

**TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**7:00 p.m., Monday, July 9, 2007**  
**Public Safety Building, 401 E. Third Street, Newberg, OR**

*"Mission Statement: To give the citizens of Newberg a forum to voice traffic safety concerns, evaluate related issues, provide a liaison with the City and promote traffic safety within the community."*

**Members**

|                 |                       |                  |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| <b>Present:</b> | Chair Michael Simpson | Vice- Dick Meyer |
|                 | Lesley Woodruff       | Leland Parks     |
|                 | Ronald Sult           | Bryce Jones      |
|                 | Jennifer Dawson       | Doris Brandt     |

**Ex Officio**

**Members**

**Present:** Mayor Bob Andrews, Councilor Bob Larson

**Staff**

**Present:** Paul Chiu, Senior Engineer  
Tim Weaver, Sergeant  
Mary Newell, Support Services Manager  
Jennifer Nelson, Recording Secretary

**Others**

**Present:** Nancy Stonebrink, Ed Bartholemy, Roger Rader, Andrew Cookson, Larry Young, Steven Gronli, Bill States, Marty Tucker, Sallie Tucker

**CHAIR MICHAEL SIMPSON CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:00 PM.**

**A) Review and approve minutes of June 11, 2007**

|                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>MOTION:</b> Jones/Brandt to approve the Minutes of June 11, 2007. (Unanimous) Motion carried. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

Nancy Stonebrink returned again to discuss the situation with the small business, The Little Red Barn, whose merchandise display is causing visibility problems at the intersection of 99W, First Street, and Morton Street. Her primary concerns were large items blocking the drivers' views as turning onto or from Morton Street as well as the customers double parking or parking on the wrong side of the street, reducing visibility and the ability for emergency vehicles to access that street without hindrance.

Chair Simpson asked her if she has been in contact with police department about her concerns.

**Ms. Stonebrink** stated she had not since first time she spoke with this commission and she is not sure what can be done.

**Chair Simpson** mentioned there have already been several discussions about this situation. He stated we needed to address these concerns to Sergeant Tim Weaver, who was on his way to the meeting from Portland. He asked Ms. Stonebrink if she would not mind tabling this discussion until after the public hearings this evening when Sergeant Weaver would be present. She did not mind holding the discussion.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **A) Reconsider limited decision to create no parking limitations within the entire circle of the cul-de-sac at 1150 Industrial Parkway and the 15 feet before the beginning of the radius (TSC-07-004)**

**Paul Chiu, Senior Engineer**, presented the staff report and provided the background information concerning this decision. He discussed how the decision came about and the requests received to have a hearing. He spoke about the radius of the cul-de-sac being fifty feet, making the measurements curb to curb one hundred feet, which is within Newberg standards before parking. He stated he also looked into the standards of geometric designs of highways and streets as a guideline. The reference indicated different types of vehicles, such as a WB50 or large semi-trailer fifty-five feet in length, requiring a minimum turning radius of forty-five feet. The WB60 double-bottom semi-trailer would be sixty-five feet in length with a minimum turning radius of forty-five feet as well. He passed the document around for the commissioners to look at. He also mentioned the WB60 was a truck with a tandem behind it and a triple trailer which would exceed the WB60 scenario. He discussed video clips that were provided showing a truck driver being able to maneuver the cul-de-sac with parked vehicles. Technical difficulties prevented the video from being shown.

**Chair Simpson** asked staff if there were any recommendations.

**Mr. Chiu** replied this was delicate situation between the agreeing parties and whatever he said would probably displease one of the two parties. He felt if there would be the need for a triple trailer delivery or huge semi-trailer on a frequent basis, then it would be best to have no parking around the cul-de-sac in order to address the needs of the businesses. There is also the need to have parking within certain distances of some businesses which would pose a challenge as well. He suggested the commission listen to both sides of the testimony and if this situation was an infrequent problem then there should be no further action or restriction on the parking as it is within the cul-de-sac.

