



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 10, 2005

7 p.m. Regular Meeting
Public Safety Building
401 E. Third Street

Subject to approval at the March 17, 2005 Meeting

Present: Dwayne Brittell Philip Smith
 Daniel Foster Devorah Overbay
 Nick Tri
 Louis Larson

Absent: Matson Haug

Staff Present: Barton Brierley, Planning and Building Director
 Dan Danicic, Public Works Director
 Kyle McDaniel, Recording Secretary
 Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Smith opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

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

1. Approval of February 24, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Overbay - Noted the following corrections needed to be made: Under Item #1 OR 219 Issues, on Page 2, the 4th paragraph, #1 issue. The sentence that she "feels the need for a new road" is not correct, and that she "addressed concerns regarding the reroute of Highway 219 to Springbrook" also is not correct. She didn't see the need for new road. She was inquiring about a proposal to reroute 219 up Springbrook. It should say that "she does not understand the need for the new road" at 8th Street. On Page 3 Concern, 2nd paragraph from the bottom was very unclear. There needs to be a more clear paragraph than what was put in the minutes. On Page 8, her name was misspelled ("Overlay" not "Overbay").

Page 6, the paragraph under 2(b) was not clear. It says, "but as far as bike lane - he would insist." It sounded as if she was saying it, but Chair Smith actually did. There are many other corrections that need to be made to the minutes.

Chair Smith - If it was trying to say that I would insist on having bike lanes on Providence Drive, then that is correct.

Commissioner Brittell - These minutes aren't making sense. The transcription from the previous tape isn't clear enough.

Commissioner Larson - I read minutes and testimonies. I considered them "cloudy." They weren't very clear.

Commissioner Brittell - Addressed page 11 (page7), bottom paragraph. The statement that says that "he was the only Commission member that was still looking at resolution number #2" is not a correct statement. The discussion was about the 2nd street proposal. The statement that "We need enough coverage for east and west highway and the bypass and make Second Street a more local street" is an example of a very unclear sentence. The City Council members request accurate testimonies. I would vote to not accept these minutes. We need to view and study planning commission notes so that the minutes are accurate.

Mr. Brierley - I discovered source of the concerns with the agenda. The minutes in front of the Planning Commission was a copy in draft form; it was not the final version.

Commissioner Overbay - The minutes on page 8 say I have been persuaded by the 2nd street testimony. That is unclear. It makes me nervous to have false information in the packet.

Chair Smith - In the minutes on page 10, under transit service, it spells Roy Gathercoal's name as Roy Gaudios. This wasn't even close. I was also concerned about the actual motion page 12, the motion on private street/driveway access. It mentions there were 2 votes, but listed only one name: Overbay.

Commissioner Tri - admitted to other no vote.

Chair Smith - Accurate minutes are not present and need to be; the votes need to be accurate. We were present at a previous meeting where we had to delay our work because we didn't have accurate minutes. I would like to avoid having to do that again this time. At the next meeting, we need to have minutes that are accurate and final. Shall we move to table minutes to next meeting?

Motion by Chair Smith to table minutes to next meeting. Approved by unanimous consent.

Chair Smith - Shared Shakespeare quote.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Chair Smith asked for Communications from the floor for items not on the agenda - none.

V. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **REQUEST:** Adopt updated Transportation Plan, including amendments to the Development Code
FILE NO.: GR-25-01

STAFF REPORT:

Mr. Brierley - We went over a long list of issues at the last meeting. We noted that there were two more items that the Planning Commission wanted to talk about: one of rerouting 219/St. Paul highway, two of general discussion plan as a whole. On the first issue, there is additional info in packet that summarizes past presentations. Staff recommendation is to adopt the plan as it was submitted. The staff report includes Attachment #3, which would recommend a study for the re-routing plan. He left the discussion open for questions.

Commissioner Overbay - Had a question about page 22 on the alternative to discuss. The analysis says the state is unlikely to accept Springbrook Road. She asked why?

Mr. Brierley – Generally, the State is trying to get rid of highways, not take on new ones. This especially applied to highways that serve more like county roads. It would be against their policies.

Commissioner Overbay - In this case they would be removing themselves from the responsibility for maintaining the current 219; they would be moving it over a block.

Mr. Brierley - The State has standards for the construction of highways, too.

Commissioner Overbay – Is Springbrook up to standards?

Mr. Brierley - Springbrook Road is not built to State highway standards. They are unlikely to take over maintenance for the same reason that the City does not take over private streets. We cannot be sure how they were built or maintained.

Chair Smith - Any proposal to move a state highway by the city needs to be joint decision. We have some say with the state. ODOT has to be involved.

Commissioner Brittell - He would like an elaboration of analysis about "Option #1". He was unclear what that option referred to.

Mr. Brierley - It is based on packet on page 21.

Commissioner Brittell - Under Springbrook option #1, it says Springbrook would need to be widened to 5 lanes. He would like explanation from Mr. Brierley.

