

City of Lafayette

Phone: (503) 864-2451

Fax : (503) 864-4501

"Third Oldest City in Oregon"

486 Third Street - PO Box 55 - Lafayette, Oregon 97127-0055



LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE WILL MEET IN REGULAR SESSION THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2010 AT 7 PM IN THE CITY HALL MEETING ROOM AT 486 THIRD STREET (99W), LAFAYETTE, OREGON.

AGENDA IS AS FOLLOWS:

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF THE **December 17, 2009 minutes**
4. **Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

The location of this meeting is accessible to the disabled. If you will need any special accommodations to attend or participate in the meeting, please notify City Hall, at (503) 864-2451, at least 24 hours before the meeting.

CITY OF LAFAYETTE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FOR
DECEMBER 17, 2009

Call to Order: Beth Cooke called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

Roll Call: Lori Labb called the roll.

Present: David Gilbey, Ronald Kerr, Beth Cooke, and Dwayne Brittell

Absent: Chad Gooch (excused), Todd Holt (excused), Marian Chasse

Staff Present: Jim Jacks and Lori Labb

Others: Darrell Flood

Approval of Minutes:

Lori Labb noted that the minutes from November 19, 2009 would be available for approval at the January Meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: Text amendment 09-02: Flood Plain Amendments.

Jim Jacks entered the staff report into the record.

Jim Jacks went over the revised memo and summarized the original staff memo.

Beth Cooke asked for public testimony. There was none.

David Gilbey questioned if a flood plain development permit was denied, was there any provisions for protection of the flood plain from construction activities adjacent to the flood plain. Jim Jacks noted that with the federal program you are either in the 100 year flood plain or you are not. If you are within the flood plain you must apply for the flood plain development permit.

Beth Cooke closed the hearing at 7:41

Commission Deliberation: None

David Gilbey made a motion to make a recommendation from the Planning Commission that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments. Dwayne Brittell seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Update on the application for a Technical Assistance Grant:

Jim Jacks noted that he has not heard from DLCD as to whether or not they have awarded the grant.

Adjourn: Dwayne Brittell made a motion to adjourn. Ronald Kerr seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 7:43 pm.

TO: LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: JIM JACKS, CITY PLANNER
SUBJ: PRELIMINARY PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES
DATE: MARCH 18, 2010

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to propose amendments to the Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Most can be categorized as housekeeping. Some material in this memo was in the November 19, 2009 memo to the Planning Commission. The repeated material is provided here so Commissioners won't have to go back and review the November 19 memo.

THE LAFAYETTE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Overall, the current Plan has the "feel" and organization of a Plan from the early 1980's. The aborted Periodic Review work of the late 1990's would have been the first comprehensive update of the Plan.

The Plan includes three major sections, Natural Resources, Community Resources and Community Development. An outline follows.

Natural Resources.

- Air Resources.
- Natural Hazards.
- Water Resources.
- Fish and Wildlife Resources.
- Mineral and Aggregate Resources.
- Energy Resources.
- Open Space.
- Implementation.

Community Resources.

- Education.
- Transportation.
- Solid Waste.
- Energy Use.
- Public Facilities.
- Recreation.

Public Safety and Service.
Communications.
Implementation.

Community Development.
Population and Economics.
Housing.
Land Use and Urbanization.
Implementation.

The Lafayette Comprehensive Plan reflects the planning knowledge and skills available, and the interest and understanding of the city's citizens, at the time the Plan was created.

2009-2011 BIENNIUM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT

About three weeks before the Planning Commission's receipt of the November 19, 2009 memo reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, the COG, in coordination with the City Council and Lafayette staff, applied for the city requesting technical assistance grant funds to review the Comprehensive Plan from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

On March 3, 2010 the COG was informed the City's grant will not be funded. Grant requests totaling about \$5.5 million were received by DLCD. The budget contained \$2.28 million, thus, Statewide, many requests were not funded.

The City has budgeted funds to support planning activities in fiscal year 2009/10, thus the Comprehensive Plan review can proceed without the grant, but the work program must be mindful of the budgeted amount.

