

**Draft MINUTES**  
**Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting #9**  
**Newport City Hall Council Chambers by Video Conference**  
**March 24, 2022**

---

**Committee Members Present by Video Conference:** Jeff Hollen, Tomas Follett, Bob Berman, Ralph Breitenstein, Judy Kuhl, Rich Belloni, Linda Niegebauer, Bryn McCornack, James Feldman, Lyle Mattson, and Roland Woodcock.

**Committee Members Absent:** Dean Sawyer, Roy Kinion, Rosa Maria Coppola, Dietmar Goebel, Beatrice Botello, and Fran Matthews.

**City Staff Present by Video Conference:** Community Development Director, Derrick Tokos; City Manager, Spencer Nebel; and Executive Assistant, Sherri Marineau.

**Consultants Present by Video Conference:** Carl Springer, and Kevin Chewuk.

**Public Members Present by Video Conference:** Nyla Jebousek, Gordon Petty, and Jeff Bertuleit.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:06 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Motion was made by Ralph Breitenstein, seconded by Bob Berman to approve the February 27, 2022 Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee meeting minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.
3. **Review and Discuss Executive Summary Chapter.** Springer reviewed the Executive Summary with the Committee. Berman noted that they didn't add "emerging technologies." Tokos explained this was a piece they needed to speak about on what the city's desire was to move forward. Berman questions if it was a task for the TSP to accomplish. Springer noted it was in the document, but not in the executive summary. He would add it.

Berman pointed out that on the summary of Chapter 6 the "constrained" and "non-constrained" needed to be defined. Woodcock agreed.

Springer reviewed the overview of Chapter 2 and no comments were heard.

Springer reviewed the refined goals and objectives. McCormack asked what a "convenient and comfortable networks of facilities" was. Springer explained this was a street, trail or bike network.

Feldman entered the meeting at 6:17pm.

Springer reviewed the decision making structure, and the public and stakeholder engagement. Woodcock asked if the Nye Beach and Bayfront subsets were addressed individually. Spring reported that they were neighborhoods in the summary but were broken out in the TSP document. He explained they were noted but not singled out. Berman pointed out that the third bullet of the decision making structure should say the Project Advisory Committee made recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council. Springer would change this.

Springer reviewed Chapter 3, Newport today and tomorrow next. Berman questioned why they were referencing to a UGB addition off of Lighthouse under households. Tokos reported this should be

changed 36th and Harney Streets. Hollen asked what the plans for housing for 52nd Street and behind the movie theater was. Tokos noted the owners of the property behind and north of the location were looking to do a phase of assisted living housing. Then other housing would be implemented in multiple phases there. Tokos didn't have any sense of timing for this. Hollen thought this would play into the stop lights there. Springer noted they were trying to just include highlights in the executive summary. Berman noted the paragraph with "households" had an extra word after Newport saying "looks". Springer would remove this.

Springer covered the motor vehicle system performance issues next. Tokos noted this was where Nyla Jebousek's comments were added to capture the concern for San-Bay-O Circle make sure they were reflected in the document. Berman thought it was appropriate to capture the concern and noted he had suggested a specific project be added, albeit minor, to try and address Jebousek's concerns. Springer explained they were trying to acknowledge the concerns without saying they were able to solve all the problems.

Springer reviewed the walking and bicycle system performance next. No comments were heard.

