

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

**Kershner Hall - GFC
Thursday, 7:00 PM**

**Newberg, Oregon
March 11, 1993**

Subject to P.C. Approval at 4/8/93 P.C. Meeting

I. OPEN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Chair Russell opened the meeting.

II. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Jack Kriz
Michael McCauley
Mary Post
Carol Ring
Steve Roberts
Wally Russell
Robert Weaver
Roger Worrall

Staff Present:

Dennis Egner, Planning Director
Sara King, Associate Planner
Barb Mingay, Recording Secretary
Bert Teitzel, Director of Public Works

Consultant Present:

Andy Mortensen and Gary Katsion, Kittleson & Assoc.
Paul Morris, McKeever/Morris

Citizens Present: approximately 160

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Kriz-Weaver to approve minutes of the February 18, 1993 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. OPEN NUAMC MEETING

The meeting was then turned over to Commissioner Goecks to convene NUAMC.

V. NUAMC ROLL CALL

Dennis Goecks
Don Halbrook
Alan Halstead
Bill Jackson
Jack Kriz
Leslie Lewis
Martin McIntosh

VI. NUAMC ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Commissioner Goeck opened nominations for chair and vice-chair. Jack Kriz was nominated for Chair and Don Halbrook was nominated for vice chair. Nominations were closed and both individuals were unanimously elected.

Planning Commission Chair Russell then resumed direction of the meeting. He reviewed the testimony process for legislative public hearings and then asked for a show of hands relating to interest in the various issues of the hearing. He indicated that individual speakers would be limited to 5 minutes and speakers representing groups would be limited to 10 minutes.

VII. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING: NEWBERG TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Applicant:	City of Newberg
Request:	Adopt the transportation systems plan as an element of the Comprehensive Plan and enact related zoning and subdivision ordinance amendments.
File No:	Newberg Planning File G-8-93
Criteria:	Sections 600-606 and Section 800 of the Newberg Zoning Ordinance (Ord. 1968); Statewide Planning Goal 12 and its related administrative rules; Section 78 of the Newberg Subdivision Ordinance (Ord. 91-2294).

Planning Commission Chair Russell opened the hearing and asked for abstentions, ex-parte contact or objections to jurisdiction. The following abstentions were noted: Carol Ring abstained due to past involvement with the issue and location of residence. Steve Roberts abstained due to business contacts with water systems located in the areas under discussion. No additional abstentions, no objections to jurisdiction, and no ex-parte contact were noted.

Staff Report: Planning Director Egner read ORS 197 relating to the hearing process. He introduced himself and welcomed the audience to participate in the transportation systems plan development. He indicated that the Planning Commission and NUAMC were receiving public testimony at this meeting and additional meetings relating to this issue. He noted that the Planning Commission would forward a recommendation to the City Council and NUAMC

would forward a recommendation to the County Commissioners. He reviewed the various topics to be discussed and he noted the roles that Planning Commission and NUAMC play in the decision making process for the transportation plan. He reviewed the Comprehensive Plan, Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance criteria and Statewide Goals that apply to the adoption process.

Public Works Director Teitzel noted that the transportation process has been ongoing for about one year. He noted that the Visioning process had identified the transportation plan as a high priority in the City. He commented that coordination with the State is also required as the State is reviewing bypass issues. He commented that the State's new transportation planning rule requires that Newberg adopt a transportation plan by 1996. He indicated that a technical advisory committee has been appointed to review the consultant's recommendations. A citizens advisory committee has also reviewed the plan. Two community workshops have also occurred. He indicated that the plan includes a street plan, bicycle/pedestrian plans, air/rail/ water and pipeline plans, etc. He presented a slide show relating to the transportation plan which included maps outlining arterial and collector streets. Several models relating to possible transportation options and roadway standards were reviewed. Slides showing samples of the various roadway standards were reviewed.

Andy Mortensen, Kittleson and Associates, consultant for the project, indicated that in meeting with the citizens advisory committees, goals were established relating to pedestrian and automobile planning. He reviewed the existing transit system now available in the community and how it relates to the Portland transit system. He noted that preliminary investigation of a direct bus transit system to Portland indicates it would be a viable option for the community. He noted that the plan proposes development of a local transit district for operation of local transit service. Part of the plan includes facets of the transportation system geared to bicyclists and pedestrians. The plan includes recommendations to improve sidewalk and bicycle paths throughout the city. He noted there is a pedestrian/bicycle pathway project planned up Hess Creek Canyon to provide for recreation. He noted that air transportation and rail service are also included in the plan. He noted that changing rail service provisions may require some revisions to the plan; however, retention of the rail rights-of-way is desirable. Water and pipeline transport was also reviewed in the plan. He indicated that implementation of the measures noted in the plan will require ordinance revisions.

