

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

May 11, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL:

The Urban Area Planning Commission met in regular session on the above date with Chair Gerard Fitzgerald presiding. Commissioners Loree Arthur, David Kellenbeck, Blair McIntire, and Dan McVay were present. Vice Chair Jim Coulter and Commissioners Lois MacMillan and Robert Wiegand were absent. Also present and representing the City was Parks & Community Development (hereafter: PCD) Director Lora Glover and PCD Senior Planner Joe Slaughter. City Council Liaison Rick Riker was present as well.

2. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

3. CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. **MINUTES: April 13, 2016** **Pg. 1-6**
- b. **FINDINGS OF FACT: 201-00103-16 & 301-00100-16: Major Site Plan Review and Major Variance ~ Gospel Rescue Mission Indoor Industrial Building** **Pg. 7-30**

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner McIntire seconded the motion to approve the minutes from April 13, 2016 as amended. The vote resulted as follows:

“AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners Arthur, Kellenbeck, McIntire and McVay.

“NAYS”: None. **Abstain:** None. **Absent:** Commissioner Vice Chair Coulter and Commissioners MacMillan and Wiegand.

The motion passed.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a. **104-00100-16 & 301-00101-16 Subdivision Tentative Plan and Major Variance ~ London Estates** **Pg. 31-88**

- Chair Fitzgerald stated, at this time I will open the public hearing to consider Application 104-00100-16 & 301-00101-16 Subdivision Tentative Plan and Major Variance ~ London Estates. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter? Seeing none do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding this application? Seeing none in this hearing the decision of the Commission will be based on specific criteria which are set forth in the development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the staff report please let us know and we will try and get you one. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue you'll not be able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.
- Joe gave the staff report.
- Mark Cross – 112 N 5th St Klamath Falls, OR 97601 – They chose this way to lay out the subdivision because of the positioning of the surrounding development, it does not allow for a stub road.
- The plans were originally designed with a stub road to the property to the west, however with the plans for the assisted living facility it wouldn't be possible to put a stub road in for a road that isn't intended to be public..
- The maximum density for the land is 35 units, this plan is only proposing 14.
- The variance request is also due to the shape of the property. They plan originally had a cul-de-sac that was at the minimum 250ft length however it pulls the bulb out about 80ft which causes so many flag lots that they lost a full lot. They are trying to accommodate the R3 zoning that encourages additional lots.
- Residents are constructing the 5ft pedestrian path to Harbeck., as well as installing the storm drain to Harbeck. The owners understand and accept the conditions of approval.

- Commissioner Kellenbeck asked if the property to the left, the proposed assisted living center, is approved.
- Joe let him know that there was a preapp meeting and the developers will be submitting an application this summer. They are interested enough that they did purchase the property for that use.
- Joe asked to put in an additional exhibit 8 to the staff report. It is an email from the home owner adjacent to where Briggs Way would come through. They have water that is from a well on a piece of property to the east of the proposed subdivision. The water is routed through property in the proposed subdivision or along Grandview. They are concerned about how the development could affect their water source. They also have concerns with the irrigation line that is along property boundary of lots 12, 13, 14. Joe did talk to Mark and they are unaware of any easement for the water source. They will need to investigate where the line is and if it would be affected in any way by this proposal.
- The commission asked if the well showed up on the preliminary. Peter Allen is the surveyor and Mark will contact him.
- As far as the GPID easement goes, GPID would have to sign off so that would be accommodated as well.
- Commissioner Arthur asked about the clause on page 44 concerning water pressure. She was told that the builders would need to install individual booster pumps that will bring it up to standard water pressure levels.
- The Commission asked about how storm water would be handled. Joe let them know that a condition to approval is testing the storm water and confirming that it would be draining at the same rate at post development as pre development.
- The Commission asked Mark if they would be using the irrigation ditch for drainage. Mark let them know that Exhibit 3 on page 52 shows an underground storm pipe on Grandview. All detention will happen onsite.
- Commissioner Mcvay asked who is responsible to install the water pressure pump. Mark let the commission know that the builder is required to install the pump. They do require power but if the power failed you would still have water at a lower pressure.
- Wanda Crisman - 343 Grandview Lane – She brought a common well agreement through Josephine County to the Commission's attention. The well is down on Brandy Lane.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner McIntire seconded the motion to approve the major variance. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners Arthur, Kellenbeck, McIntire and McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner Vice Chair Coulter and Commissioners MacMillan and Wiegand.

The motion passed.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner McIntire seconded the motion to approve the Subdivision Tentative Plan with the amendment to A.1.c and the addition of exhibit 8. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners Arthur, Kellenbeck, McIntire and McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner Vice Chair Coulter and Commissioners MacMillan and Wiegand.

The motion passed.

5. OTHER ITEMS/STAFF DISCUSSION:

- Lora let the commission know that they are currently working on the budget for PCD . There is a plan to increase the staffing levels for the planning department. They would like to wait until next year as they are scheduled to go through a PAVE audit. Joe and Lora are going to work through applications and try to get through to next year. They will reevaluate if the volume of work increases.
- There is a preapp teleconference for In and Out.
- Red Robin is moving forward and has their funding.

6. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

- Commissioner asked what the “m” stands for on the proposed plans. Joe let her know that it stands for Minimum Residential Density zoning. It’s in the Development Code but it’s not zoned in the map currently. It’s there for possible future use.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Fitzgerald adjourned the meeting at 6:41 P.M.

Next Meeting: May 25, 2016

Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commission

Date

These minutes were prepared by Carlie Paulsen, Administration Department, City of Grants Pass.

**CITY OF GRANTS PASS
PARKS & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**LANDON ESTATES SUBDIVISION
TENTATIVE PLAN & MAJOR VARIANCE
FINDINGS OF FACT**

Procedure Type:	Type III: Urban Area Planning Commission	
Project Number:	104-00100-16 & 301-00101-16	
Project Type:	Subdivision Tentative Plan & Major Variance	
Owner(s):	Jantzer & Sons Logging	
Applicant:	Same	
Representative:	Rhine-Cross Group, LLC. Attn: Marc Cross	
Property Address:	395 Grandview Ave	
Map and Tax Lot:	36-05-30-AA, TLs 1100 & 1101	
Zoning:	R-3-1 (City)	
Size:	2.47 acres	
Planner Assigned:	Joe Slaughter	
Application Date:	April 1, 2016	
Application Complete:	April 1, 2016	
Date of Staff Report:	May 3, 2016	Due: 05/04/2016
Hearing Date:	May 11, 2016	
Date of Findings of Fact:	May 25, 2016	
120 Day Deadline:	July 30, 2016	

I. PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a fourteen (14) lot subdivision in the R-3-1 zoning district. The proposal will construct one (1) new public street (Briggs Way) to provide access to proposed lots 3-14 and lots 1 & 2 will take access from Grandview Lane. In conjunction with the application for the subdivision the applicant has applied for a Major Variance to Section 27.123(1)(f) which limits the maximum length of cul-de-sac streets to 250 feet outside of the Slope Hazard area. The subject property is located outside of the Slope Hazard area and the plans include the construction of a cul-de-sac street that is 330 feet long.

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

Section 2.050, Schedule 2-1, Section 6.050 and Section 17.031 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code, authorize the Planning Commission to consider the request and make a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny.

The decision on the Tentative Plan and Major Variance must be based on the criteria contained in Sections 6.060 & 17.413 of the Development Code.

III. PROCEDURE:

- A. An application for a Subdivision Tentative Plan and a Major Variance was submitted on April 1, 2016 and deemed complete that same day. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.
- B. Public notice of the May 11, 2016 hearing was mailed on April 20, 2016, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.
- C. A public hearing was held on May 11, 2016 and the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the Subdivision Tentative Plan and Major Variance with the conditions attached in the Staff Report.

IV. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- A. The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the Staff Report, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein.
- B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on May 11, 2016, attached as Exhibit "B", summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.
- C. The PowerPoint given by staff is attached as Exhibit "C".

V. APPEAL PROCEEDURE:

Section 10.050, City of Grants Pass Development Code, provides for an appeal of the commission's decision to the Grants Pass City Council. An appeal must be filed with the Director within twelve (12) calendar days of the Urban Area Planning Commission's oral decision, and a statement of grounds to the appeal must be filed with the Director within seven (7) calendar days of the Planning Commission's written decision.

VI. GENERAL FINDINGS:

- A. Characteristics of the Property:
 - 1. Land Use Designation:
 - a. Comprehensive Plan: Moderate High Density Residential
 - Zone District: R-3-1
 - Special Purpose District: None
 - 2. Size: 2.47 acres
 - 3. Frontage: Grandview Lane
 - 4. Access: All lots will have access from a public street

5. Public Utilities:

a. Existing Utilities:

- i. Water: 8-inch main in Grandview Lane
- ii. Sewer: 8-inch main in Grandview Lane
- iii. Storm Drain: None adjacent to site

Proposed Utilities:

- iv. Water: 8-inch main in new Briggs Way
- v. Sewer: 8-inch main in new Briggs Way
- vi. Storm: 12-inch main in new Briggs Way and 12-inch main in Grandview Lane to connect to existing storm drainage line in Harbeck Road

6. Topography: Gently sloping down approximately 13 feet from southeast corner to northwest corner of property

7. Natural Hazards: None

8. Natural Resources: None

9. Existing Land Use:

- a. Subject Parcel: Mostly vacant; one existing home
- Surrounding: Moderate Density Residential

B. Discussion:

The proposal is for a fourteen (14) lot subdivision in the R-3-1 zoning district. The development, which will be named Landon Estates, will construct one (1) new public street (Briggs Way) to provide access to proposed lots 3-14 and lots 1 & 2 will take access from Grandview Lane. In conjunction with the application for the subdivision the applicant has applied for a Major Variance to Section 27.123(1)(f) which limits the maximum length of cul-de-sac streets to 250 feet outside of the Slope Hazard area. The subject property is located outside of the Slope Hazard area and the plans include the construction of a cul-de-sac street that is 330 feet long.

