



MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF NEWBERG / YAMHILL COUNTY
NEWBERG URBAN AREA MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
Newberg Public Safety Building - 401 E. Third Street - Newberg, OR
Wednesday, July 11, 2007
7:00 PM**

I. ROLL CALL

Leslie Lewis (arrived 7:04 p.m.)	Robert Soppe	Matson Haug (Chair)
Alan Halstead	Michael Sherwood	
Sally Dallas	Warren Parrish	

Absent:

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, Newberg Planning and Building Director
Ken Friday, Yamhill County Planning Division

II. OPEN MEETING Chair Haug called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR (items are considered routine and are not discussed unless requested by the commissioners)

MOTION #1: Commissioner Sherwood/Commissioner Soppe to approve the NUAMC minutes from June 11, 2007.

Commissioner Soppe - noted Motion #8, page 14. Stated he does not believe he voted in favor of the motion, but couldn't say with certainty.

VOTE ON MOTION #1: (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carried.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (5 minute maximum per person)

Ten to twelve citizens were present at the beginning of the meeting, and they were offered a chance to speak on issues not on the agenda. No additional items were brought forth.

IV. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS (A continuation from June 11, 2007)

1. APPLICANT: City of Newberg

REQUEST: Recommend Approval of Newberg Southeast Land Use and Transportation Plan

LOCATION: Area south of 99W, west of Corral Creek Road and Renne Rd., North of

FILE: UGB 05-015

Chair Haug discussed how this meeting is a continuation of the June 11, 2007 meeting. The public testimony both written and oral have been concluded. We will pick up with the staff summary and will continue deliberations.

Barton Brierley reviewed the decisions that have been made to date, the location of north/south road and the general configuration recommended. Decisions that still need to be made are how to access Highway 99W both before and after the bypass is constructed, accesses on Schaad Rd., phasing the project, funding and financing, and an overall recommendation.

There are 4 options (A - D) on how to access 99W before the bypass is constructed.

1(a) Allow that connection at Corral Creek Rd. with management to the intersection. Management would be limiting turn movements and ultimately closing the intersection as volumes increase.

2(b) Construct that part of the interchange. This is an expensive option. Technically doable but financially, probably not.

3(c) Connecting it to Providence Drive and having a road connect east/west that would connect either Corral Creek or to the north/south road directly to connect over to Providence Dr. so access could be made through the current signal at Providence Dr. There are some challenges, such as the creek would need to be crossed and the bypass would need to be crossed. There is some topography issues there.

Commissioner Lewis - the bypass would have to be crossed and at one point we were going to ask ODOT whether or not, because of where the ramps will be in that location, could this actually be under the bypass. Did we get the answer to that question? **Barton Brierley** - We've got a preliminary answer and ODOT will be working on a study to give us a more definitive answer. Looking at the map and the topography, it would go under the bypass at that location. There would have to be some structure built to go under the bypass.

Barton Brierley reviewed option *4(d)*. To simply wait and not allow development in this area until the bypass is constructed.

Chair Haug asked each member to comment on the options and asked Ken Friday for his opinion.

Ken Friday - appreciates having the opportunity to comment but doesn't have a strong opinion on any of the options.

Commissioner Soppe - From the county's point of view on the Corral Creek intersection, does the county see any need to change that without the area being developed? **Ken Friday** - The county Public Works Dept. in the past has voiced concern about that intersection. It has safety problems and with added traffic would not be the best option. In the long term, the county would be supportive with closing that off or limiting it to some degree.

Commissioner Dallas - would rather pass at this moment.

Commissioner Soppe - option (b) is a possibility but can't see having the money to do that. Just doing option (a) is a concern since that is a long distance to get from the north end of the northeast

property and can see a lot of pressure occurring directly to the east. There are concerns about extending Trails End Rd. west, but something of that general nature is in the city's TSP. I can certainly lean towards restricting the amendments until after the bypass. My order of preference is (d) first and (c) second.

Commissioner Haug - asked to see the maps for (a) and (c) and pointed out his thoughts on each with his preference of building an additional ramp to exit towards Sherwood.

