primary importance. Good urban form, with distinct identity between urban and rural uses, is fostered by sequential growth. That is, logical, phased growth outward from the main built-up area of the City. Center areas presently served would clearly be the logical areas for phased outward growth before outlying areas would be used. On the other hand, “sprawl” created by strip development along arterial highways and a leapfrogging of close-in vacant land in favor of the outer fringe areas promotes a diffused urban form and often results in untimely and illogical expenditures of public funds, as well as “eating up” usable agricultural land at an unnecessarily rapid pace.

The provision of a single urban service (usually water) by either the City or a “special purpose district” can allow development to occur in outer areas at or near urban densities. Eventually the developed area may require further urban services (sewers, streets, police protection, etc.). Many times, the need for these services is brought about sooner than expected due to health hazard conditions. In this situation, urban services are usually provided regardless of whether or not the intervening area is ready for necessary development. Premature urban development, then, can result in a distortion of urban service priorities and the misdirection of public funds without the support of a sound tax base for the increased demand on City services.

Many costs arise from the conversion of rural/agricultural land to urban uses. These costs are not, and cannot be, always measured in actual dollars. Among the many costs of converting agricultural land are environmental, social, energy, and economic costs.

The environmental costs of urbanization are great and far reaching. Water pollution tends to increase from urbanization. An urban area has a large portion of its land developed, thus not allowing the water to enter the soil in the same manner as where no development exists. Urbanization not only increases the amount of runoff, but also puts oils, gasoline, suspended solids, industrial wastes, and sediments resulting from increased erosion at construction sites after the ground cover is removed, in addition to point source pollutants (such as sewage treatment plant effluent, and industrial discharge into water sources). Organic wastes are also increased, such as animal wastes (dog and cat), wood scraps from construction sites, and vegetation (such as grass cuttings). Clearly, agricultural land is not without pollutants, such as insecticide and herbicide runoff, sedimentation runoff (especially from improperly managed fields), vegetation, and animal wastes. However, the great densities in an urban area, in combination with the relatively small amount of open space, create considerably more water pollution per acre than any other land use.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> American Public Works Association. Water Pollution Aspects of Urban Runoff, prepared for Federal Water Pollution Control Board. National Technical Information Service, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Springfield, VA. January 1969. p. 12.

Water pollution is not the only type of pollution increased by urban densities. Air pollution, coming largely from automobile emissions, and industrial emissions are greatly increased by urban densities. The Willamette Valley has a rather unique air pollution problem stemming from agricultural land, that is, field burning. Because of the geology and climate of the Willamette Valley, the smoke resulting from field burning tends to stay in the area. Field burning is regulated, however, and restricted to specific time periods, making this problem temporary, whereas urban types of air pollution are continuous. It is also important to note the increased noise from all urban activities. (Obviously, noise is a direct result of any activity, urban or rural, but it is heavily concentrated in an urban area to create much higher ambient levels.)

Probably the most difficult costs to measure, if they can be measured at all, are the social costs of urbanization. Social costs are problems such as the “cost” to an individual of having to look at a construction site. It is impossible to define the cost of an eyesore. Residents of an area experience the “cost” of losing a view as a subdivision goes in where cultivated fields or woodland previously existed. Other residents may experience a feeling of discontent, as the community in which they have lived for many years changes due to rapid growth. Social costs would also include having to wait longer in line at the supermarket because there are more shoppers. Clearly, social costs are widespread and extend to every facet of community life, as a community urbanizes.

The conversion of agricultural land to urban land also creates greater energy demand. As the City grows outward, more and more costs of commuting are incurred. This causes increased demands on gas and oil for commuter use. Eventually, greater numbers of people, using greater amounts of energy, will require additional energy producing facilities to be built. It is important to note that the type of new development makes a considerable difference in energy use. That is, the type of buildings constructed and their configuration can greatly affect energy demand.

### **6.1.1 Economic Effects of New Growth**

The economic effects of new growth, and the conversion of agricultural land to urban uses are far-reaching. New development creates the need for new roads to serve it, as well as new bridges for better access. Maintaining the new roads as well as the old roads becomes more expensive to the City. Patrolling the new roads creates greater demand on the police force. The police must also control areas of development, eventually needing more personnel and facilities. The same is true for the fire department. Growth causes greater demands on schools, parks and libraries as well as causing demand for more sewers (both sanitary and storm) and water service. Many of these costs are paid by developers as the new development occurs, but many are not. The cost of those not paid by the developer (police, fire, schools, etc.) must be picked up by the taxpayer. The new taxpayers moving into a community partially pay this, but most of it comes from the existing tax base, that is, the existing taxpayers.

All growth does not create a burden on the taxpayer. New residents and businesses contribute to the tax base in a community by paying their property taxes. The renter contributes by paying the landlord’s property taxes. Growth in a community increases sales to local businesses. One new resident shopping in the community causes more spending than merely the cost of the purchase. This is known as the multiplier effect. This means that one dollar, after passing through many hands, actually has a value to the community of more than one dollar. This cycle, in a healthy economy, goes on and on, causing more growth.

One final economic consequence of growth is a shifting of tax burdens. One example of this is the case of a farmer who owns land close to the City seeing his property taxes rise due to the encroaching development which causes the assessed value of his land to rise. In some cases, this can force the farmer to sell his land because of inability to pay the increased tax. The concept of the urban growth boundary will not stop this problem, but will at least reduce much of the uncertainty of the practicing farmer when the boundary to urbanization is drawn.

Clearly, traditional values and attitudes with respect to growth have changed in recent years in the eyes of both private citizens and public officials. No longer is it held true that growth in whatever form is good. To be compatible, growth must contribute to and not detract from the well-being and livability of the community. Furthermore, since the City will ultimately be called upon to provide urban services, it should have a strong voice in the decisions which regulate the use of land in its peripheral areas.

### **6.1.2 Farm Land Preservation**

Because the Marion-Polk Boundary Commission has been dissolved, all annexations are now the responsibility of the Dallas City Council. The concept of an urban growth boundary has been established in state law (ORS Chapter 197). Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization, requires that:

“Urban growth boundaries shall be established to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land.”

Thus, UGBs are designed to preserve farm land while concentrating growth.

### **6.1.3 Purpose of an Urban Growth Program**

The purpose of an urban growth program for Dallas, aside from compliance with State law, is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. The growth program is based upon the concept that the City of Dallas is the logical provider of urban services and, as such, should have control over its ultimate form. This is not to imply, however, that the urban growth program sets an ultimate limit to growth. Rather, it provides a guide for urban expansion and sets limits within a reasonable planning period. The decisions of where and when to allocate scarce public resources becomes the principal determinants of where and when development takes place.

The urban growth program consists of two separate parts: 1) the delineation of a specific boundary separating urban and rural uses; and 2) the development of policy statements to assist the decision-making process with respect to the phasing of urban growth.

## **6.2 Urban Growth Boundary**

The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) delineated on Comprehensive Plan Map #1 represents the limits to urban expansion to the year 2020. The area encompassed by the urban growth boundary totals 3,884 acres and amounts to approximately twice the anticipated need. Undeveloped land within the boundary could accommodate an additional 14,322 persons, based on the present density of the City of Dallas. The boundary line is based upon careful consideration of the following factors:

- Existing urban areas
- A demonstrated need to employ, house and service an expected population increase of 2,956 persons by the year 2020.

- The extent and location of natural hazard areas and urban open space.
- The potential availability of urban services.
- The maximum efficiency of land within and on the fringe of existing urban areas.
- The economic, social, environmental and energy consequences.
- The preservation of agricultural lands (defined as Class I, II, III and IV lands). See Chapter II, under soils.
- The compatibility of urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.

### **6.2.1 Locational Considerations**

Generally, the boundary line to the west and north is set by physical limitations. The land beyond is either unsuitable for urban development or slopes the wrong direction to connect to the City's gravity-flow sewage system. One large portion of land adjacent to Rickreall Creek was excluded from the boundary for two reasons: a large slide area (about 50 acres) is included in this area, but more importantly, the vast majority of the property owners in the area specifically requested exclusion from the Urban Growth Boundary.

The eastern boundary is determined by the enclaves of urban development in the vicinity of the Dallas-Rickreall Highway and Fir Villa Road and the predominance of Class II and III land in the area. To the south, it is felt that urban densities should not be encouraged beyond the present City limits. Much of the area is devoted to orchards and the increased traffic associated with a higher density use would conflict with the community's main industrial area. In addition, pumping would be required to augment water pressure to this hilly area.

### **6.2.2 Implementation Measures**

To accomplish the intent of the Urban Growth Program to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, it must be a cooperative process between the City and Polk County, jointly adopted by each government. The Urban Growth Program has been adopted by both parties through intergovernmental agreement. The agreement sets forth the boundary, policies and responsibilities of each political jurisdiction. Due to changing conditions, this agreement should be reviewed from time to time to make sure that it fully implements the policy direction found in this plan.

The Urban Growth Program is also implemented through policies which identify how public facilities are financed, assuring new development carries its share of the cost of development with existing residents. A description of the City's policies for financing the provision of public facilities is found in Chapter VI of the Plan.

The Urban Growth Program is not intended to be a static document. Rather, it must be reviewed and periodically updated to meet the changing needs of the community. However, it is not intended that the Boundary be periodically changed in size, except in minor revisions, unless conditions change considerably from what is expected at the time of writing this plan.

### **6.3 Demonstrated long-term Land Needs**

Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization, and ORS 197.298, require that Urban Growth Boundaries have sufficient buildable land to meet long-term (20-year) population (housing), employment (commercial and industrial) and "livability" (e.g., land for parks, schools, churches and other public and semi-public uses) needs.