Proponents:

**Ed Bartholemy** approached the commission as the original proponent to restricting the parking in the cul-de-sac and stated he was surprised at the resistance to the decision. He did not think it would be such a problem and actually thought most of the businesses would embrace it. He discussed the problems his tenant, who owned a cabinet company for ten years, has had with a lumber company not making deliveries anymore because of two separate occasions where the set of doubles became tangled in the cul-de-sac. He said he did not want to cause problems with the

neighbors though and if it was found unreasonable then he will go along with that decision. He also suggested a compromise could be to make no parking within just the throat of the cul-de-sac.

Opponents:

**Roger Rader, the Lead Technician for Integrity Auto Body**, discussed the debate over street parking versus public parking and employee parking being the burden of the individual businesses. He argued that closing the cul-de-sac to parking because of the use of triple trailers was unnecessary because triple trailers are required to go terminal to terminal only. He also mentioned the video they provided proving this cul-de-sac provides adequate space for turning capacities to be met. He felt with their twenty employees and the nature of their business, the parking restrictions would impede their business growth and operations.

**Chair Simpson** asked how much off street parking was available.

**Mr. Rader** replied there were maybe fifteen spaces plus three designated for handicap parking. Because of this they have employees parking in different areas, and the cul-de-sac is used by employees for street parking.

**Chair Simpson** asked how far employees would have to walk if they had to park elsewhere.

**Mr. Rader** responded it would take at least a block to find public access parking.

**Commissioner Bryce Jones** asked what they felt about the suggestion to eliminate only two parking spots on both sides of the throat of the cul-de-sac.

**Bill States** answered the question stating it would force employees to park farther down where other people are using the space for gym access. He stated that all the businesses parking lots are filling up and that he has never seen a situation where a truck has gotten stuck in the cul-de-sac.

**Larry Young** discussed the presence of driveways into their parking lot and mentioned the difficulty of parking up and down the street because of other driveways. He mentioned they also use their lot for parking cars that need repair for a couple of days and they park some on the street at night which has caused them to receive several tickets. He stated the business needs the parking in the cul-de-sac to free up room for customer activity and he also felt employees will have to walk more than two blocks if there was no parking available there.

**Steve Gronli** stated he put the building in there and never had a problem with parking until a dispute occurred with the tenants at the end of the unit concerning a suburban vehicle being out there for two days. He mentioned complaints and the police being called and he did not understand why time was being wasted over this because there were no problems before. He felt the tenants had a personal problem with him although he did nothing against them. He added there should be no problems turning around there and there never have been any triple trailers, only had doubles and he never saw a double go in there. He felt that calling the police at 2:30 in the morning was starting a feud. He stated his need to have his employees park close by and if he needed to have more spaces it should have been required in the first place and if he had known there were going to be restrictions he would not have put the building there in the first place.

**Chair Simpson** asked what his opinion was concerning only losing two parking spaces at the neck.

**Mr. Gronli** stated he did not see a good reason for doing that and no one had ever been asked to move their car.

**Mr. Young** mentioned that someone had to be gotten to move from Buckstop Truckware and three of their employees they are parking on the corners and the others on the street.

**Chair Simpson** stated one business has not been singled out here.

**Mr. States** added restricting parking would force employees to park on 9<sup>th</sup> Street which is narrower than Industrial Way is.

Proponent Rebuttal:

**Mr. Bartholemy** agreed there were a lot of things contributing to this debate. He stated he has built several buildings and the city staff is always on you about parking being handled on site. He stated his building's parking is all handled on site. He thought it was great that business is going so well for the opponents, but they are spilling out onto the road, where there are a lot of driveways and fire hydrants. He pointed out that we are only talking about four or five spaces if we took out the entire cul-de-sac. He said he has no trouble with parking operable vehicles there if they do not sit there for long periods of time. He said he did not make the problem up; his tenant cannot receive products on short notice anymore because a vendor has refused to send a truck there. He did not have documentation from the lumber company, but he felt they were trying to be reasonable. He felt there would be even more of a problem the first time a truck hits someone's car, then everyone will be upset. He stated he did not want any hard feelings; they just want to find a reasonable solution.