The subject property is designated as Moderate High Density Residential by the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is proposing a subdivision plan with 14 lots ranging in size from 5,026 square feet to 12,551 square feet. The property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) but outside of the City limit. A Service and Annexation Agreement (S&A) will be required for this development.

The site is bounded to the west by vacant property also zoned R-3. An assisted living facility has been proposed on this site and therefore a street connection to this property is not needed or wanted. To the north is a developed residential property known as Chicago Co Division, which is a series of partition plats with the property developed into smaller lots as topography has allowed. To the east is developed single family residential properties known as "Sky Way Estates Subdivision" on R-1-8 zoned property. The south property line of this development is the urban growth boundary and also the south high line canal (GPID) and therefore no connection roads are proposed to the south. The site is surrounded by moderate density development and is therefore irrevocably committed to similar use.

The site has direct access to Grandview Lane along the north frontage of the site. There is one existing house on tax lot 1101 which is proposed to remain within Lot 1 of the development. The site is located within the Grants Pass service area for water service, sanitary sewerage service, and storm water management. Other utilities readily available are power, telephone, and cable TV all existing within the right of way of Grandview Lane.

The site consists of Clawson sandy loam (#17B), with hydrologic soil classification B. The site is currently occupied by an existing residential house, with a mix of weeds and grasses covering the areas. The site is "located" on Panel No. 41033C – 0512E of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for Josephine County. The property is outside of all Zone A mapped flood areas.

An emergency turn around in the form of a cul-de-sac is proposed on the new street. Article 27.132 (1)(f) requires cul-de-sacs to be a maximum of 400 feet in the Slope Hazard District, or 250 feet in all other areas. The proposed cul-de-sac is 330 feet long and the property is not within the Slope Hazard District, therefore a Variance is required by the applicant for the proposed layout. The cul-de-sac length is dictated by the existing property shape and presence of surrounding property development and the GPID main line ditch, therefore the Variance request is not the result of a self-created condition and is unique to this property.

VII. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. MAJOR VARIANCE

Section 6.060 of the Development Code states that previously granted variances shall not be considered to have established a precedent. The review body shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application. No variance shall be granted unless the review body finds that all of the applicable criteria under (A) and (B) have been satisfied.

A. **Qualifying Condition.** The applicant shall demonstrate that the following elements are present to qualify for a variance.

CRITERION (1): Unique Physical Constraint or Characteristic. The applicant has clearly described the nature of a unique physical constraint or characteristic of the property to which the variance application is related. The constraint is related to the

particular property for which the variance is sought, regardless of the owner, and it does not relate to other property or personal conditions of the owner or applicant, such as personal financial circumstances or inconvenience. Either:

- (a) The property has unique physical constraints or characteristics peculiar to the land involved, over which the applicant has no control, such as lot size or shape, topography, natural features, or other physical conditions on the site or in the immediate vicinity, which are not typical of other lands in the same zoning district subject to the same regulation; or
- (b) The property has existing development, conforming or nonconforming, located such that it poses unique constraints to the further development of the property in full compliance with the standards of this Code.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The property and request meet this criterion under subsection (a) above. The applicant is requesting a variance for the maximum cul-de-sac length of 250' to extend it a distance of 80' for a total cul-de-sac length of 330'. The reason for the longer cul-de-sac length is based on the existing shape of the property and the fact that connecting roads to adjacent properties are not practical because the property to the east is already developed with no connecting street, the property to the south is bounded by the GPID south high line canal, and the property to the west is currently being planned for an assisted living facility where a public road is not warranted. The proposal for 14 lots is much less than the 35 units allowed by code. Shortening the cul-de-sac would lessen further the proposed density which is counter to the policy that the City has been promoting trying to maximize density within this type of infill development.

CRITERION (2): Self-Created Constraint. If the review body finds the unique constraint described in Subsection (1) was self-created, the property shall only qualify for a variance if the review body determines that the self-created constraint can no longer be reasonably eliminated or reversed, or that it is in the public interest to grant a variance rather than require the owner to eliminate the self-created constraint. A situation shall be considered self-created if:

- (a) A current or previous owner created the unique physical constraint or characteristic by dividing, reconfiguring, or physically altering the property in a manner such that it could only be subsequently developed, or further developed, by obtaining a variance to the regulations in effect at the time of alteration; and
- (b) At the time the current owner altered or acquired the property, he could have known that, as a result of the deliberate alteration, the property could only be developed, or further developed, by obtaining a variance.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The requested variance is not a self-created constraint for the reasons listed in the section above.

CRITERION (3): Need for Variance. The applicant has demonstrated that a variance is necessary to overcome at least one of the following situations:

- (a) Allow Reasonable Use of an Existing Property. Due to the unique physical constraint or characteristic of an existing lot or parcel, strict application of the provisions of the Development Code would create a hardship by depriving the owner of the rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district subject to the same regulation. The variance is necessary for preservation of a property right of the owner, substantially the same as is possessed by owners of other property in the same district subject to the same regulation.
- (b) Better Achieve Public Purpose for Development, Division, or Adjustment of Lots and Parcels. There need not be a hardship to the owner to qualify for a variance under this Subsection. Due to the unique physical constraint or circumstance, the variance is necessary to better achieve the public purposes of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code, with minimum deviation from standards. The variance will allow preservation of scenic, natural, or historic resources or features; allow a lot arrangement that represents a more efficient use of land; avoid odd shaped lots or flag lots; or alleviate other unique physical conditions to better achieve public purposes.
- (c) Allow Flexibility for Expansion of Existing Development. The location of existing development on the property poses a unique constraint to expansion in full compliance with the Code. The variance is needed for new construction and site improvements in order to provide for efficient use of the land or avoid demolition of existing development, where the public purpose can be substantially furthered in alternate ways with minimal deviation from standards.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The applicant is requesting the variance under subsection (a) and (b) above in that the variance will allow the applicant to create a lot arrangement that is a much more efficient use of the subject property while working in harmony with the surrounding developments that exist and are proposed. The lengthening of the proposed cul-de-sac by 80 feet will allow the in-fill property to be developed to the greatest density possible given that the applicant wishes to keep the lots as single family residences to match the surrounding developments. The allowable density for the existing acreage is 35 units, the applicant is proposing 14 single family residential lots. If the cul-de-sac was shortened by 80 feet, the applicant would likely lose at least one lot and the result would be many more flag lots than already proposed.

CRITERION (4): No Other Reasonable Alternative. Reasonable alternatives to comply with the provisions of the Development Code have been exhausted. No reasonable alternatives have been identified that would accomplish the same purpose in accordance with the Code without the need for a variance. If applicable, the applicant shall, at a minimum, demonstrate that the following are not reasonable alternatives instead of the requested variance:

- a. Lot line adjustment.
- b. Modified setback option, pursuant to Section 22.200.
- c. Alternate solar standards, pursuant to Section 22.623.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The above mentioned alternatives will not provide the same benefit to the future property owners that the requested variance

for an over-length cul-de-sac street will provide. A lot line adjustment is not possible as all of the surrounding properties are developed or are currently being developed in the case of the proposed assisted living facility to the west of the subject development. The modified set-back could not help because shortening the cul-de-sac would increase the setbacks due to the increase in the number of flag lots that would be required. Alternate solar standards are not applicable to this development.

(B) **Result of Relief.** If the review body finds the proposal for a variance based on the criteria in Subsection (A) above, the review body shall only approve the proposal if it finds the specific proposal is consistent with the following criteria.

CRITERION (5): Best Alternative. When a variance is needed for a purpose identified in Subsection (3) above, the proposed variance shall be the best alternative to achieve the purpose compared with variances to other standards that could accomplish the same purpose. The best alternative will be the most consistent with the overall purpose of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code, with the least impact to other properties and the public interest. Impacts to public facilities, substantial natural features, and natural systems shall be presumed to have broader public impact than localized impacts on nearby properties.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The requested variance is the best alternative for development of the subject property. The property is surrounded by development, the GPID south high line canal, and a proposed assisted living facility that prevents any other alternative from being employed.

CRITERION (6): Minimum Deviation. Adherence to the standards of this Code shall be maintained to the greatest extent that is reasonably possible while accomplishing the purpose in Subsection (3). The deviation from standards shall be the minimum necessary to accomplish the purpose, and shall not convey a special right to the property that is not available to properties in the same zoning district subject to the same regulation.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The requested variance is the best alternative for development of the subject property. The property is surrounded by development, the GPID south high line canal, and a proposed assisted living facility that prevents any other alternative from being employed.

CRITERION (7): No Hazard. The proposal shall not pose a public safety hazard such as a visual obstruction or traffic hazard, and shall not obstruct pedestrian or vehicular movement or impede emergency access.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposed variance will not create hazards to public safety. Lengthening the cul-de-sac to a total of 330 feet is still under the maximum allowable cul-de-sac length of 400 feet that is allowed in the Slope Hazard Districts.

CRITERION (8): Plan and Ordinance Consistency. The proposal shall not adversely affect implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, and shall not be materially detrimental or injurious to the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or Development Code; other applicable plans, policies, or standards; or other properties in the same district or vicinity.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. This subject development is located in an infill area where the proposed variance will not affect any implementation of the Comprehensive Plan or any proposed transportation systems.