### 6.3.1 Commercial and Industrial Land Needs

Table 6.1 shows the commercial and industrial land need estimates for the period between 1995 and 2020. Dallas will experience an employment increase of 3,033 jobs during the planning period. This equates to a net land need of about 250 acres. Assuming that 20 percent of the buildable land area will be used for public right-of-way and utility easements, there is an overall need for 300 vacant buildable acres. **Seventy vacant buildable acres will need to be zoned commercial and 230 vacant buildable acres will need to be zoned industrial.**

Table 6.1 Commercial and Industrial Land Need Projections, Dallas 1995-2020

	Existing Employees	Developed Acres	Projected New Employees	Employees Per/Acre	Net Vacant Buildable Acres Needed	Gross Vacant Buildable Acres Needed
<b>Commercial</b> <sup>1</sup>	1,863	96	1,747	30	58	70
<b>Industrial</b> <sup>2</sup>	876	274	1,286	7 <sup>3</sup>	192	230
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>2739</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>3,033</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Commercial designation generally includes trade, FIRE & services, and public administration.

<sup>2</sup> The Industrial designation generally includes resource-based industries, manufacturing, transportation, communications, and public utilities.

<sup>3</sup> This melded figure includes 849 industrial employees at 5 per acre plus 437 office/service commercial employees at 20 per acre, for an average of 7 employees per acre.

### 6.3.2 Residential Land Needs

To determine the number of acres necessary to accommodate Dallas' housing needs through 2020, the actual housing density and mix is multiplied by projected housing needs. As shown in Table 6.2, Dallas needs 659 vacant buildable residential acres -- 581 acres for single family/manufactured homes and 78 acres for multi-family/duplex housing.

Table 6.2 Summary of Residential Land Needs in Dallas, Oregon 1995-2020

	New People	New Units	Percent Housing Mix by Type	Expected Net DU/Acre	Buildable Acres Needed	Less Public ROW <sup>1</sup>	Less Public/Semi-Public <sup>2</sup>	Total Designated Acres Needed
<b>Single Family/ Manufactured Housing</b>	5,474	2,047	69%	4.3	476	95	10	<b>581</b>
<b>Multi-Family/ Duplexes</b>	1,932	920	31%	14.5 <sup>3</sup>	63	13	2	<b>78</b>
<b>Sub-Total:</b>	<b>7,407</b>	<b>2,967</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>659</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services.

<sup>1</sup> Street rights-of-way are estimated at 20%.

<sup>2</sup> Public and semi-public land needs (churches, fire stations, etc.) is estimated at 2%. Park and school needs are considered in Chapter 4, Parks and Open Space.

<sup>3</sup> 16 units per acre represents a weighted average of duplex and multi-family density.

### 6.3.3 Public and Semi-Public Land Needs

Table 6.3 combines the projected 2020 population increase with the adopted level-of-service standard to determine Dallas' park needs for the planning period. The estimated population increase of 7,400 residents, and the adopted LOS, will create the need for approximately 18.5 acres of both community and neighborhood parks.

Table 6.3 Projected 2020 Park Land Needs

Park Classification	Estimated Increase in Population 1995-2020 <sup>1</sup>	Adopted LOS Standard	Estimated Increase in Park Land Demand	1997 Existing System-Wide Surplus or Deficit	Total Projected 2020 Park Needs
Community Parks	7,400	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	18.5 ac.	+3.4 ac./1,000 pop. 39.5 ac.	21 Acre Surplus
Neighborhood Parks	7,400	2.5 ac./1,000 pop.	18.5 ac.	+1.2 ac./1,000 pop. 13.9 ac.	-4.6 Acre

Source: Winterowd Planning Services

<sup>1</sup> Based on 2020 population projection of 19,049

Table 6.4 summarizes estimated school land needs in Dallas for 2020. Based on the Dallas 2020 population forecast of 19,043, Dallas School District No. 2 estimates the need for an additional elementary school to hold 450 students, and an additional middle school to hold 800 students.

Utilizing the State Board of Education school site size criteria above it is estimated that 9.5 acres will be needed to accommodate the elementary school and another 18 acres will be needed for the middle school.

Table 6.4 Summary of School Land Needs For 2020

School Type	Estimated Students	Minimum Site Size (Acres)	Additional acre per 100 students	Total Acres Needed
Middle	800	10	8	18
Elementary	450	5	4.5	9.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>27.5</b>

### 6.3.4 Summary of Year 2020 Urban Land Needs

Chapters 2 - 4 document the need for industrial, commercial, residential and public\semi-public land needs (schools, parks, public rights-of-way and other semi-public uses, such as churches). Table 6.5 summarizes the estimated year 2020 urban land need. To accommodate estimated population growth during the planning period, Dallas will need 1,024 acres of vacant buildable land.

Table 6.5 Summary of Year 2020 Urban Land Needs

Urban Land Use	Total Estimated 2020 Land Need
<b>Employment</b>	
Commercial	70
Industrial	230
<b>Residential</b>	
Single Family	581
Multi-Family	78
<b>Public</b>	
Neighborhood Parks	5
Community Parks	0
Schools	28
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,024</b>

## 6.4 Buildable land inventory

### 6.4.1 What is a “Buildable land inventory”

The buildable land inventory measures the supply of land suitable and available to meet long-term residential, commercial, industrial and public/institutional growth needs. Not all vacant land is suitable and available for development, due to topographical or ownership limitations. By the same token, some partially developed land may be suitable and available for redevelopment or infill. To minimize confusion and to allow for monitoring of assumptions, it is important to define terms and describe methods carefully.

### 6.4.2 Definitions

As noted above, the term **buildable land** means land that is suitable and available to meet long-term growth needs. If land is not buildable, it is either **developed or unbuildable** and is therefore considered unsuitable or unavailable for future development.<sup>2</sup> The following definitions describe mutually exclusive categories of land. The buildable land inventory was executed based on these definitions.

**Vacant Land** means all parcels greater than or equal to ( $\geq$ ) 4,000 square feet with improvement value of less than or equal to ( $\leq$ ) \$10,000 which do not have an approved building permit.<sup>3</sup> Vacant land may be constrained or unconstrained.

- **Vacant Buildable Land** means unconstrained vacant land.

<sup>2</sup> The terms used in this study have a specific purpose -- to make generalizations concerning buildable land. The terms defined herein should not establish City policy. For example, nothing in the term “developed” would prevent a property owner from demolishing a structure and replacing it with a more intensive development, provided that the development is allowed by the comprehensive plan and applicable zoning standards. Similarly, the term “vacant” does not in any way imply that property owners are obligated to develop their property.

<sup>3</sup> Parcels of less than 4,000 feet do not meet minimum lot size requirements and are considered unbuildable. Parcels with improvement values of \$5,000 or less are considered vacant.



- ***Under-Utilized Land*** means all parcels  $\geq 0.75$  acre with a single family residence, with 0.5 acres subtracted to account for the residence, regardless of zoning district.<sup>4</sup> The remainder portion of the parcel is considered “vacant land” for purposes of this analysis.
- ***Constrained Vacant Land*** means vacant land *less* the portion of each vacant parcel limited by any of the following:
  1. Land within the 100-year floodplain
  2. Land within clearly defined natural drainageways (ravines) or with slopes of 20% or greater.
  3. Landlocked or “access impaired” parcels (there are very few of these).
  4. Unavailable parcels: (a) land-banked industrial parcels and (b) parcels with under public ownership are considered “unavailable” for meeting long-term growth needs.
- ***Redevelopable*** means all commercial, or industrial parcels  $\geq .5$  acre where Assessment and Taxation (A&T) improvement value is less than \$50,000 and A&T land value  $\geq$  improvement value, which are not vacant or infill parcels. In such cases, it is reasonable to conclude that the building will be replaced within the twenty year planning period.
- ***Developed Land*** means land not included within “under-utilized” or “redevelopable” categories. That is, land which is not suitable and available to meet long-term growth needs.
- ***Gross Vacant Acre*** means an acre of vacant land *before* land has been dedicated for public right-of-way, private streets or public utility easements. Assuming 25% for streets and utilities, a gross vacant acre will have 32,670 square feet of vacant land available for construction. Land which has *not* been subdivided into residential lots falls into this category.
- ***Net Vacant Acre*** means an acre of vacant land, *after* land has been dedicated for public right-of-way, private streets, or utility easements. A net acre has 43,560 square feet available for construction, because no street or utility dedications are required. Subdivided lots fall into the “net residential” category.
- ***Maximum Net Residential Density*** means the maximum density permitted by the underlying residential zone on 43,560 square feet of vacant, buildable land.
- ***Approved Subdivision Lots*** means a lot in a residential or industrial subdivision approved by the City of Dallas. When determining residential densities, approved subdivision lots are assigned one unit per lot.

### 6.4.3 Information Sources

The buildable land inventory portion of the 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan was created from the City’s land use data base. The buildable land maps were prepared and analyzed by the Polk County planning staff, with the County’s Geographic Information System (GIS). Additional building permit data was provided by the City for the housing need and density analysis.

---

<sup>4</sup> Many buildable land inventories consider vacant land with a house as either *under-developed* or *infill* property. This study simply removes 0.5 acres for the residence and considers the remaining portion of the property to be *vacant*. In reality, some parcels with a residence will not be further developed; in other cases, less than a half acre will be reserved for the residence or the residence will be demolished. The 0.5 acre figure represents what is likely to occur during the planning period, on average.