Mr. Brierley - It would need to be five lanes based on traffic. According to the model, the preferred alternative would be for St. Paul Highway to have two lanes of traffic, with the same for Springbrook. With Options #1, #2, and #3, they all put St. Paul Highway and Springbrook Road traffic onto Springbrook Road. With the Bypass, there will be a lot more traffic on Springbrook Road and OR-219. All traffic coming from McMinnville coming to Newberg via the Bypass will be routed to OR-219 or Springbrook Road. After consulting with our traffic consultant, by combining all the traffic from St. Paul Highway and Springbrook onto Springbrook, there would not be enough capacity with three lanes: Springbrook would need to be widened to five lanes.

Chair Smith - We are considering Highway 219 reroute options. The staff report includes a number options for our discussion. There is a discussion for the reasons why staff recommends against these option on page p23. If the planning commission wants to recommend rerouting Highway 219, page 33 Attachment 3 provides language to do this. Do we want to move in that direction? Do we want to study the option Dwayne has been arguing for? I believe he is recommending the option of having staff or city council begin a reroute study along the lines of Option #1.

Commissioner Brittell - If we accept the plan as shown, then it would say the Planning commission desires to improve the existing route. Section 6.2.2 says we should make capacity improvements to the existing 219 route. If the planning commission has recommended re-routing 219, then it would be a weak plan. Why spend the money on improving the existing street if the re-route works? The staff recommendation would delete the Comprehensive Plan language relating to re-route study. I would like to take the new language away and keep it how it currently is in the plan.

Chair Smith - The potential amendment in Attachment 3 states in the last paragraph that there should be a study about rerouting OR 219 to Mountain View/Springbrook. Is the new TSP language in italics?

Mr. Brierley - The plan proposes to adopt new comprehensive plan policies. Mr. Brittell means that he would like to keep the existing comprehensive plan policy language and not adopt the new language shown in the December 2004 draft.

Chair Smith - 6.2.2 (5) was discussed at the last meeting, and we approved the reconfiguration of the 2nd Street/219 intersection. If we adopt the new language of Attachment 3, section 5 as written wouldn't be sent to the City Council. Rather, we would keep the language about improving the existing route, but would encourage the City Council to study the reroute options. I'm not convinced that the proposal to reroute OR-219 option is the way to go, but I am willing to adopt Attachment 3 against staff recommendation, because I am persuaded by Dwayne's argument that this is something to study.

Commissioner Brittell - I would like to discuss another option. City staff and Newberg Transportation System Plan (TSP) consultants have recommended four different types of improvements along the existing 219 alignment (see March 10, 2005 Staff Report, Attachment #1 and 2 for the south portion). As part of these recommendations, staff has proposed deleting all references in the Newberg Comprehensive Plan (NCP) concerning re-routing of Hwy. 219. In justifying this action they have recommended that the three options that were studied by the "City" are not feasible. The City has concluded that these options would have a number of negative impacts (summarized on page 23). Although many of these arguments could be disputed, the City and several planning commissioners have not made an evaluation of the positive advantages of the proposed St. Paul Highway to Springbrook north to Crestview / Mountainview and then north on the existing College / 219 path north to Bell Road / North Valley Rd. and the potential future north urban growth boundary. Option I reroute advantages would include:

1. Would allow regional traffic to move through Newberg in an orderly fashion without meandering. Although slightly more lengthy, Option I would have only two (2) changes of directions compared to five (5) bends, with four (4) 80 degree plus turns, Draft TSP Preferred Plan.
2. Would allow better non-interrupted flow of travel for both local and regional traffic. Draft TSP would have at least ten (10) major intersections, not counting the bypass. Option one would have seven (7) at the most from the south UGB to the north UGB.
3. Would preserve important historic Newberg along College between First Street and the northern railway.
4. Would allow a revitalized, historical downtown, based on local traffic, and emphasis on bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation, and development as a "Main Street" shopping and service center.
5. Would allow the transfer of the Second Street State Highway system to be converted to a local street, serving the existing and proposed commercial/industrial properties between the airport and Springbrook Rd. and therefore resolving two major problems along the existing and proposed draft plan, (Springbrook and Second Street intersection and the Sportsman's Air Park take-off and landing conflicts.)
6. In tandem with the Wilsonville Highway re-route option, would allow a logical growth pattern to the southeast portion of Newberg's prime future industrial area, while taking care of dangerous County road problems. Also, would help mitigate the impact of the bypass.
7. Would provide for a direct and safe path of travel from St. Paul to downtown via Wyooski Road re-route to Fourth Street to College and downtown. The present route has only one stop sign between St. Paul Hwy. and First Street (downtown) at College Street, and is much shorter and safer than the draft TSP plan.
8. Although seemingly a high cost at the staff estimated 3.5 million, Option I would be much less than the options suggested in the draft plan. Compare the TSP cost for College Street (219) improvements north, Second Street / Portland Road, Springbrook / 8th Street intersection at 14.8 million, (see TSP p. 154-156 33).
9. Other miscellaneous advantages like the positive net impacts on intersections like Villa / 99W, Haworth / 219 and Elliott / 219.

