

Downtown

PLAN

COMMITTEE

1985-86

MINUTES

Downtown Plan Committee

1985

1986

10/22/85

11/20/85

11/27/85

12/4/85

12/17/85

1/29/86

2/12/86

3/12/86

4/14/86

Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

October 22, 1985

DOWNTOWN PLAN COMMITTEE

Council Chambers

Newberg, Oregon

The meeting was opened by Greg DiLoreto, Public Works Director for the City of Newberg. He suggested that the selection of a chairman for the committee be postponed until the end of the meeting as the committee members would then be more familiar with each other.

Mr. DiLoreto then introduced the consultants and asked each member of the committee to state their name and their interest in serving on the committee.

Present were the following people:

Committee Members- Jim Burres *Bill Hough says*
Peggy Campbell *Bill Hough says*
Bill Campbell *Bill Hough says*
Rick Rementeria *Bill Hough says*
Julie Young *Bill Hough says*
Darcy Williamson
Hal Grobey
Ken Hough
Carol Berkley, sitting in for Brad Berry

Consultant: Carl Buttke, Team Leader from Carl Buttke & Associates
Doug Macy, from Walker & Macy
David Yamashita, from Walker & Macy
Wally Hobson, from Leland & Hobson

City Staff: Greg DiLoreto, Public Works Director
Arvilla Page, City Recorder

Others Present: Nine (9) Interested Citizens

Mr. DiLoreto reviewed the history of the traffic and market study, beginning with the Mayor's Task Force. Since March, 1985, there were thirteen meetings to select the consultants. Carl Buttke & Associates were chosen on July 9, 1985. Mr. DiLoreto distributed a copy of the contract with Buttke & Associates (Exhibit I) which outlines the scope of work in the contract. He stated that the consultants have been requested to slow down the work on the contract in order for the committee to have more time to review their recommendations.

Carl Buttke reported that the traffic study portion is approximately 50% complete. Traffic counters had been in place for two months. Intersection turning counts have been made. A roadside interview has been conducted to determine how many are stopping or going through town without stopping. The interviews were all day on a Friday and in the afternoon on a Saturday. The interviews were on about 25% of the traffic. Two-thirds of the

weekday traffic does not stop. Other work done has been a telephone survey, count of parked cars, postcards on windshields of parked cars and interviews of merchants. At the Town Hall meeting, questionnaires were handed out. The surveys will help in developing alternatives based on traffic circulation and destination.

Wally Hobson, in charge of the market planning, described the surveys used in the marketing study which is not yet complete. He reviewed the questions asked on the Town Hall questionnaires and gave the percentages on the various options on the questionnaires. A telephone survey of 200 contacts was also conducted.

Mr. Burres asked whether the roadside survey was conducted on all traffic. Mr. Buttke responded that it was on east bound traffic only. Mr. Buttke emphasized the roadside interview was primarily to investigate traffic conditions, and not market. The market questions were an added benefit.

Mr. Buttke reviewed the findings presented at the previous meeting with the previous committee. The infrastructure in the downtown area is almost worn out. Traffic is to build on and use. An attractive downtown will attract people. Major concerns regarding the traffic are volume, speed, trucks, and pedestrian safety. Mr. Buttke then presented Plan Options (Exhibit II). Alternative #3 stands out at this point over the others. Mr. Buttke emphasized that based on the marketing approach, a bypass should be avoided now and in the future.

Doug Macy, in charge of urban design, stated we need to look at the comforts of the pedestrians as well as the attractiveness of downtown. The town has a nice quality, but the downtown is worn out. Uses in the area are scattered. A special attraction is needed and government services should be kept in the core area. Four alternate plans are being offered build around alternative #3 on the traffic study. Mr. Macy listed the following goals used in preparing the alternatives:

- Create identity for the City.
- Develop positive pedestrian amenities.
- Improve pedestrian safety.
- Define edges of commercial area.
- Establish connections into adjacent neighborhoods.
- Buffer residential areas from impacts of traffic.
- Centralize government services and establish a strong presence.
- Develop a retail framework that is conducive to commercial growth.
- Establish an open space to accommodate fairs and festivals and to provide a central focus.
- Distribute parking to be convenient.
- Preserve the character and scale of the commercial area.
- Preserve buildings of historical significance.

Mr. Macy showed drawings of four alternatives for the downtown area.

The committee members asked questions of the consultants on a number of aspects of the work done so far. Mr. Campbell expressed concern about the impact of traffic on residential areas if

traffic is shifted. Mr. Grobey expressed concern about the projected volume of traffic in the future and how the City would be affected if the actual volume is greater than the projections. The committee then discussed the impacts of the various traffic proposals.

Mr. DiLoreto stated it was now time for the committee to elect a chairman. Mr. Grobey moved and Mr. Burres seconded the nomination of Bill Campbell for chairman. Mr. Rementeria moved and Mr. Hough moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Bill Campbell was elected chairman by acclamation.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET STUDY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

November 20, 1985

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Campbell. He asked that all those present identify themselves and state their interest in being present.

Members Present: Brad Berry Jim Burres
 Bill Campbell Peggy Campbell
 Ken Hough Bill Humphreys
 Rick Rementeria Darcy Williamson
 Julie Young

Members Absent: Hal Grobey Mike Olberding

Others Present: Mike Warren, City Manager
 Greg DiLoreto, Director of Public Works
 Arvilla Page, City Recorder
 Janet Ker, Chamber of Commerce Manager
 Carol Berkley, Newberg Downtown Association Manager
 Joe Young, Councilmember (joined meeting later).

Chairman Campbell stated the purpose of this meeting was to get clearer directions of where we are going. What is the role we are to fulfill and what is the purpose of that role.

Mr. Humphreys stated his concern was that we don't feel we are a rubber stamp of the people doing the traffic study. Our purpose should be to go beyond just where the traffic will go. What do we want for downtown; parking, use of the buildings, etc. We need an image of the downtown total.

Ms. Williamson stated we should look for gaps in the plans submitted by the consultants.

Mr. Burres stated traffic is part of the overall picture. Is the purpose of the Committee to get traffic relief or urban renewal?

Mr. Rementeria stated the Committee should look at downtown and redevelopment with traffic as part of the problem.

Mr. Humphreys stated it is hard to think what is best from the traffic standpoint if we don't look at all aspects of downtown.

Ms. Campbell asked whether the Committee could guide placement of traffic. The consultants only offered four alternatives.