PROPOSED DRAFT AMENDMENTS

xxxxxxxxxThe Findings for selected Goal/Policy sections from the 1999 Periodic Review (PR) effort can be updated, except for a buildable lands inventory, housing needs analysis and UGB expansion which would require a significant time and funding commitment.

The goals and policies have been reviewed to ensure they do not commit the city to take actions the city is not financially able or adequately staffed to accomplish. Many policies use the phrase, "The City shall...", but it is not clear if the city has been able to implement all the "shall" policies. If a given policy is not required by the Statewide Planning Goals and if the review determines implementing the policy is problematic, then consideration should be given to changing the policy.

The Implementation Sections have been reviewed to ensure they are accurate and up to date.

Language to be deleted is shown in ~~strikeout~~ and language to be added is shown in **bold italics**.

1. Comprehensive Plan Map (p. 3). An electronic Comprehensive Plan Map should be prepared using Geographic Information System (GIS) technology. The current 11X17 inch map in the Plan is difficult to read. A GIS based map will be more readable, allow for quick changes to designations, allow quick and easy calculation of acreages, distances and quantities and will be able to more accurately locate steep slope and floodplain areas.

2. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 6). In the Findings Section, 3rd bullet. Correct spelling.

Soil hazards ~~in elued~~ **include** slow permeability, high water table, poor drainage, steep slopes, and land slide problems;

3. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 7). Policy 2-1. Reword the current language which calls for eliminating the potential hazard, which is impossible to do. Replace “assure” with “ensure.”

2-1. Development proposals in areas with natural hazards must show construction and design techniques that will ~~eliminate~~ **reduce** the hazard ~~potential~~ and ~~assure~~ **ensure** suitability for the proposed use.

4. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 7). Policy 2-2. Reword to reflect the proper title of the National Flood Insurance Program.

2-2. The City shall continue participation in the ~~HUD~~ **National** Flood Insurance Program.

5. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 7). Policy 2-3, Reword to refer to the Urban Growth Boundary; refer to “steep slopes,” not “building limitations;” and to refer to “the 100-year floodplain.”

2-3. The City shall designate all areas within the planning boundary that have ~~building limitations~~ **steep slopes**, and those which are in the ~~floodplain zone~~ **100-year floodplain as shown in the March 2, 2010 Flood Insurance Study for Yamhill County and Incorporated Cities**, on the plan map.

6. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 7). Policy 2-5. Delete because the city has not had the staff or funding to investigate alternative uses for areas that are unsuitable for development. Additionally, it is internally inconsistent to designate areas as unsuitable for development and then call for investigating uses for those areas. As an option to deleting Policy 2-5, if the city believes that only a use such as “open space” should be allowed in areas that are unsuitable for development, then a policy can be crafted saying that.

~~2-5. The City shall investigate alternative uses for areas unsuitable for development.~~

7. Natural Resources; Natural Hazards (p. 7). Policy 2-6, Delete because it does not appear to be a natural hazard policy. It calls for transitioning agriculture lands into urban lands in a cost-efficient and energy conserving manner, but a cost-efficient and energy conserving transition does not appear to relate to natural hazards. An option would be to consider moving the policy into the UGB policy area or the energy policy area.

~~2-6. The City shall promote the transition of existing agricultural lands into urbanized lands in a manner that is most cost-efficient and energy conserving.~~

8. Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). The Findings, Goal and Policies appear to mix naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows (rivers and streams) and the city's municipal water supplies. Because the Water Resources section is in the Natural Resources Chapter, it is assumed the Water Resources Findings, Goal and Policies should relate to the naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows.

Findings; first and second bullets: Delete as they refer to a source of water for the city's municipal system and should be moved to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities section. Once moved, they should be reviewed to ensure they are consistent with the 2007 Water System Master Plan.

Findings; fourth bullet: Revise to correct a typo (change need to needs) as follows:

A sensitive groundwater area underlies the planning area. The City needs to be aware of....

9. Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). Goal 3-A. Revise to correct typo (change are to area), and make it clear the goal refers to groundwater and surface water resources, not municipal water.

Goal 3-A. To maintain and improve the quality of **groundwater and surface** water resources of the planning ~~are~~ **area** and Lafayette **within the City**.

10. Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). Policy 3-1. Revise to refer to underground and surface water resources.

3-1. The City shall cooperate with and support State and Federal agency efforts to maintain and improve the **underground and surface** water resources.

11. Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). Policy 3-2. Delete as it appears to refer to the municipal water system.

~~3-2. The City shall maximize the utilization of its water resources.~~

12. Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). Policy 3-3. Revise so it is clearer and to ensure it addresses underground and surface water resources.

~~3-3. All effluent from future developments shall~~ **The City shall adopt regulations to ensure** ~~will not detrimentally affect the water quality~~ **of underground and surface waters** of the planning area.

13. Natural Resources; Fish and Wildlife Resources (p. 10). Update to reflect any currently listed endangered fish species in the Yamhill River. Revise the goal statement to make it clear it refers to habitat. As now worded the goal focuses on fish and wildlife, not their habitat, but the focus should be on the habitat, because the city can adopt effective regulations to protect the habitat. Policies 2, 3 and 4 properly refer to habitat. Any designated endangered species are protected by Federal law.

Goal 4-A. To conserve and protect fish and wildlife **habitat** in the planning area.

14. Natural Resources; Mineral and Aggregate Resources (p. 11). Change Goal 5-A and Policy 5-1 to not allow mining in the city. The Finding says, “There is presently no quarrying activity in the City.” A quick review of the city’s zones found that none of them allow mining, thus changing the policy would make it and the uses allowed in the city’s zones consistent.

~~Goal 5-A. To provide land use compatibility between mining and quarrying or related activities with adjacent land uses.~~ **To not allow mineral and aggregate mining in the City.**

~~5-1. The City shall require that mineral and aggregate activities operate in a manner compatible with surrounding land uses.~~ **The City shall not allow mineral and aggregate mining in the City.**

15. Natural Resources; Energy Resources (p. 12). Amend the lead-in sentence to change the reference to the city of Sheridan to the City of Lafayette, and add gasoline and diesel. Also, consider adding policies, including a policy regarding wind energy.

Electricity, heating oil, **gasoline and diesel**, wood, natural gas and propane are the principal fuel types supplying the energy needs for ~~Sheridan~~ **Lafayette**.

16. Natural Resources; Open Space (p. 13). Overall review. Revise the Findings, first bullet to be more easily read. Revise the Goal and Policies to delete “possible” and replace it with “practicable” which is a more accurate term. The word “possible” is inappropriate because it does not include any element of cost or practicality. Ensure the Implementation section is accurate.

Findings, first bullet: The community has a scenic view of the Coast Range. However, no specific *scenic view* sites have been identified for preservation ~~due to scenic views.~~

Goal 7-A. To conserve desired open space whenever possible *practicable*.

Policy 7-1. The City shall preserve open space wherever possible *practicable*.

Policy 7-2. The City shall require all future development to address natural features, open space and *designated* scenic sites and views in their proposals. Residential development within Restricted Development Overlay ~~boundaries-~~ *District* shall be prohibited.

Policy 7-3. Wherever possible *practicable* natural hazard areas shall be designated as open space.

Policy 7-4. Public access shall be encouraged ~~for~~ *to* all *natural* waterways in the planning area.

Policy 7-5. The City shall ~~develop~~ *adopt* regulations to ~~encourage~~ *require* open space *and outdoor recreation areas* in all new *multi-family developments*, residential ~~developments~~ *subdivisions and planned unit developments*.

Policy 7-6. ~~Whenever possible,~~ *The City shall promote adopt regulations requiring* the use of natural drainageways as open space *whenever practicable*, and prohibit storm water flows that would exceed the natural flows.

Policy 7-7. No change.

Policy 7-8. The significant natural features within the City shall be managed for the benefit of the community and shall include all waterways, natural drainageways, wetlands, floodplains, land with significant ~~vegetation~~ *trees*, and ~~valued~~ *designated* scenic views and sites.

Implementation: The status of the Implementation Section is not clear. It requires the City to request the expertise of agencies when reviewing proposals that would affect natural resources, but there is no Policy requiring it and the zone code does not require it. Staff will contact the DLCDC Field Representative regarding the status of the Implementation Section.