Although this option is not perfect, it is the most sensible of all options in relation to the NCP, local and regional traffic conflicts and mitigation of the impacts of ODOT's bypass.

I clocked the time, and the miles of personal driving. There are 6 minutes equal time going through either route, and the distance is the same. The paving is poor along that route due to utilities. Overall planning is needed instead of case by case

Chair Smith - You are arguing in favor of option #1? You believe it would be cheaper?

Commissioner Brittell - The reroute would be much cheaper. The bypass will take traffic from St. Paul going west. Also, it will take traffic going south and to Wilsonville.

Commissioner Larson - With the reroute plan, how would traffic that is going from St. Paul to Yamhill travel? Would it go up College to Bell Road. One part would go up and over the hill, the other part continues Mountain View on to 240?

Commissioner Brittell - That's only one option. You need to look at the overall plan.

Commissioner Larson - Option 1 eliminates 240/219 traffic beyond College?

Commissioner Brittell - 99 can split off into local streets at Main Street.

Commissioner Larson - Cites example from log truck from St Paul to Longview on 219, going up to Yamhill, and going onto 240. Which route would it take that would not go through downtown? Plan assumes that bypass would be in place. The bypass would take a longer time.

MOTION #1: Smith/Tri to approve Option 1 as shown in Attachment 3.

Chair Smith - It is my understanding that staff recommends to approve new TSP, which would eliminate all this talk about rerouting 219. Dwayne is objecting because the current comprehensive plan for the city mentions rerouting, and the draft plan says to leave 219 where it is. Attachment 3 says "yes let's do it" and study rerouting of 219. I move to accept attachment 3, which would say reconstruct the existing route or study the 219 reroute option. Personally, I don't think Dwayne's plan is as good as he thinks it is. Dwayne's plans have strengths, but I am not persuaded it's the best option. In the end, I think it's the City Council's job to decide which is the best. I would like to put this option on the table so they can discuss it.

219 is state property, and they have to pay for. If we take it over, we have to pay for it. I want them to pay for it. That is the least of my reasons, but it is an important one.

As I have said before, 219 is a line on the map. It doesn't function as a highway through the middle of Newberg. 99W brings traffic through the middle of Newberg. 219 brings traffic to the middle of Newberg, that then disperses. The downtown mess up with trucks will be partially alleviated when the northern arterial is constructed. With the reroute, there will be more traffic on Springbrook Road. The intersection with 99W and Springbrook will have much more traffic. The intersection with Springbrook and Haworth would have significantly more traffic. Stop signs have helped, but the high traffic volume and short distance to 99W makes it a very troublesome place. I think we can leave 219 where it is, build the northern arterial, and that will help traffic downtown. Not rerouting 219 might bring more traffic through which is not a good idea. I would like to put the option on the city council table for discussion.

Commissioner Brittell - Are we missing the big picture for transportation plan by not rerouting 219? The section of College is narrow; we need to think what is best for Newberg.

Chair Smith - I think we definitely need to think what is best for Newberg. Getting 219 out of downtown

isn't necessary. Dwayne will say that it is. The troublesome part of College Street is between 1st and the railroad tracks. We need to preserve. By keeping it 219 we can get ODOT to pay for it.

Commissioner Brittell - I need to give clarification of my reasons. I feel the plan should be a 20 year plan, not a 5 year plan. Should we have a recommendation to pay federal taxes of 15 million for state highway that doesn't meet local standards? Or should we spend 3.5 million to improve Springbrook, then if it gets worse, then consider widening. It is free to City of Newberg if ODOT pays for it, but you are selling your soul.

Commissioner Overbay - My problem with the motion is that it looks like we are talking out of both sides of our mouth. If you say one, it counters the other. It looks like we can't agree.

Chair Smith - I am persuaded to leave 219 where it is and adopt the TSP. But Dwayne has said enough things that are intriguing to me that I at least want to put that option to the City Council to discuss.

Commissioner Larson - The difficulty of the assumption that the city council will study 219 is that we would be making a wild assumption that they would do anything with it. Moving the City to action to make a study needs strong factors. Brittell's proposal doesn't presuppose the council would do a study, it would say that 219 needs to be rerouted. The problem with the motion on the floor is that the need for the study may be lost.

Commissioner Brittell - With the staff recommendation, I note conflicts of interest between ODOT and the City. The most important policies are getting regional traffic off the local system, and choosing 219 reroute/city improvement plans. Other policies say that we need to include the alternative most favored by the public in capital improvement plans, and hold public hearings to consider the best re-route option. With this plan, Springbrook has been looked at, tossed out and hasn't made it to the council.