Mr. Egner noted that adjustments must be made to City engineering standards and the Subdivision Ordinance. He noted that the street standard minimum of 32 feet recently adopted by the council is one part of the adoption process. He noted that revisions to the Subdivision Ordinance and general land use issues need to occur to implement the plan. He reviewed revisions needed to design review standards, bicycle and bikeway standards, pedestrian/bicycle access and internal pedestrian circulation. Using graphics he reviewed internal pedestrian, parking and landscaping designs and pedestrian friendly developments.

Mr. Teitzel reviewed the financial plan for funding the transportation plan. He noted that the City would be responsible for about \$7 million of the funding, \$14 million would be paid by

developers, system development charges would cover about \$12 million, adjacent landowners would be responsible for \$4 million, the State \$2 million and Yamhill County \$3 million. Funding available to cities includes state gas tax, local gas tax, user fees, property tax, local sales tax, economic development funds, SDC's and direct assessment. He reviewed policies and standards within the plan which had financial impacts on new developments and existing developments. He reviewed proposed timeframes for developing new streets and improving existing ones. He reviewed slides relating to alternatives for the proposed NE area arterial. He noted that neighborhood meetings in the area have occurred to discuss the various alternatives. He indicated that the citizens advisory committee's recommendation was to adopt a NE arterial with no specific location designated. He reviewed traffic characteristics by street classifications.

Staff Preliminary Recommendation:

Mr. Egner recommended that the Commission and NUAMC refer the matter back to staff for some minor modifications and additional analysis.

Public Agencies/Letters:

Mr. Egner indicated that DLCD has reviewed the transportation plan but has not offered comments and need additional time.

Letters/memos were distributed to the Commission and NUAMC and were briefly reviewed as follows:

February 18 1993 letter from Gary & Janet Warrington objecting to Crestview collector.

Newberg City Council Resolution 93-1758 relating to street widths.

March 9, 1993 memo from Michael Sherman, Newberg Fire Chief.

March 1, 1993 letter from John & Nancy Jones objecting to Crestview collector.

March 4, 1993 letter to John & Edith Plews from Duane Cole, Newberg City Manager.

February 26, 1993 letter from John & Edith Plews objecting to Crestview collector.

March 9, 1993 letter to Patrick & Patricia Ridenour from Duane Cole, Newberg City Manager.

March 2, 1993 letter from Patrick & Patricia Ridenour objecting to transportation plan issues.

March 11, 1993 memorandum from Mike Twenge objecting to all options relating to the NE area collector.

March 11, 1993 letter from Joan & Ken Austin supporting the transportation plan.

March 11, 1993 letter from Leonard Rydell objecting to transportation plan issues.

March 10, 1993 analysis from Scott Gibbons objecting to Crestview collector.

March 4, 1993 Citizen's Advisory Committee minutes, Newberg Transportation System Plan.

Commissioner Goecks indicated he had also received numerous letters and he submitted them for the record. They are identified as follows:

March 4, 1993 meeting information letters to Mr. Migaki, Mr. & Mrs. Davidson, and Patrick & Patricia Ridenour from County Commissioner Dennis Goecks
March 2, 1993 meeting information letters to John & Edith Plews, Gary & Janet Warrington, Kathy & George Rice, and Brian & Lauri O'Connor from County Commissioner Dennis Goecks
February 24, 1993 letter from Brian & Lauri O'Connor objecting to Crestview collector.
February 18, 1993 letter from Gary & Janet Warrington objecting to Crestview collector.
February 23, 1993 letter from Kathy & George Rice objecting to Crestview collector.
February 23, 1993 letter from Mrs. Janet Warrington objecting to Crestview collector.
February 26, 1993 letter from John & Edith Plews objecting to Crestview collector.
March 2, 1993 letter from Terry & Susan Davidson objecting to Putnam/Benjamin collector.
March 2, 1993 letter from Patricia & Patrick Ridenour objecting to Crestview collector.
March 1, 1993 letter from George Migaki objecting to Crestview collector.