CRITERION (9): Mitigate Adverse Impacts. Adverse impacts shall be avoided where possible and mitigated to the extent practical. If a variance is not necessary to preserve a property right, or if the unique constraint in Subsection (1) was self-created, adverse impacts may be grounds for denial.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. No adverse impacts are anticipated as all surrounding properties are developed or are in the process of being developed. As conditioned below, the proposed cul-de-sac street will be required to meet City standards for construction and will provide an adequate fire turn-around.

CRITERION (10): No Significant Increase in Residential Density. For development of an existing lot, if the variance is for a reduction to lot area, it shall not result in a significant increase in density. For a land division, the variance shall not result in an increase in density over that permitted by the zoning district, except that when a lot is reduced in size due to dedication of right-of-way, minimum lot area may be reduced by fifty square feet or less.

Planning Commission Response: Not applicable. The density is calculated by taking the total developable area (2.47 acres) and subtracting the area for street right of ways (0.41 acres) which equals 2.06 acres. Then taking the total developable area x 17.4 du/acre (R3 zone maximum density) = 35 maximum dwelling units. The applicant is proposing 14 single family residential lots and therefore the maximum density will be 14, meeting this code requirement.

CRITERION (11): Recommendation of City Engineer. The review body shall consider a written recommendation of the City Engineer when the variance is to any of the following standards:

- (a) A street, access, or utility development standard in Article 27 or 28 of the Code.
- (b) The Flood Hazard or Slope Hazard provisions in Article 13 of this Code.
- (c) To allow encroachment into existing or planned right-of-way or public utility easement. When a variance is authorized to allow encroachment into a right-of-way, the owner shall sign a right-of-way use agreement that specifies the terms and conditions under which the right-of-way may be utilized.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The requested Variance was forwarded to the City Engineer for review and comment. As shown on Exhibit 6 of the Staff Report, *the City Engineer recommended that the variance request be granted as proposed.*

CRITERION (12): Additional Criteria. Variances from the street standards in Article 27 of this Code shall meet the additional criteria of 27.121(11)(h)(4) General Design Standards, 27.122(5) Connectivity Standards, and 27.123(14) Street Section Design Standards.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. Other than the cul-de-sac length, the proposed street will meet the criteria listed in Article 27 of the code as conditioned below.

B. SUBDIVISION TENTATIVE PLAN

Section 17.413 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code states that the review body shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the request based upon the following criteria:

CRITERION (1): The plan conforms to the lot dimension standards of Article 12, the base lot standards of Section 17.510, and the requirements of any applicable overlay district.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. The R-3 zone district requires a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. The applicant is proposing a subdivision plan with 14 lots ranging in size from 5,026 square feet to 12,551 square feet. The proposed lots all exceed this base requirement. Each lot is required to have a minimum lot width of fifty (50) feet. As shown on the plans, all lots meet this requirement per the definition of "Lot Width" in Article 30. All lots meet or exceed the 20' minimum lot frontage requirement of Section 27.200.

There are existing structures on proposed Lot 1 but the tentative plan does not show setback distances for those structures. As conditioned below, the applicant will be required to submit a revised tentative, demonstrating that all required setbacks are met on Lot 1.

The lots are in compliance with Section 17.510 of the Development Code specifically the lot width to depth ratio, no through lots are created, side property lines are being created at right angles to streets as far as practical, and curved property lines are created at the public street intersections

CRITERION (2): When required, the proposed future development plan allows the properties to be further developed, partitioned, or subdivided as efficiently as possible under existing circumstances, in accordance with requirements for typical permitted uses in the applicable zone and comprehensive plan district, and in conjunction with other development in the neighborhood.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The only proposed lot that is large enough to be further divided, Lot 1, has an existing single family home and accessory structures. The applicant plans to leave these structures in place. The applicant has included a possible future development plan for tax lot 1118, showing how that property could be served by the proposed Briggs Way should that owner decide to divide the property. The subject property is bordered by to the west by vacant property also zoned R-3. The owners of that property have expressed interest in developing the property with an assisted living facility and therefore interconnecting roads are not warranted. To the north is a developed residential property known as Chicago Co Division, which is a series of partition plats with the property developed into smaller lots as topography has allowed. To the east is developed single family residential properties known as "Sky Way

Estates Subdivision” on R-1-8 zoned property. The south property line of this development is the urban growth boundary and also the south high line canal (GPID) and therefore no connection roads are proposed to the south.

CRITERION (3): When one is required or proposed, the street layout conforms to the applicable requirements of the adopted street plans, meets the requirements of Article 27 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency and environmental compatibility.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. As stated above the only property that could have future development is the property directly west of the project. At the time of this application, there is a development proposal for an assisted living facility on this property, therefore no interconnecting streets are proposed. There are no TSP identified streets that are planned through the property. As part of the project, Grandview Lane will be improved along the frontage of the development. A possible future development plan is shown for tax lot 1118 which is located on the northwest corner of the development but is not currently part of the development. There is an existing house on this property and no immediate development plans are proposed.

The plans show the construction of a new cul-de-sac street, Briggs Way, to be constructed to provide access to Lots 3-14. The proposed street name was routed through emergency dispatch and was approved provided the “SE” designator is added in front of the proposed name, per Section 6.40.030(B) of the Municipal Code. As conditioned below, the new street name shall be SE Briggs Way. The construction of SE Briggs Way and the improvements along Grandview Lane shall be to City standards, as conditioned below.

In 2004, the City Council passed Resolution 4851, which requires off-site pedestrian paths to connect all new subdivisions to “destination” streets. The nearest destination streets to the proposed subdivision are W Harbeck Road and Grandview Avenue. The plans show the construction of a 5 foot wide asphalt path along the south edge of Grandview Lane to provide pedestrian connectivity from the proposed subdivision to Harbeck Road. Existing sidewalks connect Harbeck Road to SE Grandview Ave. to the north. Resolution 4851 requires asphalt paths used to meet this requirement to be a minimum of 5.5 feet wide unless they are separated from the road surface by a borrow ditch. As conditioned below, the applicant is required to build the path as shown on the plans to a width of at least 5.5 feet.

CRITERION (4): The proposed utility plan conforms to the applicable requirements of adopted utility plans, the requirements of Article 28 and other applicable laws, and best balances needs for economy, safety, efficiency and environmental compatibility.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions.

Water: The proposal includes the extension of an 8” public water main to provide domestic and fire services to the individual properties along SE Briggs Way. Many of the proposed lots within the subdivision exist at elevations exceeding 1,020 feet. Water service pressures for homes located at the elevation of 1,020 feet will only be about 36 psi. The addition of RP backflow devices due to GPID will further reduce these

pressures by 8 to 12 psi. Point of use backflow devices on irrigation system also will reduce service pressures an additional 8 to 12 psi. The construction of multiple story housing in this area may require the installation of individual private water booster pumps to supply upper story plumbing fixtures at acceptable levels. As conditioned below, the applicant shall submit a detailed utility plan to the Engineering Division for review and approval.

Sewer: The proposal includes the extension of an 8" public sewer main to provide sewer service to the individual properties along SE Briggs Way. As conditioned below, a detailed utility plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Division. The construction drawings will also need to address the abandonment of unutilized private sewer laterals on Grandview Lane not utilized for the development. The plans may also show the reuse of the existing sewer lateral serving the existing residence on proposed Lot 1 for the service of proposed Lot 2 is acceptable provided the existing private sewer lateral is TV inspected prior to the reuse of the lateral by the new development. All defects discovered during the TV inspection shall be corrected prior to each laterals reuse. If an existing sewer lateral cannot be reutilized by new development, it shall be properly abandoned as directed by the wastewater collection division.

Storm Water: The proposal includes the construction of a 12" public storm water main in SE Biggs Way and the extension of a 12" public storm water main on Grandview Lane to connect the new line in SE Briggs Way to the existing line in Harbeck Road. The plans also show the installation of a curtain drain at the toe of the existing GPID ditch to capture any ditch seepage and direct this water around Lots 7-12. The plans show the easements needed for this proposed curtain drain. As conditioned below, the applicant shall submit storm drain calculations that must demonstrate that post-development run-off does not exceed pre-development run-off and that storm drainage does not cross property lines without an easement.

CRITERION (5): The tentative plan allows for the preservation or establishment of natural features or the preservation of historic features of the property, and allows access to solar energy to the extent possible under existing circumstances, including:

- (a) Providing the necessary information to complete the tree chart identified in Section 11.041.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. The applicant provided a tree canopy chart showing existing trees to be retained and existing trees to be removed. The site has an existing tree-canopy cover of approximately 5%. Seven of the existing eleven significant trees will be removed through the development of this property. As required by Section 11.041, residential developments in the R-3 zone shall maintain or re-establish a tree-canopy cover of 15% to 20%, which typically requires 2-3 trees per lot. As conditioned below, prior to a Development Permit being issued for the project, an existing tree canopy coverage and tree protection plan shall be submitted per Section 11.050. As conditioned below, prior to final plat, the applicant shall submit a revegetation plan and pay applicable tree deposits per Section 11.060.

- (b) No cuts shall result in retaining walls greater than 15 feet high in a single wall from the finish grade or create any un-retained slopes greater than 100%.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The site is relatively flat, therefore cuts and fills are not expected to exceed 2-3 feet. No retaining walls are proposed other than potential landscape walls less than 2' in height. Cut fill slopes will not exceed 5:1 or 20%.

- (c) No fills shall result in a retaining wall within the required setback from a property not included in the development plan greater than 6 feet in height from the finish grade or create any slopes which are greater than 100%.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The site is relatively flat, therefore cuts and fills are not expected to exceed 2-3 feet. No retaining walls are proposed other than potential landscape walls less than 2' in height. Cut fill slopes will not exceed 5:1 or 20%.