Vote on Motion #1 (accept attachment #3): 1 yes (Smith)/5 no. Motion fails.
--

Motion #2 Brittell/Larson. To accept Option #1 as a reroute of 219. Leave all of the language of the Newberg comprehensive plan related to 219 reroute.
--

Commissioner Foster - This motion would put forth the recommendation of reconsidering rerouting 219 with Option 1 on attachment 4. If we choose to do the motion on the table, does it effect what we decided last month, rerouting Wilsonville to Springbrook, and putting in a new traffic signal?

Commissioner Brittell - I am concerned about statements that Barton had made about planning commissioners possible actions on the rerouting in the draft plan. He says that a formal motion is not necessary. There were 25 items that had to be deliberated on, we took them 1 at a time. I am in disagreement: a motion needs to be made.

Mr. Brierley - You need to make a motion on a plan as a whole. You made a motion in December about the reroute. That motion was not to accept the reroute. You did indicate that that was not a final decision, and you could reconsider it. If you did not make a formal motion now, then your previous decision not to accept the reroute option would stand.

Chair Smith - We need to make a recommendation to the city council. The TSP needs to be a whole plan.

Mr. Brierley - [To Chair Smith]. There is a motion on the floor.

Commissioner Larson - Called for the question -

Vote on Motion #2 Yes: 3 (Brittell/Larson/Overbay)- No: 3 (Foster/Smith/Tri). Motion failed

Chair Smith - Now we need a different motion dealing with 219. I proposed the first one, so I will leave it to someone else. Mr. Brittell is correct with that our recommendation has implications for other parts of the TSP. I agree that our recommendation to the city council needs to hang together as a whole. We need to make downtown more liveable. Dwayne believes that the way to do this is to redesign the downtown couplet so that main street becomes a two-way street. In order to do that, he feels it is necessary to move 219 out of downtown. I feel moving 219 out of downtown Newberg is not crucial, moving traffic out of downtown is. There are other ways that can be successful in making downtown more livable without removing 219. The motion has been defeated to approve the amendment and option #1. Another option is to approve the TSP by staff, unless another option is proposed.

Commissioner Overbay - I question the statement by Commissioner Smith that you agree that traffic needs to be directed out of or around Newberg. But you don't think that rerouting 219 will do that?

Chair Smith - Rerouting 219 doesn't move a significant amount of traffic through Newberg.

Commissioner Overbay - But it does bring traffic to Newberg.

Chair Smith - Traffic from 219 comes into Newberg, then goes out all directions. Most of it goes to Highway 99W. Very little of it starts in St. Paul and goes all the way to Hillsboro. With the coming of the bypass, this will be even less.

Commissioner Larson - You are missing the traffic flow from I-5-Woodburn-St Paul-over the hill to Hillsboro and traffic that flows out to Yamhill. I would like to note that there is a lot of traffic on 219 because I drive downtown everyday around 8 a.m. I occasionally go to Caravan Coffee of St. Paul Highway. During the day there is lots of traffic on the highway; it is hard to get onto 219 during mid morning. Traffic does utilize 240 up to Yamhill. Going through Newberg is the best way to get to Hillsboro or Forest Grove. Current system goes onto Hancock and 1st Street.

Chair Smith - I agree there is a lot of traffic going through Newberg. However, most of it comes from 99W, not 219.

Commissioner Larson - Disagrees.

Commissioner Brittell - North Valley and Foothills are collectors. The goal is to move the regional traffic flow around Newberg.

Commissioner Overbay - If you don't reroute 219 or consider options, what other ways are there to get traffic out of downtown Newberg?

Chair Smith - The most obvious is to build a bypass, or build a northern arterial, so that traffic can go around Newberg. The other end of the bypass goes onto highway 18 onto Yamhill and Carlton.

Commissioner Overbay - This doesn't sound too different from the option of reroute 219.

Chair Smith - We know we have to get ODOT involved in a reroute of 219.

Commissioner Brittell - Commissioner Smith forgot one fact. The bypass and northern arterial won't get rid of "traffic." The numbers show that in 2025 traffic downtown will be the same.

Chair Smith - If you build a bypass, travel on city streets at the end of the study period will be just as much as it is now, even though the bypass will take a lot of traffic. But I don't think I ever said that building the northern arterial would not help a lot.

Commissioner Brittell - The goal is improving downtown. You don't want to plan to keep it at the same level, you want to improve downtown.

Commissioner Overbay - Growth will happen. If you create the bypass and Northern Arterial, then it'll be able to handle the increase? It will seem and feel the same as today, but growth has been redirected to the bypass and northern arterial. The problems we are trying to address are the Wilsonville Road/219/Springbrook intersection and creation of "8th street" in addition to the Northern Arterial. It seems like you are spending a lot of money to do very similar things that we may potentially be able to do with less money. We are planning on doing the Northern Arterial anyway. You can spend less money routing 219 up to Springbrook. Then the Northern Arterial can come across.