Mr. Rementeria noted there isn't any funding for any plan. It is important not to commit ourselves in only one direction. Different conditions will change the plan over time.

Mr. Burres noted that once a traffic pattern is established, it will change the value of properties affected. We will have to handle traffic as effectively as possible. The State Highway Department has estimated

a 4% traffic growth per year. Are we looking at a 20 year plan or a 10 year plan?

Mr. Campbell noted that traffic is dependent upon the economy. Within 20 years, the roadway will not be able to handle the increase, no matter the size of increase. Traffic is a common basis by which all other planning can occur. It is not an end-all solution, but our recommendation, if adopted, will have a powerful impact on the community.

Mr. Warren noted that the Mayor's Task Force Committees in 1981 determined that downtown planning is all dependent on where traffic would go. The Committee may need to go out and poll the people to what they want.

He added that there is no preconceived, hidden agenda by the Council or City staff. The Committee knows more about what its' citizens want and they should not limit themselves on looking at alternatives. If the Committee gets enthusiastic, it will be a peoples plan, not a plan of the City. Mr. Warren emphasized that there were critics of NCRC that said the people were not involved. The Committee is supposed to be the people and it is up to them to come up with a plan.

Ms. Campbell asked whether it was ever stated to the consultants that Second Street is the thing to do. Mr. Warren responded, no. It may have been said that Second Street was all that we could come up with, but there was never any indication as to what the consultants should and should not look at.

Mr. Burres noted that if we come to an agreement that traffic is keeping people from downtown, then will people develop an economic interest in the downtown area? We need to get the cars through Newberg so we can use the downtown.

Mr. Warren noted that the Committee should not limit themselves to how it will be financed. They should try, at this point, to come up with a workable plan for traffic, public buildings, revitalization and anything they chose to consider.

Mr. Burres noted that we are primarily to do traffic.

Mr. Berry stated we have to look not only to how traffic gets through town, but what it is doing to us.

Mr. Berry noted that we have to do marketing and traffic together as they compliment each other.

Mr. Humphreys noted that we cannot completely ignore the financial aspects.

Mr. Rementeria asked what was the duration of the consultants contract? Mr. Warren responded that the contract has been extended to the end of February. He added that the Committee should guide the consultants.

Ms. Williamson stated we will look at the plans submitted by the consultants. If we don't like them, we can revise and then make our recommendation. Traffic relief is the first priority.

Ms. Berkley asked if the purpose of the Committee was to also sell the plan. Mr. Warren responded that he hoped that was also the purpose of the Committee and that the Committee would follow through on bringing the plan to the people.

Mr. Burres stated we would not be obligated to go to the Council at one particular time. We could take it to the community before taking it to the Council.

Mr. Berry noted that if we choose just one alternative, we had better get some feedback from the community. We can start with the alternatives proposed by the consultants, then tear them apart.

Mr. Burres noted that we need to take time to sell the project.

Ms. Campbell noted that we need to give the people something to look at.

Mr. Warren noted that many of the responsibilities of the Committee are the equivalent of Newberg Centennial Redevelopment Commission, without the tax increment financing.

Ms. Campbell gave goals so far identified by the Committee as:

1. Placement of traffic.
2. Review the downtown plan.
3. Get feedback and publicity.
4. Take it to the City Council with a recommendation and the reasons we came to that conclusion.

Ms. Williamson stated she saw a gap in the consultants proposals. They did not provide for bike lanes. Highway 99W is in the State Bike Plan. The State will come back and ask that bike lanes be included. If we would like to see more young people downtown, we need to make it easier for them to come downtown. Funding for the bike lanes is available.

Mr. Campbell noted that the consultants presentation was focused on the commercial area and not on the impact it would have on the residential area.

Mr. Berry stated he felt the Committee should meet often to attack the plans, tear them apart and then put them together again.

Mr. Rementeria stated the work needs to be broken down into elements.

The Committee then discussed how often and when they would meet. It was determined to meet next on November 27 at 7:00 p.m. to review the draft proposals, then again on December 4 at 7:00 p.m. with the consultants.

The Committee then discussed the need for some maps. Mr. DiLoreto stated that at least four maps would be provided at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET STUDY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:00 p.m.

November 27, 1985

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Campbell.

Members Present:	Brad Berry	Jim Burres-at 7:30
	Peggy Campbell	Bill Campbell
	Bill Humphreys	Darcy Williamson
	Julie Young	

Members Absent:	Hal Grobey	Ken Hough(excused)
	Mike Olberding	Rick Rementeria

Others Present: Arvilla Page, City Recorder
Jim Kelly, Newberg Graphic Reporter
Bryant Platt, Boy Scout

Chairman Campbell stated, that at the previous meeting, the Committee agreed there was a need to set the terms and steer the consultants to where we go from here. We also need to have a good record of the Committee's actions.

The Committee took a few minutes to review the minutes of the meeting of November 20.

Motion: P. Campbell-Williamson to approve the minutes of the October 22, 1985 meeting as presented. Carried unanimously by those present.

Motion: Humphreys-P. Campbell to approve the minutes of the November 20, 1985 meeting with spelling corrections as noted. Carried unanimously.

Mr. Humphreys stated he had read the contract with the Consultants thoroughly and it appears to be a well negotiated contract.

Chairman Campbell noted there is a lot of information required in the contract that may already have been presented.

Ms. Williamson noted that as of the October 22 meeting the Consultants had not read the Mayor's Task Force Report.

The Committee discussed just where the Consultants are in fulfilling the contractual obligations. Ms. Campbell suggested the Committee should ask Mr. DiLoreto for an update on the status of the contract. The Committee concurred with her suggestion.

The maps of the four alternate plans requested at the previous meeting were then displayed. Each alternate plan was discussed with pros and cons of each plan determined.

Alternate Traffic Plan #1.

PROS: Provides two-way traffic on First Street which has the effect of slowing the traffic.

CONS: Does not demonstrate how traffic will be handled on the two ends of the downtown area. How will turns be made? The congestion created would outweigh the benefits.

Alternate Traffic Plan #2.

Similar to Plan #1 with truck traffic forced onto Second Street. The truck traffic is 6.4%. Without regulation, traffic on First Street would have a higher rate of speed with the absence of the trucks.

PROS: 1,100 trucks off of First Street. Control and two-way traffic slows traffic on First Street. Controls slow traffic on Hancock. Far better than #1.

CONS: The same bottlenecks at both ends of the downtown.

Alternate Traffic Plan #3.

The cut-off locations and severity of the curves were discussed.