Implementation item #2 explains that land with severe building limitations or natural hazards are designated on the Comprehensive Plan Map, but the Map only shows “Open Space Overlay” which appears to include only steep slopes (or maybe it’s the riparian habitat) along Millican Creek and the floodplain along the Yamhill River.

Implementation item #3: The first sentence seems to have an extra word in it (require), thus it is proposed to be deleted.

3. Site Design Review. In addition to a site and building evaluation ~~require~~ for development within the Restricted Development Boundary, ...

17. Community Resources; Education (p. 16). Overall review and updating. Some sections address issues that are not required by the Statewide Planning Goals such as education (there is no Statewide Planning Goal for education). Other government agencies, not the city, are charged with the authority to address education, for example, the McMinnville School District and the Willamette Educational Service District. A goal statement that directs the city to "...provide...educational services for the community..." should be revised to reflect that the city does not have the authority to provide education services. The goal could be changed to support and coordinate with the school district, and such language would be consistent with typical plan policies in other cities. It would slightly correct a policy that was created at a time when the fine points of policy statements were not appreciated to the same extent as today.

Findings, first bullet: Revise the spelling of the elementary school.

~~Washeer~~ **Wascher** Elementary School is the only school facility in the planning area.

Findings, second bullet: Delete because none of the property taxes levied by the city to operate the city government go to the school district. Since the school financing system was changed by the Legislature several years ago, the State pays for the day to day operation of public schools and property taxes levied by school districts pay only for voter approved bond measures or special operating levies. None of the city's property taxes levied to operate the city are spent for public school education. Staff guesses the second bullet actually meant, at that time, that a property owner living in Lafayette would pay property taxes to the city, county, fire district, McMinnville School District, Willamette Educational Service District, and soil and water conservation district, and out of that total property tax bill, 57% of the taxes levied went to the McMinnville School District.

~~57% of the City of Lafayette's tax dollars are spent for education.~~

Findings, third bullet: Revise to make it clear the elementary school referred to is the same one, Wascher Elementary, as was mentioned in the first bullet.

With the construction of ~~the~~ **Wascher e** Elementary s **School**, the community's ~~educational~~ **elementary school** needs will be met through the year 2005.

Goal 8-A. To ~~provide~~ **support the McMinnville School District in providing** the highest quality of educational services for the community in a most cost-efficient and orderly manner.

18. Community Resources; Transportation (p. 17). It appears the Transportation section reflects the 2003 Transportation System Plan. An overall review is needed, but not included in this memo, to ensure the transportation goals and policies are up to date. The public transportation language should be updated to reflect the existence of the Yamhill County Transit District.

19. Community Resources; Solid Waste (p. 23). Overall review to ensure the language is up to date given the recent county-wide issues with the landfill. There is no Statewide Planning Goal for solid waste. Solid waste issues can be affected by City policies to a certain extent, for example, a Plan policy supporting yard debris pick-up can have an effect on the amount and type of material going to the landfill. If the policy is to be meaningful, the city would need to enter discussions with the solid waste franchisee and require yard debris pick-up in the city with the associated increase in solid waste fees.

Finding #2: Update to indicate the tons of refuse generated. The amount will likely be more than 5 tons due to the 100% population increase from 1990 to 2000 and the 49% increase from 2000 to 2009.

Lafayette generates approximately 5 ? tons of refuse weekly.

Finding #3: Update to indicate the current capacity of Riverbend Landfill based on the recent land use decision to increase the area of the landfill.

The Riverbend Landfill has adequate capacity to meet the needs of the planning area beyond 2005 ?.

Policy 10-1. The City shall coordinate efforts with the contracted disposal service to ~~assure~~ **ensure** that the solid waste disposal needs on the community are being met in a most const-efficient and energy conserving manner.

20. Community Resources; Energy Use (p. 24). Wind energy is included, generally, with other alternative energy forms in Policy 11-4, but it could be included specifically, along with solar, in the material.

Findings, first bullet: Update the statistics.

For the period 1977 through 1997, total energy consumption ~~ion~~ **in** Oregon is expected to increase at an average annual rate of 2.5% per year.