Commissioner Sherwood - Fernwood/Brutscher is going to cause a traffic mess down there and is my last choice. Corral Creek is third and I can't see that happening without the bypass. Using an east/west road on Trails End over to Providence Dr. is my first choice and option (d) to do nothing is my second choice. I'm inclined to lean towards Trails End and if the bypass does happen, won't have to go under the bypass when it's built. **Commissioner Lewis** - if you do the Trails End into Providence you wouldn't in the future have to do the Corral Creek underpass and going onto the frontage road and connecting up with Crestview. **Commissioner Sherwood** - That's correct. It gives you Newberg and Sherwood options.

Commissioner Lewis - asked to see the options on the screen once again. I agree with what's been said about option (b). The question has been asked if the county was going to do something about Corral Creek Rd. anyway. It is in our TSP, but we don't have any funding source and it is something the county has recognized for a long time. There is a whole list of intersection improvements all around the county that need to be done with no way to fund. Having said that, if we're looking at it as something that would get done as part of a UGB annexation and a new development, it would certainly be one to consider doing, but it will not be enough to deal with the transportation issues of all of the potential development in the southeast area. There are difficulties if you rely only on option (a) if you only fix the Corral Creek intersection. I could go with (d) being first, and then (c) and (a) together and (b) off the table.

Commissioner Halstead - option (b) is a no go. If you institute (d) and restrict UGB amendments until after the bypass is in you're going to penalize not just the people in the northern part but everyone down to Wilsonville Rd. Providence has concerns about extending Trails End Rd. I would like to change the wording in option (a), regulating turning movements from Corral Creek to 99W, close it off as necessary and redirecting traffic to the Trails End. Traffic would not go down to Fernwood/ Brutscher but on an extension of Trails End Rd. I can see Corral Creek or the immediate 2 - 3 years being a viable option for access into that area, but after that the Trails End crossover with a light at Brutscher St. is the most viable option in the long run.

Commissioner Parrish - there is no money for option (a). We need to realize all the implications and public safety is very important. Option (b) is a nice idea but there is not definitive funding for it. There's an option that ODOT's staff has not presented. If you look down from Old Parrett Mountain Rd. and went from Corral Creek Rd. and go over towards 99W there is a road right now that goes over to the golf course. If you draw a straight line from that area past the north end of the first nine that is now constructed you can have your east/west road. I understand that Providence doesn't like that idea either. **Commissioner Soppe** - It sounds like the original east/west road. Commissioner Parrish explained in detail where the location of the road is and Commissioner Sherwood pointed it out on the map. **Commissioner Parrish** - there has been talk that it hasn't been presented as an option and one problem is the word "bridge" comes into play and no one wants to pay for it and the other is that Providence doesn't want it going into Providence. I'm in favor of Option (d).

Commissioner Dallas - Corral Creek will be a challenge no matter what we do. The bypass crossing early would be nice, but not feasible. Trails End and Providence Road is tough, although I'm inclined towards option (d) because there are so many complications in this area. I'm mixed between (c) and (d) but (d) would be my first choice but (c) should be explored.

Commissioner Haug - asked for everyone to speak one more time and summarize where each individual is with the 4 options.

Commissioner Soppe - leans toward (d) with some modifications.

Commissioner Haug - pointed out that (a) is needed once the bypass is new and the need to keep that option open. I'm going with (d) because it's clear that (a) is really not adequate.

Commissioner Sherwood - is having a problem with (d). We heard testimony at the last meeting about a lady who was injured at her mailbox due to traffic. I live on Parrett Mountain and have been nearly killed coming off of Schaad Road many times because of the curve. You're forgetting the Renne Road testimony we had and I saw an automobile in the ditch just the other day. There needs to be improvement now on Corral Creek and putting it off isn't going to solve the problem. Traffic is coming through there at unbelievable speeds now going to 99W. We need to go forward and fix Corral Creek. My option is still (c).