Question for Consultants: Why not one control light instead of two replacing the lights at Howard and Washington? Question for Consultants: Why were control lights placed in these locations?

PROS: Substantial traffic reduction on First Street. More parking. Two-way on First to slow traffic. Increased access to Hwy. 99 traffic. A more concentrated downtown area.

CONS: Increased volume of traffic, both cars and trucks, on Second Street. The cost is more than Alternate #2.

Mr. Burres suggested a test run with trucks diverted to Second Street. The Committee felt that even a short test would be detrimental to the street surface.

Chairman Campbell suggested that one option might be to start with alternate #2 and go to #3.

The Committee asked that City Staff provide them with the Goals and Objectives for Transportation in the Newberg Comprehensive Plan.

Motion: Humphreys-Berry to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. with review and questions on Alternative #4 to be delayed to another meeting. Carried unanimously.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET STUDY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers

December 4, 1985

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Chairman Bill Campbell.

Members Present: Brad Berry(at 7:41) Jim Burres(at 7:29)
Peggy Campbell Bill Campbell
Ken Hough Bill Humphreys
Rick Rementeria(at 7:23) Darcy Williamson
Julie Young

Members Absent: Hal Grobey Mike Olberding

Others Present: Mike Warren, City Manager
Greg DiLoreto, City Public Works Director
Arvilla Page, City Recorder acting as Secretary
Consultants:
Carl Buttke
Nancy Guitteau
Doug Macy
Elmer Christensen, Fire Chief
Approximately 10 other interested citizens.

Motion: Humphreys-Hough to approve the minutes of the November 27, 1985 meeting of the Committee. Carried unanimously by those present.

Chairman Campbell called the attention of the Committee members to the Transportation Goals and Guideline portion of the Newberg Comprehensive Plan. These are relevant to the work of the Committee. A copy has been provided for each Committee member.

Mr. Buttke introduced Nancy Guitteau who is doing the marketing analysis and Doug Macy who is doing the design and then the parking.

Ms. Guitteau explained how she went about the market research for the downtown. The need is to evaluate the market and the physical location of that market. Phone surveys were done to establish the trade area. A survey of the merchants was done to determine where their business comes from. Merchants were also asked what they perceive is the problem.

Ms. Guitteau reported the areas surveyed were Newberg, Dundee and St. Paul. The survey showed that people mostly use Newberg for food shopping, services and dining out. Furniture, appliances and clothes were mostly purchased out-of-town and mostly at Washington Square. Traffic was a negative influence. Most of those surveyed stated they would like more clothing stores. The merchants surveyed stated they would like more parking, of any kind, and move the trucks off First Street.

An analysis of market and available commercial space shows more space available than the market can support at present.

There is enough buying power to support a lot of small merchants, but the customers will need to be attracted. The customers driving through and not stopping need to be attracted.

There is a basic nucleus of hardware, grocery, etc. in place. There is a need to establish a strong identity for Newberg. Establishing a showcase could do that. It would be best to have a single individual spearhead the marketing program. There will need to be an improved environment with traffic control, more parking and an inexpensive building to house the showcase.

Ms. Willimson noted that the market may be broader than that surveyed. Ms. Guitteau agreed and noted that many people in the survey mentioned that the Newberg store hours are inconvenient.

Doug Macy, working on design, stated that Newberg does have a lot of good qualities. The identity of the downtown needs to be strengthened and improved. Government is an important aspect of design. You need to work to keep all government buildings downtown. The postoffice will be replaced soon because the present building and site are inadequate. The new location should be downtown to attract people to shop when they use the postoffice.

Mr. Macy showed two designs which would retain most of the present buildings, retain government buildings and provide more off-street parking.

Mr. Berry noted the City Hall building has a lot of character and the senior citizens want a center. How does this fit in? Mr. Macy stated there could be a civic zone adjacent to the downtown, near the library. The location of the postoffice will be very important.

The Fire Chief stated he was concerned with the moving of traffic to Second Street where the Fire Station is located.

Mr. Buttke stated there were four alternative traffic plans offered. Alternates #2 and #3 move some of the traffic to Second Street. Alternate #3 takes a majority of the eastbound traffic and moves it to Second Street. Traffic on First Street would be two-way and traffic on Hancock would be westbound.

Mr. Humphreys asked how traffic would make a left turn on First Street. Mr. Buttke responded that turns would be made from the traffic lane. This would have the effect of further slowing traffic.

The Committee members asked Mr. Buttke to provide them with more of the criteria used for the designs on the East and West ends of the downtown area.

Mr. Buttke explained the advantages of retaining block turns rather than going through blocks. The traffic will be slower and it is much better for pedestrian traffic. With properly designed 90° turns, they will work to slow traffic but keep traffic moving.

Mr. Buttke noted that Alternative #3 provides the most flexibility. If traffic forecasts are correct, new roadways will have to be built all the way from Portland. The projections are probably high, but we must design and plan for the highest use.

Mr. Humphreys asked, if we don't move City Hall and do not attach a showcase, would traffic change do the job needed? Ms. Guitteau responded that better traffic circulation would help, but it will not be enough to support more businesses.

The Committee discussed the showcase idea. Ms. Guitteau stated the showcase could start small, be in charge of one person, and could be operated by a non-profit group.

Mr. Burres asked what incentives are used by other communities?

Mr. Warren asked what financial means do other successful communities use?

Mr. Buttke responded that it cannot be done with financial incentives unless the traffic circulation is right. The private sector will work more effectively if the basic structure is there.

Mr. Warren noted that a business may know that it could be more successful if it had more parking but does not have the resources to provide more parking.

Mr. Humphreys noted that a venture capital fund to attract businesses will attract those that are really in need. These businesses may not last long. He also noted that, just looking at numbers, the suggested showcase could cost three-quarters of a million dollars within a few years. Who pays?

Mr. Macy suggested exhibitors could rent space. Free enterprise could pay the entire cost or a combination of private and public. There are some grant funds available for this type effort.

Ms. Williamson asked Mr. Buttke whether bicycle lanes would be included in the traffic design. Mr. Buttke responded that bicycles had not been considered yet, but agreed that they should be. Bicycle lanes could be placed on Hancock and Second streets.

The Committee questioned Mr. Buttke on the placement of the traffic lights. He stated that control lights have to be placed about equal distances in order to sequence the lights.

The Committee and the Consultants then discussed the placement of traffic control lights in some detail.