Chair Smith - The option would require cutting off 219 at Springbrook

Commissioner Overbay - The reroute would solve many of the problems at the same time that we are already planning on solving with the current proposals in the TSP, perhaps less expensively. There is a very dangerous intersection at 219 and Springbrook. The 219 reroute would take care of the problem at Springbrook and Wilsonville Road. You made a comment that if we propose the re-route, ODOT would be unlikely to fund it.

Chair Smith - If they agree to it, they will have to pay for it.

Commissioner Brittell - It seems like once again we are looking at ODOT's concerns, not the city's.

Chair Smith - Staff is doing a very good job of trying to present the truth as they understand it.

Break at 8:53 pm

Resume at 9:04pm

Motion #3: Foster/Smith to amend section 6.2.2 paragraph 5, under OR 219 reroute to switch the two paragraphs so that the main recommendation is to reroute OR 219 on Springbrook Road and Mountainview Drive, and to say that consideration was given to reconstructing the existing OR 219 route.

Amendment to Motion #3: Brittell/Larson to amend the motion to delete the proposed changes to Transportation Goal 4, policies a, b, d, e, and f, and Goal 9 policy a, and retain the current language in the Comprehensive Plan, and to accept the changes proposed to Goal 4, Policy c as shown on Page 33.

Commissioner Brittell - First we need to deal with the plan goals and policies, then we need to deal with TSP changes in 6.2.2. We always need to look at the most stringent goals and policies first.

Commissioner Foster - Are we able to do that through two motions?

Chair Smith - There is a motion on the floor, and Commissioner Brittell has proposed an amendment to the main motion.

Commissioner Brittell - We can leave it in the format of Barton has and address #1 first, comprehensive planning policies, as shown on Page 33, #1. The amendment would also add Goal 4, policies A, B, D, E, F,

and insert as they are in the current comprehensive plan. We would accept the proposed change to goal 4, policy C, so it would look like it does on Page 33 in the potential amendment.

Commissioner Brittell - The plan proposes changing goal 4. If you jump down to goal 9 policy says to analyze alternative routes for the re-routing of 219 to facilitate both local and regional traffic.

Mr. Brierley – Goal 9 is to create effective circulation and access for the local transportation system. Policy a to analyze alternatives for re-routing of 219..

Commissioner Brittell - Should we State Goal 9? And policy A?

Commissioner Overbay - By rerouting of 219, then would it be necessary to reconstruct OR 219 by lowering its elevation and making the right in and right out of at the 2nd street intersection?

Commissioner Foster - My reading was to go back to the same reason we had earlier: put the suggestion before the City Council and let them make the decision. It was my intention to have this be a 2nd option to consider for the city council. The reroute would be the 1st option, but have them take a 2nd option of improving 219 where it is.

Commissioner Brittell - My read is many things are related that are needed to be discussed, it does allow you to do things that you can't do now. That includes the rerouting of Wilsonville highway and downtown couplet.

Chair Smith - We have an amendment. Is there a call for the question?

Vote on the Amendment to Motion #3: 6 yes/0 no. Amendment passes

Chair Smith - Is there any discussion on the main motion?

Vote on Motion #3: 5 yes/1 no(Smith). Motion passes

Chair Smith - We have adopted motions on everything contained in the staff reports. Are there other topics that we need to discuss individually first? If not we need to begin discussing the TSP as a whole.

Commissioner Brittell - Commissioner Overbay mentioned 2nd street. If there is no highway, there is not a need to depress the road. 2nd Street would become a local street where it is now an arterial. With my idea, we'd be saving 2.0 million by not having to depress the roadway. What we can do is make St. Paul Highway a local street. It would continue so 2nd Street and Fernwood would be one road continuing to Portland Road.

Mr. Brierley - 2nd Street is a collector.

Commissioner Brittell - The main problem is truck traffic, when you have truck traffic you have to design for a 14 foot height. Every time I pass through there (2nd Street/St. Paul Highway intersection) I wonder what would happen if a plane wasn't flying high enough. The runway starts 5 feet from the street. With the reroute, the problem would be mitigated. It would be cheaper to make an intersection there. You wouldn't have the problem of trucks making a left turn from 2nd Street onto the existing St Paul road. I'm not sure what the St. Paul highway would be called, a collector? There would be industrial property of both sides of the street, and it would be accessing industrial land.

Chair Smith - Would both 2nd Street and St. Paul Highway north of 2nd Street be collectors?

Commissioner Brittell - Drew an example on the board. He showed that St. Paul Highway south of 2nd Street would become a local access road. Fernwood Road/2nd Street would simply continue onto the existing St. Paul Highway to the north and become one road.

Chair Smith - So remainder part would be Fernwood to 2nd would be a collector?

Commissioner Brittell - It would require renaming the new road (219 between Wilsonville Road and 2nd Street).

Unknown - Airport Way?

Chair Smith - 2nd and 219 intersection improvements would not be needed if the 219 reroute would be done.

Commissioner Brittell - Since we voted, we need different wording on redesigning the 219/2nd Street intersection.