Commissioner Lewis - earlier I chose option(d) based on the fact we don't have that much UGB to bring in and we have a 16 - 17 year supply now so we're not as desperate as I thought we were to get our 20 year supply. I'm like Robert in that I'm torn between (d) and (c) but I like the potential modification of (c). I don't remember in any of the plans any significant improvements to Corral Creek. It envisions closing it off at some point but not improving it. I would go with the modified (d) as suggested by Commissioner Soppe and Commissioner Haug.

Commissioner Halstead - option (b) is out and I cannot buy the modified (d) that only allows development below Fernwood. I can see modifying (a) with restricting access to 99W with right in right out situation. The possibility that Commissioner Parrish came up with has not been explored enough. I choose option (c).

Commissioner Parrish - agrees with Mr. Halstead. Option (b) is unrealistic. When the second nine of the golf course opens, the metropolitan area is going to be coming out here much stronger than now. We've been told that option (c) is not feasible and don't understand why it's still in there.

Commissioner Lewis - staff said that's a viable option. **Commissioner Parrish** - will go with (d) with a modification if (c) remains in there.

Commissioner Haug - suggested a question and answer time at this point.

Commissioner Parrish - if I correctly understand your opinion of Schaad Road and all the areas you were discussing and the curve, Corral Creek needs to be fixed now? **Commissioner Sherwood** - yes. **Commissioner Parrish** - you're correct on that, and you can't see development below Fernwood either because of that? **Commissioner Sherwood** - cannot see a development happening with the existing Corral Creek Road. I can see it with the proposed road going through it to the north to 99W to Trails End cutoff.

Commissioner Haug - options (a) and (c) are both needed.

Commissioner Soppe - is concerned about the traffic on Corral Creek that is taking place now and asked Commissioner Sherwood where he believes the traffic is beginning and ending within the city. **Commissioner Sherwood** - doesn't know about ending, but is originating from the new development at the golf course. **Commissioner Soppe** - previously asked the developer since their transportation plan said there wouldn't be much traffic east of there, asked if there would be an objection to traffic being prohibited and was told no, raising the question again at the City Council and was told no again with the qualifier of an adequate road system to the east the developer was willing to have it cut off. It got built without that and staff's view expressed to me was, when we can demonstrate there is a traffic problem from that area to the east, we'll cut it off. It was designed to keep traffic from the east coming in or out of there. If we can come up with data that says there's a traffic problem on Corral Creek from The Greens, the word I got from staff is we'll keep The Greens from going that direction. There are options to say city traffic needs to stay within the city until it gets out to the major roads and we need to pursue that. The other side of the argument is, if this is a county problem on Corral Creek it's not a city problem and isn't to be taken up in a City Transportation Plan. It's very unfortunate to have any accident but we have to look at whose responsibility it is to deal with it. **Commissioner Haug** - in other words, would you be willing to make a decision regarding the city that would cause a murderous situation? **Commissioner Soppe** - the cause has to do with traffic related to the city and no, I'm not pleased about it. For example, I don't want the city to solve the county's traffic problem, but if we're generating traffic that goes out into the county, yes it's our responsibility and we need to deal with it.

Commissioner Soppe - Providence does not want that traffic going through their complex. What Warren was describing, if I'm correct, is to move it further south, which I'm less excited about because the traffic that goes there and goes south would be diverted out of the Providence area. The bigger amount of traffic we've seen, based on the traffic study, is going to go up to 99W or from 99W which means we have now made a section of Providence Drive much busier in the north/south direction because of this traffic. The second issue is that Providence and CPRD are working on a swap. Is there any reason to believe that's less likely now? **Barton Brierley** - no. **Commissioner Soppe** - so this route will go right through the Providence property that would become CPRD property with the swap? **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Soppe** - if we're going to have an east/west road up in that area, that seems to me the route for it, although it does have shortcomings.

Commissioner Soppe - you mentioned (a) not being adequate if there was development. There are four movements, leaving two and cutting off two. Is your concern the two we're cutting it off or is your concern the two we leave are still not adequate? **Commissioner Lewis** - both.

Commissioner Soppe - option (a) I see happening one way or another but the question is whether it's adequate enough to handle the movements.