CRITERION (6): The plan complies with applicable portions of the Comprehensive Plan, this Code, and state and federal laws.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied with Conditions. The property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) but outside of the City limit. A Service and Annexation Agreement (S&A) will be required for this development. With the submittal of the tentative subdivision plan and the burden of proof, the applicant is demonstrating compliance with all applicable Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan, Development Code requirements, and state and federal laws given the conditions of approval stated below.

VIII. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

Based on the above findings, the Planning Commission found the applicable criteria were satisfied and **APPROVED** the request for a Major Variance to Section 27.123(1)(f) to allow a cul-de-sac street that is 330 feet long, and the request for a Subdivision, with the following conditions.

The vote was 6-0 with Commissioners Fitzgerald, Arthur, McIntire, Kellenbeck, Wiegand, and McVay in favor. Commissioners Coulter and MacMillan were not in attendance.

NOTE: *Bold Italic Highlighted Text* indicates text added by the Planning Commission that was not contained in the staff report. ~~Strikeout Text~~ indicates text deleted by the Planning Commission from the text that was contained in the staff report.

A. The following must be accomplished within 18 months of the Planning Commission's Decision and prior to issuance of a Development Permit. (Note: A Development Permit is required in order to obtain a grading permit.):

1. Submit a revised tentative showing the following:
 - a. Setback distances for existing structures on Lot 1 (all setbacks must meet or exceed required minimum setback distances).
 - b. New street labeled as "SE Briggs Way".

c. Reflect all existing easements on the property.

2. Sign and Record a Service and Annexation Agreement.
3. Provide a letter from the Responsible Engineer who will be supervising the construction of the subdivision. The Responsible Engineer will be required to submit a letter at final plat application verifying that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and that the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.

If the responsible engineer proposes to delegate any of these responsibilities, the arrangement shall be approved in writing by the City Engineering Division prior to issuance of a Development Permit.

4. Obtain an NPDES permit from the Department of Environmental Quality. Submit a copy of the approved permit to the Parks and Community Development Department.
5. Submit an existing tree canopy coverage and tree protection plan per Section 11.050.
6. Submit four (4) copies of civil drawings with appropriate review fees to the City Engineering Division for review and approval:
 - a. Provide a grading plan and receive a grading permit prior to any earthwork. Include the creation of building pads in the grading plan if completed as part of the construction of the subdivision. If building pads are created as part of the grading of the subdivision then a map showing the extent of the grading will be required at the time of final plat.

Provide an erosion control and dust control plan for the subdivision.

Include any provisions of the NPDES permit on the construction plans.

Present engineered construction drawings stamped by a registered Engineer, including plans and profiles if necessary, that detail the following improvements to the City Engineering Division for review and approval.

Street Improvements:

- i. Show full street improvements to SE Briggs Way to City standards.
- ii. Show the improvements along Grandview Lane to City Standards. Grandview Lane is still under Josephine County jurisdiction for maintenance. Obtain permit from Josephine County for any work in the right-of-way of Grandview Lane.
- iii. Show the construction of a minimum 5.5 foot asphalt pedestrian path along the south side of Grandview Lane. Install a 4" white fog line rather than the 8" bike lane line shown on the tentative plan.

- iv. Identify Mailbox locations.
- v. The location of the planned street light at the beginning of the cul-de-sac is appropriate. Relocate the planned street light at the corner of Grandview Lane and SE Briggs Way so it does not interfere with stop sign visibility.
- vi. Developer will paint 20' yellow setbacks at the corners and paint white stop bar at stop sign.
- vii. City will install the required street name sign, "stop" sign, and the "no parking" signs on Grandview Lane (if required) and will bill developer for all costs.
- viii. Any other signs will be up to the developer to install.
- ix. Install "sidewalk ends" signs at both ends of the sidewalk.
- x. Provide storm drain calculations demonstrating that post development run-off does not exceed pre development run-off and that storm drainage does not cross property lines without an easement.

Utility Plan:

- i. Show the extension of an 8" public water main in SE Briggs Way.
- ii. Show the extension of an 8" public sewer main in SE Briggs Way.
- iii. Show the extension of a 12" public storm water main in SE Briggs Way and the extension of a 12" public storm water main in Grandview Lane.
- iv. Many of the proposed lots within the subdivision exist at elevations exceeding 1,020 feet. Water service pressures for homes located at the elevation of 1,020 feet will only be about 36 psi. The addition of RP backflow devices due to GPID will further reduce these pressures by 8 to 12 psi. Point of use backflow devices on irrigation system also will reduce service pressures an additional 8 to 12 psi. The construction of multiple story housing in this area may require the installation of individual private water booster pumps to supply upper story plumbing fixtures at acceptable levels.
- v. RP backflow devices shall be required as "premises" protection on all water services (new and existing) if GPID or private wells are present.
- vi. All "premises" backflow prevention devices shall be located within 10 feet behind each water meter.
- vii. DC backflow devices shall be required as "point of use" protection on all water services containing multiple zone irrigation systems.

- viii. Separate sewer and water services shall be required for separate lots.
- ix. Unutilized private sewer laterals on Grandview Lane not utilized for the development shall be properly abandoned as directed by the wastewater collection division.
- x. The plans may show the reuse of the existing sewer lateral serving the existing residence on proposed Lot 1 for the service of proposed Lot 2 is acceptable provided the existing private sewer lateral is TV inspected prior to the reuse of the lateral by the new development. All defects discovered during the TV inspection shall be corrected prior to each laterals reuse. If an existing sewer lateral cannot be reutilized by new development, it shall be properly abandoned as directed by the wastewater collection division.
- xi. Show a manhole installation and drain line connection to the existing public system at Harbeck Road. An encroachment permit is required prior to any work in the existing right-of-way.
- xii. Install a "D" inlet at the uphill end (beginning) of the drain line on Grandview Lane.
- xiii. Show all parts of the proposed "curtain drain" near the irrigation canal as private. Show the line size of the private curtain drain as it enters the right-of-way. It is recommend that the applicant install clean outs on the "private" curtain drain at various points to increase the useable life of the system.
- xiv. Show additional drain line on Lot 14 as private.
- xv. Provide utility plans for PPL, Qwest and Avista. Show all pedestals and boxes to be installed (This is to verify utilities can be installed within dedicated City Utility Easements).

7. Sign a Developer Installed Agreement for Public Improvements.

B. The following must occur within 18 months of issuance of the Development Permit and prior to Final Plat approval:

- 1. Substantially complete all construction items related to SE Briggs Way and Grandview Lane.
 - a. Secure for any remaining construction items in accordance with City Standards.

Submit a one year maintenance guarantee.

Submit as-built drawings of all public improvements or secure for them in accordance with City policy.

2. Install the offsite pedestrian path, according to the approved plans.
3. Submit a tree revegetation plan in accordance with Section 11.060.
4. Pay the tree deposit fee in the amount of \$300 for each new lot (Section 11.060.2).
5. Separate sewer and water services are required for each lot. Private sewer and water lines shall not cross other lots.
6. Existing private laterals reutilized by the new development shall be TV inspected prior to reuse. All defects discovered during the TV inspection shall be corrected prior to reuse by the new development.
7. If individual lots were graded as part of the grading permit for the subdivision, provide a map of those lots with new building pads and include the dimensions of the area graded.
8. All adjacent streets shall be swept regularly during construction.
9. Street name sign, "stop" sign, and "no parking" signs (if needed) shall be paid for by the developer and installed by the City. All other signs and markings including "sidewalk ends signs", painting curbs at 20 foot setback at intersections for no parking, ten feet of yellow each side of hydrants, and a white stop bar at the stop signs are to be completed by the developer.
10. Power, telephone, cable television and natural gas lines shall be installed underground and within the 10 foot City Utility Easements.
11. Pay all engineering inspection fees due.
12. Submit a letter from the Responsible Engineer stating that he/she supervised the grading and construction for the entire parcel and individual lots and the grading and construction was completed according to approved plans.
13. Properly abandon any existing wells and provide evidence of proper abandonment to the Parks and Community Development Department.
14. All water services on existing public water lines shall be installed by City of Grants Pass Water Distribution Crews. All encroachment fees related to the installation of water services shall be the responsibility of the developer.
15. Complete installation of the public utility services as reflected on the approved utility plans.
16. Provide a copy of any proposed CC&R's & deed restrictions if they are desired by the developer. There are no CC&Rs or deed restrictions required as a condition of this approval.

17. Provide a land division guarantee issued by a title company.
18. Submit a final plat in accordance with Section 17.422 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code. Incorporate any modifications or conditions required as part of tentative approval. A professional land surveyor must survey the subdivision. A plat check by the City Surveyor and payment of appropriate fees is required. Failure to comply with this condition will nullify the approval of the Tentative Plat. Include the following on the plat:

- a. Dedication of SE Briggs Way to the public.

All easements indicated on approved construction plans.

A ten-foot wide City Utility Easement dedicated to the City of Grants Pass along all necessary street frontages.

Include any necessary drainage and cross access easements.

After all signatures are obtained, the plat must be recorded with the Josephine County Recorder within 30 days. The subdivider shall file one print of the recorded plat with the Parks and Community Development Department. Failure to do so will nullify plat approval.

C. The following shall be accomplished at the time of development of individual lots in the subdivision:

Note: The following conditions are not all-inclusive and are provided for the information of the applicant.

1. Payment of all System Development Charges due; including, but not limited to, water, storm, sewer, parks and transportation (see **Exhibit 7**).
2. Development of lots shall be in accordance with solar standards.
3. Each lot shall have separate utility services.
4. All utilities shall be placed underground.
5. Comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes.
6. Install landscaping in accordance with the approved landscape plan (Sections 11.041 ~ Tree Canopy and 23.031 ~ Residential Front Yard).
7. Submit lot drainage plans for approval on all building plans.
8. Significant size trees shall be retained and protected out to the drip line, in accordance with the tree protection plan and pursuant to Section 11.050.

