

**MINUTES OF THE
NEWBERG URBAN AREA MANAGEMENT COMMISSION MEETING**

**Newberg Public Library
Tuesday, 7:00 PM**

**Newberg, Oregon
July 13, 1993**

I. CONVENE MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jack Kriz at 7:15 p.m.

Staff Present:

Dennis Egner, Planning Director
Sara King, Associate Planner
Peggy R. Hall, Secretary

NUAMC Members Present:

Dennis Goecks, Yamhill County Commission
Jack Kriz, Newberg Planning Commission
Don Halbrook, Yamhill County Planning Commission
Rob Hallyburton, Sr. Planner Yamhill County
Leslie Lewis, Yamhill County Planning Commission
Martin McIntosh, Newberg City Council

Absent:

Bill Jackson, At Large
Alan Halstead, At Large

Citizens Present: Approximately 3 were present.

II. NUAMC APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Director Egner noted that on page 10, the motion relating to changing the UGB should be revised to indicated that the motion carried 4-1 with Kriz voting "no". This revision was based on a double check of the voting sheet.

Commissioner Goecks noted that on page 10, Mr. Friedman lived off Corral Creek Road in Yamhill County.

MOTION: Goecks-Halbrook to approve June 15, 1993 minutes as corrected. Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING (CONT): NEWBERG TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Dennis Egner, Newberg Planning Director, reviewed the process for adoption of the plan with discussion focussing on need to complete the County transportation plan before completion of the City plan, and the Crestview alignment. He suggested that the Commission continue discussion on the arterial collection system and public transportation plan, bike/pedestrian plan and the utilities plan.

Commissioner Goecks noted that the Mayor and City Manager met with the Board of Commissioners on the process. He indicated that the concept from last meeting, prior to final siting of arterials, was supported by the Commissioners at the meeting. He noted that the process is going through and that joint meetings with City and County are leading in that direction. He wanted to go through a fast track process relating to the transportation study, including interfacing with the County and cities. He felt that they should look at interfacing of Newberg first.

Rob Hallyburton, Sr. Planner for Yamhill Co., indicated that the County Planning and Public Works staff met today relating to a potential time frame for the County transportation plan. He noted that he was instructed to put out an RFQ to a list of potential consultants with the following time schedule: return RFQ to county - 8-19; do interviews by 8-31; and completion of selection process by 9-15. The proposal was to be off and running within two months. Everyone at the County is aware of a commitment to do the Newberg area first.

Commissioner Goecks felt the request should go out to both organizations. He indicated that local consultants included Kittleson and another group in McMinnville and there were other entities that could bid out on the project. Mr. Goecks asked for further contacts. He noted that the mailing list was open to any additions that the Board may know about.

Commissioner McIntosh noted he recognized the value of a 50 year plan. He expressed concern that whatever the County does with the transportation, it should go along with Newberg. He felt that Newberg had a 40 year plan with Crestview through Oxberg. He didn't want to see that it be included in beginning phases of 50 year plan when in reality, based on his own personal experience, it was already 25-26 years into a 50 year plan. He felt the Oxberg/Crestview portion of the plan should be resolved now. He noted that if the City and County do not do something, the State will remove the option. He felt the County should play a stronger role in this.

Mr. Egner stated that when going through the bypass study, the State will recognize the City plan and will try to work with the plan if the County plan is in the process during that process. They will not likely hold up their process waiting for the County to decide. He did not see Mr. McIntosh's concerns as a problem. He noted that the County already has policies in its plan that talks about a bypass.

Commissioner McIntosh felt there should not be unnecessary delays.

Arterial and Collector Systems

Mr. Egner discussed the arterial and collector systems of the Transportation Plan which extend outside of the city limits. He noted that some of the systems are within the UGB and the list of facilities have not been adjusted.

Aspen Way

Aspen Way is mostly within the UGB up to the top of the UGB near its intersection with Bell Road. It would be a collector status street and would be widened to two full lanes of traffic, bicycle lanes and sidewalks on each side of the street and a signal at Mountainview. Aspen Way would provided the needed connections between areas in the north. He then reviewed the map on pg. 63 of the Transportation Plan. He noted that it makes a distinction between streets that are city collectors which turn into a county collector system.

Columbia

He noted that Columbia would require reconstruction between Chehalem Drive and College to collector standards. He noted that Columbia extends outside the UGB beyond Chehalem Creek to Chehalem Drive.