Commissioner Soppe - I'm not clear on the commitment Mat thought there was with the hospital. The hospital pushed for not having Providence a through road originally. Is that correct? **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Soppe** - that was part of the agreement of the development having a through road. **Barton Brierley** - at the time of the UGB amendment, the transportation plan that was approved showed Providence going through to the south and showed a road extending east. **Commissioner Soppe** - I thought you said as an agreement with annexation was that Providence would go down and connect with Hayes. **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Soppe** - we could go with option (a) with funding in place, which needs to be done anyway. We could slow down on the UGB amendments and wouldn't have the large amounts of traffic. When the bypass goes in, the option that goes over and across has some nice advantages and solves a lot of problems. The question is, how fast is the bypass going to be built.

Commissioner Parrish asked for clarification on the east/west road. Commissioner Soppe and Commissioner Lewis explained in detail as well as referring to the map. If the potential land swap goes through, the road Commissioner Parrish is proposing will go through the golf course.

Commissioner Haug - the only thing left to discuss is the idea of (d) and allowing development south of Fernwood and a severe problem currently exists on Corral Creek Rd. Even at this point, something has to be done to prevent Corral Creek from being used by what has already been developed and if the use of Corral Creek could be cut off from Fernwood up, that would make development south of Fernwood a little more feasible. We already have a concept on Renne Road that runs into Wilsonville. Are there any other comments on the feasibility of excepting just the south?

Commissioner Lewis - I'm rethinking what I said and have taken into consideration the points that have been made concerning traffic. After researching I found there are plans in here to improve Corral Creek, but north of Fernwood, which is making me think differently. Either we go (c) or straight (d).

Commissioner Parrish - If we're going to allow development south of Fernwood Road, then where is the traffic going to go? Are they going to take Wilsonville Road back to town and Springbrook Road to get back to Fred Meyer? I don't think Mr. Soppe's idea is realistic at all. Is it feasible to cut off Corral Creek Road? **Commissioner Lewis** - there are people who live out there who have to use Corral Creek. **Commissioner Haug** - we've already developed enough out there to cause a problem and there needs to be a way to cut it off to prevent the outflow from the Green's so they wouldn't take that route. **Commissioner Lewis** - understood when it came before the County Commissioners that the traffic was going to be routed from the Green's to Brutscher. **Commissioner Soppe** - that was not part of the decision. I must agree that my idea of allowing development up to Fernwood isn't one of the best I've had so I will retract that suggestion. I would consider restricting UGB amendments until the bypass is in place or some other transportation facility, but I have a hard time with cutting the whole thing off. Suppose we decide we like (d), should we be restricting it in the properties that are on the north side of Wilsonville Road? If Renne is cut off and this road hasn't yet connected to Fernwood, people will have no choice of getting out except to go down to Wilsonville. The plan is to improve it.

Commissioner Halstead - the southeast corner in the general vicinity is the school district property? **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Halstead** - I can't see them developing unless that north/south connection is in, and once it is, the pressure to go north is going to be huge.

Commissioner Lewis - asked staff about when the school district needs to build the new high school. **Barton Brierley** - they're projecting somewhere around 2020, give or take 2 -3 years either way. **Commissioner Haug** - the problem I have with (c) is if we allow all of this to come in and assume it gets developed, what you're doing with Providence is making a major street. **Commissioner Sherwood** - it enters in about a half a block from the light. **Commissioner Haug** - Would the hospital property be on both sides of that road? **Commissioner Sherwood** - yes. **Commissioner Haug** - if you put a major road that cuts through the hospital, you're cutting down the quality of the complex as a campus. **Commissioner Sherwood** - the left side is a parking lot and the right side is the proposed medical facility, but it's only a half a block. **Commissioner Haug** - but it cuts it off like 99W going through the middle of town. It's too much of a thoroughfare going through what I think should be a campus setting. I would go for (d) rather than (c) for that reason. **Commissioner Sherwood** - you're talking about putting traffic on Fernwood and Brutscher and endangering lives. **Commissioner Haug** - the bottom line is there is no solution. **Commissioner**

Sherwood - then you table it and have no development at all.