#### 6.4.4 Methods

The City’s land use data base is grounded in A&T information maintained by the Polk County Assessor’s office. The definitions outlined above were applied to the database to create categories of vacant, under-utilized, redevelopable, and developed parcels. Utilizing Polk County’s GIS system these categories were integrated with digitized maps of the City and reviewed for discrepancies. Adjustments were made to the data and comprehensive plan maps based on staff knowledge.

The following section analyzes the amount of buildable land available within the Dallas UGB to meet future land use needs.

#### 6.4.5 Residential Land Supply

The supply of vacant residential land includes vacant parcels and the remaining vacant portion of under-utilized parcels (i.e., parcels .75 acre or greater, with half-acre removed for the single family residence). Constrained portions of vacant and under-utilized parcels were then subtracted, consistent with the definitions described in the beginning of this chapter. The result is a gross vacant buildable acreage figure for each plan residential designation. Single-family densities were projected at 4.3 dwelling units per net buildable acre; Multi-family densities were projected at 16.9 units per net buildable acre.

Table 6.6 determines the vacant buildable residential land within the 1996 Dallas UGB for each needed housing type. Dallas has 1,104 acres of vacant buildable single-family land, and 24 acres of vacant buildable multi-family land within the 1996 UGB. The Vacant Buildable land inventory (Map #6) shows the location of vacant buildable and under-utilized parcels designated for Single Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential use.

**Table 6.6 Summary of Dallas Residential Land Supply within 1996 Dallas UGB**

<b>Plan Designation</b>	<b>Plan Acres</b>	<b>Developed Acres</b>	<b>Vacant<sup>1</sup> Acres</b>	<b>Constrained Acres</b>	<b>Less 22%<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Vacant Buildable Acres</b>
<b>Single-Family</b>	2,369	910	1,460	44	312	1,104
<b>Multi-Family</b>	262	213	35	4	7	24
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,631</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>1,495</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>1,128</b>

**Source: Assessment & Taxation data; Polk County GIS; analysis by Winterrowd Planning Services.**

<sup>1</sup> Includes under-utilized portions of parcels greater than or equal to .75 acres with only one single family residence; each residence is estimated to use one-half acre, and is accounted for in the “Developed Acres” column.

<sup>2</sup> Based on 20% for public right-of-way and 2% for public and semi-public land uses (churches, fire stations, etc.) Park and school needs are considered separately in Chapter 4: Parks and Open Space.

#### 6.4.6 Commercial Land Supply

Table 6.7 shows that Dallas has 18 acres of vacant buildable commercial land within the UGB. There are 40 parcels. This figure includes vacant buildable land designated Central Business District and Commercial on Comprehensive Plan Map #1. The Vacant Buildable land inventory (Map #6) shows the location of vacant buildable and under-utilized commercial parcels.

**Table 6.7 Summary of Vacant Buildable & Constrained Commercial Land Supply, 1996 Dallas Urban Growth Boundary**

Category	Commercial Acres	Commercial Parcels
Vacant	18	-
Constrained	.4	-
<b>Vacant Buildable Acres</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>40</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1997.

#### 6.4.7 Industrial Land Supply

Table 6.8 shows that Dallas has 174 acres of vacant buildable industrial land within the UGB. The Vacant Buildable land inventory (Map #6) shows the location of vacant buildable and under-utilized industrial parcels.

**Table 6.8 Summary of Vacant Buildable Industrial Land Supply, 1996 Dallas Urban Growth Boundary**

Category	Vacant Buildable Industrial Acres	Vacant Buildable Industrial Parcels
Vacant	184	-
Constrained	9.6	-
<b>Vacant Buildable Acres</b>	<b>174.4</b>	<b>88</b>

Source: Winterowd Planning Services, 1995.

#### 6.4.8 Public/Semi-Public Land Supply

Table 6.9 shows the current community and neighborhood park level-of-service (LOS) within the 1996 UGB.

**Table 6.9 Community & Neighborhood Park LOS, Dallas UGB**

Park Classification	Existing Parks	Existing Population	Existing Level-of-Service
Community Parks	68.7 ac	11,639	5.9 ac./1,000 pop.
Neighborhood Parks	42.4 ac	11,639	3.7 ac./1,000 pop.

#### 6.4.9 Summary of Buildable Land Within 1996 Dallas UGB

Table 6.10 summarizes the supply of vacant buildable land within the 1996 Dallas UGB, by plan designation. There is an estimated total of 1,320 vacant buildable acres within the 1996 Dallas UGB.

Table 6.10 Summary of Buildable Land Supply within 1996 Dallas Urban Growth Boundary

Urban Land Use	Inventoried Buildable Land
<b>Employment</b>	
Commercial	18
Industrial	174
<b>Residential</b>	
Single Family	1,104
Multi-Family	24
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,320</b>

#### 6.5 Comparison of Year 2020 Land Need, with 1996 Buildable Land Supply

Table 6.11 compares projected 1997-2020 land need with the supply of vacant buildable land within the 1996 UGB. The 1996 Dallas UGB has a deficit of: 52 vacant buildable Commercial acres; 56 vacant buildable Industrial acres; and 54 vacant buildable acres of multi-family residential land. There is, however, a 458-acre surplus of vacant buildable Single Family land, after accounting for needed neighborhood park and school land.

Table 6.11 Summary Comparison of Projected 1997-2020 Land Need and 1996 Vacant Buildable Land Supply

Urban Land Use	Estimated 1997-2020 Land Need	Inventoried 1996 UGB Land Supply	Surplus or (Deficit) Vacant Buildable Land 1996 UGB
<b>Employment</b>			
Commercial	70	18	(52)
Industrial	230	174	(56)
<b>Subtotal Employment</b>	<b>300</b>		
<b>Residential</b>			
SF Residential	581		
Neighborhood Parks	5	-	-
Community Parks	0	-	-
Schools	28	-	-
<b>Subtotal Single Family</b>	<b>646</b>	1,104	458 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Multi-Family</b>	<b>78</b>	24	(54)
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,024</b>	<b>1,320</b>	<b>296</b>

<sup>1</sup> Neighborhood park and school land needs are met by land designated for Single Family Residential use. This 458-acre surplus represents excess vacant buildable Single Family land after accounting for school and neighborhood park needs.

**6.6 Comparison of 1996 Vacant Buildable Land, with Proposed 1997 Comprehensive Plan Land Allocation**

Table 6.12 compares projected 1997-2020 land need with the vacant buildable land supply within the proposed 1997 UGB. Note that 45 acres of vacant buildable industrial land are proposed to be added to the existing (1996) UGB.

**Table 6.12 Summary Comparison of Projected 1997-2020 Land Need and 1996 Vacant Buildable Land Supply as a Result of Proposed Plan Amendments**

<b>Urban Land Use</b>	<b>Projected 1997-2020 Land Need</b>	<b><u>Proposed</u> 1997 UGB Land Supply</b>	<b>Surplus or (Deficit) Va- cant Buildable Land Pro- posed 1997 UGB</b>
<b>Employment</b>			
Commercial	70	68	(2)
Industrial	230	219	(11)
<b>Subtotal Employment</b>	<b>300</b>		
<b>Residential</b>			
Single Family	581		
Neighborhood Parks	5	-	-
Community Parks	0	-	-
Schools	28	-	-
<b>Subtotal Single Family</b>	<b>646<sup>1</sup></b>	984	338
Subtotal Multi-Family	<b>78</b>	94	16
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,024</b>	<b>1,365</b>	<b>341</b>

<sup>1</sup> Neighborhood park and school land needs are provided by land designated for Single Family Residential use.

**Commercial & Industrial**

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan reduces the deficit of Commercial land from 52 to approximately 2 acres, and the deficit of Industrial land from 56 to approximately 11 acres. For reasons detailed in Chapter 2 of this document, the 1997 Comprehensive Plan proposes the addition of approximately 45 acres of industrial land, contained in two parcels, requiring an amendment of the current UGB. It is anticipated that the slight short-fall in commercial and industrial land (approximately 13 acres) will be made up through redevelopment of existing developed commercial and industrial land.

**Residential & Public**

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan adds 70 acres of Multi-Family Residential land resulting in a Year 2020 surplus of 16 acres. Commercial, Multi-Family Residential, park, and school land allocations are all provided for on land within the 1996 UGB currently designated for Single Family Residential use. The result is a reduction in surplus Single Family Residential land from 458 vacant buildable acres to 338 vacant buildable acres. The surplus acres of Multi-Family and Single Family Residential land proportionately reflect the projected need for these two land designations.

Chapter 4, Volume I, of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan sets forth level-of-service standards for Neighborhood Parks. This need (37 acres) will be met on land designated for Single Family Residential use, and can be met through public park dedication or private, common open space approved through the

land development process. No additional community parks are proposed because the City currently has a seven-acre surplus in this category, even after meeting Year 2020 growth projections.

## **6.7 Urban Growth Policies**

As noted in the Introduction to this Chapter, Dallas has been very successful in implementing its growth management program since adoption of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan some 20 years ago. The basic program consists of the following:

- Establish and maintain a 20-year Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to separate urban from rural land uses and to achieve a compact urban growth form;
- Require annexation to the City as a condition of urban development;
- Require that key urban services (sanitary sewer, water, storm drainage and transportation) be available as a condition of annexation to the City;
- Prohibit urban development outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB);
- Limit land divisions and new development on unincorporated land administered by Polk County within the UGB, in order to maintain large parcels of land for future urban development;
- Grow from the City center outward in a concentric pattern and avoid strip commercial development.