**Mr. States** made another comment about turning into driveways and if employees park close to hi driveway it will limit getting deliveries in the driveway and someone will get scraped.

**Mr. Bartholemy** again discussed the problem his tenant had and the fact that his buildings accommodated all parking onsite, including employee parking, as required.

**Chair Simpson** closed public testimony.

**Commissioner Leland Parks** asked staff about the city requirements for business parking for employees and if this area in question has the correct number of spaces.

**Mr. Chiu** replied the Planning and Building department requires a certain number of parking spaces per square footage of the building in industrial areas and once they have met those requirements approval they are approved to build. He was sure the number of spaces was met before approval.

**Commissioner Parks** commented he had visited the site several times and although he can see both sides he does have concerns. He mentioned that people have elected to park trailers where

cars should be parked, which is their choice to make about what they are using the spaces for and what those spaces could be used for they are forfeiting. He has also seen cars parked there when they did not need to be. He felt it is a difficult situation adding a truck can make it around there but it is difficult and cars on both sides make it even more so.

**Chair Simpson** summarized the situation mentioning only one business out of many has asked for this. There are several letters from others who are also opposed, saying their trucks have been able to come through. He also noted the body shop wants parking to stay the same. He added there has been testimony that one company already will not deliver the morning run with doubles to one company. He asked if there were any recommendations from staff or the commissioners.

**Commissioner Jones** suggested the parking stay the same, mentioning he would not have had any trouble driving his trucks around there but other inexperienced drivers are really the problem.

**MOTION: Jones/Brandt** to vacate the limited decision made concerning **TSC-07-004** creating parking limitations within the entire circle of the cul-de-sac at 1150 Industrial Parkway and the 15 feet before the beginning of the radius and to not make any changes to the existing parking already in place there.

**VOTE:** To vacate the limited decision **TSC-07-004** and leave the parking situation unchanged. (7 Yes/1 No [Parks]) Motion carried.

**Chair Simpson** suggested to the gentlemen who spoke to try to resolve any further issues by talking it out with each other first, rather than calling the police to mediate their conflicts. He asked them to work together if an inexperienced driver does happen to get stuck there. He said it is not possible to make everyone happy but the town does not have the money to resolve these issues and he urged them to work something out for themselves. He also encouraged them not to think of it as a waste of time to work through these issues as it was an opportunity to see civics in action.

**Mr. Bartholemy** stated he appreciated the commissions' consideration and he did not have a problem with the outcome; it seemed reasonable to him and he could see both sides of the issue.

**B) Reconsider limited decision to create 2-hour limited parking on the east and west side of the north half of the 100 block of N Garfield Street, between E Hancock and E First streets (TSC-07-005).**

**Mr. Chiu** stated he looked at comments by neighbors and there were both pros and cons. There is a need for customers and clients to have available parking within walking distances in order to provide services and have customers return. He said there was a need to look at whether there should be any parking for either employees or whomever for more than a couple of hours. He discussed employee parking and the fact that employees of the city park farther away in order to facilitate those people who need to receive services. He felt 2-hour parking would have advantages for consumers and could be helpful to the parking situation.

**Chair Simpson** reminded the commission a limited decision was made concerning making 2-hour parking along both the east and west side of the north half of Garfield Street, but he pointed out it was really only three parking spaces on south side of Hancock Street between Washington Street and N. Garfield Street by the old Chamber of Commerce building that were at 15-minutes. It was thought there is no use for 15-minute limitation by any of the area businesses. He suggested only changing those spaces by the old Chamber building and leaving the parking along N. Garfield Street as it is.

**Mr. Chiu** agreed that would be a desirable option.

**Chair Simpson** asked if that would satisfy the Tuckers.

**Marty Tucker** gave some background going back five or six years when the C3 zone was initiated in the downtown court area. He said they all have parking issues and they are trying to work with it all the time. He discussed how difficult it was when the state took all the north side parking. He mentioned the chiropractor and the building owner.

**Chair Simpson** interrupted he is not a complainant and the request came from the chiropractor on behalf of their customers to park legally for more than 15 minutes to get massages and treatments.

