

City of
Hubbard
Community Center Planning
Project

Prepared by
**Public Affairs Research Consultants
(PARC)**
P.O. Box 249
Independence, OR 97351
800-758-6812

Community Needs Assessment

City of Hubbard: Community Needs Assessment-Community Center Facility

Introduction

The City of Hubbard has commissioned Public Affairs Research Consultants (PARC) to produce a Needs Assessment based on the past examination of the Feasibility Study and the community visioning process. The Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments completed the Feasibility Study in May 2004 and offered the qualified conclusion that there was need for a facility and that it is possible to raise the dollars required for construction. However, the study noted that there are unresolved concerns about whether or not there are sufficient operating funds available.

This document and the larger project of which it is a part is supported by the Ford Institute for Community Building and included a community workshop on May 24, 2005, to which the public was widely invited. The vision that emerged from this workshop, as well as mailed surveys, comments to the city, and local discussions, is of a community center that embraces a multiple-purpose room, kitchen, and a technology room. Initial estimates of the space required ranged broadly, but this document will help focus the vision based on existing needs, likely future changes and comparable facilities.

The Needs Assessment presented here begins with a thorough demographic profile of Hubbard and its relationship to the surrounding county. The document then offers an estimate of future growth and future needs over the likely 40-year life span of a community center. Following the profile and growth projections, the document examines the facilities available in the community, surrounding communities and briefly comparable community centers based on the Feasibility Study done by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments.

From the base of existing conditions and projections about the future the Needs Assessment builds a case for the need for a community center and the specific characteristics. The assessment takes care to reconcile the community visioning with the needs identified through the less personal comparisons of population size, city characteristics and comparable facilities.

Finally, the document offers conclusions about the need for a community center and its configuration, use, and operation.

Community Profile

The City of Hubbard has experienced a significant population growth since the 1990 U.S. Census. That year, the population was 1,881, and by 2000, it had grown 35 percent to 2,483.¹ According to the Population Research Center at Portland State University, the most recent data shows a population of 2,750.² This steady growth puts pressure on the small community to develop the infrastructure and facilities required to manage the burgeoning population. Another challenge however stems from the absence of wealth and resources in the city.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, which is the most recent data available, the per capita income is just \$14,383, compared to the figure for Marion County, which is \$18,408, or the state figure of \$20,940. The median household and median family incomes are likewise low and are related in Table 1 below.

Table 1

	Median Household Income	Median Family Income	Per Capita Income
Hubbard	\$38,850	\$42,552	\$14,383
Oregon	\$40,916	\$48,680	\$20,940
Marion County	\$40,314	\$46,202	\$18,408
City as % of Oregon	94.9%	87.4%	68.7%
City as % of Marion Co.	96.4%	92.1%	78.1%

Data from 2000 U.S. Census

What is most striking about the income comparisons is that although the median household and family incomes are not significantly lower than the county figures, the per capita income is very low. The low per capita income figure reflects the most accurate nature of need and resources because it takes in account the large number of dependent children in the community who are not in the workforce. Indeed, fully 34.5 percent of the population is under age 18 and the average family size is 3.67. By comparison, just 24.7 percent of the Oregon population is under age 18 and the average family size in the state is 3.02.³

Not surprisingly, the poverty rate in Hubbard is also higher than the state average, at 14.8 percent compared to 11.8 percent. However, fully 20 percent of related children under age 18 live in poverty and this is indicative of the financial need in the community. Unfortunately, the Oregon Employment Department does not track unemployment for communities. In addition, because of the presence of Salem in the community means that the Oregon Employment Department does not track the county unemployment rate either. Instead it tracks the metropolitan areas of Salem and Portland and the data is meaningless when considering Hubbard. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the unemployment rate in Hubbard was 5.7 percent, compared to the county's rate of 4.9 percent and the state rate of 4.2 percent. The upshot of the data is that the city has

¹ 1990 US Census. & 2000 US Census.

² Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.

³ 2000 US Census. Unless noted otherwise the demographic figures in the following paragraphs come from this source.

generally lagged behind the county and state and anecdotal evidence from Hubbard supports this observation.

One of the more remarkable features of Hubbard is that it lacks public schools. Strategically located as it is between Portland and Salem, Hubbard is a suitable bedroom community for these larger urban areas and new housing developments continue to draw young families with children. All local children are bussed to neighboring communities. Consequently, Hubbard lacks a facility that can perform many of the public functions that schools fill in other communities. For example, the community does not have a large meeting room, a place for children's activities, groups, or events. The largest park is Barendse Park, which is more than seven acres, but other than this park, the remainder of the parks are small, one covers a city park and others are approximately one city lot.

Woodburn to the south is growing, Interstate Five to the west, like Highway 99E through town, is more heavily traveled every year and the suburbs of Wilsonville are also closer year by year. Hubbard is not about to be swallowed up by any means, but it is growing and the pattern is clear.

According to the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, over the next 40 years the county will grow from 286,300 people in 2000 to 448,671 by the year 2040. If the office is correct the county will grow by 56.7 percent for an annual growth rate of 1.4 percent. Applying the same figures to Hubbard yields a 2040 population of 3,891. Table Two below reports the most recent historic population figures for Hubbard and Marion County and combines U.S. Census data with estimates from the Population Research Center.

Table 2

	1980	1990	1998	2000	2001	2004
Hubbard	1,640	1,881	2,210	2,483	2,501	2,750
County	204,692	228,483	271,900	284,834	288,450	298,450

Clearly, over the last two-plus decades, the city has grown and so has the county. Unfortunately, the state does not make city predictions, but the Office of Economic Analysis does make long-term county projections.⁴ The following table presents the Office of Economic Analysis's estimate for the county.

Table 3

Office of Economic Analysis Population Projection						
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2040
County	323,128	344,443	367,018	388,898	410,022	448,671

Generally, the prediction is for continued growth that is similar to recent history, but not as rapid as the 1990s. Applying the same growth rates to the city's 2000 population yields the following population projection.

⁴ Office of Economic Analysis, Department of Administrative Services, State of Oregon, "Forecasts of Oregon's County Populations and Components of Change 2000-2040," April 2004.

Table 4

Extension of Office of Economic Analysis Projections to the City
of Hubbard

	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2040
Hubbard	2,802	2,987	3,183	3,372	3,556	3,891

Of course there are many factors that can influence the local growth, including the potential for new companies moving into the area and out-migration based on other unforeseen events. The availability of land for expansion, the value of property and the larger statewide economic forces all will influence the real results, but it is clear that the city should be prepared to see its population grow steadily and perhaps even dramatically.

Local Conditions Affecting Growth

While local growth may well approximate the county's growth, there are many specific conditions in Hubbard that will bear on how growth takes place. In particular, the presence of available land for growth is a consideration that must be explored. The City of Hubbard is relatively constrained and the opportunities to add housing units or land for development are limited. At present, the only available land inside the urban growth boundary is slated to see construction begin shortly. When this construction is completed, the only undeveloped land inside the urban growth boundary will be a parcel owned by the North Marion School District.

What this means practically, is that while the city will likely grow when the current development is completed, there will probably be a period of several years where growth does not take place. Assuming that it will take two to five years to enlarge the urban growth boundary and build new housing, it is likely that the city will remain at a plateau for three to six years depending on the possibility of annexation and redevelopment.

Other Community Facilities and Comparable Community Centers

The purpose of this section is not to repeat the work of the Feasibility Study and it is not to reproduce that study here. Instead, it is worth examining the relative lack of community facilities in Hubbard and how other cities of its size fare. The Feasibility Study identified four other community meeting facilities.

- Hubbard City Council Chambers
- Hubbard Community Church
- Hubbard Fire District Classroom
- St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall

The largest of these, St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall, can host up to 160 people with a classroom configuration while the Fire District classroom can hold up to 70 people, but it is not available to the general public. Only the Fellowship Hall charges a user fee at \$125 rental, plus \$190 for insurance and an additional fee to use the kitchen. By any measure this is a short lineup of meeting places and none lend themselves to use by the entire community for diverse offerings.

Many communities rely on libraries for community meeting space, which Hubbard lacks. Likewise, school facilities sometimes have space for youth groups, after-school programs or similar services, but Hubbard does not have a school district. However, Hubbard is served by a school district that serves Hubbard, Aurora, and Donald, with facilities outside of the community. Some communities turn to art centers, bed and breakfasts, hotel facilities, or city halls, all of which Hubbard lacks. Some communities rely on the halls of service organizations such as the Lions, Eagles or Elks, but the city has no such available hall. Still other Oregon cities are able to rely on VFW halls, or senior centers, but this is not the case in Hubbard.

Given the absence of facilities, it is easy to conclude that Hubbard needs a community center. Indeed, many similar communities do sport community centers, including towns with smaller populations. For example, Rufus in Sherman County has a community center that was a former school. Helix in Umatilla County with just 181 residents operates a community center, also in a former school. The Feasibility Study identified community centers in Sweet Home, Cottage Grove, Veneta, Mollala, Reedsport, and Estacada, which has a community center that it built for the purpose. Some of these communities have comparable populations and Reedsport is certainly more distressed economically than Hubbard.

Another rather common arrangement is to combine facilities, including a city hall and community center. The new facility in Rockaway Beach is one such example. The Burns Paiute Tribe is also planning a facility that combines the administrative offices of the Tribe with a community area. Pendleton combines its city hall with a library, community gym and performance hall. The combinations are common and the presence of city hall, for example, allows an economy of scale when it comes to maintenance and overall management of the facility.

Thus, there is ample evidence in the Feasibility Study that other communities have found a way to operate community centers. At the same time, the Feasibility Study also notes that these centers are subsidized by cities in recognition of the public services they perform and the public good they do. Consequently, it is reasonable to also conclude that a community center will likely require a subsidy as well, be it in the form of a direct cash payment, or in-kind services.

Nearby Communities

The closest communities to Hubbard are Woodburn, Aurora, and Donald. Woodburn is the largest with 21,790 people in 2004.⁵ Donald's 2004 population, according to the Population Research Center was 660, and Aurora's was also 660. North Marion High School is located north of Hubbard and in the middle of the triangle of Donald – Hubbard – Aurora. Not surprisingly given their size, Donald and Aurora do not have community centers. Woodburn had a community center, but closed it because it was condemned and the residents opted not to replace it.

Succinctly put, there are no comparable facilities in the communities closest to Hubbard. Indeed, Woodburn does have a pool and other recreational facilities, but they are nonetheless restricted and there is no direct competition for the proposed community center.

⁵ 2004 figures in this paragraph all come from: Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.

Specific Hubbard Needs for A Community Center

The Feasibility Study authored by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments, combined with community meetings and local discussions, identified a clear need for a community facility. Furthermore, the local characteristics and demographics also point to a need, but the precise nature of that need is less clear. Likewise, need alone cannot drive decision making, there must also be a consideration of cost, financing, what is practical, and what will be used by enough people to justify its creation.

For better or worse, the community has limited ability to raise funding locally and the remainder will likely come from grant sources. Because the city is not eligible for Community Development Block Grant funds to pay for community facilities based on the percentage of low and moderate-income residents, it will have to turn to private foundations. These funders will look to the size and scope of the project and judge how appropriate it is. While it may well be an arbitrary decision, because the funders have the money to give, they also get to make such decisions.

Thus, the proposed community center must be scaled not only to the site and the needs, but the perceptions of the funders and what they will think is appropriate. The upshot of these observations is that a 15,000 square foot facility is too big and the city is unlikely to ever find private support. Of course, if the community opted to support a bond measure to pay for the facility, the question of scope would be less relevant.