Chairman Campbell asked if the Consultants could provide the Committee with more detail on Alternative #2. The Committee needs to reach agreement on the Traffic Plan alternatives so that work can proceed with design. The designer also needs input on parking and parking lots. Should parking be parallel or vertical? Should sidewalks be wide or narrow?

Mr. Buttke presented the results of the parking survey for the Committee to review. The survey indicates parking for shopping purposes is only one-half the number compared with other towns. They are also parking for shorter time periods. This may indicate a need for more short term, 10 or 15 minute, parking spaces. The distance traveled to find parking by shoppers indicates that spaces convenient to the businesses are being used by employees.

The next meeting of the Committee was set for December 17, 1985 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The Committee will meet without the Consultants.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

ap

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET STUDY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7:00 p.m. Council Chambers December 17, 1985

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Campbell at 7:10 p.m.

Members Present:	Brad Berry	Jim Burres
	Bill Campbell	Peggy Campbell
	Ken Hough	Bill Humphreys
	Rick Rementeria	Darcy Williamson
	Julie Young	

Members Absent:	Hal Grobey(Excused)	Mike Olberding
-----------------	---------------------	----------------

Others Present:	Greg DiLoreto, City Public Works Director
	Arvilla Page, City Recorder
	Carol Berkley, Main Street Manager
	M. R. Tegg, Citizen

Motion: Berry-Williamson to approve the minutes of the December 4 meeting as submitted. Carried unanimously by those present.

SELECTION OF TRAFFIC ALTERNATIVES:

The Chairman read the description of Traffic Plan Alternative #4. The consultants gave 10 each positives and negatives for this alternative.

Mr. Rementeria questioned Mr. DiLoreto about eliminating the left turn lanes on Hancock Street. Mr. DiLoreto stated that the consultants do not recommend separate left turn lanes. Mrs. Campbell noted that this alternative is the most expensive of the four. Mr. Berry noted that many aspects of this alternative are not palatable, since much property would have to be acquired. It was the consensus of the Committee that Alternative #4 was not viable.

M.R. Tegg offered an additional alternative that has not been suggested by the consultants. His plan would designate a truck route beginning at Springbrook Road; go north to Crestview; west on Crestview to the intersection of the railroad tracks; follow along the south side of the railroad tracks to the intersection of Main Street. Mr. Tegg stated that land use on the south side of the tracks is very light and land could be obtained at reasonable cost. There would have to be a fill or bridge at the Villa Road crossing. He stated he felt this was something that should have been done 20 years ago.

The Committee discussed the various aspects of Mr. Tegg's proposal. Mr. Burres noted this plan would get the wanted traffic downtown and the trucks out of town. Mr. Campbell noted that this plan would be very expensive with land acquisition, road construction and the bridge or fill at Villa Road. It was noted that this plan would require property from the Springbrook School. It was the consensus of the Committee that Mr. Tegg's alternative would not be viable at this time due to the cost of land acquisition and the Villa Road bridge.

Mr. Tegg was thanked for bringing his proposal to the Committee.

Mr. Burres asked whether this Committee is advocating by-passing Newberg and Dundee.

Mr. Campbell noted that he had made a presentation to the Newberg City Council requesting support of a grant application and funding assistance for a study of the feasibility of a truck route around Newberg and Dundee. The truck route, if feasible, would access a lot of industrial land that is not very accessible at present. The question is whether a truck route should be included or deleted as part of the Yamhill County Comprehensive Plan. The truck route would not be a by-pass and would not be signed as such.

Mr. Campbell stated that his role as a member of the Committee is separate from that as an employee of the County. The Committee's purpose is to look for solutions that could be implemented in a few years to address Newberg's traffic problems.

Mr. Humphreys noted that a truck route is not a concern of this Committee.

Mr. Campbell stated, that in any case, a truck route would not be built for at least 10 to 20 years.

Mr. Burres noted that he has trouble with the City advocating the spending of money on a future truck route as well as on this study.

Mr. Campbell pointed out that the Council is not advocating the construction, just a study of the feasibility. Mr. Campbell also noted that this study is limited in its scope to the downtown core area and that the area has other needs, particularly trucks to Publishers and to the industrial land south of the city.

The Committee returned to the selection of an alternative.

Alternative #1. Ms. Williamson reported that one merchant she talked to stated he would like to have at least one lane of traffic westbound on First Street.

Mrs. Campbell stated the Committee has defined their likes and dislikes of #1 previously.

Motion: Rementeria-Young to delete Alternative #1. Carried unanimously.

Alternative #2 and 3: Chairman Campbell noted the Committee needs to list and review the similarities and differences in #2 and #3. Mr. Campbell also noted there would be a massive shifting of traffic in #3. Second Street would have to be rebuilt with either alternative.

The Committee discussed the similarities and differences of the two alternatives. Both will impact residents on Second Street.

The Committee then discussed what they would like from the consultants if they selected Alternative #3.

Motion: Rementeria-Berry to select Alternative #3 and to ask the consultants to provide a plan for phasing in implementation; with line item cost on each aspect of the implementation. Carried unanimously.

Mr. Berry noted that we need to know why we should do certain things rather than others.

Mrs. Campbell noted that we need to implement something quickly.

Mr. Campbell stated we need to know what is mandatory and what is optional in Alternative #3.

The Committee then discussed briefly the access and egress to Second Street.

The next meeting date, with the consultants, was tentatively set for January 15, 1986 at 7:00 p.m.; at the Library Conference Room, if it is available.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

ap

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET STUDY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:00 p.m. Carnegie Library January 29, 1986

Chairman Bill Campbell was not able to attend because of illness and the Committee chose Bill Humphreys as temporary chairman.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Humphreys.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:	Jim Burres	Peggy Campbell
	Hal Grobey	Bill Humphreys
	Rick Rementeria	Darcy Williamson
	Julie Young	

Members Absent:	Brad Berry	Bill Campbell (E)
	Ken Hough	Mike Olberding

City Staff Present: Greg DiLoreto, Director of Public Works
Arvilla Page, City Recorder
Clay Moorhead, Planning Director(arrived later)

Consultants: Carl Buttke
Nancy Guitteau
Doug Macy

Others Present: Six interested citizens which included one member of the Press.

Motion: Campbell-Williamson to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 17, 1985. Carried unanimously by those present.

Mr. DiLoreto outlined the purpose of the meeting and indicated that the consultants needed specific recommendations to the selected plan. He then turned the meeting over to the consultants, Carl H. Buttke, Inc. and Associates.