Chair Smith - We are forwarding a recommendation to the City council. It would need to be studied what to do with the existing 219.

Commissioner Overbay - Would it be helpful to be reconsidered if the points were taken, from south to north, Wilsonville road improvements, listed each one, if 219 is rerouted, these needs to be considered.

Chair Smith - Possible motion: Add to the TSP a paragraph that says if the reroute of 219 is approved, then the City Council should authorize a study of the following portions of what is now highway 219, Wilsonville Road, cutting off 219, where would it be? 2nd street needs to be studied. Service to several resident/business, traffic on 219 becomes a city street, would need to be studied.

Commissioner Foster - Would project 6 and 7 (page 122/123 of the TSP) not be dealt with? Yes or no? Those projects are affected by the reroute of 219.

Chair Smith - those things would have to be studied and reworked, including Wilsonville Road.

Commissioner Brittell - Fernwood road too.

Commissioner Overbay - Basically 6 and 7 could be changed. The reroute would eliminate the need for lowering 219: it would be beneficial and should be studied. Where would this occur was affect business and services/impact.

Chair Smith - Would like rephrasing of a motion.

Motion #4: Overbay/Larson to note on page 121 of the December 2004 TSP, that if the reroute of 219 is adopted, we would recommended a study of the portions of the current 219 including #1: where it would change into Springbrook, #2: the intersection of Wilsonville road and the new 219, #3 what the improvements would be at the intersection of the 2nd Street with the current 219 AND the new 219, #4 the impact on businesses and services along the new 219 as well as the old 219.

Vote on Motion #4: 6 yes/0 no. Motion passed.

Chair Smith - It is challenging to get the right language for adopting and addressing comments. You can see

why people spend a long time in congress. Unless there are more comments on specifics, the TSP as a whole needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Foster - Motion to reroute 219 affects project 5 on page 121 of the December 2004 TSP. We need to use the language on page 27 of this month's packet. It addresses the left turn for Newberg fire department. That is not in his citation that he gave on pg 121. Paragraph 2 of page 27 was modified the last time we met.

Commissioner Brittell - A dozen more issues need to be identified, staff can do that, we don't have to address them all.

Commissioner Foster - I didn't want it to get missed.

Commissioner Brittell - It's important to bring it up.

Open Floor Discussion as a WHOLE

Chair Smith - This is no time to hold grudges. We need to look at the whole package. I open the floor to discussion. My own feeling is for irresponsible for us not to recommend a TSP to the city council, this is the TSP we have, and may need to recommend that to the city council.

Commissioner Brittell - I have extensive deliberation. I needed it to be typed so that City Council can review it. I would be happy to submit it so it can be in the minutes next week.

After hearing the initial Staff/Consultant reports, on December 9th, hearing all of the public testimony beginning at the January 13th meeting through the February 24th meeting, reading all of the written testimony from staff, consultants, and the public, studying the final drafts of the Transportation System Plan (TSP), I believe I have more than enough information to state my opinions and concerns about the process and content of the Plan.

I admire the effort of Kittelson and Associates Inc. to provide documentation and attempt to facilitate a plan that will meet all of the needs and desires of Staff, ODOT and all of the planning committees involved in the NDTIP (bypass), our Planning Commission and the Citizens of Newberg. What an assignment! Unfortunately, this is an impossible task. As heard by ODOT representatives, it is the desire of the NDTIP planners to deter Newberg transportation planning until the "refinement plan" is completed, purportedly in about three years.

It appears to me that the City Staff/Consultant team has not come to a satisfactory solution as it relates to the following dilemma: Should we as planners design for local transportation needs, as clearly stated in previous studies and Newberg Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies, or should we put regional and state needs first? Until there is clarity in the minds of the planners concerning which is the highest priority, I don't think a viable plan is possible. I am a strong advocate of learning from experience, and building on previous plans. We have a decent Comprehensive Plan that may need updated, but we need to look carefully at the Goals:

Transportation

Goal 3: *Promote reliance on multiple modes of transportation and reduce reliance on the automobile.*

Goal 4: *Minimize the impact of regional traffic on the local transportation system.*

Goal 8: *Maintain and enhance the City's image, character and quality of life.*

Goal 9: *Create effective circulation and access for the local transportation system.*

Unfortunately, I believe the recommended plan has failed to accomplish these goals. In reflecting on the questions that I listed upon my initial review of the plan after the first hearing, I was shocked that only 1 of the 16 questions and concerns were answered. Instead of answers, many more questions arose. It appears to me that the hearings have dissuaded us from being master planners while getting bogged down in piecemeal and isolated problems, actually only two isolated problems. I reviewed all of my notes during the three public hearings and found that about 90% of the testimonies were related directly to two elements in the TSP, 11, Hayes Street extension and 13, Wilsonville Road and Springbrook Street connection. Only the Second Ave. couplet, accessibility issues and Providence Hospital concerns were vocalized by three persons. I was saddened that there wasn't more interest in issues involved in the Goals listed above to help us make relevant recommendations to the Council.