Mountainview

He noted that Mountainview held a collector status and was similar to Columbia as it extends west in the vicinity of Cullen Rd. He noted that the consultant recommended a minor arterial status on that portion of Mountainview east of College and a collector status west of College.

Springbrook

He indicated that the lower part within City would be 2-3 lanes (2 travel lanes with a center turn lane), and beyond that, it would be a two lane facility. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended that Highway 219 not be re-routed and that this section of Springbrook retain collector status. It is a County road.

County Arterials

Mr. Egner then reviewed recommendations that the following roads be designated as County arterials: Chehalem Drive, Benjamin Road, Wilsonville Road, and Bell Road. He noted that there are not specific projects identified in the plan but these roads are designated as County arterials. He noted that the County arterial standard is similar to City collector standard.

Commission Discussion:

Chair Kriz asked if there was any further discussion on any issues mentioned.

Commissioner Lewis asked if bike lanes were intended to go on each one route.

Mr. Egner indicated that the city collector standard includes a bike lane. This means that on new collector streets bike lanes would be required. No existing streets have been improved to collector standards. As streets redevelop, the fees collected by the system development charge and assessments of property owners would be used for bringing them up to standard. He indicated that the city philosophy on street improvement was that everyone who fronts on a street, pays for the local street; the system development charge pays for the added cost to make the local street a collector street.

Commissioner Lewis questioned the assessment requirement on existing streets.

Mr. Egner noted that funding could also be through a local improvement district. He noted that local streets were 32-34 ft., which includes curbs with sidewalks. He noted that a collector street has two travel lanes, may or may not have a center turn lane, and has bike lanes on both sides.

Commissioner Lewis questioned pedestrian and bike peak usage. She noted that at most 20 bikes were the maximum using bike lanes during peak usage. She felt that this was typical through most of the City with the possible exception of bike lanes near schools. She felt that for the cost to benefit ratio was too high. She felt that the transportation plan should address bike usage; however, she was concerned about the excessive cost to serve such few individuals. She felt that the average citizen would also be upset.

Ms. King noted that if roads were not easily bikeable, they would not be used extensively.

Commissioner Lewis felt that in all likelihood, bike riding would not increase that much, even if roads were made easier to bike. She noted that bikers would probably not include adults going to and from work and shopping. She felt this was not a convenient method of transportation and was, for the most part, primarily used by children in neighborhoods or near schools. Other than that, it is an expense that is asking a large percentage of the population to bear the cost burden for a small percentage of population.

Commissioner Goecks concurred. He felt that the legislature was attempting to force people into alternate methods of transportation.

Mr. Egner indicated that it was the intent of the plan to try to make opportunity for bicycles and to provide choices to the public. The steering committee that worked on the plan established broad goals to encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic. He noted that the proposed bike plan as it relates to collector streets is not different than the plan text in effect now. He noted that the current bike plan map does not show a bike lane on every collector street. The plan in effect now was completed before the steering committee goals were developed.

Commissioner Goecks noted that there were major changes in the State's direction about a year ago. He noted that now the state money is proposed to upgrade roads.

Commissioner Lewis felt that society has gotten fast paced and people value their time more. If it takes more time to commute, the plan will not be favorable.

Commissioner Kriz indicated he was on the transportation plan steering committee. He commented that general goals included all types of transportation planning and that Newberg's visioning process included the ability to get around on foot or bike. He noted that other cities have great pedestrian networks.

Commissioner Lewis was concerned about the cost to taxpayers.

Mr. Hallyburton noted that costs associated with the traffic now are created by automobile traffic and that the plan allows other forms of transportation to reduce the traffic cost.

Commissioner Lewis noted that people generally commute "through" Newberg and not within city.

Mr. Egner commented consideration of the expense of a bike plan is a good question for the City Council and Planning Commission to address. He was not sure that a recommendation on this issue ought to come from NUAMC. He felt the focus of the group should be that the City and County interface.

Commissioner Lewis indicated she would not vote on anything requiring bike lanes on collectors due to the increase in cost.

Commissioner Goecks commented that there were a number of issues to cover under the arterial/collector system.