9. Tree refund in the amount of \$300 per lot is available within one (1) year of final inspection and submittal of a valid receipt meeting or exceeding that amount of trees only.
10. Developed or undeveloped building lots will need to be maintained for weed and grass control throughout the year.
11. Provide addresses visible from the public right-of-way.
12. Gravel driveway approaches and other erosion and track out control measures shall be in place during construction of individual lots.
13. Prior to occupancy, driveways and parking and maneuvering areas shall be paved in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code.

IX. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 25th day of May 2016.

Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair

CITY OF GRANTS PASS PARKS & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**ELEMENT 10 (PUBLIC FACILITIES) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
STAFF REPORT - URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Procedure Type:	Type IV: Planning Commission Recommendation and City Council Decision
Project Number:	405-00102-16
Project Type:	Comprehensive Plan Amendment
Applicant:	City of Grants Pass
Planner Assigned:	Lora Glover
Application Received:	April 6, 2018
Application Complete:	April 8, 2016
Date of Staff Report:	May 18, 2016
Date of UAPC Hearing:	May 25, 2016

I. PROPOSAL:

Amendment adopting Addendum 2 to Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan (Public Facilities) to incorporate updates for the Wastewater Collection Master Plan, the Water Distribution System Master Plan and the Stormwater Master Plan (see **Exhibit 1**).

II. AUTHORITY AND CRITERIA:

The Comprehensive Plan and 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement authorize the Planning Commission to consider the request for the Comprehensive Plan amendment and make a recommendation to the City Council, and authorize the City Council to make the final decision. The Comprehensive Plan may be amended provided the criteria in Section 13.5.4 of the Comprehensive Plan are met.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Section 10.060 provides for the City Council's final decision to be appealed to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) as provided in state statutes. A notice of intent to appeal must be filed with LUBA within 21 days of the date the notice of City Council's written decision is provided.

IV. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

In 2008, the City Council adopted Ordinance 5460, which updated Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect updates to several of the public facility plan documents. In 2015, the City Council adopted Ordinance 15-5655 which updated Element 10, by adopting the Water Treatment Facility Plan Update prepared by Murray, Smith & Associates in association with MWH Americas, Inc. dated January 2014; and the Water Restoration Plant Facility Plan prepared by Carollo Engineers, Inc. dated May 2014. It replaced the previous Water Restoration Plant (WRP) Facility Plan completed in June 2001.

The proposed amendment will incorporate the Wastewater Collection, Water Distribution System and the Stormwater Master Plans and adopt the Capital Improvement Programs

identified in Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4 of Addendum 2 to Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Statewide Planning Goal 11 addresses Public Facilities and Services, and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Division 11 address Public Facilities Planning. OAR 660-011-0005(1) defines "Public Facilities Plan" as follows: "A public facility plan is a support document or documents to a comprehensive plan. The facility plan describes the water, sewer and transportation facilities which are to support the land uses designated in the appropriate acknowledged comprehensive plans within an urban growth boundary containing a population of greater than 2,500. Certain elements of the public facility plan shall also be adopted as part of the comprehensive plan, as specified in OAR 660-011-0045."

Consistent with OAR 660-011-0005, the proposed amendment, an addendum to Element 10, recognizes these 2014 updates as part of the City's Public Facilities Plan, as support documents to the Comprehensive Plan. The addendum also adopts certain elements of these plans as part of the comprehensive plan, as specified in OAR 660-011-0045. The addendum is attached as *Exhibit 1*. The full plans are referenced as *Exhibit 2*; they are not attached to this staff report, but the full copies are available electronically on the City website.

V. CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

For comprehensive plan amendments, the applicable criteria are provided in Section 13.5.4 of the Comprehensive Plan.

CRITERION (a): Consistency with other findings, goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendments are consistent with the Water Service Policies in Section 10.2 of the Comprehensive Plan Policies, the Sanitary Sewer Service Policies in Section 10.3 of the Comprehensive Plan Policies, and the Storm Drainage Services Policies in Section 10.4. These plans address the needs for treatment capacity and requirements for the Water Treatment Plant, Water Distribution and Stormwater Management.

CRITERION (b): A change in circumstances validated by and supported by the data base or proposed changes to the data base, which would necessitate a change in findings, goals and policies.

Response: Satisfied. In addition to structural, functional, regulatory, and other issues, the facility plans address future demand and capacity needs based on the adopted forecasts and future land use needs.

CRITERION (c): Applicable planning goals and guidelines of the State of Oregon.

Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendments are intended to address the applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and specifically OAR 660-011-0005 and -0045, incorporating these facility plans as support documents to the comprehensive plan, and adopting the elements specified in OAR 660-011-0045 as part of the comprehensive plan.

CRITERION (d): Citizen review and comment.

Response: Satisfied. The public hearing process for the proposed amendments to Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan provides for citizen review and comment during at least two public hearings.

CRITERION (e): Review and comment from affected governmental units and other agencies.

Response: Satisfied. The Water Distribution System Master Plan was prepared by Murray, Smith & Associates and included consultation and coordination with affected agencies, including the Oregon Health Authority Drinking Water Program. The Stormwater Master Plan was prepared by Keller Associates, and included consultation and coordination with affected agencies including Josephine County and the Grants Pass Irrigation District (GPID). The Wastewater Collection System Master Plan was prepared by Carollo, and included consultation and coordination with affected agencies including Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

CRITERION (f): A demonstration that any additional need for basic urban services (water, sewer, streets, storm drainage, parks, and fire and police protection) is adequately covered by adopted utility plans and service policies, or a proposal for the requisite changes to said utility plans and service policies as a part of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Response: Satisfied. The proposed amendments provide the updates that include the comprehensive plan provisions to address adequate public facilities and provide the requisite changes for the planning horizon, the identified land use needs, and the adopted land use plans.

CRITERION (g): Additional information as required by the review body.

Response: Satisfied Contingent on Review Body Direction. Additional information can be provided if requested.

CRITERION (h): In lieu of item (b) above, demonstration that the Plan as originally adopted was in error.

Response: Not Applicable. The proposed amendments are intended to address a change in circumstances, as addressed in Criterion (b).

VI. RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Urban Area Planning Commission recommend that City Council **APPROVE** the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

VII. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

- A. Positive Action: Recommend approval of the request:
 - 1. as submitted.
 - 2. as modified by the Planning Commission (list):
- B. Negative Action: Recommend denial of the request for the following reasons (list):
- C. Postponement: Continue item
 - 1. indefinitely.
 - 2. to a time certain.

NOTE: The amendment is legislative and is not subject to the 120 day requirement.

VIII. INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

- 1. Proposed Addendum 2 to Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan (Public Facilities and Services)
- 2. Full copies of the Water Distribution System Master Plan, Wastewater Collection System Master Plan and the Stormwater Master Plan.
These plans are not attached. They are available electronically on the City web site and at the Parks & Community Development Department.

**Grants Pass and Urbanizing Area Community Comprehensive Plan
Element 10: Public Facilities**

Addendum 2: 2016 Update

This addendum updates the following sections of the Public Facilities Element:

- 10.20. Water Services
- 10.30. Sanitary Sewer Services
- 10.40. Storm Drainage Services

Background

In 2008, the City Council adopted Ordinance 5460, which updated Element 10 of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect updates to several of the public facility plan documents. In 2015, the City Council adopted Ordinance 15-5655 which updated Element 10, by adopting the Water Treatment Facility Plan Update prepared by Murray, Smith & Associates in association with MWH Americas, Inc. dated January 2014; and the Water Restoration Plant Facility Plan prepared by Carollo Engineers, Inc. dated May 2014. It replaced the previous Water Restoration Plant (WRP) Facility Plan completed in June 2001.

Statewide Planning Goal 11 addresses Public Facilities and Services, and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Division 11 address Public Facilities Planning. OAR 660-011-0005(1) defines “Public Facilities Plan” as follows: “A public facility plan is a support document or documents to a comprehensive plan. The facility plan describes the water, sewer and transportation facilities which are to support the land uses designated in the appropriate acknowledged comprehensive plans within an urban growth boundary containing a population of greater than 2,500. Certain elements of the public facility plan shall also be adopted as part of the comprehensive plan, as specified in OAR 660-011-0045.”

Consistent with OAR 660-011-0005, this addendum recognizes these 2015 updates as part of the City’s Public Facilities Plan, as support documents to the Comprehensive Plan. This addendum also adopts certain elements of these plans as part of the comprehensive plan, as specified in OAR 660-011-0045.

Section 1. Plans Adopted Part of the Public Facility Plan as Part of a Supporting Document to the Comprehensive Plan

The February 2016 Stormwater Master Plan, February 2016 Water Distribution System Master Plan and the March 2016 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan are adopted as part of the Public Facilities Plan as a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan.

Some of the information and provisions in the plans referenced in this addendum supersede materials in Section 10.20 pertaining to water services, Section 10.30 pertaining to sanitary sewer services and Section 10.40 pertaining to storm drainage services.