Commissioner Parrish - I hear what you're saying about the campus and I respect that and I've heard what council has said and I respect that. Where is the feeling that the traffic's going to go north/south more than east/west? **Commissioner Dallas** - if that area develops they're going to use that road through the campus. **Commissioner Parrish** - would you be open to do it on the southern part of your Providence property? **Commissioner Haug** - if it didn't cut through the property. **Commissioner Lewis** - Mat, we're only talking about that triangle. Commissioner Lewis pointed out the section on the map.

Barton Brierley explained in detail where the hospital owns property and where the facilities and bypass will be located.

Commissioner Parrish - Where would Hayes Street end? **Barton Brierley** - Hayes Street will connect with Providence Dr. Right now it stops at the signal at Springbrook Road and is anticipated it will go through the property so that the stop light will be a four way and connect with what is now the Hayes Street by the Texaco Station and the Urgent Care Center. **Commissioner Parrish** - I'm concerned about the east end of that.

Commissioner Sherwood - with all due respect, aren't we here tonight to adopt a concept? **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Sherwood** - we're getting into a battle over the options when all we need to do is adopt a concept and work on it later. Is that correct? **Barton Brierley** - yes. Exact locations are a future project. **Commissioner Sherwood** - why can't a motion be made to adopt the concept and move on? **Commissioner Soppe** - you're saying the total of the four options is a concept and you want to leave all four in? **Commissioner Sherwood** - correct. **Commissioner Lewis** - we were asked to do a preference. Option (d) says don't do any UGB amendments until the bypass has been built. If you pick (d) none of the other options matter.

Commissioner Parrish - understands what Michael is saying, but where we run into trouble with that is we're a recommendation body and if we do this in the way your suggesting we have not resolved having a transportation plan if we allow the development. **Commissioner Sherwood** - would vote for (d) a month or a year from now if we still cannot come to an accord on a decision, but I would not vote for it tonight. This land sitting at the base of the mountain and there's only way to go and that's north to south. The road is there, the concept works and it's a matter of figuring out how to access 99W, Brutscher and Fernwood. Adopt the concept and then let the bypass happen or not happen and move forward later. **Commissioner Lewis** - this is pre-bypass.

Commissioner Haug - will vote for (d).

Commissioner Sherwood - it's either (c) or (d).

Commissioner Soppe - when this part of the question gets to the council and to the county, both have an obligation to resolve it. If we discuss this and are deadlocked, it's not unreasonable to make a recommendation that clearly states the issues we can't resolve. Also, this body will spend more time on this question than the council will and it's very important to have information to pass on to them. Option (b) is off the table, option (a) by itself is not a solution.

Commissioner Dallas - Option (d) makes sense, but until it's built bothers me because it technically means we can't touch it until it's a done deal. It should say until it's funded.

Commissioner Soppe - what's the language ODOT used? **Barton Bierley** - until it's reasonably

likely within the planning period. **Commissioner Haug** - would you change (d) to restrict the UGB amendment until after the bypass is reasonably expected? **Barton Brierley** - until it's reasonably likely to be built within the planning period.

MOTION #2: Commissioner Dallas/Commissioner Lewis to approve the amending of the wording on option (d), "restrict the UGB amendments until after the bypass is reasonably likely to be funded within the planning period." 6 yes - 1 no (Sherwood). Motion passed.

Commissioner Soppe- do we want to say funding or construction in the planning period? We need to be able to have these roads constructed when the development occurs. **Commissioner Dallas** - if we word it, "restrict amendments until the bypass is being built." **Commissioner Sherwood** - you still a problem if it's reworded. The concept should be adopted. Going over to Crestview is a mistake. The Providence option is the right option.

Terry Cole/ODOT - The term reasonably likely is part of the Administrative Rule that we have to implement. ODOT has to make the determination that a facility is reasonably likely to be constructed within the planning horizon in order for you to rely on it for the purpose of making zone changes, plan amendments, and annexations.