21. Community Resources; Public Facilities (p. 26). Overall review and update to reflect the sewer facility upgrade and the 2007 Water System Master Plan. Due to the voluminous material in the Water System Master Plan, proposed amendments to the Public Facilities section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

22. Community Resources; Recreation (p. 27). Overall review and update to reflect the Park and Recreation Master Plan. Staff has not been able to properly review the recent Parks and Recreation Master Plan, thus proposed amendments to the Recreation section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

23. Community Resources; History (p. 28). Overall review and update to reflect changes such as the relocation of the Yamhill County Museum out of the City and determine if any historical structures have been demolished. The proposed amendments to the History section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

24. Community Resources; Public Safety and Service (p. 29). Overall update. The proposed amendments to the History section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

25. Community Resources; Communications (p. 30). Overall update. Determine if the Communications Policies are implemented in the Zoning Ordinance with Wireless Communication Facility standards and a process to review them. The proposed amendments to the History section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

26. Community Development; Population and Economics (p. 33). The city is not the same as it was in the mid-1980's when the original Plan was created. The city's population more than doubled from 1990 to 2000 and then grew 49% from 2000 to 2008.

Policy 17-8 does not allow the population projection used for the wastewater treatment facility to be used for urban growth boundary (UGB) expansion purposes and calls for any population projection to be developed as part of Period Review (PR). Even though the city will not expand the UGB as part of this review, the policy could be changed to more accurately reflect that cities less than 10,000 population are no longer required to be in PR and be eligible for the PR funds in the DLCDD biennial budget. As a practical matter, cities less than 10,000 population that want to enter PR, may not be rated for PR funding as high as cities that are required by Statute to enter PR.

The economy goal/policies could be reviewed in terms of the vineyard and winery agribusiness and tourism that has become an important part of the Yamhill County economy. Nearby small cities such as Dundee and Carlton have prospered commercially compared to Lafayette.

The proposed amendments to the Population and Economics section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

27. Community Development; Housing (p. 37). A housing needs analysis will not be prepared as part of this review. The proposed amendments to the housing section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

28. Community Development; Land Use and Urbanization (p. 40). Policy 19-8 (p. 41) requires a change to the UGB to be based on 7 factors. It is not clear if the 7 factors are consistent with current State Statute. If the 7 factors are different than State Statute, they should be considered for deletion so the State Statute would be the governing factors controlling UGB changes. A revised policy could commit the city to comply with the State Statute rather than add 7 local factors to the State's factors.

Policy 19-9 (p. 41) requires the city to establish a review schedule in conformance with the period review schedule established by LCDC, but periodic review isn't required any longer for cities less than 10,000 population. Consider adding a 10-year review period for the comp plan.

The proposed amendments to the housing section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

29. Community Development; Citizen Involvement and Plan Development (p. 45). Overall review is needed. The proposed amendments to the citizen involvement and plan development section are not included in this memo, but will be included in a future memo.

End.

TO: LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: JIM JACKS, CITY PLANNER
SUBJ: SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT: Water Resources and Public Facilities
DATE: MARCH 18, 2010

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to show the proposed amendments to the Water Resources Findings, Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan and to the Public Facilities Section.

WATER RESOURCES

Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). The Findings, Goal and Policies appear to mix naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows (rivers and streams) and the city's municipal water supplies. Because the Water Resources Section is in the Natural Resources Chapter, it is assumed the Water Resources Findings, Goal and Policies should relate to the naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows.

Findings. Amend to separate the subject of the naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows from the city's municipal water supply. Remove the bullets and assign numbers to clearly identify each finding.

First Bullet:

1. The most abundant groundwater source is ~~most likely~~ south of the planning area.

Second Bullet:

~~Lafayette's water supply is derived from groundwater sources.~~ [Move to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities Section, and amend to clearly indicate the source of the city's municipal water supply.]

