

Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #2

July 23, 2018, 6pm-8pm

Newberg Public Safety Building (401 E Third St.) – Council Chambers/Court

Chair Brian Love called meeting to order at 6:05pm

Attendees:

CAC Members – Brian Love, Geary Linhart, Lesley Woodruff, Todd Baker, Ron Wolfe, Chris Strub, Derek Brown, Denise Bacon, Fred Gregory, Stan Primozich, and Mike Ragsdale
Mayor Bob Andrews
City Staff - Doug Rux, Cheryl Caines, and Brett Musick
Consultants – Joe Dills, Andrew Parish, Kyra Haggart (APG), Morgan Maiolie (Walker Macy), Brian Vanneman (Leland Consulting), and Garth Appanaitis (DKS Associates)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Joe Dills opened the meeting and explained the purpose of the meeting is to go over the Existing and Planned Conditions of the Riverfront (Task 2) and how this fits into the overall schedule.

Kyra gave an overview of the public outreach city staff have done or will be doing (Public Works Day, Tunes on Tuesday, Old Fashioned Festival, Newberg Rotary) and social media (website/Facebook). The public event is coming up on August 23, 2018.

2. Vision and Goals

Andrew Parish presented the draft Riverfront vision statement and plan goals based on the input from the first TAC meeting. He brought up recommended changes by members of the Technical Advisory Committee, including regional connectivity. Joe Dills asked the committee, is it valuable to add in a reference to regional and state partnerships to implement the plan? The consensus was yes. This could lead to opportunities, relationship and synergy and using regional resources.

Mike Ragsdale – Why is industrial history a goal? Other than the mill have you discovered other industrial uses? Doug Rux noted a tie to the grist mill activities on the Ewing Young site and the various users of the mill site. Mayor also pointed to the river being used as a highway in the past for products. Joe Dills verified with the group that this should still be included as a goal.

Joe also confirmed changes to the vision statement and goals – be explicit about regional destinations that are also part of the plan and regional partnerships. There was consensus on these changes.

3. Existing and Planned Conditions

Andrew Parrish presented the existing and planned conditions for the area. He noted constraints, existing and potential development.

Brian Love asked if there are any potential developments not shown on the maps. Doug Rux said there is some small infill development and partitioning. Several inquiries over the last five years?

Lisa Rogers asked if the objective is the look at what we have and determine what we want based on the zoning? Joe Dills said we're using the zoning more as background information. We'll draw concept plans and ask how well existing zoning implements the plan and recommend any needed changes.

Garth Appanaitis went through the transportation presentation outlining the existing system (including condition), planned system, and the deficiencies. These include nonexistent pedestrian facilities and missing ramps. This is mostly due to the standards in place at the time of construction. There are several attractions in the area to walk/bike to (schools and parks) that could support connections. There is some good wayfinding signage. Speeds and shared lanes mean biking opportunities in the area are a bit better than pedestrian. Bypass path has a missing link.

Todd Baker asked if there would be any funding from ODOT to replace sidewalk ramps. Doug Rux said no ODOT money for city facilities. For things like Downtown (Hwy 99), the money came out of litigation and is being used on state facilities.

Joe Dills asked the committee what are the highest priority transportation investments needed?

- Roads and pedestrian walkways (too sporadic)
- Agree, even existing sidewalks and streets are not in good shape
- Can't get to Rogers Landing without hitting potholes and mud, walking is almost impossible
- Hard to pick because based on numbers and attractions, which right now is not there.
- Are there multiple jurisdictions controlling roads in this area? *Wynooski 7th to Hwy 219 is Yamhill County, Bypass is ODOT, Waterfront is Yamhill County, Weatherly is now City, College is City. There is a mix. Mostly south of the Bypass.*
- Is it the city's practice for ownership to transfer as streets are improved? *If it is brought up to city standards, then City would entertain a jurisdictional transfer.*
- Hard to make choices until I know the future uses.

Morgan Maiolie presented how the Riverfront fits into the region and the importance of the Willamette River connectivity to other parts of the valley including Portland Metro region and factors that factor into the urban design concepts for this area. A good starting point is looking at the walking radius from points of interest such as parks, Edwards Elementary, mill site, viewpoints, etc.; this leads to breaking down the Riverfront into smaller areas or neighborhood nodes and providing connectivity between them.