Ms. Guitteau said the market study was given previously. There will be changes and improvements reflected in the final plan along with a strategy for implementing the plan. The first problem is that First Street is very long with little depth. It is important to shift the emphasis toward the middle and create a sense of entry to the area. It is also very important to strengthen the retailing in the center of the area. This will require a pleasing environment and it is now very bleak. It is important to put as much parking as possible on First Street with angle parking. Traffic needs to be two-way on First. There will need to be signs to encourage people to enter the street. The marketing strategy will be to create a destination attraction, but also to create a more solid retail market. Fundamental: Offer a set of enjoyable activities. There does not need to be a building, but a sense of activity. This will not happen overnight. A showcase can be started before the other improvements are made or even begun. When the improvements are done, it will be easier to then grow. There are funds that can be applied for especially for this kind of project.

Mr. Burres asked whether a senior center could be part of this market place. Ms. Guitteau responded that it could be part of it. It is very important that any new civic center be on First Street and keep the post office downtown because of the activity it generates.

Mr. Humphreys asked why emphasis was shifted away from what is historically the center at First and School. Ms. Guitteau responded that the area just west of that center allows better opportunity for development. The existing core is composed of buildings in good condition. We would not want to tear them down. The banks at First and School will continue to attract activity.

Mr. Grobey asked whether it was possible that the Chamber of Commerce is the place where the marketing improvement effort should be. Ms. Campbell noted there are now two groups, Chamber of Commerce and Downtown Association, involved in the activities of the downtown area. Ms. Guitteau said the resources of all groups would be drawn on and you would draw on them for the structure now existing. The marketing effort might be better done with a separate group that represented all the groups plus others. Mr. Buttke noted that if the group is too large, the focus may be lost.

Mr. Macy described the operation of Pioneer Square in Portland which is operated by a board made up of people representing various groups. He stated that the traffic will need to be brought into the downtown area as close as possible. Traffic lights will improve the flow of traffic. Traffic in the core area will be slowed down and there will be less volume.

Mr. Buttke showed the proposed traffic patterns in the concentrated downtown area. The plan will accommodate to the year 2000, or a 50% increase in traffic. Growth will not occur unless roads leading to Newberg are improved and widened.

Mr. Macy described the suggested locations of various new buildings. He stated there should be an aggressive plan for street trees and plantings.

Ms. Williamson noted that it is not likely that the post office will relocate in the downtown area as they have a policy of relocating on the fringe of the business area. The Consultants agreed that keeping the post office downtown would require lobbying, but, if we have a plan we stand a much better chance of keeping the post office downtown.

Mr. Burres and Mr. Grobey called attention to the problem of the railroad on Blaine Street. Mr. Grobey noted that Publishers Paper Company needs to be encouraged to move the railroad. They have no incentive now to remove it, but the downtown would be improved with its removal.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Consultants distributed their implementation recommendation. The implementation is divided into four (4) phases. (Exhibit I of these minutes). Phase I is organizational and the phases carry through to Phase IV which has traffic improvements and expanded parking.

Mr. Buttke reported that he and Mr. DiLoreto had met today with the State Department of Transportation to bring them up-to-date on what we are doing. They talked about the possibility of financing for the improvements. The State has 25 million dollars generated by the new gasoline tax that is tied to economic development. The funding has requirements of jobs generated and community backing. Changing the highway through Newberg will require an environmental impact statement in order to get state funding, so the project will have to go on the Six Year Highway Plan program. It is not now on the Six Year Plan. After it is in the Plan, the EIS will require eighteen months to complete.

Mr. DiLoreto said the DOT hearings on the Six Year Plan will be held in April, 1986. They will not hold hearings again for two years. Our documents will be done by the time of the hearing.

Mr. Buttke noted that we will need to have a unified community consensus.

Mr. Burres asked whether the city could move the traffic off First Street themselves. Mr. DiLoreto responded that we could if we chose to spend the money. We will need to know the minimum cost there will be to take the trucks off First Street.

Ms. Guitteau stated financing will need to be determined for the sidewalks, street trees and lights. Ms. Guitteau said that the increment financing was the best way to pay for these improvements. She stated that, if possible, the city should attempt to reform the redevelopment agency. Gas tax receipts could be designated over a period of time to pay the cost of capital improvements. Financing other First Street improvements could be a combination of a Local Improvement District and General Obligation bonds. She noted the marketing problem is a little easier. Contributions can be requested from local and regional business. Banks and utility companies can be asked to contribute. Additionally, it will require a lot of volunteer hours. There are also foundations. Once the ball is rolling, it will generate cash. The budget would be about 50 to 60 thousand dollars per year. With a history of successful funding and activity, you will be able to build a building.

Mr. Humphreys asked what would be the total cost of the proposed plan. Mr. Buttke stated the roadway improvement and change would be around two million dollars. This would not include sidewalks other than standard cement. There would be extra cost for different sidewalks and better street lights.

Mr. Buttke stated the next step in their work will be to prepare detailed costs by phase and project.

Chairman Humphreys called for any more questions from the Committee and audience. There were none.

Mr. Buttke stated they will be able to wrap up their work and submit a draft report by the end of February.

Motion: Grobey-Rementeria to accept the preliminary report from the consultants. Carried unanimously.

The Committee and consultants then discussed the need to schedule a joint meeting with the City Council. There is one more meeting scheduled in the consultants contract and it was the feeling of the Committee that this should be used for a presentation to the Council and to as many citizens as possible.

A meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 12th, in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

ap:trmr0129.mnt

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:00 p.m. Council Chambers February 12, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Campbell.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:	Brad Berry	Jim Burres
	Bill Campbell	Peggy Campbell
	Hal Grobey	Bill Humphreys
	Rick Rementeria	Darcy Williamson
	Julie Young	

Members Absent:	Ken Hough	Mike Olberding
-----------------	-----------	----------------

City Staff Present: Moorhead, City Planning Director
Arvilla Page, City Recorder
Michael Warren, City Manager

Others Present: Carol Berkley, Sam Sherrill, Fred Casey, Joe Young,
and Bob Bigelow from the Newberg Graphic

Motion: Humphreys Burres to approve the minutes of the meeting on
January 29, 1986. Carried unanimously by those present.

Chairman Campbell asked Mr. Moorhead to give a review of the previous meeting for those that were not present. Mr. Moorhead responded that the Committee determined that the group wanted to meet one more time as a group to discuss how to bring the plan across to the public as they will be supporting the plan. One more meeting is scheduled with the consultants. That meeting will be a joint meeting with the Council. The meeting will be in mid March, around the 17th. Also discussed was whether the group should have another town hall type meeting.