Commissioner Soppe - if the second will agree, I would like to retract my amendments to Sally's motion and reword it the way Terry said it. **Barton Brierley** - change (d) to restrict UGB amendments until ODOT has determined it's reasonably likely that bypass will be constructed within the planning horizon.

MOTION #2A: Commissioner Soppe/Commissioner Dallas to amend the rewording of option (d). 6 yes - 1 no (Sherwood). Motion passed.

MOTION #3: Commissioner Soppe/Commissioner Haug to accept option (d) as the recommendation. 2 yes - 5 no (Parris, Dallas, Halstead, Lewis, Sherwood) Motion failed.

Commissioner Halstead - doesn't like the motion.

Commissioner Lewis - senses the concern that Michael is having. For the transportation system in Newberg, I personally believe that you're going to need both and also that there will be a pre-bypass time. I have long felt that taking all of this development under the bypass and over to Crestview is going to be too much with the other development that's coming down. If I vote for the motion, I don't want it to be interpreted that I don't think that (c) shouldn't get done.

Commissioner Soppe - the general rule when you bring property into the URA is to say that there is some way to deal with the traffic In this area there's an even higher standard.

Commissioner Dallas - if we build the Trails End, ODOT may not feel obligated to do the underpass to the frontage road.

Terry Cole/ODOT - what Commissioner Soppe says is correct in that if the option (c) is built ahead of the bypass and it is determined that the facility can handle the traffic circulation in that area, then there wouldn't be a necessary cure that ODOT would have to participate in at a Corral Creek under crossing as we've talked about before. That wouldn't mean it wouldn't necessarily be done. You could also do the same in reverse. There is also a cost responsibility. In the instance where you wait for ODOT to build it, clearly there would be a shared cost responsibility. In the instance if you move ahead with (c) there may not be a shared cost responsibility and the city may in fact take on the cost of both improvements. Specifically to Mr. Sherwood's question, the access to Newberg is directly from the bypass to 99W. The frontage road from Crestview over to Corral Creek is a separate facility that actually happens in the existing west bound highway lanes. The west bound lanes are abandoned and rerouted up to Crestview which is totally disconnected with the bypass. The frontage road, itself continues to be a necessity for the project. It's cut off and we have to replace that and the terrain differential that would allow a culvert that would accommodate that crossing is still going to exist with the bypass construction. Much of the cost components of the under crossing will already be born by the project.

MOTION #4: Commissioner Halstead/Commissioner Sherwood moved to regulate turning movements from Corral Creek Road to 99W and also redirect traffic to a Trails End Road extension of Providence Drive with Trails End Road. Options (a) & (c). 5 yes - 2 no (Haug, Soppe) Motion passed.

*** 7 Minute Break ***

Barton Brierley - the second decision to be made is what to do with this after the bypass is built. One option is to go under Corral Creek, connect up with the new frontage road on the north side of 99W ultimately to Crestview Drive. The second option was post-bypass to continue to use the Trails End/Providence Drive connection, and the third option was to do both. Based on the previous decision you want (c) which is to do both. I would suggest a motion to approve 2(c).

MOTION #5: Commissioner Halstead/Commissioner Lewis moved to adopt 2(c).

Commissioner Halstead - this is the best option, giving the city the most alternatives.

Commissioner Soppe asked staff if the inclusion is both of these we can get them in our TSP and we can come up with additional funding. **Barton Brierley** - yes. **Commissioner Soppe** - do you see us jeopardizing anything by doing that? **Barton Brierley** - I don't think ODOT will change their analysis.

VOTE ON MOTION #5: Motion passed 7-0.

Barton Brierley - there was a phasing schedule in the plan and one of the challenges is until this road gets built if there's development that occurs, it would have to use the existing Corral Creek Road to get up to 99W. We came up with a couple different phasing schedules to do this and actually heard a another one tonight that we can talk about too.