Public Transportation Plan

Mr. Egner noted that the consultant has indicated a connection into the Tri-met system may be feasible relating to commuter traffic. He indicated that on a first cut analysis, it appeared possible to have a bus system that would work. He suggested that the City, County, ODOT and McMinnville should conduct a market survey relating to a local transit system, in order to make an agreement with TriMet for development of better bus access to Portland. He noted that Newberg could not do a bus connection to Portland by itself. He added that the steering committee expressed a desire to for a public transportation connection.

MOTION: Goecks-Lewis that NUAMC go on record opposing any type of action that would bring the County into the Tri-met taxing district. The approach would be to develop transportation plans county wide so that there would be interfaces within the county.

Discussion on Motion:

Mr. Egner suggested that the proposed change could be added on pg. 72. of the transportation plan.

Commissioner Halbrook noted that one of the selling points for Yamhill County is that it is not in the Trimet taxing district.

Mr. Egner commented that the reference to Tri-met was a recognition that Tri-met runs a transit district and that we may want to get Tri-met to run this district.

By consensus NUAMC members did not want to get Tri-met involved.

Ms. Lewis felt it was debatable that Tri-met runs their transportation district successfully. She felt that people moved to Newberg to reside in a small community and not in the METRO area, and that it is important that this opportunity remain. She noted that MLP Associates think that Newberg is a bedroom community of Portland. She urged the City to attract good paying jobs including manufacturing to Newberg, so people don't have to commute. She noted that the Chehalis future focus hoped to create more jobs in the area rather than what the consultant thought was to happen. The City needs to make a good effort to not make Newberg a bedroom community. She added that being out of the Tri-met taxing district was one more reason to move to Yamhill County. This district adds costs to businesses.

Commissioner Goecks asked how would it interface with point 4, page 74 relating to the local transit system.

Mr. Egner said that it would mean a direct bus line to Portland instead of being required to connect to Sherwood; a bus line much like that in Vancouver that Seatran (separate district) runs to incorporate Seatran buses into the Tri-met system. Seatran buses are non-stop commuter buses.

Commissioner Lewis noted that Salem and Portland commuters are generally government employees and she felt that more commuters would be likely use transit to Beaverton and Tigard.

Mr. Egner indicated that market studies could be done to consider these different things and that more studies should be done.

Commissioner Goecks called for the question.

Vote on Motion: Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Goecks-McIntosh to request that all current road access, including rail, in use, be held in the public good rather than under private ownership. Once corridors are lost they are more expensive to re-establish. Take section out of air/rail/water, etc. that deals with passenger service and move to public transportation section (pg. 78).

Discussion on Motion:

Commissioner McIntosh questioned how to handle alleyways which are vacated and un-used for a year or so. He felt the issue would be an easy matter to include. He mentioned Rocket Park and the gun shop across from Dairy Queen.

Mr. Egner noted that the City receives numerous requests for street vacations. He noted that there is a fairly careful analysis process for the City to use and there is no need to worry about the street vacation process. He noted that it was a council decision each time a vacation request was processed.

Commissioner Goecks said there was a major project now occurring relating to abandoning the Southern Pacific line between Carlton and Yamhill. He thought it was still part of a transit line and it would likely end up reverting to private ownership. He noted that Southern Pacific owns that piece of railroad; the right-of-way is still there and not owned by the County.

Commissioner McIntosh felt that something needed to be done to retain public ownership.

Commissioner Goecks indicated the need for a policy statement for preserving easements rather than have them revert out.

Commissioner Halbrook asked if they were public easements or private property.

Ms. King indicated both situations occur.

Commissioner Goecks, Kriz, and Halbrook indicated there was a need for some kind of mechanism to provide for this type of ownership and be more pro-active.

Mr. Egner indicated that the plan did not address passenger travel very clearly in the original draft. He noted that the May 17th memo from Public Works Director Teitzel included corrections to the plan. There is a whole section on rail including an amendment to the air/rail/water and pipeline section. The City's plan reiterates what the State's plan states. It noted that there should be a further study of the use of the line for passenger service.

Commissioner Goecks indicated there was a need to study the issue further, but also to preserve the right-of-way in whatever form is necessary.

Mr. Egner noted that the passenger rail section includes three policy sections relating to cooperation with the state and other agencies to preserve rights-of-way. He suggested that the section relating to air/rail/water, and dealing with passenger service should be moved to the public transportation section.

Commissioner Lewis noted that the rail is already there. She questioned whether there was a need to pay for the right-of-way and what other issues were involved.