Mr. Humphreys gave his understanding of the meeting. The Committee agreed to select a design based upon the presentation by professionals. The next step is whether to go to the Council with that design and recommend it by the group. We also need to talk about financing options. If we can promote and support, then we can take it to the public.

Mrs. Campbell gave her understanding of the meeting. There would be input by the Committee and then make a recommendation to the Council.

Mr. Rementeria stated that he does not know if a town hall meeting would be all that beneficial. He suggested that a mass mailing with questions might be more beneficial.

Mr. Burres stated that his understanding was that the Committee was to take the information, discuss and argue and then submit it to the Council. We do not need to input more raw data. We are supposed to be representing the community. Also, we will be rushing to get it done by March or even May.

Chairman Campbell noted there is an interim step we must take. We do not have a product to take to the Council or to a town hall meeting.

Mr. Grobey stated that we have been given expert opinion on strategy. The Committee should take the plan to the community. A town hall would develop any number of opinions. Are we going to market the advice to the community, including packaging the finance? We need to develop community support to develop the plan.

Mr. Burres stated that the community does not necessarily buy the expert advice. We need to get the feel of the community.

Mr. Grobey stated that this plan could be implemented in phases in five years if there is a commitment to do it. Anything beyond what we have is design detail. One the concept is accepted, then go to the design detail.

Mr. Humphreys noted that we have a design. Implementation was very general, including the financing portion. We need more detail on how we are going to do this. In particular, what are the short term benefits.?

Mr. Burres noted that he had asked the consultants whether the traffic plan could be implemented with paint and traffic cones to see if there would be a benefit.

Mr. Grobey stated that this could not be done. The traffic plan for Second Street would have to be implemented. You could slow down traffic on First Street and at the same time could implement other strategies.

Mr. Rementeria noted that the marketing is already being done by NDA. In regard to the buildings, this group shouldn't designate buildings in specific places, but stress desire to have certain things, such as the post office, in the downtown. Businesses might then hang on for awhile with the hope that things will improve.

Mr. Burres stated there was an overwhelming request heard to get the traffic off First Street.

Chairman Campbell noted that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODT) has a hearing on the Six Year Plan every two years. The next meeting will be in April 1986.

Mr. Grobey noted we need to show up with a committed group of people and a firm commitment of community support. NDA and the consultants state emphatically will be a benefit to the community.

Mr. Berry noted there is a lot of energy now. If we have to wait two years for traffic change, it will be too long. Rerouting the traffic is a viable, acceptable improvement.

Mr. Burres stated that he objected to having to meet somebody else's time frame. We should do it by our own time frame.

Chairman Campbell noted that what we have now is just some ideas. When we talk about traffic, we are talking about fairly fixed elements. We could take traffic to the Council. NDA is moving forward with marketing. ODT has an on going process and we need to get our foot in the door. We will then have two or three years to work on the other aspects of the plan. We cannot act on the whole thing at once.

Mr. Rementeria suggested the traffic plan be separated from the plan as a whole.

Mrs. Campbell asked the question, "If all the Committee supports the traffic plan, what is the harm going to the ODT?"

Mr. Humphreys said we need to make a strong statement to the state. We need to have a plan together to make a strong statement.

Mr. Grobey noted that the city has been successful with other projects where they had a limited time frame for implementation. This Committee was made up to cover the issues and to represent the community. If we draw back because we feel we have to hurry, this community will die a diesel death.

Mr. Burres asked how much money we will ask the community to put up for this?

Mr. Grobey responded that the cost would be 1.5 to 2 million dollars for the couplet only. The financing by the community would be general obligation bonds.

The Committee discussed the impact this amount of bonding would have on the tax rate. It was estimated to be about \$.90 per thousand of assessed value.

Chairman Campbell noted that part of the cost of some signals would be paid by the State. They would not participate in other signals.

Mr. Moorhead noted that this project would not get high points with the ODT because it has no identifiable hazards. The only way to get on the list is to participate heavily.

Mr. Grobey noted that if we are lucky enough to get on the Six Year list, we will not be scheduled until near the end of the list. We need to gain the State's approval and then plan to pay all or part of the cost ourselves.

Mr. Burres agreed that the only way to finance the traffic part would be to go to the public with a general obligation bond.

Mr. Humphreys ask whether everyone was ready to say there will be 2 million dollars of benefit. If so, we need to go to an action plan.

Mr. Grobey noted the consultants had stated that given all the factors, the city will choke in 15 years with traffic.

Mr. Rementeria asked whether we are now ready to go to the Council and say the group supports the traffic plan? We should at the same time put out a flyer to the community asking for input.

Mr. Burres suggested writing a group letter to the citizens describing how we arrived at this plan.

Mr. Grobey suggested a two pronged approach. Market the concept in the community and at the same time approach the state with representation from the Committee involved.

Mr. Rementeria noted that other groups should get involved.

Mr. Grobey noted that different groups could run on parallel paths with the Committee representing the community and developing additional community support. Phases for implementation on the traffic could be: Reroute to Second Street, implement two-way on First Street, temporary barriers to narrow First Street, and slow down traffic on First Street to 18-20 Mph.

The Committee discussed how much the State would participate in various parts of the plan and how much local participation would be required.

Mr. Grobey stated the Committee needs to determine what action to recommend to the Council. #1. The action that needs to be taken to the State. #2. Develop the concept in the minds of the community, (a) Marketing. (b) Solution to traffic problem.

Mrs. Williamson asked, "If we go to the State in April, when will we know if we are on the Six Year plan?" Mr. Warren responded that we would probably know no later than August.

Mr. Burres stated that we need to take as few dollars as we can and get the traffic off of First Street..

Mrs. Campbell said that the Committee needs to narrow this down to step-by-step and take it to the Council.

Mr. Grobey said this Committee or an expanded committee should take it to the community. The Council does the political part with the State. We should take to the Council a firm supportive recommendation of what we want to take to the community and what we want the Council to take to the State.

Mr. Rementeria stated the commitment should be that we will try to implement the first portion over the first few years. We need to break it up into portions.

Mr. Humphreys stated we should do the first part ourselves, but ask for help.

Ms. Berkley said a petition could be circulated to get the speed reduced on First Street to 20 MPH.

Mr. Berry stated the concept of the Yamhill Showcase is just too much money now. We need to concentrate on just the traffic.