Assuming that the city and project proponents will have to seek out support from private funders, the facility should be able to meet as many needs as possible, but also be as contained and simple as possible. What this means is that a multiple-use facility is preferable to one with several dedicated spaces. Also, the fact that all other identified community centers require a subsidy means that the design should minimize the need for support to the extent possible. In turn, this suggests that a library or other function that requires regular staffing is impractical. Minimal equipment also reduces cost and the need for monitoring. The characteristics that make the most sense include the following.

- Multiple-use space
- Open design
- Designed to minimize need for staff and monitoring
- Simple design to ease maintenance
- Economical
- 5,500 – 7,500 square feet
- Floor plan that allows at least one small activity to take place in addition to main one
- Non-commercial kitchen (warming or concession kitchen)
- Controlled access
- Storage space
- Capacity to rent the facility for weddings, reunions and similar events

Library Space

Clearly, there is interest in including library space in a community center, but there are several cautionary points that bear discussion. First, a library demands staff and there is no source of staff funding identified. Across the state of Oregon library staff and libraries in general are supported by tax dollars and taxing districts. Absent a move to raise tax funds for a library it is unlikely that Hubbard will find the money required to operate a library. In addition to staffing libraries carry periodical subscription, Internet subscription and other costs that Hubbard does not appear to be ready to cover.

Second, a library requires watching, as they have valuable books, materials, computers, and other items that demand security systems of some sort. This too adds to the costs and makes a library more expensive than other uses.

Finally, libraries tend to generate more controversy than other potential uses. From filters for Internet use, to which books meet community standards, libraries invite scrutiny and strong feelings. While libraries are one of the most democratic of institutions and a source for public information and communication, it does not follow that Hubbard has the resources to support one.

One alternative worth considering is the creation of a reading room. Volunteers or a community organization could run the reading room and provide staff on a regular basis. The volunteers would then be responsible for the users and materials and adhering to center guidelines. A reading room might also be a good first step toward a library if there is truly community support for such a facility in the future.

Meeting Space

Given the space available in the community, reaction of the residents and the creation of multiple use space, it does not seem necessary that the city should put its resources into creating a dedicated meeting space. Based on the surveys and discussions such a space would not be used enough to justify dedicating square footage to this purpose. Of course, combining meeting space and an area for children to play while parents recreate, or for after-school programs, would make sense.

Users and Volunteers – Versus Staffing

The economics of staffing suggest that it is unlikely the city or any other operator could afford to staff a community center in Hubbard. Thus, the operating model will have to take advantage of existing city staff to schedule events, volunteers to staff any programming and individuals willing to organize sporting leagues and similar undertakings.

Relying on existing staff and volunteers is not unreasonable and the current city staff indicated it could be possible to add scheduling center use into their duties. Indeed, the specific operational procedures and policies are a long-way from being worked out, but there are examples from other communities that allow groups to use their community centers and require a deposit. The user, a sports league for example, is required to lock and clean up the facility at the end of the day. Likewise, after-school programming would have to be done by qualified individuals and depending on the charge for the service might pay rent. At the very least they would be required to clean the facility and monitor use.

Operating Considerations to be Determined

There are many things that the city would have to make decisions about if it elects to move forward. These include how it will operate the center, with whom will responsibility be vested, will there be fees, what are the rental fees to use the building for a wedding, for example. Other decisions will revolve around how other groups, nonprofits or businesses can use the center to deliver services.

As with any facility such as this, there will be some hard decisions that will have to be made including who can do what. Some communities opt to insulate the council by creating a separate appointed or elected board to oversee the operation of the facility. The board would be responsible for making sure that there was no discrimination in terms of who could use the facility and that fees fit the use.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The original Feasibility Study identified a need for a community facility in Hubbard and this has been reiterated in surveys, community meetings, and other discussions. At the same time it is important to recognize some of the survey respondents clearly dismissed the idea as a waste of taxpayer money and resources. Of course, the next time everyone in a community of 2,750 people agrees on something will probably be the first time. Nonetheless, the fact that there are apparently strong feelings that the project is not needed, it is incumbent to move forward with a project that is conservative and does not attempt to be all things to all people.

Typically, projects that are measured, relatively modest and aimed at specific goals tend to do better in rural communities and in this case Hubbard will probably be the same way. Thus, a facility with the following characteristics offers the best combination of amenities, features and characteristics that it will be possible to raise the funds for, to build and to operate. Significantly, the facility must be configured in a way to secure political support locally so that it can be successful.

- 5,500 to 7,500 square feet in size
- Small warming kitchen
- Bulk of the facility devoted to a single multiple use space
- Inclusion of a basketball court in the multiple use space
- Capability of also hosting volleyball court in the multiple use space
- Separate area for a reading room that can double as a child play area or special use area
- Simple slab on grade construction with durable materials and limited finishings
- ADA restrooms that can serve the rest of the park if needed
- Storage area for chairs and tables to allow multiple use space to work for meetings

The facility may not meet all of the perceived needs, but it can provide real and important services and also serve as a first stage in the development of community infrastructure. If the reading room, for example, is very successful it may prompt future development of a library, or conversely demonstrate the lack of community interest in such a thing. The project will be better received and more successful if it proves to be on the small side and heavily used, rather than to be partially used and thus an unwarranted expense.

Community Services Plan

City of Hubbard Community Center: Community Services Plan

Section 1: Introduction

The City of Hubbard has contracted with Public Affairs Research Consultants (PARC) to prepare a Community Services Plan for the proposed Hubbard Community Center. The Hubbard Community Center (center) is slated to be located in Barendse Park on the approximately 32,450 square feet recently acquired by the city. The purpose of this document is to identify and define the services, users, and partners for the community center project.

The Community Services Plan assumes that the Needs Assessment is accurate in the type of facility that is most appropriate in this location for this purpose. Specifically, this means that the facility will be approximately 7,000 square feet and be designed to fulfill multiple purposes. In addition, the facility will have two main rooms, apart from the mechanical and storage areas, that will allow for the main activity area and a separate space for children, quiet activities or some other smaller event.

With this assumption and purpose, the Community Services Plan is divided into five subsequent sections following this introduction. The first section is this introduction and the second section offers a profile of the community and the characteristics that bear on the likely users of the facility. The third section examines similar facilities and existing services that may or may not be duplicated in the new center. The fourth section identifies the local partners and users available to the city or the operator of the facility.

The fifth section presents an inventory of services and uses that are the best fit for the facility and the community. This section offers a discussion of different ways that the services can be offered and what the repercussions are for staffing, costs and operations.

The final section makes conclusions about the way that the residents are most likely to use the center and what makes the most sense given the characteristics of the city. Moreover, the section makes recommendations about the characteristics of the building based on the service model. The way the building will be used bears on the decisions that the city makes about how to proceed and what specifically to build. The service model also speaks to the configuration of the amenities and this section briefly reviews the funding required to build such a structure.

Section 2: Community Profile¹

The City of Hubbard is a small community, traditionally agricultural, based in northern Marion County. The community has seen rapid growth over the last 15 years and is coming up against the practical limits, as almost all lands within the urban growth boundary have been developed, or are under development. In 1990, the population was 1,881, and by 2000, it had grown 35 percent to 2,483.² According to the Population Research Center at Portland State University, the city's population in 2004 was 2,750.³

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, which is the most recent data available, the per capita income is just \$14,383, compared to the figure for Marion County, which is \$18,408, or the state figure of \$20,940. The median household and median family incomes are likewise low and are related in Table 1 below.

Table 1

	Median Household Income	Median Family Income	Per Capita Income
Hubbard	\$38,850	\$42,552	\$14,383
Oregon	\$40,916	\$48,680	\$20,940
Marion County	\$40,314	\$46,202	\$18,408
City as % of Oregon	94.9%	87.4%	68.7%
City as % of Marion Co.	96.4%	92.1%	78.1%

Data from 2000 U.S. Census

What is most striking about the income comparisons is that although the median household and family incomes are not significantly lower than the county figures, the per capita income is very low. The low per capita income figure reflects the most accurate nature of need and resources because it takes in account the large number of dependent children in the community who are not in the workforce.⁴ A larger proportion of young children and families with children tends to bring down the per capita figures while not affecting the computation of the median household and family incomes.

One significant caveat that deserves mentioning is that it is impossible to determine the characteristics of the almost 300 people who have moved to Hubbard since the last census. Moreover, the current housing development underway will build up-scale units and attract a clientele that will likely increase the relative wealth of the residents.

¹ Parts of this section are excerpted from the City of Hubbard Community Center Needs Assessment drafted by PARC, June, 2005.

² 1990 US Census. & 2000 US Census.

³ Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.

⁴ 2000 US Census. Unless noted otherwise the demographic figures in this and the following paragraphs come from this source.

Examining the population of Hubbard reveals several other important characteristics that bear on who will use the proposed center. The median age of Hubbard is a young 29.2 years and the population 18 years and younger constitute 34.5 percent of the residents. By contrast, in Marion County, those under 18 make up 27.4 percent of the population and just 24.7 percent of all Oregonians are 18 or younger. The county median age is 33.7 years and the Oregon median is 36.3 years. Not surprisingly, the city has a relatively small senior citizen population, as just 7.2 percent of residents are over age 65. Senior citizens comprise 12.4 percent of the county population and 12.8 percent of the state population.

The age figures all bear out the observation that Hubbard is home to a disproportionately large population of young people and this is reflected in the household size as well. The average household has 3.30 members and the average family size is 3.67 members. By contrast the figures for the county are 2.70 and 3.19 respectively and in the state the numbers are even smaller at 2.51 and 3.02 members respectively. Just as telling is the fact that in Hubbard the 2000 U.S. Census identified 753 households, of which 595 or 79 percent were family households. Thus, the overwhelming majority of households are family units and this is important to understanding who will use the center. Of the 753 households, fully 350 are families with their own minor children in the home. Examining the marital status of the population over the age of 15, which is where the 2000 U.S. Census breaks down the figures, fully 83.2 percent of the population is either married, or has never married. As of 2000 57.7 percent of the population was married and just 11.5 percent were divorced.

One of the more remarkable features of Hubbard, especially given its population of young children, is that it lacks public schools. Strategically located as it is between Portland and Salem, Hubbard is a suitable bedroom community for these larger urban areas and new housing developments continue to draw young families with children. Local children attend the North Marion School District that combines the children of Aurora, Donald, and Hubbard. Consequently, Hubbard lacks a facility that can perform many of the public functions that schools fill in other communities. For example, the community does not have a large meeting room, a place for children's activities, groups, or events. Furthermore, the city has a limited park system, especially considering the population of almost 3,000 people. Barendse Park is the largest at over seven acres, but the remainder are small. There is a park near the community center that covers one block while the others are approximately one city block.

The area surrounding Hubbard is largely agricultural and the development has encompassed the available land inside the urban growth boundary. Consequently, there is little to no land for future developments and the direction of growth is a matter of conjecture, depending on where the boundary is eventually moved. Given the current development, the last remaining large residentially zoned land is owned by the school district and there is little evidence they are interested in selling.

When considering education, it is worth noting that within the community there may well be some demand for facilities to cater to those seeking educational opportunities. According to the 2000 Census, just 10.4 percent of the population over age 25 had a Bachelor's degree or higher, compared to the county rate of 19.8 percent and state rate of 25 percent. Given the relative educational attainment and the absence of a library, there may be demand for such services, depending on the configuration of the center.