The 1997 update of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan builds upon this solid growth management framework by:

- Adoption of a “Public Facilities Strategy” to allocate limited sanitary sewer treatment plant capacity until the treatment plant is upgraded consistent with EQC standards (expected by the Year 2000).
- A commitment to follow-up, and update the City’s Urban Growth Management Agreement in 1998 with Polk County to ensure proper management of land within the UGB as prescribed in the Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume I, Goals and Policies.
- Adoption of measurable public facilities standards that are to be applied in the review of annexation, zone change and land development requests, in accordance with the Dallas City Council Urban Growth Management Policy, 1989.
- Amendment of the Dallas UGB to include approximately 45 acres of vacant buildable industrial land and to extend Fir Villa Road to connect E Ellendale with the Monmouth Cut-Off.

The most innovative provision of the 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan is the adoption of master planning policies and land use regulations to be applied to three “mixed use nodes” located along Ellendale Road. The purpose of this master planning process is to ensure:

- efficient land use and avoidance of disjointed land development patterns;
- adequate provision of public facilities and services;
- coordinate with ODOT on transportation issues to minimize traffic congestion on arterial and collector streets;
- provision of affordable housing opportunities and higher density housing near new retail and service centers;

- encourage use of alternative modes of transportation;
- provide parks, open space and schools to population and employment growth centers;
- meet demonstrated needs for multi-family housing and commercial land use.

In order to effectively implement mixed-use node and master planning concepts, and to address concerns raised during the CAC’s public review process, the City is committed to seeking a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant to fund needed master planning and development code update efforts.

#### 6.8 Proposed Urban Growth Boundary Expansion

Statewide Planning Goals 2 and 14 establish the rules for amending urban growth boundaries in Oregon. Goal 14, Urbanization, reads:

*Urban growth boundaries shall be established to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land. Establishment and change of the boundaries shall be based upon considerations of the following [need and locational] factors:*

*[Need Factors]*

Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;

*Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;*

*[Locational Factors]*

*Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;*

*Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;*

Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;

*Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority; and,*

*Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.*

Factors 1 and 2 (and ORS 197.296) are applied to determine the how much land is needed to accommodate growth over a 20-year period. Factors 3-7, the Goal 2, Part II Exceptions process and ORS 197.285 are used to determine the where the UGB should be expanded. The 1995 Oregon Legislature enacted statutory language which reinforces and clarifies established priorities for inclusion of land within an expanded UGB, provided that need can be demonstrated.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> ORS 197.296 reads:

(1) *In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:*

(a) *First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.*

(b) *If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.*

Section 6.9 is intended to set the stage for a future UGB amendment to include needed industrial land and to facilitate the extension of an alternative truck route through the community.

### 6.8.1 Need for Additional Industrial Land

Chapter 2: Sustainable Economic Growth, demonstrates a need for an additional 230 acres of industrial land to accommodate planned industrial development through the Year 2020. To meet this need, approximately 45 acres of vacant buildable industrial land, preferably in large parcels, should be added to the 1996 Dallas UGB. The City projects that the remaining need for industrial land (approximately 185 acres) will be met through redevelopment and more intensive use of existing industrial sites.

### 6.8.2 Alternatives Considered to Meet Industrial Land Needs

Chapter 4 identified specific industrial siting needs, as follows:

1. acres or more of buildable land;
  - a) Adjacent to an industrial sanctuary to minimize conflicts with residential areas;
  - b) Separated from residential land by a natural buffer such as a stream corridor or a major street;
  - c) Served by a existing or planned arterial or major collector street, that minimizes truck traffic through residential neighborhoods;
2. Gentle terrain (no more than five percent slope);
3. Availability of water and sewer services, and with access to fire and police protection.

Dallas carefully examined vacant buildable areas within the UGB, and found no land that met these siting criteria. Land north of Miller Avenue and Rickreall Creek should be reserved for residential and open space uses.

Extension of the industrial area to the west, across Ash Creek, was rejected because of:

- a) the lack of parcels 20 acres or greater in size;
- b) conflicts with existing residential areas;
- c) the natural buffer provided by Ash Creek would no longer be effective;

---

*(c) If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition).*

*(d) If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.*

*(2) Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.*

*(3) Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:*

*(a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;*

*(b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority due to topographical or other physical constraints; or*

*(c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority land in order to include or to provide services to higher priority land.*



- d) inadequate transportation access; and
- e) truck traffic would unnecessarily be routed through residential areas and downtown Dallas.

### **6.8.3 Selected Alternative Outside the UGB**

The City recognizes that a thorough consideration of alternative sites outside the 1996 UGB must take place before a final decision regarding UGB can be made. However, Dallas has tentatively selected approximately 45 acres immediately east of the existing industrial area, in order to allow the extension of SE Fir Villa Road, to connect E Ellendale Road with the Monmouth Cut-Off. There are no significant differences in agricultural soil classifications or servicing costs for land abutting the southeast UGB, adjacent to industrial land.

The strongest argument in favor of extending the UGB directly to the east relate to transportation. This extension would allow truck traffic to reach the industrial area from Salem without traveling through the center of the City. Moreover, developer financing of the Fir Villa Road extension is much more likely if land adjacent to this major collector street can be developed. Finally, the success of the mixed-use nodes at Barberry and LaCreole depends, in part, on avoiding truck traffic through these master-planned areas.

## **Chapter 7: Public Facilities Plan**

### ***Public Facilities Goal***

**To provide a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for community development.**

### ***7.1 Introduction***

The public facilities element is an integral part of the City's comprehensive plan. It is primarily the provision of these facilities (water and sewer, transportation, drainage, emergency services and schools) which determine the direction of growth and future form of the community. New development creates demand for water, sanitary sewers, parks, streets, storm sewers, schools, and fire and police protection. The Dallas School District is responsible for planning and financing educational facilities. However, the City must provide financing for basic support facilities.

New development, which will occur, can impose costs for the extension of sewer and water facilities; it can intensify the problems of street deficiencies; or it can cause a realignment of school building service boundaries, classroom sizes, or elementary school total enrollment. All of these factors and concerns can result in higher than normal operating costs for usual public services, unless goals and objectives are adopted by the governing bodies involved. User rate payments simply cannot afford to absorb all the increased utility costs related to growth. Inflation has caused the City to increase user charges to provide funds for operation and maintenance costs. The cost of new growth, for the most part, should be borne by new growth itself.

The Systems Development Charge (SDC) levied since 1974 on all new building activities has gone a long way toward providing some of the funds necessary to make needed improvements in services provided by the City. The fee schedule for the charge should be reviewed from time to time, in conjunction with other service charges and user fees, to make sure the amount is reasonable and that it will provide the funds to keep up with inflation.

This chapter considers Dallas' public facilities needs and provides support (see Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume I) for policies identifying how, and at what level, facilities must be provided to support new development.

### ***7.2 Existing Conditions***

This section describes Dallas' current public facilities.

#### ***7.2.1 Sanitary Sewer***

The Wastewater Treatment Plant is located adjacent to the south side of Rickreall Creek two miles downstream from the City. A site plan and area map are included in the Revised Wastewater Facility Plan compiled by CH2M Hill (1996) for the City of Dallas.

The Sanitary Sewer Collection System serves approximately 1800 acres of the UGB discounting the Parks and Open Spaces. The system is shown in Map 8. Detailed descriptions and maps of the system are included in the Revised Wastewater Facility Plan prepared by CH2M Hill and Regional Fi-

nancial Advisors (1996) for the City of Dallas and on the Geographic Information System (GIS) on file in the City Engineering Office.

### *1. Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF)*

The Dallas Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) has been in service since 1969 with year-round discharge to Rickreall Creek.

The plant is designed to treat a maximum dry weather flow of two million gallons per day (mgd), but can handle a peak hydraulic flow of six mgd. The dry weather flow is nearing the capacity of the treatment facility, while the wet weather average daily flows is 3.36 mgd. On occasion, however, winter flows exceed the hydraulic capacity of the treatment plant thus bypassing to Rickreall Creek.

No major improvements to the facility have been necessary since initial construction. Generally the plant has met discharge requirements. The facility has been well-maintained, especially considering the plant is approaching 25 years of service. Due to the change from effluent-based to water-quality-based standards since the WWTF was placed in service, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has identified areas of noncompliance with the new water-quality-based standards. In addition, building and safety codes have changed since the WWTF was built. Much of the equipment at the WWTF has met or exceeded its design life and, as a result, some equipment may warrant replacement or modification.

In August 1989, the City's NPDES Waste Discharge Permit expired and was renewed following DEQ's evaluation of water quality compliance issues. Since 1989, the DEQ and the City of Dallas have performed studies and evaluations on Rickreall Creek and at the Dallas WWTF outfall.

On December 19, 1991, a Notice of Noncompliance from DEQ was received informing the City that current studies now indicate that Rickreall Creek will be placed in the Federal Register as a "water quality limited" stream during the summer months because of high coliform bacteria and nutrients. The City and DEQ entered into a Stipulation and Final Order Agreement on June 30, 1992, to upgrade and construct a Wastewater Facility to meet the State and Federal effluent regulations.

The Revised Wastewater Facility Plan prepared by CH2M Hill for the City of Dallas Wastewater Facility is the final planning step to define the wastewater system improvements necessary for the City to comply with new water quality standards, to upgrade and replace 25-year-old facilities, and to provide for future planned growth.