**Mr. Tucker** expressed concern for employees to look at parking further up then and wondered where they are going to go, all the way to the north side of Specialty Glass. He stated he thought there was supposed to be parking by the wood shop and if there was 2-hour parking it may interfere with Sartron, Inc. and they have been there a long time.

**Chair Simpson** reminded him the suggestion was to not change parking at all on Garfield and only to the three existing 15-minute parking spaces on Hancock Street to 2-hour parking. He asked if that would work since they are really adding three spaces of 2-hour park time instead of only 15-minutes.

**Mr. Tucker** apologized stating he did not understand it that way since there were complaints about Sartron, Inc. people parking there. He said if that is the compromise, that is good, but he felt we should be able to go to Sartron, Inc. and talk to them if there is a problem.

**Chair Simpson** replied the decision would not take anything away from Sartron, Inc.

**Mr. Tucker** agreed it sounded like a good compromise, but he wanted to think about it a little bit.

**Mary Newell, Support Services Manager**, added the 15-minute parking space has already been removed in front of the old Chamber of Commerce building.

**Chair Simpson** stated the new proposal would be to removed all three spaces that are currently 15-minute parking within that block.

**Mr. Chiu** stated there are several blocks with 15-minute parking there.

**Sallie Tucker** also added that they could be changed as well to 2-hour parking because that business is no longer a wood working shop; it is a natural health business too.

**Chair Simpson** stated there had not been a request for that to be changed.

**Commissioner Dick Meyer** added that the spot in front of the old Chamber building was big enough for two cars to park there.

**Commissioner Jones** thought that by doing this it would eliminate more people taking spots away from Sartron, Inc.

**Chair Simpson** closed the public testimony.

**Mr. Chiu** asked if considering the commission was considering changing the other 15-minute parking on Garfield, recommending it all be 2-hour as well and be taken care of at the same time.

**MOTION: Jones/Brandt** to vacate the limited decision made concerning **TSC-07-005** creating 2-hour limited parking on the east and west side of the north half of the 100 block of N. Garfield Street between E. Hancock Street and E. First Street and create a new limited decision to change all the 15-minute limited parking on the south side of Hancock Street from Washington Street to Main Street to 2-hour limited parking instead.

**VOTE:** To vacate the original limited decision on **TSC-07-005** and approve a new limited decision to change all 15-minute limited parking to 2-hour limited parking. (Unanimous)  
Motion carried.

**Chair Simpson** asked staff to make sure someone speaks with the woman who made the original request.

**Ms. Newell** said she would notify her via email.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Ms. Stonebrink** returned to the podium to resume discussions from earlier in the meeting that occurred while Sergeant Weaver was not present. She addressed her concerns to him.

**Sergeant Tim Weaver** asked her if the visibility was not any better.

**Ms. Stonebrink** replied it depends on which day. Today there were big television sets on a table and she was concerned about parking there and if a fire truck could get through if they needed to.

**Sergeant Weaver** asked if people are parking on First Street along the fence line, which would block that entire lane. She replied that occasionally occurs.

**Chair Simpson** noted there was also a white van parked the wrong way with for sale sign.

**Ms. Stonebrink** confirmed there was and stated it was there for about four days.

**Chair Simpson** asked if this was a parking enforcement since the business has the required permits; he wondered if there was anything this commission able to do about this.

Sergeant Weaver replied a code enforcement official and an officer have been working on this, but evidently it may not be enough. He said another step needed to be taken because he believed there is a fire hydrant on the west side of Morton Street opposite to the business that should be yellow-curbed. He said the visibility triangle had been addressed as much as it can, so to address the parking they may need to paint some of the curbs yellow since motorists cannot be blocking the driveways. He felt the business has been cooperating with them so far.

**Ms. Stonebrink** added some customers were double parking to load and unload merchandise.

**Chair Simpson** asked if it was allowable to double park for a brief period to make deliveries.

**Sergeant Weaver** replied it was as long as the required permits were obtained. This situation is for a customer to drop off. The other option may be to block that access from 99W onto west First Street and move everyone down to 2<sup>nd</sup> Way.