Another type of facility that some cities use to serve as community centers are legion halls or VFW halls. However, in Hubbard, the percentage of civilian veterans is also relatively low at 11.1 percent compared to 14.5 percent for the county and 15.1 percent for the state. This means that in Hubbard 187 people are veterans.

An examination of the ethnicity in Hubbard reveals that 32.7 percent of the population identifies itself as Hispanic or Latino, while the second largest minority is Native American at just 1.9 percent. African Americans comprise just 0.3 percent of the population and the balance identified themselves as White. Not surprisingly, 27.3 percent of the residents reported speaking Spanish at home while 17.0 percent of all respondents reported they speak English less than "very well."

Section 3: Similar Facilities and Existing Services⁵

As noted in the Needs Assessment, there are few comparable community facilities or community recreating spaces in Hubbard. The Feasibility Study authored by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments identified the following four other community meeting facilities.

- Hubbard City Council Chambers – located at the City Hall
- Hubbard Community Church
- Hubbard Fire District Classroom
- St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall

The largest of these, St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall, can host up to 160 people with a classroom configuration while the Fire District classroom can hold up to 70 people, but it is not available to the general public. Only the Fellowship Hall charges a user fee at \$125 rental, plus \$190 for insurance and an additional fee to use the kitchen. By any measure this is a short lineup of meeting places and none lend themselves to use by the entire community for diverse offerings.

The City Council Chambers, located as they are in the city hall, are relatively cramped and there is a decided lack of parking at the site. Moreover, while the city has made reasonable accommodations especially given the age of the building, it is not fully accessible.

As discussed earlier many communities rely on libraries for community meeting space, which Hubbard lacks. Likewise, school facilities sometimes have space for youth groups, after-school programs or similar services. However, Hubbard is served by a school district that serves Hubbard, Aurora, and Donald, with facilities outside of the community. Some communities turn to art centers, bed and breakfasts, hotel facilities, or city halls, all of which Hubbard lacks. Some communities rely on the halls of service organizations such as the Lions, Eagles or Elks, but the city has no such available hall. Still other Oregon cities are able to rely on Legion Halls or senior centers but these facilities do not exist in Hubbard.

Given the absence of facilities, it is easy to conclude that Hubbard needs a community center and that it will find a large and ready list of potential users. Indeed, many similar towns do sport community centers, including places with much smaller populations. For example, Rufus in Sherman County has a community center that was a former school. Helix in Umatilla County with just 181 residents operates a community center, also in a former school. The feasibility study identified community centers in Sweet Home, Cottage Grove, Veneta, Mollala, Reedsport, and Estacada, which has a community center that it built for the purpose. Some of these communities have comparable populations and Reedsport is certainly more distressed economically than Hubbard.

⁵ Parts of this section are excerpted from the City of Hubbard Community Center Needs Assessment drafted by PARC, June, 2005.

Another rather common arrangement is to combine facilities, including a city hall and community center. The new facility in Rockaway Beach is one such example. The Burns Paiute Tribe is also planning a facility that combines the administrative offices of the Tribe with a community area. Pendleton combines its city hall with a library, community gym and performance hall. The combinations are common and the presence of city hall, for example, allows an economy of scale when it comes to maintenance and overall management of the facility. The city council has discussed a shared facility, but there are no obvious locations or opportunities to create a shared facility. The current city hall may need to be replaced, but there is no obvious place to put it. Rebuilding on the site still leaves the city with no parking and financing such a structure would be a major challenge given the current assumptions.

Operations

Along with the existence of facilities in other places, it is also worth noticing that most facilities are subsidized by one or more local jurisdictions. The Feasibility Study makes this observation and PARC's experience likewise bears out this operating reality. The subsidies typically include everything from cash for staffing, to in-kind support for utilities, maintenance, replacement, and cleaning. Given the fact that most community centers operate with support, it is reasonable to assume that the Hubbard facility will require some degree of ongoing support. The fact that there will not be a tenant in the building also reinforces this reality.

Nearby Communities

The closest communities to Hubbard are Woodburn, Aurora, and Donald. Woodburn is the largest with 21,790 people in 2004.⁶ Donald's 2004 population, according to the Population Research Center, was 660 and Aurora's was also 660. North Marion High School is located north of Hubbard and in the middle of the triangle of Donald – Hubbard – Aurora. Not surprisingly given their size, Donald and Aurora do not have community centers. Woodburn had a community center, but closed it because it was condemned and the residents opted not to replace it.

Succinctly put, there are no comparable facilities in the communities closest to Hubbard. Indeed, Woodburn does have a pool and other recreational facilities, but they are nonetheless restricted and there is no direct competition for the proposed community center.

⁶ 2004 figures in this paragraph all come from: Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.

Section 4: Local Partners and Users

Partners and Local Organizations Likely to Use the Proposed Facility

The surveys and conversations undertaken by the city and on its behalf in regards to the proposed center have identified a range of potential users and this is the logical place to start. Among the potential users are organizations that already use the City Council Chambers. One of these groups is Take Off Pounds Sensibly (TOPS), which has approximately 18 to 22 people attend each meeting. Neighborhood Watch also occasionally uses the City Hall and the number of attendees varies.

Other existing groups identified by the public survey process include a group of home schooling parents. The group includes approximately 40 to 50 families and they have a wide range of needs, including recreational objectives as well as organized activities. Another group is the Hubbard Organized for Progress and Safety (HOPS) Afterschool Program that serves approximately 25 children daily during afterschool hours. The group now uses the Hubbard Community Church. Locally, the Boy Scouts are another organization that has occasional needs for a large facility including a monthly meeting with approximately 100 people.

The local organization Program for Recreation Youth Development and Education (PRYDE) hosts a wide range of activities from T-ball to babysitting classes, art classes, and other athletic activities. The organization serves 300 to 400 children during some seasons and has diverse facility needs.

Along with the organizations identified by the city and surveyed, there are 13 other registered nonprofits in Hubbard or those with a Hubbard address.⁷ These organizations include the following.

- Air Heritage Inc – IRS ruling dated 2002, contact person is Jack Lenhardt
- Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International
- Future Farmers of America
- Gold Wing Road Riders Association – contributions are not deductible, IRS ruling dated 1983, contact person is Michael Bean
- Hubbard Hop Festival Inc
- Hubbard Organized for Progress & Safety – IRS ruling dated 1998
- Hubbard Parks Improvement Committee – IRS ruling dated 1996
- North Marion Boosters – IRS ruling dated 1973
- PTA Oregon Congress
- Two Rivers Farm – IRS ruling dated 1978, contact person is Beverly Viers
- WHK Soccer Club – IRS ruling dated 2004
- Woodburn Evangelical Church of North America

⁷ The following list was generated by the service "Guidestar," available at www.guidestar.org

The actual level of activity of each organization and how active they are in the community is not revealed by the available sources. Indeed, contact information is sparse and is typically a mailing address. However, the organizations do provide additional information about the activities that are, or have, taken place in Hubbard and who potential users might be. Of course, some organizations, such as the Hop Festival, are well known and may be one-weekend a year users of the facility. Likewise, the PTA, by definition, is likely to use school facilities and have no need of a Hubbard Community Center. At the very least, the number of local organizations helps remind the reader that there are groups that are potential users who may or may not be well known.

Building Partnerships

As the City of Hubbard moves forward, it will find that fund-raising is much easier if it can point to a diverse coalition of supporters, especially nonprofit supporters. Indeed, it may be necessary to work with a nonprofit organization to be eligible for some grant support. To facilitate this process, the city will need to formulate basic policies that announce its intention in terms of how it will operate the facility.

One operational option is to create a separate organization, either nonprofit or governmental, to operate the center. By creating a separate nonprofit the facility could be eligible to seek grant support for programs and it would also insulate the city from complaints about the minutia of daily operation. Another option is to identify an existing nonprofit that will operate the facility. Of course, the city could also retain control, but regardless it must identify its intentions to potential funders and users that it has thought about operational concerns. In particular, the city should decide if it will charge a user fee, will it seek to support "open" hours for use by the public, if so, will it charge a user fee then. Generally, what is the purpose of the fee, to support operations, to limit access, to cover a specific expense, or to encourage a sense of value.

Significantly, the decisions do not have to be complex, but instead signal the city's intentions and allow potential partners to better understand the potential relationship and use. The city should not bind itself to legal agreements, but instead identify the appropriate uses of the facility and its purpose as a community facility. Also, the city would do well to identify its general approach to scheduling and requirements for use. This can be as simple as first-come, first-served, or the identification of a responsible person and some type of liability waiver, assumption of liability or will users have to provide evidence of insurance.

Potential Partners Based on Hubbard Community Organizations and Demographics

The potential list of partners could stretch for pages and be little more than an academic exercise of the possible. Instead, the following list attempts to focus on the probable given the activities in the community, the changing demographics and the community discussions. The list below identifies the organization and a hypothesis as to how much or often the group would use the facility.

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Use Frequency / Amount</i>
TOPS	1 – 2 hrs a week
Neighborhood Watch	1 – 4 hrs a month
HOPS Afterschool Program	10 – 12 hrs a week
Boy Scouts	0 – 8 hrs a month
PRYDE	0 – 12 hrs a week
Hubbard Hop Festival Inc	0 – 20 hrs a year
Hubbard Organized for Progress and Safety	0 – 6 hrs a month
Hubbard Parks Improvement Committee	4 – 10 hrs a month
WHK Soccer Club	0 – 6 hrs a month
Total Per Month	16 – 52

The range above is wide and by definition dominated by conjecture. The hourly use rates come from the November 2004 survey done by the city, as well as extrapolation based on organizational missions and similar organizations elsewhere. Among the most reliable figures are those for the HOPS Afterschool Program, if they did indeed use the facility, as well as the organizations that use the City Hall. Other users, such as the Boy Scouts or the Hubbard Hops Festival, are likely to only use the facility once a year for a big event, even though that event would average out to a few hours a month over the course of a year.

What these figures suggest is that there may be plenty of organizations that will use the facility to justify creating a community center and operating it. However, just as surely the calculations demonstrate that it will be important for the city to reach out and attract users, as the potential use is quite variable. If the facility is not used, it will be judged unsuccessful and given the obvious need this would be regrettable.

Individual and Other Users

The potential users also include individuals and non-organized uses of the facility, depending on the way it is operated and run. Some communities offer open hours or free use periods during which individuals can use the facility and these people constitute another group of potential users. To offer such open hours requires staffing, which may be beyond the ability of the city to support at this date. Nonetheless, the city could work to create an intern position during the summers, or secure grant program support for specific activities in the future and thus expand the recreational offerings in the community.

As important as individual users might be, it is unlikely that individuals will go to the trouble of scheduling a time and date to use the facility absent an organized activity. Therefore, other potential users would be those groups that might be created or coalesce around the new opportunity a center would present. In such a case, a new recreation league or group might organize if they can reliably secure the center for a few hours two or three nights a week. Again, the city or some other center operator might have to help this happen too.

Many communities have dedicated senior centers, or organizations that tend to serve seniors, such as Legion Halls, which Hubbard lacks. The community center could further serve as a place for senior citizens to gather at prescribed times and even receive meals depending on the need and interest. Again, the most important factor will likely be interest and the presence of some person or organization willing to champion the use of the facility to serve senior citizens.

Another class of potential users consists of single event sponsors. These single events might include weddings, family reunions, class reunions, birthday parties, business events, special classes, seminars, or similar happenings. A common feature of community centers from Keizer to Stayton is to offer the facility for rent for weddings. Wineries, parks, bed and breakfast establishments, historic buildings, and ballrooms all cater to weddings and there is every reason to believe that a Hubbard facility will also see some use as a venue for weddings or similar events.

