

City of Newberg
Transportation Task Force
April 10, 2001
7:00 p.m. Newberg City Hall

City Manager Duane Cole called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. In attendance:

Present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
Doris Brandt	1609 Aldersgate Lane	503 538 2742	
Merle Brandt	1609 Aldersgate Lane	503 537 2742	
Jerry Dale	P. O. Box 248	503 538 2134	jerry@sportsmanairpoark.com
Larry Anderson	112 N. Springbrook Road	503 538 9259	andeng@open.org
Mike Ragsdale	1119 N.W. 1 st St. Dundee	503 557 0617	Mike@rkaonline.com
Gene Kennedy	1909 N. Springbrook Road	503 524 3803	GKennedy01@aol.com
Charlie Harris	19400 N.E. Jaquith Road	503 538 7350	charris@teleport.com
Mary Brillas	17800 N.E. Chehalem Drive	503 538 2927	
Russ Brandt, A-Dec	14235 Fletcher Road, Dayton	503 537 2730	russ.brandt@a-dec.com
Leonard A. Rydell	601 Pinehurst	503 538 5700	larydell@teleport.com
Tim Weaver	P. O. Box 970,	503 538 9421	(City internal)

Absent

Mat Haug	1524 Hess Creek Court	503 538 1186	matson_haug@mentor.com
Barbara Brown	101 W. Foothills, Dr.	503 538 7433	sofashionable@yahoo.com
Dan Schutter	2216 Thorne Street	503 554 2014	dschutter@georgefox.edu

City Staff

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
Duane Cole, City Manager,	P. O. Box 970	503 537 1207	ColeDua@ci.newberg.or.us
Mike Soderquist, Com. Dev. Dir.	P. O. Box 970	503 537 1282	Soderqm@ci.newberg.or.us
Kathy Tri, Finance Director,	P. O. Box 970	503 537 1216	Trik@ci.newberg.or.us

The mission of the Task Force is as follows:

1. Review, revise, prioritize and recommend the specific projects to be built to improve the transportation system. Determine if the community supports the identified projects.
2. Review, revise and recommend funding solutions, if any, that will be used to pay for the transportation system improvements identified on the priority list, including a time-line for completing the projects. Determine if the community would support funding the projects.
3. Provide a report to the City Council within four (4) months from the date of the first meeting of the task force.

The agenda was reviewed and Duane explained that the railroad person would be joining the group during the meeting for a presentation. The Committee reviewed the policies they might consider in the design of streets in Newberg:

- ▶ More flexibility in the designs to experiment or develop alternative designs.
- ▶ Design collectors to a narrower standard with shallow drainage ditches. Include right-of-way

- credits or a reduction of set-backs, if design requires more property.
- ▶ Combine bicycles and pedestrians where possible.
- ▶ Design improvements to reduce the impacts on the environment.
- ▶ Design each project to be project specific.
- ▶ Design each project to balance the transportation uses.
- ▶ Design each project to reduce and limit the costs.
- ▶ When development occurs on arterial and collector streets, just extra width the intersections and leave the street a more nature friendly area.
- ▶ Existing local residents pay for local street standard improvements, not arterial or collector street standards. This does not include commercial or industrial property.
- ▶ Bulb-outs on arterial and collector streets are to be included in the design.

The Committee discussed an addition to the policies regarding public transit. Ragsdale made the observation that the policies did not define a specific transportation strategy, like relieving congestion or connectivity. Harris agreed, but focused on public transportation and included car-pooling and ride sharing. It was suggested that the Committee add a project for public transit. An additional policy was identified as follows:

- ▶ Projects shall include bus stops, turn-outs, and a park and ride center on the East and West side of the City possibly in conjunction with a rail stop.

The Committee had a discussion regarding the projects and how to prioritize them. It was decided to rank in order the criteria identified in the hand-outs. Each member of the Committee ranked in order the nine criteria.

Bob Post from B.R.W. arrived and provided a presentation on commuter rail. He started the presentation with some definitions regarding the distinction between commuter rail and light rail. Commuter rail operates on commercial lines that also provide freight service. He indicated that the local line through Newberg is not in very good condition. The freight service operates at 10 miles per hour over the trestles and they would need to be replaced in order to handle higher speed rail service. He also said that the stations and crossing guards would need to be built and installed.

Mr. Post talked about the development of the line from Beaverton to Wilsonville. He said the line had received some federal interest. It is feasible due to the anticipated growth in the area. There are no significant plans at this time to develop a rail system to Newberg. The cost of the project was identified as \$112 million to get the line as far as McMinnville, and, \$16 million to Newberg which was just an estimate of the cost of the track. In addition, there would be a need to construct the stations and purchase vehicles. Mr. Post also identified insurance as a major cost component. He said that there is a major negotiation process involved in agreeing to operate commuter rail on private lines.

The Committee expressed their appreciation to Mr. Post for coming to Newberg and presenting this information.

The Finance Director, Kathy Tri, then provided the results of the priority identification process by listing the criteria ranked by the Committee. The ranking was as follows:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.	Reduce Congestion	25
2.	Safety	30

3.	Neighborhood Impact Mitigation	49
4.	Public Support	51
5.	Funding Opportunities	61
6.	Improvements to public transit	66
7.	Cost/vehicle	79
8.	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	82
9.	Project Readiness	83

The Committee indicated that other than Public Support, the staff should match the criteria to the projects and this evaluation provided to Committee at their next meeting. In addition, the Transportation System Plan policies and projects should be compared to the Committee's list of projects. Cole indicated that this could be completed and identified the next meeting date as April 24, Tuesday, 2001.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.