Mr. Egner noted that there is a state law which talks about vacation of railroad right-of-way.

Vote on Motion: Motion carried unanimously.

Bicycle/transportation Plan

Mr. Egner noted that the State will install bike lanes on facilities that extend outside the city limits into the County.

MOTION: Goecks/McIntosh that city staff review the county bike plan and coordinate the City bike plan with the County's adopted bicycle plan. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Egner noted that the County plan was only available in draft form last year.

Commissioner Goecks noted the County bike plan was completed within the last six months.

Commissioner Kriz noted he had been involved in the County transportation study.

Commissioner Goecks noted that the County was looking at gas tax money for improvement of Northfield Road with a potential upgrade on Westside Road. He was concerned that they tie in around the Newberg area. He expressed concern that the road plans be coordinated.

Mr. Egner discussed various bike paths, indicating that most are pretty well networked. He noted that Mountainview does not connect.

Commissioner Kriz said it should be connected.

Commissioner Halbrook noted that off east 14th street, under or over bypass along Dayton Avenue, all the property is private and the route should be connected.

Mr. Egner noted that one bike path follows Chehalem Creek and one follows the bypass. He noted that there is a connection from Wyooski to Chehalem Creek creating a recreational loop.

Mr. Halbrook expressed concern that all bike routes should be connected.

Ms. King indicated that open spaces should be kept available for recreational use.

Mr. Egner suggested that a bike route be added on Ninth Street.

Commissioner Halbrook asked if that Aspen Way up to Bell Road was anticipated to have two bike lanes.

Mr. Egner indicated it should be connected and this would occur through coordination with the county bike plan. Mr. Egner noted that 14th street as a bike route is in the current plan.

Commissioner Halbrook asked if there was a bike lane on College or Hwy 219.

Mr. Egner noted that the City needed to coordinate better with the County plan and connect more bike lanes.

Commissioner Halbrook felt that the bike plans should coordinate better.

Commissioner Kriz noted that as the areas develop the routes would be improved.

Mr. Egner felt the option should be reserved to install bike lanes.

Commissioner Goecks noted that in Wichita, Kansas streets are laid out with complete planning for bicycle and vehicle access.

Commissioner Kriz noted that provide there is a way to get there, people will commute on bikes.

Mr. Egner noted that pedestrian use requires that sidewalks are installed on all streets. He noted that the only additional pedestrian benefit is that off-street bike paths could be used as a walking or running path. He cited the area along Chehalem and Hess Creek as an example.

Commissioner Halbrook asked about bikes and access to buildings.

Mr. Egner noted that NUAMC would not be involved, but they would be participating in city's committee.

Air, Rail, Water and Pipeline Plan

Mr. Egner noted that this section recognizes Sportsman Airpark at its present location. He reviewed the section relating to airport retention. He noted that if the airport was upgraded, some revisions to this section would be required. He commented that an airport study was done a few years ago and the City was considering buying the airport. The result of the study was that it was not financially advisable for city to purchase airport; however, the city was interested in keeping its options open.

Mr. Egner commented that the other portions of this section were pretty minor and discussed water borne transportation and rail service, including freight, passenger and pipelines in and out of city. He noted that these items were included to address state requirements.

Commissioner Goecks questioned the justification of purchase of the airport and whether it was a good investment for city.

Mr. Egner indicated that there was a concern about keeping the airport and the possibility of rerouting Hwy. 219 and how much impact the city has on keeping the airport.

Commissioner Goecks asked what the airport does for the city.

Mr. Egner indicated the airport provides agricultural service and air services for local businesses.

Mr. Halbrook noted that it provides passenger service and agricultural uses together with plane rentals. He noted that local businesses utilize the services and there are hangers for private planes, maintenance, etc. He felt the Highway 219 problem was aggravated by the Second Street access.

MOTION: Halbrook-Lewis to recommend approval of the action that the Planning Commission took relating to rerouting Hwy 219 from Hancock to Springbrook. Vote on Motion: 4 Yes/1 No (McIntosh). Motion carried.

Commissioner McIntosh thought there were benefits in re-routing Hwy 219. He thought the airport would benefit and the airport would like to see it moved.

Mr. Egner indicated that the transportation plan indicates Hwy. 219 should be rerouted out of the airport area off Hancock down Springbrook. He noted that another option was to route it onto Springbrook to Mountainview and over to College.