Locally, the Fellowship Hall is one facility that is available for rent for use as a wedding reception center, and the fee is \$125 for a day rental, plus \$190 for insurance and an additional fee to use the kitchen. Another facility relatively nearby is the Settlemier House in Woodburn. The Settlemier House is available for rental and it costs \$400 for the first three hours and \$85 for each additional hour.⁸ The house allows the renter to use any caterer, but they must hire a licensed beverage company to dispense beer or wine. The organization recommends booking several months in advance for a summer weekend event.

Two other comparable facilities, in that they are community centers available for rent, are the Stayton Community Center and the Keizer Heritage Center. The City of Stayton operates the Stayton Community Center and rental fees include any combination of chairs, tables, a podium, microphone, sound system, and a kitchen with two ovens and a sterilizer. Dishes must be hand washed. Security is required for groups up to 100 people at \$25/hr with a minimum of two officers. Extra officers are required for every 50 people over 100 at \$25/hr. If a guest wishes to serve alcohol, they may, but it requires a \$50 non-refundable beverage permit fee and a \$50 alcohol cleaning deposit, which is refundable but based on inspection by city employee. Rates for the center are as follows:

- *Private use of whole facility:* (223 people w/tables/chairs, 479 people w/chairs) - \$100 cleaning fee (non-refundable) - \$22.20/hr. rental
- *2/3 rental w/kitchen access:* (147 people w/tables/chairs, 315 people w/chairs) - \$65 cleaning fee (non-refundable) - \$17.25/hr rental
- *1/3 rental w/out kitchen access:* (76 people w/tables/chairs, 164 people w/chairs) - \$35 cleaning fee (non-refundable) - \$12.30/hr rental

The Keizer Heritage Foundation operates a restored historic building on Chemawa Road. The facility is available for events and celebrations.⁹ The facilities can hold 185 people for a reception or 100 at tables for a sit down meal. Prices are as follows.

⁸ Pricing and policy data comes from an email message to PARC Staff from Cindy Thomas on January 12, 2005.

⁹ See their Web page: <http://www.keizerheritage.org/>

- Weddings or Receptions (8 hours only) - Large Room \$600 Patio Only (no kitchen) \$250
Large Room and Patio \$700
- Anniversaries, Birthdays and Social Events (Not available Monday evenings)
 - (4 hour rental) Large Room \$250 Half Room \$150 Patio Only (no kitchen) \$125
Large Room and Patio \$350
 - (8 hour rental) Large Room \$450 Half Room \$250 Patio Only (no kitchen) \$200
Large Room and Patio \$550
- Meetings, Classes and Seminars
- Large Room for 8 hours \$150 Large Room for four hours \$100 Half Room for eight hours \$100 Half Room for four hours \$ 75

The city can build a more complete pricing guide once the facility actually exists, but the above data does provide a snapshot of what other entities do with community facilities and what the revenue potential is. Based on the review of other facilities it is clear that typical users include the following:

- Special events
- Weddings
- Birthdays
- Family reunions
- Classes
 - Red Cross
 - Car seat seminars
 - Parenting classes
 - Cooking classes
 - Seminars
- Trainings
- Athletic leagues
- Group therapy i.e. Alcoholics Anonymous
- Homeschoolers
- Youth groups
 - Boy Scouts
 - Girl Scouts
 - Campfire
- After school programs
- Diversion programs
- Lecture series
- Senior Center
- Community celebrations
- Performers
- Art shows and displays

Section 5: Services

The primary purpose of the proposed community center will likely be to meet as many needs and uses as possible, with minimum specialization and thus minimum costs. The more specialized the space, the fewer uses that are appropriate and the more it costs. Thus, the design calls, at least preliminarily, for two rooms, one of which will be a multiple use gymnasium space with room for a half of a basketball court or more. The second room will be smaller with space for separate activities. At present, the plans tentatively also call for a warming kitchen, integrated into the main room, likely within an alcove along the same wall as the mechanical room or storage rooms.

Given that the focus on the facility's design will be on multiple purposes, the services that can and will be offered from the center can be diverse, if not specialized. For example, the facility will not be able to be a senior meal center because it will not have a commercial kitchen. However, it could serve as a site where seniors could come to and receive meals, but they cannot be prepared there.

The following list includes the most likely services that will be offered from the facility.

- Recreation services
- Rental for weddings, events, reunions, etc
- Meeting space
- Afterschool program(s)
- Athletic leagues
- Reading room – pending identification of an organization wishing to operate it
- Small performing arts hall
- Warming kitchen for concessions at events in the park or in the center
- Community lectures, seminars and trainings

Significantly, the services that will be offered out of the center will be done by organizations other than the city. Relying on the city to offer services is not a practical or cost effective strategy. Staff is expensive and the city does not appear to have the resources to support the cost. At the same time, the city can take responsibility for scheduling use at the center and for checking out users, in terms of collecting fees, distributing keys and ensuring the center is cleaned properly to determine whether or not to return cleaning deposits.

While the city is not going to offer services, there is every reason to suspect that there are more than enough potential users to offer varied services at the center. Indeed, given the rate of growth the city has undergone and it will likely see, the center may become booked solidly within five to ten years as people come to recognize the potential it holds. Already the Hops Afterschool Program could use the center every day in the afterschool hours. Other communities see their centers used by homeschoolers, by daycare providers, by recreation providers, as well as groups as diverse from Alcoholics Anonymous to Weight Watchers and local arts groups.

Assuming that the groups can afford a modest fee and that renters who use it for weddings are charged a fee similar to the Fellowship Hall, the center should be able to cover the majority of the costs associated with maintaining it. The following budget extrapolates expenses and potential revenue based on the assumptions discussed in this document. The budget assumes there is no debt servicing requirement.

Expenses	Amount
Utilities @ \$1.75 per square foot per year – 7,000 sq. ft	\$12,250
Maintenance & replacement	\$ 1,250
Insurance	\$ 2,000
Cleaning	\$ 4,500
Trash	\$ 480
Advertising, printing etc	\$ 500
Total:	\$20,980

Revenues	Amount
Event rental Fees 2 days per month @ \$150 per	\$ 3,600
Forfeited cleaning fees	\$ 400
Athletic league fees	\$ 500
Donations	\$ 3,950
Performances / lectures / training rental fees 1 day per month	\$ 1,800
Fees from Hops & homeschoolers other regular programs – - @ \$150 / month for three users	\$ 5,400
Fees from TOPS & similar Groups	\$ 1,200
In-Kind water, sewer, trash, cleaning, maintenance from city	\$ 4,130
Total:	\$20,980

Section 6: Conclusions

Given the city's revenue and the current menu of community services it is unlikely that the city is going to be able to take the lead in offering services at the proposed Hubbard Community Center. Consequently, it makes sense to build a facility that can host multiple uses and is flexible enough to meet the fullest possible range of uses and users. At the same time, this strategy demands little specialization, which means that it will not be ideal for everyone. However, this is the reality of small communities and people who demand the fullest menu of services do not tend to live in places like Hubbard. Fortunately, the quality of life available in Hubbard makes the trade-off worthwhile to most.

The multiple use approach also serves to keep costs as low as possible and this is an important concern given the survey results. The survey indicated strong support in some quarters for a facility, but also healthy skepticism about it as well. A modest facility will strike a balance and give proponents an opportunity to demonstrate just how valuable it can be. Assuming that the center will be full and quickly booked to capacity, it may be that the city is able to consider a second phase, either in the park, or at a different site.

Significantly, the facility outlined here is consistent with those developed in other rural communities, especially when starting from scratch. In the case of communities with considerably larger facilities there are usually different variables, such as a pre-existing building, or a large bond measure used to finance the facility. Since a multi-million dollar bond is unlikely to be approved, the alternative is to pursue a modest facility of 5,000 to 7,500 square feet that will be used, which is precisely what is recommended.

Finally, a facility of approximately 7,000 square feet is designed efficiently and economically could be built for \$110 to \$120 per square foot exclusive of land and professional fees. The total for such a project is \$770,000 to \$840,000. Given a modest bond or low interest loan, the total is something that the city is likely to be able to raise within 12 to 24 months relying on local donations and private foundations for approximately two-thirds to three-fourths of the total.

Capital Capacity Analysis

City of Hubbard: Community Center Capital Capacity Analysis

Introduction

The City of Hubbard has commissioned Public Affairs Research Consultants (PARC) to analyze the capacity of the community to raise funding for a community center to be tentatively located in Barendse Park. The purpose of the analysis is to identify a target amount that is reasonable and can be raised in a timely fashion to meet the local needs and fit the perceptions of the private funding community based on the size and demographics of Hubbard. As a part of the determination, PARC is charged with identifying sources from Hubbard and its environs that have the potential to serve as a "local match" to outside funding principally from private foundations and trusts.

Organization

This study is organized into the following 10 major sections, with appropriate support, documentation, and discussion sections.

Section 1: Local Fund-Raising Capacities and Constraints.

Section 2: Funding Options Available for Consideration

Section 3: Governmental Programs

Section 4: Private Foundations

Section 5: Businesses and Corporate Foundations

Section 6: Individual Donations Events

Section 7: Debt and Bond Financing

Section 8: Other Organizations and Facilities

Section 9: Organizational Capacity

Section 10: Capital Scope Recommendation

Section 1: Local Fund-Raising Capacities and Constraints

Introduction

The proposed community center would primarily serve the City of Hubbard, its residents and in secondary fashion the people of the North Marion School District, or the surrounding rural areas of northern Marion County. Because of the relatively small service area, this analysis will emphasize the town of Hubbard as the area from which local donations would have to come to support the facility.

There are scenarios whereby the potential users and beneficiaries of the facility could include a broader region, but most likely to draw people from as far away as Woodburn would require a much more sophisticated and elaborate facility than the site can support. Consequently, the support for the center is much more likely to come from the immediate community.

The reason for the concern about defining and identifying local funding is that traditionally, most outside funding sources prefer to wait until significant local funds have been raised to support a project. Just what "significant" means or entails is a moving target but, as a minimum, 5 to 10 percent is a good place to start, although depending on the project and community characteristics, some funders may expect to see a 25 to 50 percent local match. There is no absolute formula for determining what the local contribution should be, and the characteristics of the community served are important. Likewise, outside funders prefer to see site control and solid cost estimates, along with evidence that the project is needed. In conjunction with the need, funders like to see a commitment to the project from those benefiting from the organization or project.

Significantly, as outside funders look at a project, the total amount contributed is indeed important. However, just as important, if not more so, is the number of people who gave. Evidence that a large percentage of households have given to a project, even if it was only five or ten dollars per household, is compelling evidence of need and support.

Of course, this analysis is about determining what the community can afford to give, and what a reasonable target looks like for Hubbard. Thus, a good place to begin is with a look at specific local characteristics, including demographic and income data.

Demographics¹

The City of Hubbard is a small community, traditionally agriculturally based, in northern Marion County. The community has seen rapid growth over the last 15 years and is coming up against the practical limits, as almost all lands within the urban growth boundary have been developed, or are under development. In 1990, the population was 1,881, and by 2000, it had grown 35 percent to 2,483.² According to the Population Research Center at Portland State University, the city's population in 2004 was 2,750.³

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, which is the most recent data available, the per capita income is just \$14,383, compared to the figure for Marion County which, is \$18,408, or the state figure of \$20,940. The median household and median family incomes are likewise low and are related in Table 1 below.