Public Testimony, Groups:

Jeff Osborne, 3202 Crestview Drive, representing the Crestview Group, indicated he has been dealing with this issue for about 4 years. He addressed two areas: the plan and its credibility. He felt the basic elements should protect the current residents of the community. He felt that protection was often one of the last things discussed. He indicated that there was a lack of credibility from the City and the County and that the City's close association with the Chamber of Commerce is not healthy. He indicated that the City gave \$30,000 in city taxes to help fund the Chamber and is also a member of the Chamber, paying dues of \$3,000 yearly. He felt that the workings of the community were not enhanced by this relationship and that the City was being overly influenced by the Chamber. He felt that the County has neglected their responsibilities in the transportation issue. He expressed concern about the matter of alignment in the NE Newberg area. He felt that the County should realize that Newberg is someone to be dealt with and not the second cousin to McMinnville and western parts of the county.

Jeff Kleinman, attorney, 1207 SW 6th Avenue, Portland OR 97204, representing Oxberg Lakes Homeowners Assoc., reviewed the history of development of Oxberg Lake Estates in 86-88. He indicated that prior to the subdivision applications being filed with the County, the owner had filed numerous applications with the City to develop the property to City standards. He indicated that the City did not wish to annex the property and the owner then went to the County to subdivide the property. He indicated that the City attempted to interfere in the County subdivision process at that time. He further reviewed exhibits relating to the development process of Oxberg and the development of Crestview as a non-arterial in this area. He presented exhibits relating to the history of this development process. He commented that under the State's transportation rule, development of transportation plans will require exceptions to Goal 11 and Goal 14 of the transportation rule. He indicated that OAR 660-12-0353A (?) would be violated if this alignment were adopted. He indicated that there is an apparent assumption that this arterial has been on the maps for 20 years. He noted that maps lying around at the County and City indicating this arterial were never adopted.

Nan Atzen, 29365 Putnam Rd., and Dave Dailey, Putnam-Benjamin Road Association, presented a petition in opposition to the Putnam/Benjamin Road alignment. He indicated that the rural lands rule would apply to their area as well. He discussed the approval process for Oxberg Estates Phase III. He noted that the County did send out inquiries relating to the subdivision application and the City's response was very specific relating to the development of Crestview as an arterial. He indicated that the County approval process did include the City's requested conditions. He reviewed the County's stand in the development of Oxberg Lake Estates. He indicated that the Putnam-Benjamin Road Association is opposed to the Putnam alignment as being inefficient and not cost effective, especially in light of the extensive history relating to the anticipated Crestview alignment. He indicated that topography and waterway crossings alone would make this option cost prohibitive. He reviewed proposed cost for construction of each bridge required for the Putnam alignment. Additionally, he noted that notices had not been received until late January. He indicated that their neighborhood doesn't want the road. He noted that the Kittleson report had some inaccuracies relating to housing counts on the various alignments. He noted the impacts on the existing homes, wells, and septic systems with the Putnam alignment.

Dennyses Wheeler, 3112 Crestview, representing Crestview Drive Neighborhood Group, expressed concern relating to buffering of residential properties. She supported development of a transportation plan for the community which could be depended upon by the community in the future and she would like to see a plan where all present and new development would be buffered. She presented a diagram relating to buffering of residential areas from arterial traffic, trucks etc. She cited Bull Mountain Road as an example of this type of buffered housing development. She indicated that schools should be built within these residential areas and not surrounded by commercial and industrial development. She noted that the Crestview area was a good example of the possible expansion of industrial uses into residential neighborhoods. She stressed the importance of buffering existing residential areas in every way possible. She noted that College, Main and Chehalem Drive are recommended to be 3 lane roads. She recommended that College and Illinois south of Main should be designated truck routes to deter truck traffic from the north Newberg area. She noted that the City's connection with the Chamber of Commerce should be revised and the support money should be redirected to school or transportation expenses in the community.

Don Clements, Supt. of Chehalem Park and Rec District, 1802 Haworth, noted that as a citizen of the community, he supported the commission and encouraged them in their endeavors. He discussed the planned collector near Highway 219, Chehalem Drive and North Valley Road. He indicated that the Park District is discussing locating a park in that area. He requested that the Commissioners clear up the specific problem areas prior to adopting any document. He requested that specific information be included in the plan relating to areas of concern. He next addressed the comments relating to the \$30,000 Chamber donation. He noted that the money came from the motel/hotel tax and that was dedicated to the Chamber some time ago.