The Revised Wastewater Facility Plan has three stages of construction in order for the City of Dallas to economically finance the construction:

1. Phase I: Construction of the Treatment Facility liquid's component with installation of two main interceptors in the Collection System.
2. Phase II: Construction of the Poplar Tree Plantation separating industrial flow from the Treatment Facility.
3. Phase III: Construction of the Treatment Facility's filtration system to meet final Rickreall Water quality standards and complete the solids treatment/disposal system.

Phase I of three phases of the Wastewater system improvements is scheduled to be completed by December 1999. These improvements are anticipated to serve the City to the year 2010 at which time Phase III will be implemented, through addressing all existing water quality issues of Rickreall Creek.

## *2. Wastewater Collection System*

The City's existing sanitary wastewater collection system collects wastewater from residences, businesses, industries, and public facilities and conveys the water to the City's Wastewater Treatment Facility. Flow through the collection system is mostly by gravity to the LaCreole Interceptor, which conveys wastewater along the north bank of Rickreall Creek to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Four lift stations pump wastewater from areas that cannot flow by gravity to the treatment facility.

Approximately 1,800 acres of the UGB presently have sewer if parks and open space within the UGB are discounted. The total length of municipal sewer, excluding private service laterals, is approximately 40 miles and ranges in diameter from 6 to 27 inches. During extreme weather events, flow to the Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) periodically exceeds the hydraulic capacity of the collection system and the plant. Diluted raw sewage overflows to Rickreall Creek during these high flow events at up to two points in the collection system. The major problem with the sanitary collection system is not because of service but rather because of excessive infiltration and inflow of storm water into the sanitary system. Infiltration is groundwater entering the system through deeper pipeline defects below the groundwater table. Inflow of storm water is the greater contributor to the sanitary system and is primarily dependent on the magnitude of the rainfall. Inflow sources consist of roof drains, area drains, foundation drains, catch basins, and surface runoff. Further details on the wastewater collection system are included in Chapter 5, Infiltration/Inflow Evaluation of the Revised Wastewater Facility Plan.

## **7.2.2 Water System**

### **1. Sources of Water**

- Mercer Reservoir is located about 8.5 miles west of the City Limits on Rickreall Creek. The City of Dallas currently owns water rights to 1,550 acre/feet of storage and can divert 10 cubic feet per second (cfs) of this amount.
- Rickreall Creek flows from the Coast Range to the Willamette River. Rickreall Creek flows into Mercer Reservoir.
- Rockhouse Creek flows from the Coast Range into Mercer Reservoir. The City currently owns the rights to 3.50 cfs of direct flow from Rockhouse and Rickreall Creeks combined.
- Applegate Creek and Canyon Creek flow from the Coast Range into Rickreall Creek downstream from Mercer Dam and before the raw water intake. The City owns the right to 1 cfs flow from Applegate Creek and 0.77 cfs flow from Canyon Creek.

Phase I of a Water Supply Study for the City of Dallas was prepared by CH2M Hill (July 31, 1996). This study identifies a Regional Plan and outlines alternatives for City of Dallas future supply options.

## *2. Water Treatment System*

The City of Dallas Water Treatment Plant is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the City just off West Ellendale Avenue. The Water Treatment Plant was updated in 1994 to meet the water quality regulations and expanded to a design capacity of 8.6 mgd. In addition, a new Water Intake Station and pipeline were constructed to pump 8.6 mgd with a future pumping capacity of 12.8 mgd. A Water Treatment Plant Evaluation Report is part of the Engineering Report (March 1991) prepared by CH2M Hill for the City of Dallas.

### *3. Water Pump and Distribution Systems*

The Water Distribution System is described in detail in the Engineering Report of the Water System (September 1983) prepared by CH2M Hill. The system serves the residents of the City and approximately 360 customers outside the City. The City also contracts to provide water to the Ellendale Water District west of the City. Additionally the City provides backup water service to the Rickreall Water District to the east. A map of the system is on file in the Engineering Department and is included as Map 7 in this plan.

### *4. Water Supply & Treatment System*

Mercer dam and reservoir above the Water Intake provides supplementary flow to Rickreall Creek during the dry summer months. This added flow assures the community of a year-round, uninterrupted water supply. The City of Dallas obtains its water supply from Rickreall Creek at a point several miles west of town. The water is pumped by a new 8.6 mgd variable speed Intake Pump Station via a 16-inch pipe (and one-half the distance via a new parallel 16-inch pipe) to the City's Water Treatment Plant on Ellendale Road. The older Intake Pump Station is used as a standby and for added capacity. The capacity of the plant was expanded to 8.6 mgd and treatment consists of coagulation, sedimentation, filtration and chlorination.

The current maximum demand for water is 5.2 mgd. The Treatment Plant can serve the needs of Dallas through the year 2017, based on the City's population projection of 19,043 persons. The plant is designed for easy expansion and sufficient land was initially obtained at the site to increase capacity to 12.8 mgd

Distribution storage consists of four ground level reservoirs with a capacity of four million gallons. The reservoirs are located north of West Clay Street about 1400 feet west of the City Limits. In 1994 the City constructed a 2.0 million gallon reservoir above the Water Treatment Plant to provide added capacity for the City and to augment the pressure required in the northwest section of Dallas. This storage and the Clay Street Reservoir fully meet the City's peak day, fire flow, and emergency reserve requirements.

### **7.2.3 Storm Drainage System**

Until the 1996 flood, the storm sewer system was based on a 5-year flood design consisting of: (a) both open channel in public and private properties; and (b) closed conduit methods of drainage. A map of the system is on file in the Engineering Department and is included as Map 9 in this plan.

The City's new design criterion is a 25-year flood on all main drainageways. All main drainageways are to be maintained by the City in the public right-of-way and by City easements on private property.

The City has three drainage basins: Rickreall Creek, Ash Creek and Baskett Slough. These three basins each flow to the Willamette River. Within these basins are storm districts which are the collectors of the storm runoff to the basins.

## **1. Storm Drainage Districts**

The major storm drainage districts in the City are as follows: (Refer to Map 4 in the plan for Drainage District Location.)

- District 1** SW Maple Street - SW Washington Street. The Oregon Street area, with Maple and Washington Streets the main storm collectors, drains by culvert to Rickreall Creek.
- District 2** SW Clay Street. The Clay Street area is served by a natural drainageway to SW Hunter Street, the present storm outlet to Rickreall Creek. The proposed plan is to develop the existing drainage along the City right-of-way with an outlet to Rickreall Creek (via a City easement) when development occurs.
- District 3** North Dallas area. This is the largest area, encompassing North Dallas from the west end of NW Brentwood Street east to NE Polk Station Road and from NE Reed Lane south to Rickreall Creek. The existing drainage channel traverses private property and City right-of-way by deep ditches and channels to SE Hankel Street. From SE Hankel Street the drainageway is intercepted by a large culvert to Rickreall Creek along SE Uglow Street. The proposed plan is to improve the drainage in the northeast portion of the drainage area as development occurs.
- District 4** West Ellendale - NW Douglas Street. Douglas Street and the area east of Douglas Street are drained by culverts in the City right-of-way to the Douglas-Ellendale intersection. Drainage of the area west of Douglas Street is by an open channel on private property to the Douglas-Ellendale intersection. From this intersection, the storm water is channeled on private property and City Park land to Rickreall Creek. The proposal is to improve the Douglas-Ellendale intersection storm system as development occurs.
- District 5** SW Oakdale area. Drainage of the area is by existing channels through private property to Ash Creek. The proposal is to improve the drainageways as development occurs.
- District 6** Greenway - Hawthorne. Existing drainage is by way of open channel to Rickreall Creek. A large portion of storm drainage was intercepted from this channelway into the North Dallas area drainage on SE Uglow Street. The proposal is to improve the drainage channel as development occurs.
- District 7** Northwest Hillcrest area. Existing drainage is by culvert to W. Ellendale through private property with City easements and then by way of culverts and drainage

channels in City right-of-way to Rickreall Creek. When developed, the Mill Valley Shopping Center area will be drained by culvert in the City right-of-way along SW Harder Street to Rickreall Creek. Existing drainage channels are proposed to be improved with development.

**District 8** SW Levens and SE Uglow main lines. The majority of area south of Rickreall Creek, east of Fairview, and west of Uglow Streets, within existing City Limits, is drained by culvert to SW Levens and SE Uglow main lines, which flow to Rickreall Creek.

**District 9** Ash Creek Drainage Basin. Ash Creek drains the Kings Valley Highway area (south end of Fairview Avenue) to the east side of the City Limits and south of the railroad tracks. The district is predominantly industrial property with private drainage to Ash Creek. Existing drainage ditches are proposed to be improved with development.

**District 10** North of E. Ellendale. A natural swale drains this area to the East to Baskett Slough. Urban development (other than existing residences along Polk Station Road and E. Ellendale) has not occurred in this area. A drainage system of the area will be created with development.

Rickreall Creek is the major open creek channel flowing from west to east in the middle of the City. Rickreall Creek flows through both private and City property under the property owners' maintenance. Ash Creek is a major open creek channel draining the south area of the City through private property. The maintenance of the drainage area east of SE Holman Street and south of the Southern Pacific Railroad is in the Ash Creek Drainage District. The remaining drainage basin in the City is an existing natural drainageway which will be improved for drainage at time of development.

## **7.2.5 Emergency Services**

### **Police**

The Dallas Police Department is composed of 17 full-time personnel: 16 sworn and 1 civilian employee. The Department is located at City Hall and occupies approximately 1,190 square feet of space. According to national standards, 200-300 square feet of floor space is needed for each employee. It would appear the facility is less than adequate. If the Department is to maintain its present level of service as the population increases, additional space will be needed during the planning period.