Table 1

	Median Household Income	Median Family Income	Per Capita Income
Hubbard	\$38,850	\$42,552	\$14,383
Oregon	\$40,916	\$48,680	\$20,940
Marion County	\$40,314	\$46,202	\$18,408
City as % of Oregon	94.9%	87.4%	68.7%
City as % of Marion County	96.4%	92.1%	78.1%

Data from 2000 US Census

What is most striking about the income comparisons is that although the median household and family incomes are not significantly lower than the county figures, the per capita income is very low. The low per capita income figure reflects the most accurate nature of need and resources because it takes account of the large number of dependent children in the community who are not in the workforce.⁴ A larger proportion of young children and families with children tends to bring down the per capita figures while not affecting the computation of the median household and family incomes.

One significant caveat that deserves mentioning is that it is impossible to determine the characteristics of the almost 300 people who have moved to Hubbard since the last census. Moreover, the current housing development underway will build up-scale units and attract a clientele that will likely increase the relative wealth of the residents. Examining the population of Hubbard reveals several other important characteristics that bear on who will use the proposed center. The median age of Hubbard is a young 29.2 years and the population 18 years and younger constitute 34.5 percent of the residents. By contrast, in Marion County those under 18 make up 27.4 percent of the population and just 24.7 percent of all Oregonians are 18 or younger. The county median age is 33.7 years and the Oregon median is 36.3 years. Not

¹ Parts of this section are excerpted from the City of Hubbard Community Center Needs Assessment drafted by PARC, June, 2005.

² 1990 US Census. & 2000 US Census.

³ Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.

⁴ 2000 US Census. Unless noted otherwise the demographic figures in this and the following paragraphs come from this source.

surprisingly, the city has a relatively small senior citizen population, as just 7.2 percent of residents are over age 65. Senior citizens comprise 12.4 percent of the county population and 12.8 percent of the state population.

The age figures all bear out the observation that Hubbard is home to a disproportionately large population of young people and this is reflected in the household size as well. The average household has 3.30 members and the average family size is 3.67 members. By contrast the figures for the county are 2.70 and 3.19 respectively and in the state the numbers are even smaller at 2.51 and 3.02 members respectively. Just as telling is the fact that in Hubbard the 2000 U.S. Census identified 753 households, of which 595 or 79 percent were family households. Thus, the overwhelming majority of households are family units and this is important to understanding who will use the center. Of the 753 households, fully 350 are families with their own minor children in the home. Examining the marital status of the population over the age of 15, which is where the 2000 U.S. Census breaks down the figures, fully 83.2 percent of the population is either married, or has never married. As of 2000 57.7 percent of the population was married and just 11.5 percent were divorced.

One of the more remarkable features of Hubbard, especially given its population of young children, is that it lacks public schools. Strategically located as it is between Portland and Salem, Hubbard is a suitable bedroom community for these larger urban areas and new housing developments continue to draw young families with children. Local children attend the North Marion School District that combines the children of Aurora, Donald and Hubbard. Consequently, Hubbard lacks a facility that can perform many of the public functions that schools fill in other communities. For example, the community does not have a large meeting room, a place for children's activities, groups, or events. Furthermore, the city has a limited park system, especially considering the population of almost 3,000 people. The largest park is Barendse Park, which is more than seven acres, but other than this park, the remainder of the parks are small. There is a park near the community center that covers one block while the others are approximately one city block.

The area surrounding Hubbard is largely agricultural and the development has encompassed the available land inside the urban growth boundary. Consequently, there is little to no land for future developments and the direction of growth is a matter of conjecture, depending on where the boundary is eventually moved. Given the current development, the last remaining large residentially zoned land is owned by the school district and there is little evidence they are interested in selling.

When considering education, it is worth noting that within the community there may well be some demand for facilities to cater to those seeking educational opportunities. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, just 10.4 percent of the population over age 25 had a Bachelor's degree or higher, compared to the county rate of 19.8 percent and state rate of 25 percent. Given the relative educational attainment and the absence of a library, there may be demand for such services, depending on the configuration of the center.

Another type of facility that some cities use to serve as community centers are American Legion halls or VFW halls. However, in Hubbard, the percentage of civilian veterans is also relatively low at 11.1 percent compared to 14.5 percent and 15.1 percent for the state. This means that in Hubbard 187 people are veterans.

An examination of the ethnicity in Hubbard reveals that 32.7 percent of the population identifies itself as Hispanic or Latino, while the second largest minority is Native American at just 1.9 percent. African Americans comprise just 0.3 percent of the population and the balance identified themselves as White. Not surprisingly, 27.3 percent of the residents reported speaking Spanish at home while 17.0 percent of all respondents reported they speak English less than "very well."

Discussion of Demographics

The upshot of the demographics described above is that the city's residents are not comparatively wealthy, but at the same time conditions are not bad enough to qualify it for special programs and many grant funds. Specifically, the city does not qualify for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, which would otherwise be the best source of funding for such a project. The only caveat to this condition is that if the facility could demonstrate that at least 50 percent of the people it serves are at or below the low and moderate-income bracket. However, this is doubtful and it would require considerable paperwork for years.

Given the relative lack of wealth and the small size, combined with the young population, the potential for large individual gifts is relatively small. Thus, it will be incumbent on project proponents to build a comprehensive campaign that focuses on getting even a little bit from as many people as possible. As noted earlier, the total number of people or households that contribute are important markers of community support and this is a better target for Hubbard based on the consideration of the local economy, local wealth and demographic factors.

Section 2: Funding Options Available for Consideration

The City of Hubbard and proponents of building a community center have many funding options, which fall into eight main categories. These categories include the following:

- Government programs
- Grants
- Fee waivers
- Private foundations
- Businesses and corporations
- Individual donations
- Events
- Debt

A potential ninth category, endowment and investment income, is not an option for the city. Cash reserves could constitute another category as well, but presently the city has not identified this as a viable option for the project.

Each funding option carries relative costs and benefits and is divisible into sub-categories by geographical area, size, and other variables. Regardless, the funders represent not only options but also categories to pursue, so that a thorough funding campaign would include each and every type. Indeed, in a rural county and rural community, the best capital campaigns leave no proverbial stone unturned and no potential donor un-asked.

Significantly, each of the categories has opportunities for the city. The full range of programs and funders is discussed in subsequent sections, but it is worth noting here that within the rubric of "private foundations," there are local foundations, regional foundations, and national foundations that all are potential sources of support. Likewise, the full range of local fund-raising opportunities deserves complete consideration as the organization moves forward.

Section 3: Government Programs

In many ways, governmental funding is the most attractive way to finance a community facility. Moreover, there are many examples in Oregon of governmental support being used to build, remodel, or create civic centers, including recreational centers. Within the category of governmental programs, there are local, state, and federal funding sources that the proponents of the center can pursue.

Community Development Block Grant

By far the most popular mechanism is the Community Development Block Grant. The program funds come from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the grants are available in amounts up to \$800,000. However, while the city is an eligible applicant, the percentage of low and moderate-income residents is not high enough to qualify the project.

The Oregon Economic and Community Development Department administers the CDBG program, but it carries several qualifiers. First and foremost, a CDBG must be used to benefit a population consisting of at least 51 percent low and moderate-income individuals. Unless Hubbard can find a way to argue that the building will serve an eligible population, it will not be able to access this source of funding.

Other Oregon Funding

Unfortunately, the economic downturn starting in 2000 resulted in the gutting of most other granting programs operated by the state. The Oregon Housing and Community Development Department was operating the Community Incentive Fund, but it has not received appropriations over the last two budget cycles, although it would be a good potential funding source if it were reauthorized. Likewise, the Regional Economic Alliance has fewer resources today and is not a likely source.

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department offers grants to support municipal parks throughout Oregon and because the proposed project is a recreational facility located in a park, it is nominally eligible. Unfortunately, indoor facilities are not a priority in Oregon's "Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan" (SCORP), which the Department uses to guide its funding decisions. Indeed, the word "outdoor" is a major indicator that the proposed community center is not likely to find ready support from the Department.

City and County Support

Typically, municipalities and counties have little direct support to offer nonprofits, especially rural jurisdictions. As noted above, a CDBG will require partnering with a city or county, but it is unlikely that either will have available cash for a project. However, there are other important contributions that cities and counties can make. For example, a municipality can waive permit and development fees. Likewise, cities and counties sometimes have work crews available, as well as equipment and materials. In some places, depending on the severity of the winter storm season, some counties have contributed road crews and county equipment to pave, excavate, and move materials. Moreover, some counties or cities have been willing to donate crushed rock for footings and below concrete slabs, depending on their budgets and the community support for the project. Securing these resources typically requires developing a relationship with the city or county officials and a persistent advocate who is willing to cajole those officials.

Federal Grants

The potential sources of federal grants are few and there are no ongoing federal programs that fit this proposed project. Potential funders might include the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Education, or even the Department of Justice. Unfortunately, most potential grants would be special programs and initiatives, which will require the project proponents to monitor the Federal Register to identify potential funding opportunities. Based on the last year of grant offerings, the project is unlikely to find ready federal grant funding.

Federal Loan Programs

The question of debt financing is discussed at length below, but the federal government does offer low-interest loan financing of community facilities. The best source for such funding in Oregon is the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and again, it is discussed more fully below.

Section 4: Private Foundations

Compared to other states and regions, Oregon and the Pacific Northwest have a higher density of private foundations than most other places in the west, or even the nation. The presence of private foundations creates opportunities for nonprofits to secure significant funding for projects and programs from outside their communities. For the proposed community center in Hubbard, this is certainly the case, and there are several foundations and trusts that represent good potential sources of funding.

Important Variables and Concerns

Private funders in Oregon, and to a lesser degree, those in the Pacific Northwest, tend to talk to one another and respond to shared challenges. Thus, many of them have similar concerns when they review a project or application. These common concerns include the following:

- Is the project scope appropriate for the community, the applicant, and the goals?
- Has the local community demonstrated support for the project – specifically, has it given local resources to help make it happen?
- Is the project sustainable?
- Is the funding plan reasonable, and will it be completed in a timely fashion?

Local Support

Examining the above list of funder concerns, there really is no one constraining question for the community center, but instead all of the questions have real relevance to the ability of the project proponents to find funding. With that said, there is one concern that may be more difficult than the others for the project champions to answer, specifically, is there a need and local support. The easiest question to answer is that of scope, the project, as envisioned, is relatively modest and consistent with the size of the community. At the point of this writing, the budgeting and suggested service model identifies a facility that is sustainable and the timetables currently possess no red flags or potential concerns.

As noted earlier, local support can come in many different forms, but it is essential nonetheless. Of course, cash donations from the community are the most helpful in demonstrating local support. Other important measures come in the form of letters of support, donations of in-kind materials and labor, as well as a tax assessment. If the residents are willing to tax themselves to support a project or facility, it is a compelling demonstration of local support.

There are many ways to solicit local support as will be discussed later, but they include directly solicited cash donations, participation in fund-raisers or events, sales of commemorative bricks, pavers or plaques, as well as by selling memberships or naming rights.

Funding Sources

Increasingly, foundations have exhibited a preference for funding late in the process. Specifically, two of the three biggest private funders have announced that they prefer to be “cap-off” funders. What this means is that the presence of local funds is vital to attracting private grants. The preference of the two foundations—to be the final funder into a project—does not necessarily mean that both will not participate in the same project, but it does mean that the organization capitalizing the proposed community center must show that its dollars will at least leverage the final grant needed to complete fund-raising.

Of course, the above discussion assumes that an applicant can make a clear and compelling case demonstrating the need for the proposed project or program. In this key factor, the proponents of the community center will have to gather letters of support, testimonials and support from throughout the community if it is going to make a strong and compelling case. Doing this will not only help in attracting foundation support, but it will also build local support and ensure success.