Mr. Burres stated we need to avoid it looking like it is for just the benefit of the businesses.

Mr. Grobey noted the whole plan could be implemented in increments by different groups.

Mr. Humphreys noted that if it is not done right, we may just create more problems than we now have.

Mr. Rementaria said we do not have to give a recommendation at the Council meeting. The consultants can be asked to do a better job of phase detail.

Mr. Berry said he wanted a break down of the phases of the traffic pertains.

Mr. Humphreys stated he would like to know what is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Rementeria stated it may be appropriate to ask the downtown people for an L.I.D. for the street trees, etc. if the traffic shift works well. There are parts of the plan that should be paid for by the city as a whole and parts that are appropriate for only part of the city.

Mr. Warren stated the Committee is expected to embrace a plan and the financing of a plan they are willing to sell. This group represents the people. The questions he has heard are: What is the plan? Is the senior center in the downtown according to the plan? We need to tell the post office what we want if we want them downtown. This committee has more of a responsibility than you are talking about. In 1981 and 1983 we talked to the State. How do we get on the Six Year plan? We have to have the community behind it and show need. The Committee people are the ones that need to go to the State.

Mrs. Campbell asked Mr. Warren if he wanted the Committee to present a completed plan to the Council. He responded no, as he sees this as an on going committee.

Mr. Humphreys noted that, because of the time factor, all the Committee can present to the Council is the traffic portion. The Committee cannot support some of the other parts yet.

Mr. Warren stated the Committee will need to have a financing plan. He stated he would also like to know what to say to the senior citizens and to the post office.

Mr. Casey stated he was concerned about the public feeling. The Committee needs to ask them and find out the answers before going to the Council. They also need to get to the post office now to let them know they want the post office to stay downtown.

Mr. Humphreys stated that we are not ready yet to say where we want things to go specifically.

Mr. Warren noted that the Committee will have to support the plan enthusiastically.

Chairman Campbell asked how the Committee and what they are doing relate to the Planning Commission. That advisory board is being overlooked.

Mr. Moorhead responded that the Planning Commission is being kept advised of this committee's work. He added that if there are no citizens willing to work to make a change, then a change cannot happen.

Mr. Grobey stated the Committee could take this to the Planning Commission. But the Committee was set up to go directly to the Council. It will not leave out any of the legal processes. The Comprehensive Plan has broad goals and this is not inconsistent.

Mr. Moorhead noted that many meetings were held with NCRC. There will be a need to do more through the public hearing process. He outlined for the Committee the determinations to this point in the discussion.

- A joint meeting with the consultants and the Counsel.

- Ask the consultants to be more specific with phasing and cost of the traffic portion.

- Look to the Council for some guidance on where to go from there.

- Recommend to the Council: 1. We want to go with a phased implementation. 2. The Committee will be on going to continue the plan.

Mrs. Williamson asked the Committee to appoint a committee to address the design portion. Mr. Burres stated that would be the concern of NDA.

Mr. Grobey noted this Committee would be the forerunner in developing a

concept and selling it to the community. He suggested that the Chairman of the Committee should present the background to the Council, introduce the consultants and then let members of the Committee speak to the Council.

Mrs. Campbell stated she believed the Committee should meet before the Council meeting at a time when we have more information from the consultants.

Mr. Grobey suggested that a progress report be given to the Council at their meeting on March 3.

Mr. Moorhead stated he agreed with Mrs. Campbell that the Committee should meet again before the presentation to the Council and after more information is received from the consultants.

Motion: Humphreys-Rementeria to hold a joint meeting with the Council and consultants. To recommend a phased in program. Traffic only to be phased in in detail with cost. The Council to approve NDA as the marketing arm. The Council to appoint a continuing committee, that will be on going, that will be handling the traffic aspects of the plan. Carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers

March 12, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 7:12 p.m. by Chairman Bill Campbell.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:	Brad Berry	Jim Burres
	Bill Campbell	Hal Grobey
	Bill Humphreys	Rick Rementeria
Members Absent:	Peggy Campbell	Ken Hough
	Mike Olberding	Darcy Williamson
	Julie Young	
City Staff Present:	Greg DiLoreto, Public Works Director	
	Arvilla Page, City Recorder	
	Clay Moorhead, Planning Director	
	Mike Warren, City Manager	
Others Present:	Carol Berkley, NDA Downtown Manager	
	Janet Ker, Chamber of Commerce Manager	
	Bob Bigelow, Newberg Graphic Reporter	

Also present were two (2) unidentified citizens.

Chairman Campbell referenced the City Manager's Memo to the City Public Works Director dated March 6, 1986. The members of the Committee have each received a copy of the memo. In the memo, the City Manager expresses his concerns in three areas of the Committee's work. These three areas are: #1. Time/quality, #2. Staff Input and Assistance, and the Financing. Chairman Campbell stated the roll of the Committee needs to be discussed and called for each member present to give his views of this subject.

Brad Berry: The Committee has looked at the options presented by the consultants and there has been a clear consensus from the Committee for Alternative Traffic Plan #3. The City Manager feels the Committee should make a recommendation on how to finance the project. Do we tell the Council, "We want you to adopt #3.", or "We favor Alternative #3."? Do we state, "Do as you want." on financing, or do we look at financing? The last issue is, if we take this to the Council, who spearheads what is next? The City Manager wants the Committee to take it to the community. We should look at the financing to see if we can come up with some alternatives.

Bill Humphreys: Agrees with Mr. Berry. We are not ready to take anything to the Council. Our charge was beyond just recommending a traffic plan to the Council. We have a traffic plan and the beginning of an overall downtown plan, but the financing needs to be studied. We need to put the brakes on, even if we have to do the financing ourselves. We should not hurry just to get on the State Six Year Plan.

On the issue of selling to the public, we need assistance from the Council. We can propose the plan to the Council, recommend financing, and ask them to give us guidance on presenting it to the public.

Hal Grobey: Agrees with Mr. Berry and Mr. Humphreys. We now need to get the ball rolling with the financing. The Council is waiting to see what this Committee will bring. We have to get moving. Financing alternatives could be general obligation bonds or economic development funds from a lottery grant. There is not enough time to get on the State Six Year Plan. We cannot get on the Plan without community support. We could have an 'Advisory Vote' of the people.

Rick Rementeria: Would favor a different approach. We need to separate the funding from the plan. He would favor adoption by the Council of the plan. Some sectors of the community, i.e., the post office, need to know the plan now. We should take a poll, not a vote. In a poll, we could offer options. We should look for funding options that are most palatable to the people. We need to get a feeling from the community on whether they want to do the plan.