An exact assessment of future manpower needs cannot be made, but a range of 1.5 - 2.5 sworn persons per 1,000 population has been established for municipal police departments of cities over 10,000 population. The City's police force now averages 1.4 sworn persons per 1,000 population. Dallas is expected to increase its population by approximately 7,400 persons by 2020. This will mean an addition of approximately 10 new positions if the present level of service is maintained. Floor space requirements will increase accordingly.

Several alternatives exist for providing additional space:

- The City could build a new police facility.
- The City could move part of the police function to another part of City Hall (presently the resource division is occupying space behind the Civic Center.)
- Non-police functions (dog control, records) could be moved to another City department.

It is apparent that more space will be needed for police functions during the planning period. The City should undertake a study to determine which alternative or combination of alternatives, should be implemented to facilitate this expansion. Since the City presently contracts some parts of police functions outside City hall, that might forestall the need for additional space. The City presently contracts with Polk County Sheriff's office for the provision of jail facilities. Full time, 24-hour dispatching services for the Dallas Police Department are provided through a contract agreement with the Mid Willamette Valley Communications Center. Polk County provides for central communications operations at their Emergency Services Communications Center located on the ground floor of the County Courthouse in Dallas.

The City should begin, however, to consider the long-term needs for a new facility. For example, should the police function be separate from City Hall? Could a new police building be shared by City, County, and State Police? Should the City acquire land during the planning period for additional law enforcement activities? Ideally, decisions should be made on these questions and other related concerns as soon as possible.

## **Fire and Ambulance**

The Dallas Fire Department is currently staffed by four full time employees, the Chief, Fire Marshal, Training Officer and Fire/EMS Volunteer Coordinator, and by approximately 70 volunteers. The department began in 1878 and provides fire and emergency services to the Dallas urban area as well as the Southwestern Polk County Rural Fire Protection District. The central fire station was constructed in 1973 at 915 SE Shelton Street and contains more than 13,000 square feet of space and presently houses nine pieces of equipment. The new ambulance facility was built in 1995 at 246 SE Washington Street. This facility houses up to six emergency medical technicians and three fully equipped Advanced Life Support medic units. The Fire Chief is responsible for all operations and maintenance of all emergency equipment.

As the City continues to grow and its emergency needs become more complex, the department must continue to expand its capabilities through training and equipment to meet these challenges. Additional space for classrooms, apparatus and facilities for females needs to be planned and implemented. Additionally, the replacement of an aging ladder truck and pumper must be considered. As the community expands and distance from the central station increases, response times must be addressed. Serious consideration should be given to methods of reducing the time it takes to respond to emergency situations. The volunteer system is a proud and effective tradition in the City. Recruitment and retention of volunteers is essential. Efforts must be made to support the membership with the tools and equipment necessary to remain a ISO Class 2 fire department and premier EMS provider.



## **7.2.6 Public Library**

The City Library is located at 950 Main Street, one block south from the Polk County Courthouse. The Library was opened on July 23, 1990 and formally dedicated on August 11, 1990. A new Library was authorized by the voters of Dallas on June 27, 1989.

\$750,000 was set aside to remodel property presented to the City by the Dalton Family whose furniture store had occupied the Main Street location for many years. \$90,000 of that sum came as a result of an LSCA (Library Services Construction Act) grant. The Dallas Library contains approximately 8,440 square feet of space. The Library houses a book collection of approximately 60,000 volumes. In 1996 the Library circulated 180,975 items, which is an average monthly circulation of 15,081.

The Dallas Public Library is a participating member of the Chemeketa Cooperative Regional Library Service, a program of public library service involving 17 Mid-Willamette communities and Chemeketa Community College. The service provides inter-library loans and a courier service to deliver materials between member libraries. Dallas patrons may use their library card at any of the 18 participating CCRLS member libraries. Dallas residents thus have access to a multitude of resources without the expense of acquisition.

One of the marks of a viable library is its integration into the everyday life of the community it serves. The Dallas Library sponsors a series of ongoing service programs as well as various workshops and special events designed with the community's programs and outreach delivery of materials to the home-bound. The Library has paid special attention to the development of new technological resources. The Dallas Library provides Internet access and a local area network of CD ROM products for patron use. In 1997, the Polk County Historical Society presented the Dallas Library with the Luckiamute Award in recognition of the Library's efforts to preserve local history.

The ever increasing public use of Library facilities and resources suggests both the success of the library in meeting its obligations to the public and a need in the not too distant future to consider ways of expanding floor space.

## **7.3 Planned Public Facilities**

This section discusses planned public facilities.

### **7.3.1 Sanitary Sewer**

#### **1. Treatment System**

According to DEQ projections, the new Wastewater Facility will be more than adequate to serve the needs of Dallas during the planning period. The design capacity is sufficient to service the projected year 2020 population projection of 19,043. Two factors, could, however, hasten the expansion and modifications of the plant.

First, if the City succeeds in attracting industry, a much greater volume of industrial waste (even with pre-treatment) could enter the sewage system. The treatment of industrial wastes is more difficult than the treatment of domestic waste. No allowance for a new high-strength industrial discharge was included in the new Wastewater Facility projections. Therefore, construction of tertiary stage treatment facility may be necessary, depending on the type of industry involved.

Secondly, the possibility of the Rickreall area connecting to the Dallas Treatment Plant to form a regional sewage system was identified in a 1974 Water Quality Management Plan prepared by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments. The feasibility of such a system was conditioned to the industrial development of Rickreall and the political acceptability to the City of Dallas and Polk County. If such a connection is made during the planning period, the possibility exists that the plant would need to be enlarged and tertiary treatment added. The new Treatment Plant is expected to be operational in December 1999.

## 2. Collection System

Most of the City is adequately served by sanitary sewers. One problem does exist, however, in the western portion of the north Dallas trunk system. The existing 12-inch diameter sewer that flows through the City Park currently suffers from capacity and grade problems. The existing pipe is also known to contribute excessive infiltration into the sewer system. The segment that requires replacement runs from the east end of Park Street easterly through the park to the intersection of Walnut and Levens Street. The replacement pipe could follow the current alignment. In addition, two major interceptors are scheduled to be installed as identified in the Revised Wastewater Facility Plan.

- **LaCreole Interceptor.** A new 30-inch-diameter parallel relief sewer line along the existing LaCreole Interceptor is required to convey projected flows. The existing interceptor's capacity is now exceeded at less than the 5-year design storm. The new parallel sewer line will extend from the influent pump station at the wastewater plant upstream and adjacent to the existing sewer until it reaches the easterly side of the Urban Growth Boundary. At this manhole the interceptor that continues west will be diverted into the new 30-inch relief sewer line. Also at this manhole another new 27-inch interceptor will begin and will follow an existing 12-inch sewer line across LaCreole Creek. This sewer line will be called the Ash Creek Interceptor.
- **Ash Creek Interceptor.** A new 27-inch sewer line is needed to convey the wastewater from a large southeasterly section of the City to the LaCreole Interceptor. This new sewer line would also serve vacant areas in southeast Dallas that currently do not have access to the sewer system. This interceptor will eliminate the need for the existing bypass point at LaCreole Creek just downstream from the new connection point at the intersection of SE Ash and Fenton Streets. This diversion of the flow into the new interceptor will relieve the downstream siphon crossing and interceptor from its current capacity limitations

The major problem with the sewage system is not one of service, however, but rather one of excessive infiltration and entry of storm water through combined storm and sanitary sewers (inflow). This inflow rate is primarily dependent on the magnitude of the rainfall. As the population of the community increases and the sewers become more heavily loaded with sanitary flow, the problems associated with excessive infiltration/inflow become more severe. The City has had an ongoing sewer separation program since the early 1960s. Today, nearly 95 percent of the original public combined sewers have been separated. See the City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume I, Policy 7.1.2.

In order to assure that the impact of providing and maintaining new sewer facilities is not a burden to the community, the new subdivisions and areas of development shall pay for the cost of up to eight-

inch sanitary sewer lines. Extra capacity facilities, required to meet the standards of the Master Sewer Plan, may be paid from accumulated income of the System Development Charge Fund.

In addition the City will continue paying the cost of maintaining and improving the existing collection system with funds derived from user fees.

### **7.3.2 Water System**

The Master Water Plan identifies the need for additional winter water rights and expansion of the water supply. It is the City's intention to acquire additional winter water rights and raise the Mercer Dam Spillway for immediate additional water supply and continue the Water Supply Study to a design and construction phase for additional long term water supply during this planning period.

The distribution system itself is arranged in a grid and is adequately looped in a circulatory system. The City has adopted the Master Water Plan prepared by CH2M Hill and has incorporated it into its Capital Improvement Program. In addition, the City will undertake a periodic review and update of the Master Water Plan.

In order to assure that the impact of new water facilities is not a burden to the community and to assure adequate system maintenance, the City will continue paying the cost of maintaining and improving the existing distribution system with funds derived from user fees. Benefited properties which have not previously been assessed for the construction of a water main to serve them shall be required to pay the cost of a six-inch main. Extra capacity water mains (over six inch diameter) may be paid from System Development Funds. The City also will seek voter approval to issue bonds to provide the necessary funds to construct major system improvements as needed.