Section 2. Sections Adopted as Part of Comprehensive Plan

1. The parts of the February 2016 Stormwater Master Plan, February 2016 Water Distribution System Master Plan and the March 2016 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan identified in Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4 are hereby adopted and incorporated as part of the comprehensive plan.
2. In accordance with OAR 660-011-0045(2), certain public facility plan project descriptions, location, or service area designations will necessarily change as a result of subsequent design studies, capital improvement programs, environmental impact studies, and changes in potential sources of funding. It is not the intent of this section to:
 - a. Either prohibit projects not included in the public facility plans for which unanticipated funding has been obtained;
 - b. Preclude projects specification and location decisions made according to the National Environmental Policy Act; or
 - c. Subject administrative and technical changes to the facility plan to ORS 197.610(1) and (2) or 197.835(4).
3. In accordance with OAR 660-011-0045(3), the public facility plan may allow for the following modifications to projects without amendment to the public facility plan:
 - a. Administrative changes are those modifications to a public facility project which are minor in nature and do not significantly impact the project's general description, location, sizing, capacity, or other general characteristic of the project.
 - b. Technical and environmental changes are those modifications to a public facility project which are made pursuant to "final engineering" on a project or those that result from the findings of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement conducted under regulations implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) or any federal or State of Oregon agency project development regulations consistent with the Act and its regulations.
 - c. Public facility project changes made pursuant to subsection (3b) are subject to the administrative procedures and review and appeal provisions of the regulations controlling the study (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508 or similar regulations) and are not subject to the administrative procedures or review or appeal provisions of ORS Chapter 197, or OAR Chapter 660 Division 18.

4. Land use amendments are those modifications or amendments to the list, location or provider of, public facility projects, which significantly impact a public facility project identified in the comprehensive plan and which do not qualify under subsection (3)(a) or (b). Amendments made pursuant to this subsection are subject to the administrative procedures and review and appeal provisions accorded “land use decisions” in ORS Chapter 197 and those set forth in OAR Chapter 660 Division 18.

Table 2-1. Water Distribution Capital Improvement Program

**Table 5-4
Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Summary**

Improvement Category	CIP No.	Project Description	CIP Schedule and Project Cost Summary				Preliminary Cost % to Growth
			5-year thru 2021	10-year 2022-2026	20-year 2027-2036	Estimated Project Cost	
Storage Reservoirs	R-13	0.7 MG Ausland Reservoir - Zone 4 Reservoir No. 13 replacement	\$ 2,100,000			\$ 2,100,000	40%
	R-14	0.5 MG Laurel Ridge Reservoir			\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	40%
	R-16	1.3 MG Meadow Wood Reservoir		\$ 3,900,000		\$ 3,900,000	69%
	R-17	1.2 MG New Hope (Cathedral Hills) Reservoir		\$ 3,600,000		\$ 3,600,000	42%
	R-19	1.2 MG Pearce Park Reservoir Zone 2 Spalding Industrial Park			\$ 3,600,000	\$ 3,600,000	100%
		Capital Maintenance	\$ 75,000			\$ 75,000	52%
	Subtotal	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 5,100,000	\$ 14,775,000	\$ 9,282,000	
Pump Stations	P-1	Meadow Wood P.S. high (Zone 3MW) - fire flow capacity upgrade	\$ 250,000			\$ 250,000	52%
	P-2	Panoramic P.S. - fire flow capacity upgrade	\$ 400,000			\$ 400,000	52%
	P-3	Ausland P.S. supplying proposed Ausland Reservoir (R-13)	\$ 500,000			\$ 500,000	52%
	P-4	Zone 4N P.S. - constant pressure			\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,200,000	100%
	P-5	North Valley P.S. replacement		\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,000,000	79%
		Capital Maintenance	\$ 125,000			\$ 125,000	52%
	Subtotal	\$ 1,275,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 3,475,000	\$ 2,654,145	
PRVs	V-1	Spalding Industrial Area - Ament Rd PRV			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	100%
	V-2	Zone 4N Highland Ave PRV			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	100%
	V-3	Blue Gulch PRV			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	100%
	V-4	Overland PRV			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	100%
	V-5	10th Street PRV	\$ 150,000			\$ 150,000	52%
	V-6	NW B Street PRV			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	100%
	V-7	Zone 2A PRV replacements (Capital Maintenance)	\$ 250,000			\$ 250,000	52%
	Subtotal	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 958,000	

Distribution Mains	M-1, 2, 3, 9, 10	Piping improvements for fire flow	\$ 683,000			\$ 683,000	52%
	M-4 to 8	Zone 2A - Hwy 99, Savage, Manzanita Loop	\$ 758,000			\$ 758,000	52%
	M-11, 12	Proposed Zone 2H - connect Harbeck and Hilltop			\$ 532,000	\$ 532,000	100%
	M-13 to 22	Spalding Industrial Area - Zone 2 expansion			\$ 3,181,000	\$ 3,181,000	100%
	M-24, 25, 26	Zone 3 Granite Hill to Scoville Loop			\$ 1,415,000	\$ 1,415,000	100%
	M-27 to 30	Zone 3 Scoville to Spring Moutain Loop			\$ 1,107,000	\$ 1,107,000	100%
	M-31 to 33, 42	Zone 3 I-5 crossing at Cedar Loop, Spring Moutain to Hillcrest Loop			\$ 1,396,000	\$ 1,396,000	100%
	M-34 to 41, 52	Proposed Ausland P.S. (P-3) and Reservoir (R-13) mains	\$ 2,897,000			\$ 2,897,000	52%
	M-43, 44	Zone 3 I-5 crossing at Humane Society			\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000	100%
	M-45, 46	Zone 3 Vine Street Loop - Highland to Hawthorne			\$ 996,000	\$ 996,000	52%
	M-47 to 51	Zone 4N mains			\$ 1,996,000	\$ 1,996,000	100%
	M-53 to M-57	Zone 1 Spalding Industrial Area loop			\$ 1,362,000	\$ 1,362,000	100%
	M-58 to 62	Meadow Wood future mains		\$ 1,173,000		\$ 1,173,000	100%
	M-63 to 68	New Hope future mains		\$ 2,532,000		\$ 2,532,000	100%
	M-69 to 75	Laurel Ridge and Blue Gulch future mains			\$ 1,870,000	\$ 1,870,000	100%
	M-76, 77, 81, 82, 83	Zone 1 Fruitdale future mains			\$ 2,087,000	\$ 2,087,000	100%
M-78, 79, 80	Zone 1 Looping- Cloverlawn & Grandview		\$ 639,000		\$ 639,000	52%	

	M-84 to 87	Zone 1 Lincoln Road Loop		\$ 814,000		\$ 814,000	52%
		Routine Main Replacement Program (Capital Maint.)	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 16,000,000	\$ 32,000,000	52%
Subtotal			\$12,338,000	\$13,158,000	\$ 32,512,000	\$ 58,008,000	\$ 39,390,240
Planning		Seismic Resilience Study	\$ 100,000			\$ 100,000	52%
		Water Management & Conservation Plan update		\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	52%
		Water Distribution System Master Plan update			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	52%
		Unidirectional Flushing (UDF) Program Development	\$ TBD			\$ -	52%
		Distribution Piping Corrosion Study	\$ 100,000			\$ 100,000	52%
Subtotal			\$ 200,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 208,000
Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Total			\$16,388,000	\$21,708,000	\$ 39,712,000	\$ 77,808,000	\$ 52,492,385
Annual Average CIP Cost							
		\$3,277,600	\$3,809,600	\$3,890,400			
		5-year	10-year	20-year			

Table 2-2. Wastewater Collection System Master Plan CIP (Table 6.12)

Table 6.12 Detailed Capital Improvement Plan Wastewater Collection System Master Plan City of Grants Pass											
Project Description				Project Size and Cost				Total CIP	Total CIP Cost (\$) - Project Phasing		
Improv. ID	Improv. Type	Project Purpose	Address Description	Existing Size	Proposed Size	Replace/ New	Length (ft)	Total Capital Improvement Cost(\$)	Phase 1 (2015-2020)	Phase 2 (2021-2025)	Phase 3 (2026-2035)
Project 1 - SW Western Street / SW Spruce Street											
P-1A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SW Western Ave between I St and K St	8	12	Upsize	581	\$184,000	\$184,000		
P-1B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SW Western Ave between K St and SW Bridge St	10	15	Upsize	546	\$195,000	\$195,000		
P-1C	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SW Spruce St between SW Bridge St and Webster Rd	8	18	Upsize	1,998	\$791,000	\$791,000		
P-1D	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SW Bridge St between SW Western Ave and SW Westhorn Ave	10	18	Upsize	481	\$190,000	\$190,000		
P-1E	Diversion	Capacity	Diversion to east Bridge St	10	-	Plug	-	-	-		
Total Project 1 - SW Western / SW Spruce Street								\$1,360,000	\$1,360,000	\$0	\$0
Project 2-1 - NW Highland Street											
P-2A	Gravity	Capacity	Along NW Highland Ave between 300 ft north of NW Parker Dr and NW Midland Ave	8	12	Upsize	939	\$296,000	\$296,000		
Total Project 2-1 - NW Highland Street								\$296,000	\$296,000	\$0	\$0
Project 2-2 - NW Prospect Street											
P-2B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NW Midland Ave between NW Highland Ave and NW Prospect Ave	8	12	Upsize	623	\$196,000		\$196,000	
P-2C	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NW Prospect Ave between NW Midland Ave and 150 feet south of NW Sandy Dr	10	15	Upsize	834	\$298,000		\$298,000	
Total Project 2-2 - NW Prospect Street								\$494,000	\$0	\$494,000	\$0
Project 3 - NW Midland Avenue											
P-3A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Midland Ave between NW 6th St and NW Washington Blvd	-	12	New	710	\$224,000	\$224,000		
Total Project 3 - NW Midland Avenue								\$224,000	\$224,000	\$0	\$0
Project 4 - NE A Street											
P-4A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NE A St between NE 9th St and NE 7th St	12	18	Upsize	844	\$334,000	\$334,000		
Total Project 4 - NE A Street								\$334,000	\$334,000	\$0	\$0
Project 5 - NE Savage Street / NE 9th Street											
P-5A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NE Savage St between NE 10th St and NE 9th St and along NE 9th St between NE Savage St and NE Josephine St	8	12	Upsize	3,431	\$1,084,000	\$1,084,000		
Total Project 5 - NE Savage Street / NE 9th Street								\$1,084,000	\$1,084,000	\$0	\$0
Project 6 - SE Mill Street / SE Rogue View Lane											
P-6A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SE Mill St between NE D St and SE M St	12	18	Upsize	3,755	\$1,486,000	\$1,486,000		
P-6B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SE M St between SE Mill St and SE 12th St	12	21	Upsize	907	\$395,000	\$395,000		
P-6C	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along SE M St between SE 12th St and SE 7th St	-	21	New	2,177	\$946,000	\$946,000		
Total Project 6 - SE Mill Street / SE Rogue View Lane								\$2,827,000	\$2,827,000	\$0	\$0
Project 7 -Annabelle Lane											
P-7A	Gravity	Capacity	RSSD Interceptor between Wineteer Ln To Leonard Rd	15	21	Upsize	1,948	\$848,000		\$848,000	
Total Project 7 - Annabelle Lane								\$848,000	\$0	\$848,000	\$0
Project 8 -Leonard Road											
P-8A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Leonard Rd between Redwood Ave to south of Mesman Dr	8	12	Upsize	888	\$281,000	\$281,000		
P-8B	Gravity	Capacity	Along Leonard Rd between south of Mesman Dr and intersection of Leonard Rd with Mesman Dr	8	15	Upsize	384	\$138,000	\$138,000		
Total Project 8 - Leonard Road								\$419,000	\$419,000	\$0	\$0