Funding Potential with Private Foundations and Trusts

Most private funders have a mission statement and funding philosophy that they seek to follow as they distribute grants. However, almost all funders, with the exception of those that focus on the arts or the environment, will fit a Hubbard Community Center. Indeed, all of the large foundations have guidelines and priorities that fit a community center that caters to multiple populations and groups. The obvious fact that the center will serve a community with at-risk members and a rural, underserved population in general makes a compelling case for support.

The need, the importance of the project, and the ability to answer the four questions above affirmatively should translate into real fund-raising ability for the proposed center and the project. When Oregon nonprofits seek out grant support, their initial strategy is to approach the three largest funders, which are the Meyer Memorial Trust, the Ford Family Foundation, and the M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust. Between them, the organization should find a responsive audience that is familiar with rural Oregon and its challenges. Significantly, Ford and Murdock both prefer to be one of the last, if not the final, funders into a project, and Meyer has been increasingly concerned that the project be substantially funded before becoming involved. For a project of this scope, a realistic, conservative goal for funding from the largest foundations combined is \$100,000 to \$150,000, assuming they are approached after local support is evident.

There is a “second tier” of foundations, in terms of the amounts typically granted. For example, the Collins Foundation should be interested in the project and willing to give at a level between \$25,000 and \$50,000, if they like the project. A challenge that this project faces is that there are relatively few “second tier” foundations that fund in the county.

A third tier of funders, those that give from \$2,000 to \$15,000, will constitute a very important part of the fund-raising effort, as they signal broad support for the project. Some foundations specifically address youth, recreation, education, and seniors, while others emphasize community facilities and general benefits. The foundations and trusts that fit into this category include the following:

- Autzen Foundation
- Bank of America
- W. Glen Boyd Foundation
- Max and Victoria Dreyfus Foundation
- A.J. Frank Family Foundation
- Robert Hemingway Foundation
- Henry L. Hillman Foundation
- Irwin Foundation
- Lannan Foundation
- Manley Foundation
- Charlotte Martin Foundation
- Oregon Community Foundation
- Trust Management Services
- Rose E. Tucker Charitable Trust
- U.S. Bank
- Verizon Wireless
- Wells Fargo Charitable Contributions
- Juan Young Trust

From this group, the capitalization effort for the center can reasonably expect to raise from \$45,000 to \$65,000, depending on how thorough an effort the campaign makes. In particular, some of the listed funders look more favorably on a project endorsed by their local representatives, offices, or board members. This is especially true for the banks and for the Oregon Community Foundation. The bank foundations are included above because they tend to be divorced from corporate operations, but there are other corporate giving programs and foundations that the project can and should pursue.

Conclusion

A community center in Hubbard should be able to raise \$150,000 to \$300,000 through grants from private foundations and trusts, given a reasonably aggressive campaign and grant writing effort. Support from local sources listed above can also be used to leverage giving from businesses and corporations. Significantly, the total above assumes that the grant writing for the project will be undertaken by a nonprofit organization with a logical connection to the proposed center and the community. The people championing the project will need to find an existing nonprofit, because a new nonprofit, created for the campaign, will probably not have the experience or track-record necessary to impress funders. Moreover, the nonprofit used for fund-raising for the project cannot simply be a pass through organization with no obvious connection to the parks, the center and the community.

The projected total of \$150,000 to \$300,000 may appear modest at first blush, and it deserves explanation. Community facilities, especially multiple use centers, are not currently in vogue, although in general families and children are. At the same time, a facility owned by the city and operated by the city constitutes a clear public project with public benefits that most funders will expect the residents to fund. In addition, the facility is certainly conceived as an appropriately sized structure that fits the needs, as well as the area, but the city has no experience operating a community center and that will make it relatively more risky to private foundations who like to see evidence of past success.

Significantly, part of the reason for the relatively modest projection in grant raising ability is the lack of a track record in the community. There are no other facilities or projects that have introduced the community to the granting community and little evidence of local capacity to support such a project. However, if the community center is a success, there is every reason to believe that it would create opportunities for future fund-raising for other Hubbard initiatives. The adage that "nothing succeeds like success" is apt, in that once communities and organizations prove they can deliver on their promises, manage a project and produce benefits, it makes them more likely to find support in the future. Thus, if Hubbard has plans or designs on future projects, a successful community facility such as the proposed center will make fund-raising for them easier, providing the center is successful.

Not only does a successful project resonate with funders, it also creates local momentum that can create optimism in a community. If the residents have not seen a local project be successful in their midst, they are more likely to believe it is not possible. Once they see however, that they can come together to create a community facility, they are more likely to support future projects, more likely to donate to future efforts and become involved themselves. Ultimately, this project can spur donors and residents to focus on building a strong community, which is much more important than just building a structure.

Section 5: Businesses and Corporate Foundations

Corporate giving programs tend to rely heavily on local representatives and their endorsements. If a local representative is willing to champion a project, it stands a much better chance of being funded. Moreover, some local representatives have discretionary funding for nonprofits, and any request should start with the local manager. Unfortunately, Hubbard has limited corporate presence in the community and this limits the potential to tap these deeper pockets. The following corporations either have a stated presence, or it is likely that, for example, the insurance companies do business in the community.

Allstate Insurance
Key Bank
Shell Oil
Farmer's Insurance
State Farm
Chevrolet
Furniture Outlet
Turf-Seed
Ulven Companies

The above list is not exhaustive, but it reflects the paucity of corporations with a local presence. For the most part, Hubbard businesses tend to be ones that are local and consequently have limited abilities to give. The local businesses include the following:

777 Market
A&D Chiropractic
99E Classic Antiques
Action Metal
Acu-Tex
All Resistant Coatings
Am / PM Janitorial
American Marine Service
American Sportsman
Barry & Company
Bonnets & Curls
Burger Hut
Center Stage
CitiHomes Group
Commercial Westside Drywall
Conifer Pacific
Countryside Construction
D&D Concrete & Utilities
DMK (property management)
Don Sprague Sales
Dream Dresses

Dressen Design
Duty Fence co.
Engleman Electric
Executive Motors
Fjord Ltd.
Formco Machinery
Garcia's Upholstery
John I Hass Inc
Highway 99E Cars & Trucks
Hi-Class Painting
Homestead Family Steak House
Hubbard Auto Wiring
Hubbard Cleaners & Laundromat
Hubbard Inn
Hubbard Market
Hubbard Self-Storage
In His Image
JB Enterprises
JK Delights
Jerky Hut
Joan Vires Income Tax

Judy's Faithful Companion Grooming
 K&K Properties
 Ken's Auto Body
 Kriegesco Manufacturing
 Latino's Auto Repair
 Little Ones Daycare
 Loxscreen Co.
 Medina's Auto Repair & Body Shop
 Mid Valley Cycles
 Mocha Delight
 Morgenthaler & Graham
 NW Leisure Products
 Cates RV
 National Security Safe Co.
 Nursery Connection
 One Dog
 Parker Buildings
 Poker Parrot
 Rack-Strap

Russell Manufacturing
 Sabas Auto Repair
 Saddle Mt. Meats
 Ann Schultz
 Sideco Building Products
 Senior Lopez
 Restaurante y Taqueria
 Stone Works
 The Water Doctor
 Thomas Products
 Trish's Hair Station
 Ultrapure Solutions
 Variedades Lopez Gifts
 Voget meats
 Walex Drywall
 Webb Core Inc
 Western Farm Service
 Xincom Corporation

In-Kind Donations

While cash is the most desirable donation for any campaign, in-kind donations can be just as important for a capital campaign. Given that the proposed project seeks to build or create a physical structure, the most logical sources of in-kind donations are building supply stores, but tradesmen and builders should not be neglected. Many nonprofits have sought and secured donations from electricians, plumbers, concrete suppliers, dry-wallers, roofers, carpenters, flooring specialists, landscapers, garage door installers, window and door manufacturers, and any other trade or service that building a community multiple-purpose center requires.

Locally, the sources for such donations are relatively limited, but they do exist. A review of the Hubbard city business registry reveals builders, dry-wallers, and tradesmen, although in limited numbers.⁵ Invariably, board members will have connections to different people and firms in the business community, and these links should be exploited. Additionally, many firms discount work to nonprofits.

A caveat in regards to in-kind donations should be recognized, however. To be able to "count" these donations, so that private funders will recognize them as legitimate contributions or responses to a challenge, the gifts need to be made in writing. Additionally, if government funds are ultimately used in the project, there are likely to be requirements for bidding the project that may make it difficult to realize the in-kind donations. If a firm, for example, has agreed to donate \$2,500 worth of materials when it does the job but does not get the bid, then that donation is probably gone, too. Also, once donations have been secured from one electrician, for example, there is no real advantage to seeking additional donations from electricians, especially if labor is a component of the donation.

⁵ City of Hubbard, available at: <http://www.open.org/~hubbard/buslst01.htm>. Accessed July 22, 2005.

Utilities

The utility sector is another type or market segment whose members are potential supporters of the project In Hubbard, the following utilities may be able to offer a range of support, from cash to in-kind donations:

Willamette Broadband
Qwest
PGE
NW Natural Gas
United Disposal
Ferrell Gas

Conclusion

Business and corporate donors are in many ways the most difficult type of donation to secure for local nonprofits. The large gifts tend to go to projects at corporate headquarters, and often, local managers do not know about the corporate giving programs or are simply too busy. Nonetheless, they do constitute a potentially important source of support. Whether corporate support comes in the form of a grant or in-kind donation, it would be calculated as a local match for private foundations; the bottom line is that corporate donations will help move the organization closer to its fund-raising goal.

Given the relatively low number of companies with corporate giving programs that have a presence in the county and the local economic conditions, a goal of \$10,000 to \$25,000 is a reasonable target. A commitment on the part of the board and staff should be enough to secure that level of support.

Section 6: Individual Donations and Events

There are many mechanisms that nonprofits use to solicit donations from individuals. Organizations with membership bases run mailing campaigns; others buy mailing lists and distribute bulk solicitations. Many use fund-raising events or operate concessions at larger events. Some nonprofits sell commemorative bricks, pavers, or plaques. Other venues allow donors to name buildings, rooms, or trees, or to put a tag on the items their dollars purchase. This is popular with theater seats, for example. Regardless of the mechanism, individuals tend to require a bigger investment than grants, both in terms of time and dollars.

Generally, PARC recommends against commemorative bricks or pavers because they entail a perpetual maintenance cost. Bricks and pavers also cost the organization to purchase and have engraved. However, some organizations like the idea and are happy with the results. Smaller communities have very good luck with events organized around a related theme. Walla Walla's Planned Parenthood uses a wine auction to raise annual operating funds, and people travel from Seattle to participate. The Harney County Library uses a barbecue feed with an auction of books signed by the authors. Doernbecher Children's Hospital in Portland uses a black-tie dinner and ball. Domestic Violence Services in Pendleton hosts a golf tournament, while Homestead Youth and Family Services hosts a bowling tournament. In addition to some logical connections between the nonprofit and the event, the most important thing is that somebody in each agency has a passion for the event and is willing to undertake the organization required.

Once the decision to move forward has been made by the citizen and residents, it will be important to erect signage to announce that the project is underway. Project champions must make every effort to let people know about the effort, since local press is the best friend a capital campaign can have. Cultivating the local press should be done carefully and with an understanding of the deadlines and competing pressures. Plenty of lead-time and pictures of people doing something more than accepting a check are things that most newspapers appreciate.