1) North to south option

3) Wait for the bypass

2) Middle out option

4) South to North option

1) In the north to south option one of the challenges is if development occurs in the area without constructing the road. You start by building the northern part first. If the traffic is not directed to Corral Creek, the only place to use is The Green's Avenue. Then you can continue building from the north down to the south until you hit Fernwood Road. A Renne Road cutoff will need to be done. You then continue going south and build the north/south road until you hit Wilsonville Road and then you have to build backwards to fix the Wilsonville Road creek crossing, improving the road and the S curve. Frontage improvements will follow as well as improvements on Renne and Corral Creek which will be safety improvements.

2) The middle out option is when you start developing in the middle, which is Fernwood Road in this case, improve Fernwood, and extend utilities. One option as you start extending out is to do a restriction on Renne Road and on the south side of Corral Creek Road/Schaad Road intersection. Corral Creek would become a local access road. At that point, development can occur around the Fernwood Road area, both north and south.

Commissioner Parrish - asked staff for clarification on the property owners developing the roads and not the City of Newberg. **Barton Brierley** - depending on the phasing. Barton referred to the map about what the city would finance and what the developer would do.

Commissioner Halstead - 3 to 4 meetings ago there was a preliminary plan for the top of Corral Creek. Is that still in the works? **Barton Brierley** - yes, those property owners and developers would like that to happen.

Commissioner Soppe - the middle-out option has enormous problems.

Barton Brierley - an argument for the middle-out option includes financing. The early projects are mostly developer funded projects and the big city funded projects are near the end. You collect your SDC and then you build your project rather than building your project and then collect the SDC. There are some considerations such as developing a good sequence of utilities. As far as limiting access, if you do that kind of restriction you've really eliminated those problems of having a lot of traffic on the rural roads and intersections. Barton pointed out the various routes on the map.

Commissioner Parrish - asked how to enforce those restrictions. **Barton Brierley** - put a barricade across the road or a gate.

Commissioner Haug - asked how to prevent people from making left hand turns from Sherwood onto Corral Creek Rd. **Barton Brierley** - can do it with a channelization that makes it difficult to come that way. Channelization is made up of a combination of curbs, raised concrete, etc.

Commissioner Haug - asked staff to present the positive and negative aspects to the North to South option.

Barton Brierley - before there's any development in this area you've provided some better access to Corral Creek Rd., and then develop from that point out, addressing the issue of 99W first. The con is that the city will probably have to front the money for this, and the other is the traffic at the Green's.

Commissioner Sherwood - asked staff about the timetable for either one of these phases. **Barton Brierley** - no. Sequencing, not time.

Commissioner Soppe - I understand the statement of the third option, but not necessarily what it translates into for the bypass. **Barton Brierley** - what that says is, we've built this with the bypass and then take the whole issue of Corral Creek Rd./99W intersection off the table but not the rest of Corral Creek.

Commissioner Haug - asked staff which of the two options is less stressful for Corral Creek.

Barton Brierley - both avoid it and are both comparable.

Commissioner Sherwood - my wife's mother is completely terrified to go out Parrett Mountain Rd. and get on 99W. She comes down Schaad to get to Newberg. Would Schaad Rd. be blocked on either option? **Barton Brierley** - on the north/south it would not and in the middle-out it would.

Commissioner Soppe - now that Barton has explained it, waiting for the bypass has some attraction.

MOTION #6: Commissioner Soppe/Commissioner Halstead moved to recommend the North to South option. 6 yes - 1 no (Soppe) Motion passed.

Barton Brierley - Schaad Rd. has been resolved with the option you've selected.

Barton Brierley - County Funding Options are:

- 1) None
- 2) Maintenance Money
- 3) Local SDC
- 4) Pedestrian Bike Improvement Money

Barton Brierley - asked for time to resolve the plan for considerations.

Commissioner Soppe - there is a requirement in one of our standards that the bodies that are going to be responsible need to have approved financing plans if you amend the TSP.

Ken Friday - strongly recommends against the adoption of any funds when we have comments from our public works director that say Yamhill County cannot commit to participate financially on the projects listed on this level at this time. It doesn't make sense to float it along and try to figure out the county's contributions later when we're saying up front that we're not going to contribute and be part of the funding for the city's roads. I recommend that you take the county's portion out.