**Chair Simpson** mentioned the increase in traffic to the area that will occur with the twenty some homes that were just built there. He also feels nervous as a driver in that area. He thought maybe that intersection has lost its usefulness and vacating it could possibly remove a huge problem. He asked if the commission made a recommendation to break that access off with a wooden barrier or something would it be overstepping the commissions' boundaries.

Discussions continued about whether the railroad would have a problem with it and whether that could be opened for parking. There was also concern for whether it would cause a problem for emergency vehicles. There was also concern for whether or not the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) needed to be notified or involved because it was an exit from 99W.

**Chair Simpson** requested staff to conduct a feasibility study of what it would take to close that road off for the next meeting.

**Mr. Chiu** was concerned he would need more time because it requires him to contact ODOT and they may take some time to respond. He also needs to chat with police and fire officials to see if there would be a problem with some sort of closure. He stated the fire trucks are usually reluctant to run over anything when the suggestion was made about breakaway gates like Tualatin.

**Chair Simpson** asked that he try for September's meeting instead then. He called for a five minute break at 8:25 PM and reconvened at 8:34 PM.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**A) Install *End School Zone* signs on Mountainview Drive, near Joan Austin Elementary School (Suggestion box, no contact info)**



**Sergeant Weaver** stated there are speed zone signs showing 35 mph at the end of the school zone and by statute that is acceptable.

**Commissioner Ronald Sult** stated he believed there were school zone signs at both ends.

**Mayor Bob Andrews** asked staff if the end of school zone signage was the responsibility of the school district.

**Ms. Newell** stated they have to make the request.

**Chair Simpson** asked staff to contact the district and discuss this matter to determine responsibility since it would not hurt to have it.

**Mr. Chiu** stated it was difficult to get money from the school district so he was not optimistic, but he would check with them and try to find out for the next meeting in August if the administrators are available during the summer.

**B) Request for speed bumps on James Street and Michelle Court (Suggestion box, no contact info)**

Discussion determined that unless someone came forward with a formal request they could not consider this because there are too many problems surrounding the installation of speed bumps. Staff made recommendations there should be a policy concerning speed bumps and how to address them and at some point when there is time a draft should be composed for the commission and city council to consider. The Mayor mentioned a semi-formal policy being developed in the early 90's that could be looked at as a starting point. Criteria were discussed, such as having a certain number in the area that supported it and who would have to fund it.

**STAFF REPORTS - GENERAL INFORMATION**

**A) Police**

**Sergeant Weaver** passed out and gave a brief summation of a report concerning bills of interest to ODOT. He stated most bills concerned impaired drivers and new child safety standards. Another bill of interest regarded videotaping and tazers with digital recorders. There is a big push for telephonic warrants to test for impairment immediately when manslaughter with a vehicle is concerned. Another one concerned mobile phone use, Oregon does not prohibit the use of mobile phones while driving unless user is under the age 21. He announced the bills passed both houses and would not be in effect until January 1<sup>st</sup>.

**B) Engineering – Project updates**

Mr. Chiu provided updates on the Mountainview Road "S" Curve project which is still closed on N. Springbrook Road for an additional month. He discussed utility disputes that delayed the process. He said they are still on the first of five phases that are still expected to be completed by December. He discussed that roads would be unpaved until entire project complete, in order to pave all at once. He also invited anyone in the commission to visit the site by simply contacting him to make arrangements. He also announced an informational meeting concerning N. Villa

Road between Mountainview and Crestview that will meet this Wednesday between 7-9:00 PM at Newberg Christian Church.

Discussion occurred concerning these new upgrades and if the utilities would be installed in advance and including piping for reuse water. Staff replied they have not gotten to that point yet.

**ADJOURN TO NEXT MEETING**

**MOTION:** Sult/Dawson to adjourn at 9:13 pm until the next meeting on August 13, 2007.  
(Unanimous) Motion carried.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Jennifer Nelson**  
**Recording Secretary**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Mary Newell**  
**Support Services Manager**