Question to Mr. Clements: Where is the specific location you are looking at for a park? He noted it was in the vicinity of the Crater site designated for a school on the Comprehensive Plan and he requested that the transportation plan be a little more specific. He noted that the Chamber has contracted with the City for a service which would cost more to the City if independently funded.

A 10 minute recess was called after which the meeting was reconvened.

Public Testimony, Individuals:

Terry Atzen, 29365 NE Putnam Road, spoke in opposition to the third option. He reviewed an overhead relating to both positive and negative aspects of the Crestview and Mountainview options. He noted that the cost of bridges in Option 3 would be a minimum of \$4 million. He noted that there is a historical site in the area.

Paul Anderson, 4601 Blue Heron Ct., asked Dave Dailey about the limitation of choices to Crestview or Putnam as arterials and where he got his information.

Mr. Dailey responded that the material came from public record.

Mr. Anderson felt that Oxberg residents were not proposing that the arterial be moved to Putnam. He questioned that the option to do nothing would cost \$10 million more and that there were other options.

Dennis Farber, 1808 Leo Lane, felt any kind of northeast arterial would impact his subdivision. He expressed concern that all Kittleson reports and graphics had no scale. He felt the reports were meaningless and that accurate information should be provided to the public. He noted that there has been very little breakdown of cost provided to the public. He indicated that he had been told schools were not a consideration and that the concern was only about roads. He noted that the plan was proposed to be pedestrian friendly but 3-5 lane roads were designed to divide neighborhoods up. He felt that public health would be impacted by the diesel fumes coming from the arterials into their backyards.

George Alexander, POB 350, Newberg, indicated he has been involved in the east-west road discussion since 1972. He noted that the traffic impacts are already severe in the area. He indicated that it was the duty of the City to try its best to represent its citizens. He indicated that the process cannot occur overnight but a plan is needed. He felt that the route chosen in 1972 was the most appropriate and also that the Mountainview Route through Buckley's Mountainview Park was also designated and should be used.

Kathy Rice, 4600 Blue Heron Ct., indicated she has lived in the area for 15 years, and built in Oxberg Lake Estates several years ago. She noted that the subdivision has approximately 30 children. She noted that they would all have to cross this 'truck route' to get to school and

the Springmeadow Subdivision. She felt it was a safety hazard for the children and she opposed this route.

Carla Anderson, 4601 Blue Heron Ct., discussed safety for children and safety for the community. She indicated there are 30 children in their community, 25 of elementary age or younger. Residents live there for the open spaces and a safe environment. She pointed out that Bird Haven Loop is a road which connects Oxberg to Springmeadow and is a connector to that subdivision, used for pedestrian and bicycle access. She felt it was important to recognize the humanness of each small community within the larger one.

Ray Johnson, 4201 Birdhaven Loop, mentioned how cooperative the City staff has been. He noted that the files have all been accessible to him. He noted that he spent many years as right-of-way agent. He noted that he did search the records prior to purchase in Oxberg Lake. He noted that he purchased his property based on filed documents relating to streets in his area. He noted that Mr. Teitzel has indicated that the existing 60 ft. right-of-way would be adequate to provide paved width, sidewalks and utility installations. He noted that he would be required to move some of his sewer leach lines if the road were improved in his area.

Keith Wingfield, 4204 Birdhaven Loop, indicated he was the first homeowner in the subdivision, and he noted that there is a 60 ft. right-of-way through Crestview. He indicated that there would be an 80 ft. arterial on either side of that 60 ft. section through Oxberg Lake. He noted that the proposal includes a 90 degree right-hand turn. He noted that it is not possible to use arterial speeds in a 90 degree turn on a 60 ft. right-of-way. He indicated that the City has until 1996 to come up with a comprehensive transportation plan and he suggested that a short term solution should not be taken to a long term problem. He felt that more input should be required and that all possible alternatives should be investigated. He felt that the bottom line in any plan should include existing and future objectives with all the people considered. He suggested that the plan be referred back to staff for further study.

Question to Mr. Wingfield: Mr. Goecks noted part of the plan was how the County road system relates to the City road system, and what parts of VLDR areas would be potentially interested in annexation. Mr. Goecks asked how the Oxberg residents felt about retaining a rural residential character or if they were looking at possible annexation within 10 years.