MOTION #7: Commissioner Parrish/Commissioner Lewis - moved for the county's funding option be none.

Commissioner Soppe - we should expect something out of the county. The maintenance money is the one thing we should be able to negotiate with the county on. **Ken Friday** - it doesn't mean that you can't come back later and ask the county for the maintenance money. **Commissioner Soppe** - doesn't want the county in the future to come back and say it was agreed the county wouldn't pay

but I agree that the sum listed is completely unrealistic to expect from you. By the same token, I don't want to agree that the number is zero. Can we write something in there that says that we put zero in but expect the county to be negotiating with us for maintenance money? **Ken Friday** - I don't mind having something that says the county will negotiate in the future, but I do mind having it in a document, in a chart where we have to budget with dollars that the county is adopting. I want a number of zero as far as the budget.

Commissioner Lewis - can we have a footnote?

MOTION #7A: Commissioner Lewis/Commissioner Soppe - moved to amend and add a footnote that would indicate that although County funding is shown as \$0, that some County contribution could be negotiated when facilities are constructed. Motion passed 7 - 0.

VOTE ON MOTION #7: (as amended): Motion 7-0

Commissioner Soppe - a question on build it first. The city has been doing something with the advanced financing and there has been some legal questions have been raised on whether we have the authority to do that. Are you comfortable that we have the legal authority? **Barton Brierley** - yes. There are different avenues depending on what the project is. **Commissioner Soppe** - has the city done anything like this before, building major roads, etc., and getting reimbursed from the developers?

Barton Brierley - yes, that's true. The most equivalent is what we're doing with the S curve, since we are doing that in advance of development. It clearly has a wide range of benefits.

Ken Friday - our recommendation was to have this looked at by the Road Advisory Committee. The resolution does say that it's going to the City Council and Board of Commissioners. Barton, do you see this being adopted and then it going to Road Advisory Committee? **Commissioner Lewis** - I think Bill Gille is being a little optimistic. This is not a shy group. **Commissioner Haug** - wouldn't it be up to the county then to bring in the advisory committee? **Ken Friday** - I'm fine with that I just didn't want a misunderstanding. **Commissioner Lewis** - we'll send it to the Road Advisory Committee. **Barton Brierley** - I have no problem doing that.

MOTION #8: Commissioner Halstead/Commissioner Soppe moved to adopt 207-19. Motion passed 7 - 0.

Commissioner Lewis - Kathy, who was in attendance at the meeting tonight was bothered by calling it a plan when she thinks of it as being more conceptual than a plan. Barton tried to explain to her that once this comes into the URA it is then a Transportation System Plan. **Barton Brierley** - one of the things was calling it a Land Use and Transportation Plan as opposed to Transportation and I think we're agreeing to take the Land Use Plan part out of it. That addresses part of the concern. It is a plan, but plans can be changed. It's our best estimation of what the future should be based on where we are today. It is a concept and it can be amended as facts and figures change.

Commissioner Soppe - asked staff if there is a distinction between a Transportation System Plan and a Transportation Plan. **Barton Brierley** - there is in state law. In a TSP there are many requirements as opposed to a Transportation Plan. You have to have a TSP in place for when you develop property in the UGB.

MOTION #9: Commissioner Soppe/Commissioner Halstead moved to take out the word “system” out of the title of the resolution on pg. 21. Unanimous voice vote.

*** 5 Minute Break ***

VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF: Barton Brierley - Next meeting is August 21, 2007 to deal with Urban Reserve. Barton asked for some direction from the commission if they want a hearing on the different items and suggested a motion be made. The Commission agreed that they would like a hearing on the URA as suggested in the staff report. There will also be a meeting September 20, 2007.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10: 52 p.m.

Passed by the Newberg Urban Area Management Commission this 15th day of August, 2007.

AYES: 7

NO: 0

ABSTAIN: 0
(list names)

ABSENT: 0

ATTEST:

Dawn Beville

Recording Secretary

Date

Michael R. Shewood 8/21/07

NUAMC Chair

Date