Project 9 - Gilbert Creek Park											
P-9A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Gilbert Creek Park 500 ft north of NW Parker Dr and west of NW Hawthorne Ave	8	12	Upsize	451	\$143,000			\$143,000
Total Project 9 - Gilbert Creek Park								\$143,000	\$0	\$0	\$143,000
Project 10-1 - Rogue River / SE Blue Bird Drive											
P-10A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along Rogue Dr between SE N St and SE Blue Bird Dr	15	18	Upsize	1,831	\$725,000		\$725,000	
P-10B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Through properties on north bank of river, south of Waterman Ln and Lela Ln to Blue Bird Dr	12	15	Upsize	1,890	\$675,000		\$675,000	
Total Project 10-1 - Rogue River / SE Blue Bird Drive								\$1,400,000	\$0	\$1,400,000	\$0
Project 10-2 - West SE Blue Bird Drive											
P-10C	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Through properties on north bank of river, from Blue Bird Dr to just upstream of pipe split under Rogue River	18	24	Upsize	2,208	\$1,051,000			\$1,051,000
Total Project 10-2 - Rogue River / SE Blue Bird Drive								\$1,051,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,051,000
Project 11 - Park Street											
P-11A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Through properties on south bank of the river between Mystic Dr and Gold River Ln	18	27	Upsize	202	\$108,000		\$108,000	
P-11B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Through properties on south bank of the river between Gold River Dr and SE Acacia Ln	24	27	Upsize	795	\$426,000		\$426,000	
Total Project 11 - Park Street								\$534,000	\$0	\$534,000	\$0

Table 6.12 Detailed Capital Improvement Plan Wastewater Collection System Master Plan City of Grants Pass											
Project Description				Project Size and Cost				Total CIP	Total CIP Cost (\$) - Project Phasing		
Improv. ID	Improv. Type	Project Purpose	Address Description	Existing Size	Proposed Size	Replace/ New	Length (ft)	Total Capital Improvement Cost(\$)	Phase 1 (2015-2020)	Phase 2 (2021-2025)	Phase 3 (2026-2035)
Project 12 - Darnelle Lane											
P-12A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Dameille Ln between the intersection of Dameille Ln with SW Harvest Dr and Dameille PS	12	18	Upsize	1,551	\$614,000			\$614,000
Total Project 12 - Darnelle Lane								\$614,000	\$0	\$0	\$614,000
Project 13 - Mesman Drive to Coutant Lane											
P-13A	Gravity	Capacity	RSSD Interceptor between Mesman Dr and Schroeder Ln	18	21	Upsize	2,047	\$890,000			\$890,000
P-13B	Gravity	Capacity	RSSD Interceptor between Schroeder Ln and Coutant Ln	18	24	Upsize	1,282	\$610,000			\$610,000
Total Project 13 - Mesman Drive to Coutant Lane								\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000
Project 14 - NE 7th Street											
P-14A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NE 7th Street between NE A St and NW F St	12	18	Upsize	1,531	\$606,000	\$606,000		
Total Project 14 - NE 7th Street								\$606,000	\$606,000	\$0	\$0
Project 15 - NE Dean Drive / NE D Street											
P-15A	Gravity	Capacity	Along NE Dean Dr and NE D St from NE A St to SE Mill St	-	18	New	2,009	\$795,000	\$795,000		
Total Project 15 - NE Dean Drive / NE D Street								\$795,000	\$795,000	\$0	\$0
Project 16 - NW Evelyn Avenue											
P-16A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Evelyn Ave between Washington Boulevard and NW 2nd St	-	8	New	727	\$190,000	\$190,000		
Total Project 16 - NE Evelyn Avenue								\$190,000	\$190,000	\$0	\$0
Project 17 - NW Morgan Lane											
P-17A	Gravity	Capacity	Along Morgan Ln between NW 6th St and NW Washington Blvd	-	12	New	208	\$66,000		\$66,000	
Total Project 17 - NW Morgan Lane								\$66,000	\$0	\$66,000	\$0

Project 18 - NW Washington Boulevard											
P-18A	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NW Washington Blvd between NW Midland Ave and NW Manzanita Ave	8	12	Upsize	2,239	\$708,000			\$708,000
P-18B	Gravity	Capacity and R&R	Along NW Washington Blvd between NW Manzanita Ave and NW Evelyn Ave	10	12	Upsize	727	\$230,000			\$230,000
Total Project 18 - NW Washington Boulevard								\$938,000	\$0	\$0	\$938,000
Project 19 - Darnelle Pump Station											
PS-19A	Pump Station	Capacity and R&R	Alternatives Analysis Study	-	-	Study	1	\$75,000	\$75,000		
PS-19B	Pump Station	Capacity and R&R	Darnelle PS	4.2	7.8	Upsize	1	\$5,038,000	\$5,038,000		
Total Project 19 - Darnelle Pump Station								\$5,113,000	\$5,113,000	\$0	\$0
Project 20 - Webster No.1 Lift Station											
PS-20A	Pump Station	Capacity and R&R	Webster No. 1 PS	0	0.66	Upsize	1	\$614,000	\$614,000		
Total Project 20 - Webster No. 1 Pump Station								\$614,000	\$614,000	\$0	\$0
Project 21 - Webster No.2 Lift Station											
PS-21A	Pump Station	Capacity and R&R	Webster No. 2 PS	0	0.23	Upsize	1	\$998,000		\$998,000	
Total Project 21 - Webster No. 2 Pump Station								\$998,000	\$0	\$998,000	\$0
Project 22 - Spalding Area Development Expansion											
PS-22A	Pump Station	Expansion	SE Portola Dr	-	0.16	New	1	\$986,000		\$986,000	
P-22B	Force Main	Expansion	From Spalding PS to NE Portola Dr	-	6	New	1,227	\$351,000		\$351,000	
P-22C	Gravity	Expansion	In Spalding Area	-	8	New	4,779	\$1,249,000		\$1,249,000	
P-22D	Gravity	Expansion	In Spalding Area	-	8	New	8,461	\$2,211,000			\$2,211,000
P-22E	Casing	Expansion	Railroad crossing	-	12/24	New	200	\$385,000		\$385,000	
Total Project 22 - Spalding Area Development Expansion								\$5,182,000	\$0	\$2,971,000	\$2,211,000
Project 23 - North I-5 Area Development Expansion											
PS-23A	Pump Station	Expansion	Monument Dr and I-5	-	0.14	Upsize	1	\$813,000			\$813,000
P-23B	Force Main	Expansion	From I-5 PS to pipe on Pony Ln and NW Highland Ave	-	6	New	5,622	\$1,611,000			\$1,611,000
P-23C	Gravity	Expansion	In I-5 North Area	-	8	New	31,251	\$8,166,000			\$8,166,000
P-23D	Casing	Expansion	I-5 Crossings (3)	-	12/24	New	750	\$1,445,000			\$1,445,000
Total Project 23 - North I-5 Area Development Expansion								\$12,035,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,035,000
Project 24 - South Highway Development Expansion											
P-24A	Gravity	Expansion	In South Highway Area	-	8	New	11,377	\$2,973,000			\$2,973,000
Total Project 24 - South Highway Development Expansion								\$2,973,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,973,000
Project 25 - Bridge Street Pump Station											
PS-25A	Pump Station	R&R	Bridge Street	0.94	0.94	Upgrade	1	\$25,000	\$25,000		
Total Project 25 - Bridge Street Pump Station								\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0