Mr. Wingfield noted that he had reviewed all requirements, responsibilities and maintenance relating to his subdivision and that it was his sense that the community would chose to retain its rural character and integrity. He noted that the community has its own water and septic systems and that originally the City refused to provide city services, even when the developer anticipated paying the expense of extending service.

Barbara Kirk, 1808 Leo Lane, concurred with previous speakers relating to protection of the residential areas, particularly relating to public health and pollution protection. She felt that if there had been previous planning, the negative issues would not be occurring today. She felt

that after-the-fact road building was not appropriate and that the planning should be done in a long-term fashion, not through existing residential areas. She asked why in all the planning documents the Crestview to Highway 99W connection was always indicated as a solid black line, as if it is already in place. She also expressed concern about the water table in the area and she asked what kind of impact there was on the water table if a roadbed were placed in that area.

Scott Gibbens, Oxberg Lake Resident, indicated he had submitted a letter. He reviewed the overall plan proposed and compared and contrasted the goals of the City's comprehensive plan with the transportation system plan. He noted that there were numerous conflicts in the two documents. He felt that adoption of the transportation plan was premature. He questioned whether the need for the transportation plan has been satisfied, whether the capacities for the new roadways were able to be sustain, and whether the calculations used to project these capacities were accurate. He noted that Bell Road is currently a county arterial, and improving it up to its intersection with Highway 99W would help alleviate much of the congestion. He felt more accurate traffic studies should be done. He then reviewed non-motorized modes of transportation including rail and water transportation. He felt the plan was lacking in those areas.

Question to Mr. Gibbens: Mr. Goecks asked Mr. Gibbens if he felt Oxberg residents would continue to be rural residential in 20-40 years or whether he saw the area as a transition area that would eventually be annexed to the City. Mr. Gibbens indicated he anticipated retaining the residential nature of his site and would oppose annexation.

William Cofield, 3104 Zimri Drive, indicated he has been an area resident for many years. He noted that the City has been dealing with the State regarding a southside bypass for at least 25 years and that at the time this was originally proposed, it was anticipated that in 10-15 years it would be completed. He noted that it still isn't done. The same thing is likely to happen to the NE area if something is not done now. He indicated that he had been chair of the committee at the time that an arterial was planned for this specific area. He noted that specific alignments need to be decided upon and analysis of alternatives and problems would assist in the process. He indicated that the north side arterial was imperative and the problems would not go away. Principle factors to be considered in location of new developments is new water and roads. He suggested that the process be expedited, not slowed down.

Rachel Kennedy, 1909 N. Springbrook, indicated that if the road was widened, it would take out her front yard and would abut her front porch. She commented that there are many senior apartments on both sides of Springbrook Road. She did not feel that Springbrook Road should be widened to 5 lanes. She felt that if the railroad was going to be eliminated, Villa Road should be extended out to Highway 219. She noted that connection would relieve a lot of traffic. She commented that often traffic from Highway 219 comes down Bell Road to Aspen or Zimri and then continues down Springbrook to 99W. She commented that many

of the individual businesses in the downtown are suffering now because of decisions made over 28 years ago relating to a bypass.

Nan Atzen, Putnam Road, Alternative 3 area, reviewed a paragraph relating to keeping the arterial out of an ecologically significant area, with wetlands and many species of birds and animals. She also noted that there are significant old oak groves in the area and that many of the oak trees are over 300 years old.

Commissioner McCauley asked about the wetland designations. Mr. Egner noted that Springbrook Creek is identified on the national wetlands inventory.

Scott Stiefbold, Crestview and Springbrook property owner, indicated that one proposal would entirely eliminate his home. He asked when the transportation planning began. Staff indicated prior to 1991. He indicated he couldn't fight the proposal but would like some answers so that he can start planning to sell his house and find some other place to live.

Leonard Rydell, 601 Pinehurst, indicated he was a civil engineer who designs subdivisions. He asked how the plan would address bike paths on existing streets. He asked about the streets in town which do not have curbs. He indicated that standards are subjective. He felt that the consultants have done an excellent job of giving background information. He indicated that the citizens must decide what to do with the plans for the community. He felt that a citizens committee should review the transportation plan line by line and then return the plan to the City for approval.

Blake Williams, Oxberg Lake, expressed concern about the impacts on the Putnam and Oxberg neighborhoods. He commented that if the people were spotted owls there would be no discussion. He expressed concern that more discussion should occur as to a possible solution. He felt that Crestview was the easy solution but that it was not a long term solution. He felt that breaking up a neighborhood would cause more long term problems down the road.