#### **1. Sources of Water**

- A) Mercer Reservoir is located about 8.5 miles west of the City Limits on Rickreall Creek. The City of Dallas currently owns water rights to 1,550 acre/feet of storage and can divert 10 cubic feet per second (cfs) of this amount.
- B) Rickreall Creek flows from the Coast Range to the Willamette River. Rickreall Creek flows into Mercer Reservoir.
- C) Rockhouse Creek flows from the Coast Range into Mercer Reservoir. The City currently owns the rights to 3.50 cfs of direct flow daily from Rockhouse and Rickreall Creeks combined.
- D) Applegate Creek and Canyon Creek flow from the Coast Range into Rickreall Creek downstream from the Mercer Dam and before the raw water intake. The City owns the right to 1 cfs flow from Applegate Creek and 0.77 cfs flow from Canyon Creek..

#### **2. Treatment System**

The Dallas Water Treatment Plant is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the City just off West Ellendale Avenue. A detailed description of the Water Treatment Plant is part of the Engineering Report of the Water System (September 1983) and the Water Treatment Plant Evaluation Conceptual Report (March 1991) prepared by CH2M Hill for the City of Dallas. The Water Treatment Plant will be adequate to serve the needs of Dallas through the year 2020.

### 3. Pump and Distribution Systems

The Water Distribution System is described in detail in the Engineering Report of the Water System (September 1983) prepared by CH2M Hill. The system serves the residents of the City and approximately 360 customers outside the City. The City also contracts to provide water to the Ellendale Water District west of the City and, as a backup, to the Rickreall Water District on the east. A map of the system is in the Engineering Report of the Water System and is included as Map 7.

#### 7.3.3 Storm Drainage System Management

In order to construct and assure maintenance of the storm drainage system in both the public right-of-way and private properties, storm drainage systems must be within the street right-of-way or in City storm easements prior to development and shall be constructed to a 25-year flood design. Storm drainage improvements through already improved land will be made as the need arises from resources of the System Development Charge Fund and/or bond issues, depending upon the scope and expense of the project. New subdivisions and areas of development are required to pay for the cost of up to eighteen-inch storm sewer mains. Extra capacity lines, required to meet standards of the Master Drainage Plan, will be paid from accumulated revenue resources in the System Development Charge Fund. See Policy 7.1.4, of the City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan, Volume 1.

#### 7.3.5 Summary of Needed Public Facilities Projects, Timing and Costs

*Table 7.1 Sanitary System Short Range Facility Needs - (five year)*

Project Title	Year	Estimated Cost	Funding
Wastewater Treatment Facility, Phase I	1999	\$13.26 Million	Loans, Economic Development Grants, System Development
Phase II	2003	\$4.10 Million	Loans, Economic Development Grants, System Development
SE LaCreole Interceptor	2000	\$0.91 Million	Loans, Economic Development Grants, System Development
Ash Creek Swale Interceptor	2000	\$1.56 Million	Loans, Economic Development Grants, System Development
Sanitary Line through City Park	1998	\$ 80,000	System Development
Inflow-Infiltration Management Plan and Correction	1998-2008	\$1.68 Million	Loans, Economic Development Grants
Sanitary Line Extensions	Upon De-	78" Pipe Size	System Development

velopment

Table 7.2 Sanitary System Long Range Facility Needs - (20 year)

Project Title	Year	Estimated Cost	Funding
Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase III		\$4.01 Million	Economic Development Grant, Loans, Bond
Inflow-Infiltration Correction		\$2.97 Million	Economic Development Grant, Loans
West Ash Creek Sanitary Line SW Fairview to Main Street		\$ 300,000	Upon Development, Economic Development Grant

Table 7.3 Water System Short Range Facility Needs - (five year)

Project Title	Year	Estimated Cost	Funding
Transmission Water Line: Water Treatment Plant to Clay Street Reservoir	2000	\$ 820,000	System Development, Economic Development Grant
18" Transmission Line: SW River Drive to SW Levens on W Ellendale	1999	\$ 176,000	System Development, Economic Development Grant
Flashboards Raising Spillway Level on Mercer Dam	1998	\$ 300,000	System Development, Economic Development Grant
Silt Removal and Settling Pond on Mercer Reservoir	1998	\$ 650,000	Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
High Pressure Water System Circulation - W Ellendale	2000	\$ 80,000	System Development, Developer's Cost
Water Supply Study & Recommendation for Planning	1998	\$ 150,000	Economic Development Grant, System Development
Water Line Extensions	Upon Development	6" Pipe	System Development

**Table 7.4 Water System Long Range Facility Needs (20 year)**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Funding</b>
New Dam-Reservoir		\$2.5 Million	Bond, Economic Development Grant, Loan
Raw Water Transmission Line - Water Treatment Plant to Ellendale		\$0.5 Million	Economic Development Grant, Bond, Loan, System Development
Water Reservoir: South Side to Serve Industrial Area and East Side of City Limits		\$1.5 Million	Bond, Economic Development Grant
River Drive - Allgood 12" Line		\$ 200,000	Bonds, Economic Development Grant

**Table 7.5 Storm System Short Range Facility Needs - (five year)**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Funding</b>
Acquisition of Storm Easements & Drainage Improvements - SE Hankel Street SE to Rickreall Creek	1998	\$ 90,000	System Development Revenue Sharing
SW Harder Storm Line	1999	\$ 128,000	Developer's Cost, System Development
W Ellendale-Douglas Street Intersection	2000	\$ 30,000	Revenue Sharing, System Development
Storm Extension	Upon Development	18" Pipe Cost	System Development

**Table 7.5 Storm System Long Range Facility Needs - (20 year)**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Funding</b>
Acquisition of Storm Easements & Drainage Improvements		\$50 lf	System Development, Economic Development Grant

**7.4 Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards**

Volume I of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 5 and 7, Transportation and Public Facilities) identifies level-of-service standards that must be met in order for an annexation, zone change or a land development application to be approved. LOS standards are also incorporated into the Dallas Development code in the zone change and land divisions sections.

The Public Facilities Deficiency Areas Map (Map 10), identifies specific geographic areas of the community where there are (a) sanitary sewer collection, (b) potable water distribution, storage, or pressure, (c) storm sewer collection or storage, and/or (d) transportation deficiencies that must be resolved prior to annexation, zone change or development approval.

Listed below are the main public improvements needed for various areas within the Urban Growth Boundary:

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Install a 15" sanitary sewer through the City Park from SW Park Street to SW Levens. Install a parallel sanitary line for additional capacity in SW Bryson from SW River Drive to SW Westwood.
3. Development above 400 ft. elevation is in second level water system and a water line will need to be installed up from W. Ellendale Ave.

4. Improvements of Woods Lane including storm, curbs and sidewalks, needs to be completed for traffic circulation and development of the property to the North. In addition, extend sanitary and water in NW Woods Lane from W Ellendale Ave.
5. SW River Drive from the area of SW Park Street South needs street and storm improvements including curbs and sidewalks.
6. The main traffic travel in the NW section of Dallas uses the SW Levens Street - W Ellendale Ave. intersection. The Mill Street bridge will need to be constructed for the area Transportation system.
7. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.2 Douglas**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantity from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Install a 15" sanitary sewer through the City Park from SW Park Street to SW Levens. Install a parallel sanitary line for additional capacity in SW Bryson from SW River Drive to SW Westwood.
3. Development above 400 ft. elevation is in second level water system and the Douglas Street pump size will need to be increased or have 700 ft. of 18" waterline and 1400 ft. of 8" waterline installed in W. Ellendale necessary for level 2 water system in order to eliminate the Douglas Street pump station.
4. Area needs to develop according to the W. Ellendale Traffic Safety Corridor Study.

#### **7.4.3 Hillcrest**

1. Development above 400 ft. elevation is in second level water system and the Douglas Street pump size will need to be increased or have 700 ft. of 18" and 1400 ft. of 8" waterline installed in W Ellendale Ave. in order to eliminate the NW Douglas Street pump station.
2. Area needs to develop according to the W Ellendale Traffic Safety Corridor Study.

#### **7.4.4 Jasper**

1. Storm sewer is required for additional capacity: 1700 ft. of 30" along SW Harder Ave. and SW Jasper Street, from the alley west of SW Levens Street to W Ellendale Ave.
2. Development above 400 ft. elevation is in second level water system and the pump size on Orchard Dr. will need to be increased or have 700 ft. of 18" water line, 1400 ft. of 8" waterline on W Ellendale Ave. and the 8" waterline in NW Denton Street from the West installed to NW Fairhaven Lane for the level 2 water system in order to eliminate the NW Douglas Street and Orchard Drive pumps.

#### **7.4.5 Orchard**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.



2. Development above 400 ft. elevation is in second level water system and the pump size on Orchard Drive will need to be increased or have 700 ft. of 18" waterline, 1400 ft. of 8" waterline on W Ellendale Ave. and the 8" waterline in NW Denton Street from the West installed to NW Fairhaven Lane for the level 2 water system in order to eliminate the NW Douglas Street and Orchard Drive pumps.
3. Street improvements including storm, curbs and sidewalks are needed along SE Dimick Street and SE Davis Street and SE Rowell Street and NE Polk Station Road.
4. North Dallas intersection and the Main Street - SE Hankel intersection both need to be planned and improved for the future traffic.

#### **7.4.6 Polk Station**

1. Storm runoff is the beginning of a drainage basin to Baskett Slough. Storm design will need engineering design for detention of large areas and special residential design for storm detention.
2. Sanitary Plan is to install a lift station in Oak Villa Road to E Ellendale Ave. Intermediate lift stations to E Ellendale Ave. will be necessary as development occurs from the West.
3. Need a traffic signal at NE Polk Station Road at E Ellendale Ave. when traffic volume warrants are met.
4. A water system needs to be extended from Orchard Drive along NE Kings Valley Highway to NE Dallas Drive.
5. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.
6. Street improvements including storm, curb, and sidewalk are needed along NE Polk Station Road.