Jim Burres: We have asked all the questions the typical citizen will ask. We have not looked at a long range implementation. We need to recommend a method of implementation to the Council and we need to make clear to the community the scale of the project. We need to emphasize the negatives and the positives. He is in favor of the general obligation bond option. We need to give the people more than one choice. We are kind of side stepping the political issue by taking this off the backs of the Council that are the elected representatives of the people.

Bill Campbell: The routing elements must be analyzed in the downtown plan other than just traffic. The financing needs more time for study. There is the question of who should be responsible for taking the plan to the community. Within city government, people seek responsibility and should take this responsibility. The Planning Commission's role in the community is more than zoning. They plan economic elements also. More time is necessary so what we are proposing is clearer. There will be new hearing two years from now on the State Highway Six Year Plan.

Chairman Campbell asked for comments from those present that are not members of the Committee. None were received.

Hal Grobey: Time will be required to look at financing options and we will need legal input. The post office relocation question is critical at this time. They have asked for input. We need to demonstrate that this plan is what the community wants. He would like to see us move forward as soon as possible.

Greg DiLoreto: Would another Town Hall Meeting, rather than a presentation to the Council by the consultants be better? He heard concern about this group selling the plan. This group knows the plan best.

Brad Berry: The question is who is taking charge of selling the plan. The Committee will be involved in selling the plan. The Council is responsible for knowing the plan as well as the Committee.

Hal Grobey: The Council will need the support of the Committee to guarantee the community support. He sees the Committee as a continuing function and thinks the Council will adopt the consultants report.

Bill Humphreys: We will need more than the backing of the Council. They need to take the lead. The Committee will assist.

Jim Burres: We should go to the Council and recommend Plan #3 as a guideline, then go back to the Committee to talk about funding.

Brad Berry: Why not look at financing before we go to the Council?

Hal Grobey: The Council will need time to study the plan. There is benefit to getting the plan adopted even without some of the unknowns. It is now time to start adopting what is in the consultants report. He would recommend the plan presented in the report from the consultants, but wants the Committee to study the other aspects.

Jim Burres: Is there implementation in the report?

Hal Grobey: There is only a general plan that will work.

Rick Rementeria: We cannot ask for financial support from the community in 1986. We need to get the community familiar with the plan first. We need to develop an implementation plan with more detail.

Jim Burres: We need to ask the citizens whether they want to do it now, or over a time line.

Bill Campbell: There will be just one final presentation by the consultants. The financing options will change over time. We also need to look at a time frame.

MOTION: Humphreys-Rementeria that the Committee take a strong leadership role and take the plan to the community. We go first to the Council to get their endorsement. We then arrive at a conclusion on financing and implementation and then get the Council's endorsement on those.

Jim Burres: We are a Committee of the Council. Let them tell us whether we should take a leadership role.

Hal Grobey: Believes the Council will approve the Committee taking a strong position on selling to the community. The Committee will tell the Council what they want to do.

Vote on Motion: Carried unanimously.

(Mr. Grobey left the meeting at 8:00 p.m. - No quorum of the Committee now present.)

Discussion continued on the best use of the final presentation by the consultants, whether there should be another Town Hall Meeting, when a report and/or recommendation should be made to the Council and possible dates. Input was requested from the City Manager. It was agreed by those present to set a tentative date for a Town Hall Meeting as April 14 with all concerned, Council and Committee, present.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

TOWN HALL MEETING
DOWNTOWN-TRAFFIC/MARKET COMMITTEE

Monday, 7:30 p.m. George Fox College April 14, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Campbell.

Members of the Committee present were: Brad Berry, Jim Burren, Peggy Campbell, Hal Grobey, Bill Humphreys, and Rick Rementeria.

Present representing the consulting team were: Carl Buttke, Doug Macy and Nancy Guitteau.

Also present were Elvern Hall, Mayor; Mike Warren, City Manager; Arvilla Page, City Recorder and six other members of the City staff. Others present were: Approximately 35 citizens.

Chairman Campbell described the origin, organization, and purpose of the Committee and then introduced the consulting team and turned the meeting over to the consultants.

Carl Buttke stated the work consisted of three parts:

1. Marketing under Nancy Guitteau.
2. Design under Doug Macy.
3. Traffic under himself.

Doug Macy reviewed the goals of the consulting team obtained from previous town hall meetings. He then reviewed the design recommendations.

Nancy Guitteau described the marketing study and some of the statistics obtained from the study. Several recommendations are made based on the information. She suggested that a long-term strategy be developed with a focus.

Carl Buttke described the traffic study, the statistics obtained from the study and the traffic changes recommended after review by the Committee.

Mr. Buttke described the phases of implementing the recommendations of the consultants.

1. Organize key people into a task force to develop the "Yamhill Showcase" concept.
2. Construction: One way traffic on Hancock and Second streets. Two way traffic on First Street with just two lanes and angle parking.
3. Widen First Street between River and Meridian. Rebuild First Street from Harrison to Main.
4. Landscaping on First, Second and Hancock streets.

Mr. Buttke stated that the plan could be done in pieces according to availability of financing. The total cost would be approximately 4.5 million dollars. Two-thirds of that amount would be capital construction costs and the balance would be for land

acquisition. He then opened the meeting to questions and input from the audience.

Comments from the audience were:

Why not have the reconstruction of Second run from Harrison to River Street?

Has the location of historic buildings on Second Street been taken into consideration?

Are there any plans to do something about the railroad on Blaine Street?

Where would the "Yamhill Showcase" be located and what would be its purpose?

The citizens have stated they do not want the traffic to go through the downtown area.

Citizens do not want a civic center and cannot afford one.

We have to keep the traffic downtown.

We need to slow the traffic down.

The City is already in debt and cannot afford more debt.

The City is now doing the needed long term planning.

The merchants need to change their hours of operation.

We need to have a strong merchants organization such as those in mall operations.

The consultant team responded to the questions and offered additional input on the comments.

Bill Humphreys, a member of the Committee, stated the questions that need answers are:

Do the people like the plan presented? Should the Committee now take the plan to the Council? How should the plan, if implemented, be financed.

Joe Brugato, local businessman, stated the Committee should go out and knock on doors to get the answers. The people present are not representative.

Carol Berkley, Downtown Manager, suggested several methods of advertising the plan. Some of these were presentations before local civic groups, window displays and displays in banks.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.