Target

As always, a target for fund-raising requires an analysis of the local conditions. Given the service-based economy and the population, a target of \$2.25 to \$5.00 per person is appropriate. Two and a quarter dollars per person would yield almost \$6,200, and \$5.00 would represent \$13,750. Assuming that local funding should produce at least 10 percent of the cost—ideally at least 15 percent—this level of funding would only support a project of \$137,000 in a fashion that would make a convincing case to private funders.

Simply put, donations from local individuals will have to either be much higher, or the giving from local businesses, the city or local nonprofit will have to be considerably more. The importance of strong local support in the project funding mix cannot be overstated, unless the nonprofit is lucky enough to be able to find a single donor.

Bond or Levy

The type of debt most readily available to the people of Hubbard is a bond or a levy, which amounts to debt financing through the city. Given the demographics, the presence of funders in the community and the other resources available, a bond offers the project proponents the best possible source of funding.

A nice thing about a bond or debt funding is that many outside funders, especially private foundations, look at it as a local contribution. Indeed a bond is a vote of the populace to give their dollars to the specified project and it is a good lever to use to attract additional funding. Of course, it is not as good as direct donations, but it is an effective tool.

Worth noting, is the fact that when communities do opt to use a bond for a project, it tends to create a sense that "I've already given" among the residents. Thus, the use of a bond or levy may make other fund-raising efforts in the community more difficult to pursue. Nonetheless, without a bond or significant local contribution, it is difficult to conceive of this project being successfully funded.

The prospect of a bond also deserves attention when considering a Hubbard Community Center because there is evidence that it would be well received. Based on the city mailed survey, 75 percent of respondents indicated that if a bond cost less than \$5 per household per month they would support it. Assuming a bond of approximately \$252,000 Wedbush Morgan Securities calculated that at current rates, the cost would be \$26.52 per year for a household of \$150,000 assessed value, or \$2.21 per month.⁶ The rates assume a 20-year bond payback period and current rates, if rates increase, then the cost of borrowing will too.

Assuming that the survey was accurate, it is likely that a bond may find success at the hands of local voters. If a bond were in place, then the project would immediately become much more attractive to outside funders, assuming that the bond would cover at least a third to a half of the total project costs. The relatively modest expense of \$2.21 per average household per month is likely within the capabilities of most residents.

⁶ Wedbush Morgan Securities, "General Obligation Bonds, Estimated Level Levy Structure," August 15, 2005. Provided to PARC by the City of Hubbard.
City of Hubbard: Community Center Capital Capacity Analysis
Prepared by Public Affairs Research Consultants

Section 7: Debt Financing

The usual responses to suggestion of debt are fear and loathing. Given the shrinking governmental budgets, poor economy over the last five years and general taxpayer attitudes, this is not surprising. Nonetheless, given the other avenues available to the proponents of a Hubbard Community Center, some sort of debt financing appears to be one of the best, if not the best way to raise the necessary funds locally. Thus, it makes sense to note some of the opportunities.

If the city is going to pursue a bond, it would be well advised to do so during a general election so that they do not have to pay a fee to place the issue on the ballot.

USDA

One of the most attractive low-interest loan programs available to nonprofits or communities is the USDA Rural Development Community Facilities Direct Loan Program. The program offers loan terms up to 40 years, and the rate is discounted based on the prime. Most recently, the rate has been in the 4.5 percent range. Over 40 years, the loan amounts to a payment of \$460 per month per \$100,000 borrowed.

The Community Facilities Direct Loan Program also has limited grant funds, but they typically are awarded as a package. The grant program has relatively little funding available and is not a viable option for the project proponents unless it is also going to pursue a loan.

Although the Community Facilities Direct Loan Program is an excellent way to secure low-interest loan funds, it still must be secured by collateral, just like any loan. The proposed building can serve as collateral, but the borrower must also be able to show a revenue stream that can service the debt. Moreover, USDA involvement mandates a specific bid process, plan review by an USDA architect and other control systems that do tend to slow the project down, or at least slow the pre-construction phase of the project.

Because the center will not generate significant funding, the city would have to guarantee income from some source and this probably makes a bond a more attractive option. Of course, the longer payback period reduces the cost, but at the same time it creates the long-term obligation.

Oregon Economic and Community Development Department

The Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD) was discussed earlier under the Community Development Block Grant section. The OECDD also administers loan programs but emphasizes economic development. Of course, the OECDD does make loans unrelated to economic development, but based on past projects and PARC discussions with program staff, the project would not be a good fit for one of these projects. Unless the Hubbard Community Center is going to incorporate an economic development activity into the center, the OECDD's programs are not an ideal fit.

Section 8: Other Organizations and Facilities⁷

As noted in the Needs Assessment, there are few comparable community facilities or community recreating spaces in Hubbard. The Feasibility Study authored by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments identified the following four other community meeting facilities.

- Hubbard City Council Chambers – located at the City Hall
- Hubbard Community Church
- Hubbard Fire District Classroom
- St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall

The largest of these, St. Agnes Church Fellowship Hall, can host up to 160 people with a classroom configuration while the Fire District classroom can hold up to 70 people, but it is not available to the general public. Only the Fellowship Hall charges a user fee at \$125 rental, plus \$190 for insurance and an additional fee to use the kitchen. By any measure this is a short lineup of meeting places and none lend themselves to use by the entire community for diverse offerings.

The City Council Chambers, located as they are in the city hall, are relatively cramped and there is a decided lack of parking at the site. Moreover, while the city has made reasonable accommodations especially given the age of the building, it is not fully accessible.

As discussed earlier many communities rely on libraries for community meeting space, which Hubbard lacks. Likewise, school facilities sometimes have space for youth groups, after-school programs or similar services, but Hubbard does not have a school district. However, Hubbard is served by a school district that serves Hubbard, Aurora, and Donald, with facilities outside of the community. Some communities turn to art centers, bed and breakfasts, hotel facilities, or city halls, all of which Hubbard lacks. Some communities rely on the halls of service organizations such as the Lions, Eagles or Elks, but the city has no such available hall. Still other Oregon cities are able to rely on VFW or American Legion Halls and senior centers but these facilities do not exist in Hubbard.

Given the absence of facilities, it is easy to conclude that Hubbard needs a community center and that it will find a large and ready list of potential users. Indeed, many similar towns do sport community centers, including places with much smaller populations. For example, Rufus in Sherman County has a community center that was a former school. Helix in Umatilla County with just 181 residents operates a community center, also in a former school. The feasibility study identified community centers in Sweet Home, Cottage Grove, Veneta, Mollala, Reedsport and Estacada, which has a community center that it built for the purpose. Some of these communities have comparable populations and Reedsport is certainly more distressed economically than Hubbard.

⁷ Parts of this section are excerpted from the City of Hubbard Community Center Needs Assessment drafted by PARC, June, 2005.

Another rather common arrangement is to combine facilities, including a city hall and community center. The new facility in Rockaway Beach is one such example. The Burns Paiute Tribe is also planning a facility that combines the administrative offices of the Tribe with a community area. Pendleton combines its city hall with a library, community gym and performance hall. The combinations are common and the presence of city hall, for example, allows an economy of scale when it comes to maintenance and overall management of the facility. The city council has discussed a shared facility, but there are no obvious locations or opportunities to create a shared facility. The current city hall may need to be replaced, but there is no obvious place to put it. Rebuilding on the site still leaves the city with no parking and financing such a structure would be a major challenge given the current assumptions.

Operations

Along with the existence of facilities in other places, it is also worth noticing that most facilities are subsidized by one or more local jurisdictions. The feasibility study makes this observation and PARC's experience likewise bears out this operating reality. The subsidies typically include everything from cash for staffing, to in-kind support for utilities, maintenance, replacement, and cleaning. Given the fact that most community centers operate with support, it is reasonable to assume that the Hubbard facility will require some degree of ongoing support. The fact that there will not be a tenant in the building also reinforces this reality.

Nearby Communities

The closest communities to Hubbard are Woodburn, Aurora and Donald. Woodburn is the largest with 21,790 people in 2004.⁸ Donald's 2004 population according to the Population Research Center was 660 and Aurora's was also 660. North Marion High School is located north of Hubbard and in the middle of the triangle of Donald – Hubbard – Aurora. Not surprisingly given their size, Donald and Aurora do not have community centers. Woodburn had a community center, but closed it because it was condemned and the residents opted not to replace it.

Succinctly put, there are no comparable facilities in the communities closest to Hubbard. Indeed, Woodburn does have a pool and other recreational facilities, but they are nonetheless restricted and there is no direct competition for the proposed community center.

⁸ 2004 figures in this paragraph all come from: Population Research Center, "Certified Estimates for Oregon, Its Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," December 15, 2004. Available at: <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>.
City of Hubbard: Community Center Capital Capacity Analysis
Prepared by Public Affairs Research Consultants

Section 9: Organizational Capacity

The proponents of a community center in Hubbard include a loose mix of individuals and while the city has taken a lead in exploring the question, its ultimate role in operating the facility has not been defined. Indeed, the design and features of the shelter itself remains to be finalized, so that detailed analysis is not possible. However, it is reasonable to assume that the City of Hubbard will own the facility and that ultimate responsibility will fall to the city. Of course, the city may opt to turn operations over to another organization, be it a nonprofit or a for-profit entity.

Another item that is not clear is the operating budget for the center, how it will be maintained and who will retain responsibility for opening and closing the facility. However, in all likelihood, the city will delegate the responsibility to one or more organizations to use the facility and carry the responsibility for cleaning, opening and closing. Given the multiple-purpose nature of the proposed facility and the relative simplicity of the layout, the city should certainly be able to oversee the center.

Although the center may not be operated by the city, it will behoove the city to cement operating and management plans before it makes grant applications. Private funders will certainly want to know how the city will operate the center and how it will pay the bills associated with its utilities, maintenance and replacement of equipment.

Sustainability, as noted in an earlier section, is a key criterion that funders look at when considering granting funds. If users or operators charge a fee, it will impact local support and certainly the support for a bond. The city may find itself in the position of having to make assurances of its intent to operate the facility and pay the bills.

Momentum and Future Projects

As noted earlier, it is worth considering the impact that a project such as the proposed community facility will have on future projects. PARC is aware of interest locally in a new city hall, a need for a new police station and interest in the parks. Generally, a community facility would not compete for funds with these projects, other than the public financing portion of them. A community facility is eligible for grant funds, whereas most foundations and private funders will not consider funding a city building or city functions, such as a police station or city hall.

A community center can make a real difference in future efforts to build a new city hall or any other undertaking by building momentum and creating a sense of what is possible. The project has the potential to show people that the community can build facilities and do it in an efficient and effective manner. When a project demonstrates to residents what is possible, there is a chance to build community involvement and support for the next improvement. In this way, the proposed center can build momentum behind efforts to make Hubbard a more livable place with a stronger sense of community.

Section 10: Capital Scope Recommendation

There are several factors that will determine the size of a multiple use community center in Hubbard. Generally, these factors fall into the following categories:

- The site available.
- The demand for services to be available at the center.
- The ability of the city or other organization to operate the facility.
- The ability of the city or project proponents to raise funds locally and, by extension, through grant sources and other mechanisms.
- The degree to which the funding communities find the design and plan appropriate in scope and approach.

The community service assessment identified a need for a combination facility of approximately 7,000 square feet, designed efficiently and economically that could be built for \$110 to \$120 per square foot exclusive of land and professional fees. The total for such a project is \$770,000 to \$840,000. Assuming the above analysis has missed no large likely funder and that there is no single donor prepared to give hundreds of thousands of dollars, a facility of 7,000 square feet will require local participation for at least 30 percent, or \$231,000 to \$252,000.