**Table 6.12 Detailed Capital Improvement Plan
Wastewater Collection System Master Plan
City of Grants Pass**

Project Description				Project Size and Cost				Total CIP	Total CIP Cost (\$) - Project Phasing		
Improv. ID	Improv. Type	Project Purpose	Address Description	Existing Size	Proposed Size	Replace/ New	Length (ft)	Total Capital Improvement Cost(\$)	Phase 1 (2015-2020)	Phase 2 (2021-2025)	Phase 3 (2026-2035)
Project 26 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 1 North of Rogue River											
P-26A	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	48,231	\$12,603,000	\$12,603,000		
P-26B	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	5,262	\$1,509,000	\$1,509,000		
P-26C	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	12	12	Replace	2,060	\$651,000	\$651,000		
P-26D	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	15	15	Replace	104	\$38,000	\$38,000		
P-26E	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	18	18	Replace	923	\$365,000	\$365,000		
P-26F	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	21	21	Replace	1,926	\$838,000	\$838,000		
P-26G	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	24	24	Replace	492	\$234,000	\$234,000		
Total Project 26 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 1 North of Rogue River								\$16,238,000	\$16,238,000	\$0	\$0
Project 27 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 1 South of Rogue River											
P-27A	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	60	\$15,000	\$15,000		
P-27B	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	462	\$133,000	\$133,000		
P-27C	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	15	15	Replace	378	\$135,000	\$135,000		
Total Project 27 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 1 South of Rogue River								\$283,000	\$283,000	\$0	\$0
Project 28 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 2 North of Rogue River											
P-28A	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	38,468	\$10,051,000		\$10,051,000	
P-28B	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	8,581	\$2,460,000		\$2,460,000	
P-28C	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	12	12	Replace	6,618	\$2,090,000		\$2,090,000	
P-28D	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	18	18	Replace	1,278	\$506,000		\$506,000	
P-28E	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	21	21	Replace	385	\$168,000		\$168,000	
Total Project 28 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 2 North of Rogue River								\$15,275,000	\$0	\$15,275,000	\$0
Project 29 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 2 South of Rogue River											
P-29A	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	1,402	\$366,000		\$366,000	
P-29B	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	76	\$21,000		\$21,000	
P-29C	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	15	15	Replace	417	\$149,000		\$149,000	
P-29D	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	30	30	Replace	542	\$319,000		\$319,000	
Total Project 29 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 2 South of Rogue River								\$855,000	\$0	\$855,000	\$0

Project 30 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 3 North of Rogue River											
P-30A	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	59,905	\$15,653,000			\$15,653,000
P-30B	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	6,181	\$1,773,000			\$1,773,000
P-30C	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	12	12	Replace	2,760	\$871,000			\$871,000
P-30D	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	15	15	Replace	433	\$155,000			\$155,000
P-30E	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	18	18	Replace	217	\$86,000			\$86,000
P-30F	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	21	21	Replace	243	\$106,000			\$106,000
P-30G	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	24	24	Replace	914	\$435,000			\$435,000
P-30H	Gravity	R&R	North of Rogue River	48	48	Replace	22	\$16,000			\$16,000
Total Project 30 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 3 North of Rogue River								\$19,095,000	\$0	\$0	\$19,095,000
Project 31 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 3 South of Rogue River											
P-31A	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	8 and less	8	Replace	19,049	\$4,978,000			\$4,978,000
P-31B	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	10	10	Replace	3,525	\$1,010,000			\$1,010,000
P-31C	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	12	12	Replace	4,499	\$1,421,000			\$1,421,000
P-31D	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	15	15	Replace	2,556	\$913,000			\$913,000
P-31E	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	18	18	Replace	1,228	\$486,000			\$486,000
P-31F	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	24	24	Replace	1,164	\$554,000			\$554,000
P-31G	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	27	27	Replace	5,276	\$2,824,000			\$2,824,000
P-31H	Gravity	R&R	South of Rogue River	30	30	Replace	1,524	\$898,000			\$898,000
Total Project 31 - Condition Only Projects - Phase 3 South of Rogue River								\$13,084,000	\$0	\$0	\$13,084,000
Project 32 - General Projects											
G-1	General	General	Asset Management Program	-	-	-	1	\$150,000	\$150,000		
G-2A	General	General	Master Plan Updates (2021)	-	-	-	1	\$300,000		\$300,000	
G-2B	General	General	Master Plan Updates (2031)	-	-	-	1	\$300,000			\$300,000
Total Project 32 - General Projects								\$750,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Total CIP (\$)								\$108,243,000	\$30,558,000	\$23,741,000	\$53,944,000
Total CIP (%)									28.2%	21.9%	49.8%
Notes:											
(1) ENR CCI = 10,037 (20-City Average, July 2015).											
(2) Capital Improvement Cost includes a 20% construction contingency applied to the Baseline Construction Cost to account for unforeseen events and unknown conditions, a 30% allied cost applied to the Estimated Construction Cost to account for engineering services, construction management, and project administration, and a 25% planning contingency applied to the Total Allied Project Costs.											

Table 2-3. Stormwater Master Plan CIP (Table 6-1: Priority 1A Improvements)

FEBRUARY 2016

STORMWATER MASTER PLAN FINAL



Table 6-1: Priority 1A Improvements

ID#	Priority	Item	Total Estimated Cost (2015)
Priority 1A Improvements (0-15 years)			
Allen Fruitdale			
AF-1	1A	Golf Course	\$ 371,000
AF-2	1A	South Highline Canal near Allen Creek	\$ 1,211,000
AF-3	1A	Harbeck Road, Nebraska Avenue	\$ 200,000
AF-4	1A	Pond Near Calvary Chapel off Harbeck Road	\$ 629,000
AF-5	1A	Grandview Avenue and the Hospital	\$ 611,000
AF-7	1A	Lower Parkdale Drive/Highway 199 Trunkline	\$ 1,590,000
AF-11	1A	Sugar Beet Line, East Park Street	\$ 1,330,000
AF-12	1A	Sunset Way and Tributary Pipes	\$ 2,226,000
AF-13	1A	Harbeck Road and Southridge Way	\$ 1,082,000
AF-14	1A	Highway 238	\$ 661,000
AF-15	1A	Main Gravity Canal Spills and Central Parkdale Drive Trunkline	\$ 889,000
AF-16	1A	Upper Parkdale Drive Trunkline and South Highland Canal Spill	\$ 601,000
AF-17	1A	Highways 238/199/99 Intersection Detention	\$ 959,000
AF-18	1A	Union Avenue	\$ 646,000
AF-19	1A	Meadow Glen	\$ 236,000
AF-20	1A	Liberty Drive	\$ 473,000
Gilbert			
G-1	1A	5th Street, 6th Street	\$ 1,656,000
G-3	1A	G Street, I Street, Alder Street, L Street	\$ 795,000
G-4	1A	Demoray Canal Spills- Southwest	\$ 127,000
G-5	1A	Demoray Canal Spills- Central West	\$ 29,000
G-6	1A	Hilcrest Drive, 6th Street, 7th Street	\$ 1,664,000
G-7	1A	Demoray Spill-South East	\$ 106,000
G-8	1A	Demoray Canal Spills- North Central	\$ 810,000
G-9	1A	Demoray Canal Spills- Northwest	\$ 460,000
G-10	1A	Demoray Canal Spills- Northeast	\$ 438,000
Sand			
S-1	1A	Trunkline from South Main Canal to River along Dowell Road	\$ 3,412,000
S-2	1A	Flow-split Kellenback Avenue to Dowell Road	\$ 691,000
S-3	1A	Expansion of South Main Canal	\$ 583,000
S-6	1A	Leonard Road to Ditch	\$ 926,000
S-7	1A	Willow Lane to Ditch	\$ 975,000
S-8	1A	Willow Court, Estates Lane	\$ 696,000
S-10	1A	Kokanee Lane, Leonard Road	\$ 1,613,000
S-12	1A	Rainwood Lane to Leonard Road	\$ 141,000
S-13	1A	DDOT Pond South of Redwood Highway	\$ 1,353,000
S-14	1A	New Flow Diversion to Sand Creek at I-5	\$ 168,000
S-15	1A	Yellowtail Lane to Mary Lynn Lane	\$ 392,000
S-16	1A	Damelle Lane	\$ 1,138,000
Skunk Jones			
SJ-10	1A	Channel Northwest of Dewey Drive and 10th Street	\$ 3,000
Total Priority 1A Improvements			\$ 31,891,000

212047/S/S15-01a

CITY OF GRANTS PASS

Page 6-14

Table 2-4. Stormwater Master Plan CIP (Table 6-2: Priority 1B, 2A, & 2B Improvements)

Table 6-2: Priority 1B, 2A, & 2B Improvements

ID#	Priority	Item	Total Estimated Cost (2015)
Priority 1B Improvements (15-20 years)			
<i>Allen Fruitdale</i>			
AF-6	1B	West Park Street, Josephine County Yard, Tussing Park	\$ 407,000
<i>Sand</i>			
S-4	1B	Redwood Circle to River	\$ 650,000
<i>Skunk Jones</i>			
SJ-1	1B	F Street	\$ 1,829,000
SJ-8	1B	Spill Northwest of I-5 and Hilcrest Drive to 7th Street	\$ 386,000
SJ-11	1B	Rogue Drive Trunkline	\$ 2,938,000
SJ-12	1B	M Street	\$ 759,000
SJ-13	1B	A Street-West	\$ 1,126,000
Total Priority 1B Improvements			\$ 8,095,000
Priority 2A Improvements (20-25 years)			
<i>Gilbert</i>			
G-2	2A	9th Street	\$ 457,000
<i>Skunk Jones</i>			
SJ-7	2A	Demoray Canal	\$ 61,000
Total Priority 2A Improvements			\$ 518,000
Priority 2B Improvements (20-25 years)			
<i>Skunk Jones</i>			
SJ-2	2B	D Street	\$ 2,181,000
Total Priority 2B Improvements			\$ 2,181,000



CITY OF GRANTS PASS
WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM MASTER PLAN

March 2016

DRAFT REVIEW



Exhibit 2

**City of
Grants Pass, Oregon**
Stormwater Master Plan
Final



KELLER
associates



KELLER
associates

Keller Associates
707 13th St. SE. Suite 280
Salem, OR 97301

212047/5/S16-013



EXPIRES: 12/31/16

Signed by:
Peter Olsen, P.E.
Project Manager



WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM MASTER PLAN

FOR

CITY OF GRANTS PASS

FEBRUARY 2016

DRAFT

MURRAY, SMITH & ASSOCIATES, INC.
121 SW Salmon, Suite 900
Portland, OR 97204
503.225.9010