Third Bullet:

2. ~~There is little recreational use provided by~~ **The ground water and surface water resources in the planning area *have a low level of use for recreational purposes.***

Fourth Bullet:

3. A sensitive groundwater area underlies the planning area. The City needs to be aware of potential impacts on sensitive groundwater areas from underground storage tanks, storm drainage, chemical spills, residential on-site sewage disposal systems, and other similar land uses. [Revise to correct a typo -- change need to needs.]

Goal. Amend to correct a typo (change are to area), and make it clear the goal refers to groundwater and surface water resources, not municipal water.

Goal 3-A. To maintain and improve the quality of *groundwater and surface* water resources of the planning ~~are~~ *area* and ~~Lafayette~~ *within the City*.

Policies. Amend Policy 3-1 to refer to underground and surface water resources.

3-1. The City shall cooperate with and support State and Federal agency efforts to maintain and improve ~~the~~ *underground and surface* water resources.

Policies. Move Policy 3-2 to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities Section, as it appears to refer to the municipal water system.

~~3-2. The City shall maximize the utilization of its water resources.~~

Policies. Amend Policy 3-3 to be clearer and to ensure it addresses underground and surface water resources.

~~3-32. All effluent from future~~ *The City shall adopt regulations requiring new development to connect to the municipal sanitary sewer system to ensure developments shall will not detrimentally affect the water quality of underground and surface waters* of the planning area.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Findings. Amend to reflect the 2007 Water System Master Plan. Remove the bullets and assign numbers to clearly identify each finding.

Add a finding regarding the source of the City's water as the first finding.

1. Lafayette's water supply is derived from ~~groundwater sources~~ *springs and wells northeast of the city and from the Dayton/Lafayette well field south of the city. The springs and wells are the primary source, but their flow decreases in the summer and it is augmented by a well in the Dayton/Lafayette well field. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 1.1, p. 1-1.)* [Moved here from the Natural Resources Chapter, Water Resources Section, second bullet.]

First Bullet:

2. ~~The City Park well presently violates Environmental Protection Agency standards~~ ***The City's finished water quality is generally good. The water is tested periodically for bacteriological contamination, organic and inorganic chemical contaminants, disinfection byproducts, and a variety of radioactive compounds. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.3.3, p. 4-11.)***

Second Bullet:

3. A 500,000 gallon storage reservoir was completed in 1979 , ***but its capacity is insufficient for the City's current population resulting in odd/even water rationing in the late spring or early summer.***

Third Bullet:

4. ~~The City's water distribution system is adequate for the present time.~~ ***The layout of the existing water system appears to be adequate to deliver the required domestic flow rates to the community. However, some portions of the system do not have the capacity to deliver required fire flows while maintaining the required 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure at all service connections. This lack of capacity is the result of pipe sizes that are too small and the configuration of the distribution system. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.4.1, p. 4-11.)***

Fourth Bullet:

5. ~~The present water supply system will meet City needs to at least the year 2005.~~ ***The 1994 Water Master Plan anticipated a population of 3,014 in 2014 (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.4.1, p. 4-11). The July 1, 2009 estimated population by the Oregon Center for Population Research and Census was 3,925 which is 911 more, five years prior to 2014.***

Fifth Bullet:

6. ***The City upgraded its waste water treatment plant in the mid-2000's.***
The City's sewer system is in good condition and has adequate capacity to meet demand to 2005; ~~only provided in the downtown business area and in new residential developments~~ ***about 201X .***

Goal. Amend to correct a typo (change and to an).

Goal 12-A. To provide ~~and~~ ***an*** orderly and efficient arrangement of water, sewer and storm drainage services to the City.

Policies. Amend Policy 12-4 to include water and sewer systems.

Policy 12-4. The City shall require new development to provide a ***water, sewer, and*** storm drainage and collection system within the development.

Policies. Add a new Policy 12-5 committing the City to follow the recommended capital improvement plan in the 2007 Water System Master Plan.

Policy 12-5. The City shall follow the capital improvement plan in the 2007 Water System Master Plan, Section 7.1.2, p. 7-3.

Policies. Add a new Policy 12-6 committing the City to work with Yamhill County and the cities in the county to consider a joint water distribution plan.

Policy 12-6. The City shall support efforts, and shall participate in a process, to consider a joint water distribution plan for the north-central Yamhill County.

End.