Unless the community is prepared to support a bond or levy, it is unlikely that the city or any other entity will be able to raise the necessary funds to leverage private foundations, trusts or similar sources. Simply put, the Hubbard community has limited resources and while it is not poor, it has few large businesses, or the presence of corporations that are likely to give support to a community facility. Likewise, there are no foundations or trusts that by design or habit tend to funnel funding to Hubbard.

If the community is willing to raise a bond, of a quarter of a million dollars or more, provide land, and a local campaign exists to support the facility, along with a solid operations plan, it could reasonably expect to leverage up to \$500,000 in grant funding. Significantly, this would be a relatively "bare-bones" facility with a straightforward design and limited equipment. Nonetheless it is certainly possible.

Capital Fund-Raising Target

Based on the analysis of the community to support a capital campaign, a facility costing between \$500,000 and \$840,000 should be within the capacity of the community and appear reasonable to funders. Again, the project hinges on local support and donations. Without strong community support in dollars, testimonials, work, enthusiasm, and operations, the project will be very difficult to fund, especially with the city in the lead.

In summation, the capital capacity of the Hubbard community is limited, and a community facility project will demand all of the local capacity in order to leverage outside dollars, grant support and the interest of private foundations. Short of a fully publicly funded facility, making the case for grant support will be difficult. In general, community facility projects tend to succeed or fail based on the level of local excitement and support they engender. If people rally to the project, talk about it, encourage one another, turn out to discuss it, champion it, and lend their support, it will get accomplished. If people are not enthused, if they don't give money and if people won't register their intents to use it, outside funders will not support it. Indeed, why would a private foundation care about a project that the people, who will benefit from it, do not? The project is certainly feasible, but it will require a concerted effort to bring it to fruition.

Note on Timing

If the city is going to pursue a bond, it would do well to make that decision soon and take advantage of scheduled elections. If the city opts to put a bond on the ballot it can do so at no cost during a general election, which is held every odd year. The city could also place the bond on the ballot for no cost six months before a primary election, also during odd years. Any other vote will cost the city to place the issue before the public. Thus, the time to act is next year, so that the bond is before the public in 2007.

Section 11: Source Document

Foundation Center, available at www.fdncenter.or

Office of Economic Analysis, Department of Administrative Services, State of Oregon,
"Forecasts of Oregon's County Populations and Components of Change 2000-2040,"
April 2004.

Oregon Blue Book, 2005-2006.

Oregon Department of Education, "Students Eligible for Free/Reduced School Lunch," 1999-
2000. Available at: <http://www.ous.edu/aca/eisenhower/ODEschoolsXpoverty.htm>

Oregon Economic and Community Development Department, "Community Development Block
Grant Guidelines, Appendix A: Eligible Applicants for 2004 Program," February 2004.

-----, "Community Profile for Hubbard,"
Last update unspecified, accessed on December 26, 2004.

-----, "County Profile for Marion
County," Last update unspecified, accessed on December 26, 2004.

-----, "Distressed Areas and Associated
index Values," Last update unspecified, accessed November 24, 2004.

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department, "State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan,"
2003-2007. Available at: http://www.prd.state.or.us/scorp_review.php

Oregon Progress Board, "County Benchmarks," Updated 8-26-04. Available at:
www.econ.state.or.us/opb/

PARC Interview with Rob Daykin, Hubbard Finance Manager, Various dates, 2005.

Population Research Center at Portland State University, "Preliminary Estimates for Oregon, Its
Counties and Cities, July 1, 2004," Released November 15, 2004. Available at:
<http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>

Hubbard City Online, available at: <http://www.open.org/~hubbard/buslst01.htm> accessed July
25, 2005.

2000 U.S. Census. Available at the website for the Population Research Center at Portland State
University at <http://www.upa.pdx.edu/>

Action Plan

City of Hubbard – Community Center Action Plan

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to identify the key actions, decision points and considerations for the people or organizations interested in pursuing the development of a multiple use community center in Barendse Park. The following discussion and recommendations assume that the general facility discussed in the previous work Public Affairs Research Consultants (PARC) has done for the city, especially the Community Services Plan, has not changed. Specifically, the community center will encompass approximately 7,000 square feet of multiple use space with limited special equipment and a simple design. In short, the proposed facility will be economical and emphasize efficiency over a dramatic visual appeal or complicated design.

Furthermore, the discussion below assumes that the facility can be constructed for approximately \$700,000 to \$840,000, excluding land, but including architectural and associated development costs. In general, the design ramifications of the assumptions means that the building will be a slab-on-grade structure, with a steel frame and two primary interior spaces, including a large gymnasium with room for a basketball court and a second room. The facility will have limited storage space, but be fully wired for computers and equipment, should they be added in the future.

Planning and Logic of Development

The development of a proposed Hubbard Community Center in Barendse Park will require the people of Hubbard to rally to the project. As discussed in the Capital Capacity Analysis, without strong and committed local support, the project really is not feasible. Thus, everything that happens in developing and creating the facility must flow from local support and a local campaign to fund the center.

Planning and The Local Campaign

Step 1: Identifying a Nonprofit

The local campaign is the most important part of any community fund-raising project and it should be thought out carefully. The undertaking must reach every household, make direct appeals and be done by an organization to which contributions can be tax-deductible. Thus, it is absolutely necessary from the outset to identify a nonprofit organization that will lead the effort and provide the public face for the campaign. Not only is a nonprofit necessary to entail tax deductible status to gifts to the campaign, it will be a necessity for grant writing activities in the future as well.

Step 2: Planning

Unfortunately, the local campaign requires several things in order for it to commence, not the least of which are preliminary plans and drawings. A comprehensive budget is an integral part of this process and it should identify the costs that the city will cover, such as development fees, utility hook-up fees and permits. The local campaign also demands that the proponents have evidence of need, combined with a plan for operating the facility. Along with the plans, it will be necessary to make decisions about naming opportunities and indeed the proposed name of the entire facility. Likewise, a plan for identifying and thanking donors needs to be in place. With these documents and planning pieces in place, the project proponents will be able to talk about the center with the public in an intelligent and informed fashion.

Step 3: Bond Campaign

If a bond is indeed going to be part of the project, campaigning to gather support for the bond will be essential. The effort will have to be targeted and include direct contact and visits with civic organizations, such as the Elks, Rotary, Eagles, Lions, or whatever exists in Hubbard. Moreover, the proponents will have to reach out to the Chamber of Commerce for support, individual businesses and as many households as possible. If a bond is unlikely to pass, or fails to be supported, the project is in all likelihood, dead in the water.

Step 4: Ongoing Local Appeal for Donations

As the heading suggests, so long as the fund-raising is going on, especially during the grant writing campaign, it will be essential to continue to solicit funding in the community. This will be true regardless of support for the project from a bond.

Grant Writing

Step 5: Identify Funders With Local Connections – If Any

There may be people in the community with connections to regional foundations and there may be residents who sit on boards and this information would be very helpful in pursuing grants.

Step 6: Begin Grant Writing to Oregon and PNW Foundations

The order that foundations and trusts are approached matters and it is imperative that the campaign adheres to the various foundation guidelines. For example, the M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust prefers to be one of the last funders into a project, therefore, it should not be approached until at least two third to three-quarters of the funds are committed. The same is true of the Ford Family Foundation.

Grant writing to foundations will be at least an eighteen-month process, as many foundations or trusts take four to six months to make a decision. So long as there is a strong element of local support, the grant writing will be effective, but it must rest upon a solid foundation of giving from the Hubbard community.

Step 7: Research and Outreach

Throughout the grant writing process, someone involved will have to maintain an eye on the Federal Register along with the State of Oregon grant opportunities. The state and federal government may issue request for proposals that fit the project and the organization should be prepared to act if that is the case. While federal grants tend to be onerous, they could provide the bulk of the funding if the right opportunity arises.

Reporting

Step 8: Communicate with Funders

Throughout the process, the city and the nonprofit must make regular reports to the community, the donors and participating private foundations. Regular updates help maintain support and ensure that the foundations that elect to give remain happy and report favorably to other foundations that have not yet made a decision. This is important to realize. Private foundations and trusts talk to one another through regular forums and meetings and they talk about the ongoing projects.

Step 9: Create Signage

Erect a sign in Barendse Park announcing the future community center and keep the project in front of the community.

Bidding the Project

Step 10: Hire an Architect

When sufficient funds have been raised to guarantee success, the city and nonprofit will have to hire an architect, which may or may not be the firm that produced the preliminary drawings. Depending on the sources of funding there may be stipulations on the city or nonprofit do this.

Step 11: Commission Construction Documents

Step 12: Bid the Project

Step 12 will take at least a month and the plans will have to be reproduced and placed in plan centers throughout the region. The city or nonprofit will schedule a bid opening and make a decision at that point about whom to hire.

Construction and Final Reporting

Step 13: Construction

The relatively mild climate, flat site and straightforward building design will allow construction to proceed in just about any season and the project proponents may find that off-season construction comes cheaper than does summer construction. Regardless, the facility should not take an inordinate amount of time to construct. Three to five months is reasonable to expect.

Step 14: Opening and Reporting

When the project is complete the nonprofit will be obliged to report the outcomes to the various funders. Likewise, it makes good sense to hold a community party to celebrate the center's opening and to garner attention wherever possible. The resulting publicity should be shared with the funders and set the stage for future activities and partnerships.

Synopsis

- Step 1: Identify a Nonprofit
- Step 2: Planning -- drawings, budget, City contribution, naming policies
- Step 3: Bond Campaign
- Step 4: Ongoing Local Appeal for Donations
- Step 5: Identify Funders With Local Connections -- If Any
- Step 6: Begin Grant Writing to Oregon and PNW Foundations
- Step 7: Research and Outreach
- Step 8: Communicate With Funders
- Step 9: Create Signage
- Step 10: Hire an Architect
- Step 11: Commission Construction Documents
- Step 12: Bid the Project
- Step 13: Construction
- Step 14: Opening and Reporting

Alternatives

Manifestly, the project is possible, so long as a significant local match exists. However, the requirements of a bond measure and the comprehensive local campaign that will be necessary will consume considerable time and energy. There are alternatives that could move the city toward a facility that would take longer, but help any future efforts to build a facility.

Specifically, if the city opted to focus either in whole or individually on the parks and making improvements to them, the logic of development would eventually lead people and funders to the need for a multiple purpose community center. By working on smaller projects, the city could take time to cultivate a local nonprofit developed specifically with the eventual center in mind. Likewise, the city and residents could begin to consider what it is they want from their parks.

A central thrust to the go-slower approach would be the concurrent development of a parks master plan of some sort. Without a master plan, it will be difficult to convince funders that the project is well thought out and meets a local need. However, by taking the time to create a plan, the city or center proponents could bring people to the idea and build real grassroots support for a center that really reflects the desires and preferences of the residents.

By making improvements to the parks and securing smaller grants, the city or local nonprofit also has the opportunity to develop relationships with Oregon's foundations and trusts. These relationships, if properly tended, have the potential to yield significant benefits in the long run.

Given the inherent challenges, the proponents of a Hubbard Community Center in Barendse Park face a long-time frame under the best circumstances. A bond measure takes time to prepare and to campaign for. Unless a fairly comprehensive push for the bond is undertaken, it will likely fail, as ample evidence throughout the state attests. The time may be better used developing a plan, and a track record of accomplishment that will build a foundation for future development.