Let's get back on track. It's obvious we can't resolve all of the issues. But, at the same time, we can't accept statements like, "We will not do this" (ODOT representative) even though detrimental to the citizen's safety and effectiveness access, or, "Not recommended to be a part of the TSP" (Kittelsohn representative), even if it was mentioned in the Newberg's Comprehensive Plan policies at least six times. I see too much compromise in the TSP, at the cost of local Goals.

Also, it is incomplete planning, not comprehensive. I don't think Newberg's Comprehensive Plan and Development Code should be amended until all of the transportation plan is addressed and successfully, generally designed while answering the needs of the citizens of Newberg, not for facilitating a dream about a regional, State and National highway system. Newberg is too important to be absorbed into this kind of planning. What happened to the Riverfront Specific Plan? What happened to the five alternates presented to solve the problematic Main/Illinois/240 intersection? What happened to the analysis of alternate routes for the re-routing of 219 to facilitate both local and regional traffic (Goal 9, Policy a.)? When are other major intersections going to be studied like Villa/Mountainview, Wyooski/219, College/Bell Rd. and many more as the Bypass progresses and future developments within the study areas for future urban growth boundaries projected to 2025.

We need a viable downtown, with emphasis not only on the vehicle, but also on the pedestrian, which facilitates commerce and human interaction. This can't be done with two State highways intersecting and virtually dissecting the town center. The following policies in our comprehensive plan address the TSP 219 re-route issue: (For some reason it was easier for the authors of the proposed TSP to delete all of these policies and to improve 219 to meet all of the standards of a new State highway, including bike lanes, turning lanes, etc.)

Goal 4:

Policy a. *Enhance the efficiency of the existing collector/arterial street system to move local traffic off the regional system.*

Policy b. *Provide for alternative routes for regional traffic.*

Policy c. *Identify and analyze options for the re-routing of 219 in conjunction with ODOT, in an effort to support both Bypass and delayed Bypass development scenarios.*

Policy d. *Before choosing the 219 re-route to be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program, hold public hearings to determine which re-route alternative is most satisfactory to the public.*

Policy e. *Include the 219 re-route alternative most favorable to the public in the City's Capital Improvement Plan, Transportation Section.*

Policy f. *Minimize the use of local and minor collector streets for regional traffic through application of traffic calming measures as traffic operations and/or safety problems occur. (Adopted by Ord. 99-2513,*

approved by the City Council 8-2-99)

Goal 9:

Policy a. *Analyze alternative routes for the re-routing of 219 to facilitate both local and regional traffic.*

I, in good conscience, could not call the proposed TSP a 20 year plan. I think maybe a disjointed 5 year plan. I believe the time, effort and expense of this study would have been more effectively spent working jointly with the planners of Springbrook Oaks Development, Chehalem Parks and Recreation Golf Course, Northwest Newberg Austin Development, (approximately 500 acres presently in design phase), Newberg Downtown Association, Newberg Revitalization - Committee, Ad-hoc Urban Growth Futures Committee, and plan to help facilitate the Specific Plans that were adequately and successfully planned in the past, and be actively involved in representing the City interest during the "Refinement Plan" of the bypass. In fact, it's not too late. Let's recommend to Council that we don't spend time re-writing this plan. Let's be practical and proactive.

I have been reminded by this experience that transportation planning isn't necessarily accurate or effective. Only 3 of the 18 items listed on the 2001 task force priorities have been accomplished, and they were accomplished due to pressure put on the State of Oregon to improve Highway 99 West (see Page 99 of the Dec. 9th Planning Commission Packet). The only item listed under the pedestrian access is not mentioned in the new proposed plan. I also noticed that in an earlier (1993) list of street improvement priorities that none of the improvement priorities had been accomplished. The point is, we should plan but we don't need to spend a lot of time and public money unless a realistic local facilitation plan is identified.

The preferred plan in the packet has no mention of adjacent roads, such as the Chehalem Drive/240 intersection. It does not take into account the 2025 projection of population made by the ad hoc committee. The zoning of 2nd Ave. has been commercial for 60 years. I am disappointed we are not looking at the local street system. We are compromising the community for construction of the freeway. We are not looking at future growth areas. In three years we will be looking at freeway plans, why bother to do the study now? In 4 or 5 months there may be a plan for urban growth boundary and extension into County areas. If the same money was spent on this study a year ago, we would have been way ahead, because of where we are, we should vote yes. I am very grateful for being on the commission and being able to work on the TSP.