Mike Ragsdale pointed to a stream corridor that runs NE from Chehalem Creek. Doug Rux said it does not have a name and is mostly from stormwater. Mike said he had not noticed it in the past, but this could be an amenity.

Joe Dills asked what ideas come to mind with these visuals:

- What does circulation barrier? *Areas where access under the Bypass is limited.*
- South Side of Bypass has no sound wall. Could it be installed? *Whatever comes out of this plan, that means that ODOT will need to consider if sound walls are needed.*

4. Market Analysis and Development Programs

Brian Vanneman presented the market analysis. His research showed that development in Newberg over the last ten years has been mostly residential (roughly 85%). Retail in the Riverfront would be limited due to lack of access and visibility; destination retail would be more viable. Case studies from other riverfront areas were also presented.

Recommendations for the area include incremental infill development in the existing neighborhoods and potential expansion of the small commercial node on E Ninth Street. There should be anti-displacement measures to keep existing residents in place if new development occurs. A great place for paths, trails, event space, connections to the region. At the River Street terminus, there could be some destination retail. The mill site has potential for adaptive re-use for employment. Housing makes sense and the possibility for a hotel in the long term.

Based on this information, the team has come up with three potential redevelopment programs for the area. In program A, the River Street terminus (RST) is about 5 -10 acres with destination retail and some housing. WestRock mill site remains industrial and employment. Program B shows RST expanding into the warehouse portion of the WestRock site. A larger area could mean a greater variety of uses. In program C, the RST area expands to 60 – 130 acres. That could accommodate larger campus type development.

Joe Dills explained that these concepts are based on market, but policy issues must also be considered in deciding what uses are allowed in the area. The variables that come in for future development have to do with how the land at the end of River Street might be used or how much of the mill site may be available. The consultant team will be looking at all of these layers when coming up with plan alternatives in the next phase.

Joe Dills opened up the programs for discussion:

- We're short on industrial land, and we should work with the Newberg 2030 committee to ensure we're aware of Newberg's land needs.
- I went to the Hood River site you mentioned. It is easy to access even for RVs. Can we picture a 33 – 35 foot motor home going down River Street to this area?
- What is the WestRock site purchase price? *We were not given a price but were given a target of \$1.75 - \$2.00, which is about \$12 million based on acreage.*

- What time of day do we want people there? What would be appropriate here?
- Do you have data on how these other sites developed? Is there a formula? *It depends on the area. In the case of Hood River. They've done several different plans and finally found success by finding the right mix for the area. Joe Dills – they led with public improvements (event site, family park, parking). The rest of the land was master planned in a second era.*
- Is there any progress on the Chehalem Trail? *CPRD has a master plan they are implementing over time. The Bypass trail is one piece of that. Many of the trails in that plan will connect parks in the area. Just need to find the funding. Mike Ragsdale – I'm on the CPRD Board and the plan is aspirational. Pieces of the trail will be done over time. Possibly urban renewal could be used for construction of trails.*
- I'm drawn to alternative C without considering any other factors. The mill site is fabulous property for so many other uses. I know we have a need for industrial, but we also need to consider this is prime property.
- One of the challenges here is the extreme topography. Can't just walk to the River. How do you integrate that so people can enjoy the different areas considering the obstacles and accessibility issues for individuals?
- I see some high level view concepts. I haven't heard us talking about marinas, houseboats, or uses on the river.
- This is an opportunity to take nothing and turn it into an attraction. How far are we looking beyond the UGB and the study area? This could impact the plans we come up with and plan even beyond 20 years.
- If this were a destination, Sportsman Airpark could be a feature. We need to involve and work with them.

5. Public Comment


No public comment.

6. Next Steps

Brian Love said he took the "come back 20 years from now – what do you see" question. I heard back from people and got good and positive feedback. Thank you for all your help

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45.

Approved by the Riverfront Master Plan Citizen Advisory Committee this 12th day of February, 2019.



Brian Love, Chair



Cheryl Caines, Senior Planner