#### **7.4.7 Hankel**

1. Storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Some properties in this area are long narrow lots requiring resolution of multiple ownerships for development.
3. SE Academy St. needs street right-of-way on the West end with street, storm, water and sanitary improvements from SE LaCreole Drive West to SE Uglow Street.
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.9 Hawthorne**

1. Storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Some properties in this area are long narrow lots requiring resolution of multiple ownerships for development.
3. Sanitary and storm sewers to serve this area need to be extended from the south.

4. SE Hawthorne Avenue needs to be improved to City standards including storm, sanitary, curbs and sidewalks from development to an improved street right-of-way.
5. This property is outside City limits and needs to be annexed prior to development.
6. Street extension of SE Hankel Street needs City acquisition of property for street right-of-way.
7. Sanitary system needs to be constructed from the South, for new development and for SE Hawthorne Avenue. SE Academy Street lift station can be eliminated when sanitary gravity system from the South is installed.
8. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.10 Rickreall**

1. This property is outside the City limits and needs to be annexed prior to development.
2. Sanitary and storm need to develop from the South.

#### **7.4.11 K**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek
2. Sanitary and storm sewer needs to develop in this area from the south.
3. Major intersection with E Ellendale Avenue needs to be planned with installation of a traffic signal when warrants are met.
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.12 Fir Villa Road**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek. Storm system needs to be installed in SE Fir Villa Road.
2. The Northerly property is outside the City limits and needs to be annexed prior to development.
3. Sanitary sewer in this area needs to develop from the southeast or from the South in the street extensions.
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.13 L**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Sanitary and storm sewer in this area needs to develop from the south.
3. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.14 M**

1. Storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Sanitary and storm sewer in this area needs to develop from the southeast.
3. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.15 East Ellendale**

1. Storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall Creek.
2. Sanitary and storm sewer in this area needs to develop from the southeast.
3. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.16 Godsey**

1. Sanitary sewer in this area needs the Ash Creek Swale line installed from the southern interceptor main line on the North side of Rickreall Creek to this area.

#### **7.4.17 Holman - Uglov**

1. A sanitary system needs to be extended from SE Holman Street for development and the existing developed properties.
2. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from development to Ash Creek.
3. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.18 Ash Creek**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Ash Creek.
2. Sanitary sewer line needs to be installed from Main Street to SW Bridlewood Drive.
3. A main water transmission line needs to be extended through this area to the East.
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.19 Cherry**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Ash Creek.
2. Sanitary sewer in this area is developed from SW Cherry Street.
3. The area's water system is level 2 for areas above 400 foot elevation and water service 3 level for areas above 550 elevation. (A pump station and tank will have to be constructed to serve level 3. For development of level 3, a 16" transmission line from the Water Treatment Plant needs to be installed to the SW Maple Street pump station. For level 2, either the subject 16" transmission

line needs to be installed or a 16” water line around the Clay Street reservoirs connecting with the Water Treatment Plant line to the SW Maple Street line or connecting to the Maple Street Pump station.)

4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.20 Oakdale South**

1. Existing storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and a hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Ash Creek.
2. Sanitary sewer in this area needs to be developed from the Ash Creek area which is a sanitary system from Main Street.
3. The area’s water system is level 2 for areas above 400 foot elevation and water service 3 level for areas above 550 foot elevation. (A pump station and tank will have to be constructed to serve level 3. For development of level 3, a 16” transmission line from the Water Treatment Plant needs to be installed to the SW Maple Street pump station. For level 2, either the subject 16” transmission line needs to be installed or a 16” water line around the Clay Street reservoirs connecting the Water Treatment Plant line to the SW Maple Street line.)
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.21 Oakdale**

1. Storm drainage channels (ditches) need easements for City maintenance and hydraulic study for flow quantities from the development to Rickreall or Ash Creek.
2. Sanitary sewer in this area needs to be extended from the southeast around Oakdale Heights elementary or from the Cherry Street area or from the Ash Creek area.
3. The area’s water system is level 2 for areas above 400 foot elevation and water service 3 level for areas above 550 foot elevation. (A pump station and tank will have to be constructed to serve level 3. For development of the level 3, a 16” transmission line from the Water Treatment Plant needs to be installed to the SW Maple Street pump station. For level 2, either the subject 16” transmission line needs to be installed or a 16” water line around the Clay Street reservoirs connecting the Water Treatment Plant line to the SW Maple Street line.)
4. Properties outside the City Limits need to be annexed prior to development.

#### **7.4.22 City Wide**

1. The City’s Future Water Supply expansion study needs to be completed and implemented during the planning period.
2. Drainageways need to be provided with City easements for maintenance and designed and improved to a 25-year design flow.
3. The sanitary collection system needs to have a continuing inflow-infiltration correction program to reduce the flows to the Wastewater Facility.
4. The following LOS standards have been adopted by the City of Dallas:

- The City of Dallas needs to develop from the Core Area out into the Urban Growth Area.
- Development is to occur when adequate public facilities are available.

### **7.5 Sanitary Sewer**

The sanitary sewer will be extended for development by a gravity system unless the Sanitary Master Plan identifies the service area for a Lift Station.

### **7.6 Potable Water**

Water System will be extended in a circulatory system according to identified levels of pressure areas. Minimum water pressure to a building site is 30 psi.

### **7.7 Stormwater Management**

Stormwater System will be extended to development based on a 25-year storm frequency design. Main drainageways will be maintained by the City within street right-of-way or storm easements.

### **7.9 Geographic Phasing of Key Public Facilities and Services**

The City Engineering Department has prepared a map showing areas with critical sanitary sewer, water, storm drainage and/or transportation deficiencies. (See Map 10, Public Facilities Deficiency Areas.) This map has been used to set priorities for phasing of key public facilities and services to different developable areas within the UGB.

Table 7.8 is keyed to Map 10, and establishes a priority ranking for annexation to the City.

**Table 7.8 Geographic Phasing Areas**

<b>Priority Ranking</b>	<b>Geographic Area</b>	<b>Service Deficiencies</b>
1	Godsey	Godsey Street Improvement
2	Hankel	Storm Easements and Drainage
3	Orchard	A) Storm Easements and Drainage B) Street Improvements to Dimick, Davis & Rowell
4	James Howe	A) Sanitary Line through City Park B) Storm Easements and Drainage Improvements C) W Ellendale Improvement
5	Uglow-Holman	Holman Street Improvement

**7.10 Educational Facilities**

The Dallas school system is composed of nine public schools – one alternative, six elementary, one middle school and one senior high is administered by Dallas School District Number 2. The District extends beyond the planning area, with three elementary schools in the area outside Dallas accounting for only a small percentage of the total enrollment. The school system operates generally on grade separations of K-5, 6-7-8, and 9-12.

Table 7.9 summarizes the important data pertaining to the Dallas School system.

	Morrison Alternative School	Lyle Elementary	Whitworth Elementary	Oakdale Heights Elementary	LaCreole Middle School	Dallas High School
Location	Main & Ash	Ellendale & Levens	Miller Ave. & Gleason	Maple & 13 <sup>th</sup> Street	LaCreole & Academy	East Ash and Holman
<b>GRADES TAUGHT</b>						
Presently	K	1-5	1-5	1-5	6-7-8	9-12
Planned	6-12	K-5	K-5	K-5	6-7-8	9-12
<b>CLASSROOMS</b>						
Presently	7	15	17	18	-	-
Planned	-	17	19	20	-	-
<b>TEACHING STATIONS*</b>						
Presently	7	20	19	20	45	67
Planned	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>ENROLLMENT</b>	194	400	350	300	780	1000
<b>PRESENT CAPACITY</b>	175	400	400	450	800	1200
<b>PLANNED EXPANSION</b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
<b>MAXIMUM PLANNED CAPACITY</b>	175	425	475	475	800	1200
<b>SIZE OF SITE</b>	1.3A	19A**	9A	14.5A	22A	29.5A

\*The School District prefers to use the number of teaching stations as an indicator of school size, rather than the number of classrooms.

\*\*Approximately 4 acres of this site are leased to the City for park development.

SOURCE: Interview with David Voves, Superintendent, Dallas School District #2, 1997.

In addition to local schools, Dallas residents have access to a wide range of higher education facilities at Salem, McMinnville, Monmouth, and Corvallis, all of which are within reasonable commuting distance.

### **7.10.1 Future School Needs**

See discussion under Chapter 4, Parks and Schools.

#### **School Plan**

New schools attract and encourage residential growth and are important building blocks of community form. Therefore, it is essential that the selection of future school sites be coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan and actively involve community officials in the process. In addition, the State Board of Education has established minimum size criteria for school sites. Elementary schools

should have a minimum area of 5 acres, plus an additional acre for each 100 students of predicted ultimate enrollment. Junior and senior high school sites should have a minimum area of 10 acres and one additional acre for each 100 students of ultimate enrollment.

To further help guide the community in the site selection process, the Citizens Committee on Public Facilities developed the following policies.

- School sites should be located and purchased well in advance of need in order to obtain the most satisfactory sites at a minimum cost to the public;
- School sites should be located to provide the best possible access to the student population served;
- Public schools should not be located in existing or potential commercial or industrial areas;
- Junior and Senior high schools should have adequate and safe access from the community's major street network.

The 1997 Dallas Comprehensive Plan Map shows a new school site located in the LaCreole Mixed-Use Node area. The school site as indicated by the policies presented above, should be convenient to its service area and have good access from the arterial street network. Present growth trends indicate that a majority of new students will live in the western sectors of the community.