Commissioner Larson - Comments: Dwayne covered a lot of territory, I don't want to backtrack, would like to vote YES. My main comments entail: we had a gentleman in a wheelchair that devoted a lot of energy to sidewalks, our plan falls short, idea today was driving around central park, a person in wheelchair and access to central park is difficult to get in. It is part of public policy. I had a difficult time understanding why the city, any city, our city, is avoiding the issue of accessibility: it's very unfortunate, it's an issue with the transportation plan and was overlooked. We had excellent presentations, that part was a major disappointment for me. The plan was motivated and driven by the state of Oregon and not the local public. When there were comments from the state of Oregon, no one was here with accountability. I recall a very nice and personally nice representative without any specific answers. We are essentially told that this is the only one, if you don't like it, you may not like what we do if you don't accept it. I'd like to remind the commissioner that employees of the state, county and city work for you and I, not themselves. The input and effort that took the time by people that gave testimony was overlooked and was looked down upon, being brief. We need to move onward.

Question was asked about how long we had worked on the TSP.

Chair Smith - At least 15months

Motion #5: Larson/Tri - Move to adopt the TSP for 2005 as Amended

Chair Smith called for the question

Vote on Motion #5: 6 yes/0 no. Motion passed unanimously

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Mr. Brierley - You had asked us to go back to the tapes from February 10 meeting and prepare a supplement for one section. We did go back to the tapes, and that section was not audible. Mr. Brittell had made statements about zone changes and wanted additional detail about what he had said.

Commissioner Brittell – This was Chair Smith’s request.

Chair Smith - I requested a clearer version.

Mr. Brierley - Also the vote for the measure on the ballot, that would have repealed the cities local ordinance, it failed 3-1. The City retains its local improvement ordinance. For those of you who attended the open house for the Ad-Hoc committee it was packed house. There were a lot of good comments, there was a number of optional scenarios that were presented for growth of the city. A short survey was given and is being complied now. The Ad-Hoc committed is invited to a Planning Commission meeting to give a report, like they did a few months ago

Chair Smith - City Council will likely shuffle that work onto us.

Commissioner Brittell - He would like to share thoughts or follow up with an email letter for the survey. Is it too late?

Mr. Brierley - No. You can still comment. 2 ½ Planning Commission members showed up (Commissioner Tri had to leave early).

Commissioner Brittell - There were several maps on display. There was consideration of creating an industrial part of town in the south. That land is considered flat, and is adjacent to the urban growth boundary. Most of the studies from the consulting firm said that it would be better to leave the NW reserve area for schools, parks or farmland. I was pleased to see that the whole SE area was designated industrial. 200 acres exists in southern parcel. Concurs with Mr. Brierley that the meeting was worthwhile.

Mr. Brierley - Reported on Council items. At the last city council meeting, they adopted water distribution plan, a technical document, providing water service for 2025, including the urban reserve boundary. The biggest thing that changed is the plan for the north side of town. It is hard to provide water service; the new plan has new reservoir up higher for areas. Basically up to Bell Road. Generally, our water systems are working well. There will need to be new trunk lines ran up to the north area. This will be a big project but

will help out. On the 21st the Council will hold a workshop on the TSP. It will be an informal workshop on the plan. The hearing will be on April 4th. Introduced new minute taker Kyle McDaniel. For the next meeting a week from tonight, there were some problems, so there will be no hearing in one week. The minutes from tonight can be adopted to next weeks meeting. The city council needs the minutes approved before continuing.

Chair Smith - We need to have a meeting to approve those minutes. We will hold a meeting on March 17th to adopt the consent calendar.

Commissioner Brittell - Based on the report that we heard testimony on the two meetings ago on the rezoning of Springbrook. There were issues concerning Springbrook Specific Plan. My recommendation is to go back and reconstruct those minutes based on my recollection, would be closer then “nothing”. It is important for the council to receive those.

Chair Smith - You would like to amend the minutes?

Commissioner Brittell - I would like to review.

Chair Smith - You would have to bring a proposal for amending the minutes for the record.

Commissioner Brittell - Is that a good idea?

Chair Smith - Yes, bring them. It would be an unusual way, but it can be done.

Commissioner Larson - Memory is foggy, was I there?, What prompted the conversation?

Chair Smith - We came to a meeting to approve the minutes. Dwayne had a question about what he said and what was written, asked staff to check the tapes. Barton reviewed the tapes, but was unable to hear anything on them.

Commissioner Larson - Did we ever hear back from the consultation from City Council? We never got anything back? I would like to suggest that we give the City Council a copy of our resolution and a verbal presentation. I guess I am not pleased that we had no communication from the City Council on that, I find that highly irregular, when something is sent up and is ignored.

Mr. Brierley - On the issue of having the Commission review areas of public input, there has been a reply. On the other topic, the zone change, I would say that the communication hasn't come back yet. City council has spent couple hours chewing on what they want to do, they did ask that we proposals together and come back to them so that they can get an idea of what they would like to do with that. It wasn't ignored, they are working on it.

Commissioner Larson - How many years does it take to get a reply?

Mr. Brierley - The reply is “Thank you very much, were are giving your suggestions serious consideration.”

Commissioner Larson - That's their comment?

Commissioner Overbay - The City Council is requesting our feedback?