Commissioner Lewis noted that was a long term plan and that NUAMC needs to make recommendation.

Mr. Egner discussed the changes and asked whether this section of Springbrook should be a collector street, arterial or minor arterial street. He indicated this affects a number of access points.

Commissioner Goecks noted this changes the access flow and there are additional needs beyond that of a normal collector.

Mr. Egner noted that in the State Plan relating to Highway 219, the minimum space between access points (intersection or driveway) is 500 feet. The City minor arterial standard is the same as the State's; however, the City's collector standard is 100 feet. This would allow an access every 100 feet along Springbrook. If the State standard were applied on 219, the access would be limited to 500 feet.

Commissioner Goecks indicated that the City was talking about major improvement.

Mr. Egner noted that the plan could incorporate improvements relating to access management along Springbrook Road. He noted there are a number of small individual parcels in this area, and every time a change is requested, the owners would be required to coordinate access with their neighbors. He noted that in the short run, perhaps the area should have collector rather than arterial status.

Commissioner Kriz noted that the Planning Commission discussed this issue and they noted that it would hold up people from doing things because they would have to coordinate access with abutting property owners.

Commissioner Goecks recommend that it be looked at as potential option when dealing with the city/county interface.

MOTION: Goecks/Halbrook that as the County starts to look at the transportation plan and interface with the City, a northerly route for Highway 219 (straight north off Springbrook and connecting across Mountainview), or a route following the State proposed bypass, should be looked at as a potential method of re-routing traffic.

Discussion on Motion:

Commissioner Kriz suggested routing 219 along the State proposed bypass route.

Mr. Egner suggested that the design of intersection may not allow a Springbrook/219 intersection at Mountainview.

Commissioner Goecks indicated that the intent appeared to be to loop the road around the City to allow individuals to choose whether they wanted to go into the city or go around it and not clog up the streets.

Mr. Egner noted that the bypass was being designed as a "bypass", not as a facility to allow inter-city traffic to occur. He noted that it was likely that the limited access would prevent people from entering or existing the bypass at frequent intervals.

Commissioner Kriz felt that the option to allow Highway 219 to follow the bypass route should not be eliminated at this time.

Commissioner Goecks suggested a northerly routing of 219 be included.

Commissioners Kriz and McIntosh concurred.

Commissioner Goecks indicated that no matter what decision was made, someone wouldn't like it. He noted that he would just as soon take the heat for a long term solution than a 5-10 year solution which would just require the process to be repeated.

Vote on Motion: Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Egner noted that all the issues have been reviewed which cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Chair Kriz asked if there were any further issues to be discussed.

Commissioner Halbrook asked the road system near the Werth property was being upgraded.

Mr. Egner indicated that there was a very large area of potential development and it is assumed there will be a local street system to service the area.

Chair Kriz noted there would be no access to bypass from the Werth property except at Brutscher or Fernwood.

Mr. Egner requested the NUAMC make a recommendation to both City Council and County Commissioners on the issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Commissioner Lewis questioned whether NUAMC should move the whole plan forward since NUAMC has not discussed the whole plan.

Mr. Egner noted that the discussion has centered over what NUAMC has jurisdiction over; however, NUAMC has authority to make recommendations on any part of the plan.

MOTION: McIntosh-Lewis to recommend approval of that portion of the transportation plan as adjusted by NUAMC motions and which pertains to areas NUAMC has jurisdiction over.

Discussion of Motion:

Commissioner McIntosh asked if the motion would allow both the city and county to move forward with the transportation plan.

Mr. Egner indicated that the Planning Commission has not yet concluded the transportation plan hearing and will be forwarding a recommendation to the City Council at their August meeting.

It was noted that additional public testimony would be taken on issues such as the Crestview collector at the City Council hearing.

Vote on Motion: Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Goecks-McIntosh to adjourn at 8:55 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Egner indicated that he had a 15 minute slide presentation introducing the NW specific plan and he requested the additional time to share it with the Committee.

Goecks-McIntosh withdrew the motion to adjourn.

Mr. Egner presented the slide show, pointing out that it was proposed as a sample master plan for the area. He noted that the issue and plan amendment requirements will be presented to NUAMC in September. He noted that NUAMC would be meeting on August 10 to discuss urban reserve areas.

MOTION: Goecks-Halbrook to adjourn at 9:25 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.