Gary Warrington, 4307 Birdhaven Loop, felt that the plan to extend Crestview was a short term, stop gap plan. He felt the solution would not benefit the area to the north and its expected population in the future. He felt the proposal for Crestview was far too close to Highway 99W to benefit the area. He felt the City should slow down the process and see what impacts there would be from the bypass. He noted that 25 years or more ago Bell Road was considered as an arterial. He felt that Bell Road would be a better road to study for inclusion in the plan and that the bigger regional picture should be considered.

Pat Ridenour, Birdhaven Loop, expressed concern about the NE area arterial options. He felt there are many discrepancies throughout the plan. He cited pages 50 and 51 of the plan as having discrepancies. He noted that many words in the goals were subjective and needed to be measurable. He reviewed various graphs which had areas of oversight. He felt that the

plan was not complete enough and that the City should generate better material to address the goals.

Carl Wagner, 29665 NE Putnam Road, felt that the transportation plan has been studied for years and that planning should progress with as much speed as possible. He expressed concern about the Putnam Rd/Highway 99W intersection. He indicated that the intersection is hazardous at this time and increased traffic capacity would make it even more hazardous. He indicated that wintertime ice and snow also create additional problems. He felt that improvements on Highway 99W should also be considered.

Daniel Peek, 4402 Birdhaven Loop, indicated that the extension would be in his backyard, sideyard and frontyard. He supported further review of the plan by staff. He indicated to Mr. Goecks that he did not anticipate dividing his lot in the future. He noted that just because they did not live in the City didn't mean they weren't members of the community.

Roger Currier, 504 Pinehurst, Newberg City Council member, expressed his thanks to the citizens for their interest and input into the process. He indicated he was sorry to see neighborhoods pitted one against the other and he hoped that the issue of the Crestview alignment could be resolved. He indicated that the Crestview alignment voted on several years ago did not mean that Crestview would never be reconstructed. He noted that the State has jurisdiction over where access points will occur. He suggested that the connection would likely be somewhere in the area of the proposed bypass. He indicated that the primary concern was the environmental impacts, cost and what best serves the community. He felt the recommendation to return the plan to staff for further study was a valid recommendation. He noted that something must be done with the traffic and any comments were welcome.

Carol Ring, Crestview Drive, encouraged the commission to interface with the School District, especially relating to site acquisition and street connections and that everyone should work together toward a united plan.

Herb Gueldner, Sherwood, owner of land directly south of Oxberg Estates, wanted to know what exactly would be happening. He felt that the Commission should decide quickly so that owners in the area can make decisions about their properties.

Question to Mr. Gueldner: Are you planning to develop your property yourself and are you anticipating tying in to the existing systems. Mr. Gueldner indicated he was planning to develop his site and that development of his property was contingent on whether a road would be required to go through the middle of it. He was asked where he was anticipating a road connection if the road did not go through. He noted that he would develop access both from Highway 99W and from Oxberg Lake Estates. Mr. Goecks asked what zoning was on that site. Mr. Gueldner indicated it was AF-10 and that he was not anticipating annexing to the City.

Chair indicated that additional meeting dates will probably be scheduled to further review the plan.

Mr. Egner indicated that it might be best to establish a date for a community forum and re-advertise a hearing at a later date to discuss the matter with NUAMC and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Goecks indicated that the County Commissioners were going into budget year 93-94 to discuss this issue. He requested that as the Planning Commission reviews the plan, they consider a fairly distant horizon from the planning perspective.

Mr. Egner recommended that the Commission not continue to a specific date but instead should re-advertise to reconvene and discuss this material at a later date. He noted that in the interim a public workshop could be held relating to these issues.

Mr. Teitzel was asked about the timeline for this plan as it impacts the State's planning for the bypass. He indicated that there was no immediate need for information. He added that the bypass project has many impacts on the community including environmental, social and civic impacts.

Mr. Egner noted that the April meeting agenda is already full. He suggested that the staff review the plan and re-advertise an additional hearing. He noted that based on audience comments, the following items appeared to be primary concerns: Mountainview extension, Highway 219 realignment and the collector from Aspen Way to Chehalem Drive.

NUAMC member Halbrook indicated that financing methods should be further defined.

Chair Russell indicated that the record would continue to remain open for further testimony.

The meeting of NUAMC and Planning Commission was unanimously adjourned at 11:09 pm.