Springer reviewed the transit services next. Neigebauer asked if they had talked to Lincoln County Transit about what their plans were. Springer noted the County had a transit plan the document referred to on what they expected to do in the next six to eight years. Neigebauer asked if the city had given input in this plan. Tokos confirmed they had and he had provided feedback on it when the full document was prepared. Neigebauer asked if Transit was able to advise the city on the plans they had. Tokos noted that they read their document to get the information. Neigebauer pointed out that the bus stops and additional routes for their loop wasn't noted. She was on the Transit Committee and they hadn't talked much about Newport because the city hadn't worked much with Lincoln County Transit in the last 10 to 15 years. It concerned her that there hadn't been much facetime meetings with them to work together to solve some of the transportation problems. Tokos reported the Bayfront, Nye Beach and City Center was either a van pool/carpool or tourist option that was explored in the 2018 plan. They were able to map this out with the Advisory Committee and carry it forward into the Comprehensive Plan. Tokos had talked to the Transit District when they had development projects and one of the challenges with bus stops was there wasn't a clear map of where they wanted future connections. The discussions were more of a dialogue to say when a project came up if they wanted a bus stop or shelter with it. Neigebauer noted that as far as routing of bus stops and making considerations for bus travel, no one had worked with Transit to come up with a plan. She was concerned it would be lost in the shuffle. Kull noted that the Vision 2040 Advisory Committee talked about transportation regarding tourists. Tokos noted cost estimates were done when they were having the discussions in 2018 and they adopted them in the Parking Element of the Comprehensive Plan which included a route, timing for the route, and a cost estimate for what it would take to make the route happen. Nebel noted that he and Tokos did the routes with transit to understand them. There was a City Council liaison for the Transit Committee but they never got invited. Nebel wanted to make sure they were invited. Neigebauer asked to be notified who this person was to follow up with them. Berman asked if paratransit service was what they called dial a ride. Neigebauer noted this was something anyone could use and was funded by Lincoln County Transit. It wasn't just for people with disabilities. Berman thought the phrase "disability" should be taken out. Neigebauer thought it might be a legal thing to keep in.

Springer reviewed other transportation systems next. Berman thought the bullet point of the bridge needed to be a paragraph, not a bullet. He also thought they should add FedEx under the list of who the airport supported. Tokos noted it could be general and to say "cargo." He also thought the international terminal needed to be referenced as well.

Springer reviewed Chapter 4, system design and management principles covering the street functional classification changes. Woodcock asked what the designation was that qualified a street for traffic calming. Springer explained this wasn't in the executive summary, but was in the document. He added a note to mention changes to the bike/pedestrian facilities in the summary. Hollen thought they should reference that it also allowed a multimodal design system to be changed.

Springer reviewed Chapter 5, project development and evaluation and the special transportation studies next. Tokos reported that the special area study for US 101 and US 20 wasn't referenced in the summary. The different options for this and the potential alignment of the options should be summarized. Also for the current US 101 alignment they needed to add language for the US 20 tradeoff. If they maintained the current highway alignment they had to add equality for a bicycle facility along 9th Street. Tokos pointed out that the short couplet concept started at Fall Street, not Bailey. Berman noted they talked a lot about the Nye Street extension and thought it should be included. Springer agreed. Tokos thought it was reasonable to summarize it because they had a fair amount of discussion on this. Hollen pointed out the bike group was very interested in this. Tokos asked if the ODOT had a policy that allowed their agency to change mobility targets within local jurisdictions to allow for higher congestion levels. Feldman would follow up on this.

Springer reviewed Chapter 6, projects and priorities. Nebel asked that there be a definition on what "financially constrained" meant. Springer noted it had been defined earlier. Berman thought there should be some sort of parenthetical definition there. Tokos thought they would ask the Committee to give thoughts on projects. A discussion ensued on the projects in South Beach that were included in the downtown list but were located in South Beach. McCormack thought a South Beach map should be included.

Berman noted that the Nye Street extension to Oceanview Drive was still shown as vehicular traffic as opposed to the public wanting it to be bike and pedestrian only. He questioned why they didn't discuss vehicular alternatives when they discussed the Nye Street extension. Berman wanted to see it go forward as the couplet versus current alignment, and let the policy makers make the decisions and hear additional testimony. Tokos thought they could include it as an alternative project because there were tradeoffs there. They could include both of them so when they went to do the projects they had the flexibility to dig into it with further detail. Berman supported this. Hollen was in favor of this connection being vehicular, and bikes could be arranged with it. He suggested a one way section of Oceanview Drive then two way sections in other portions. Tokos noted this option had been included already. Berman thought given the public opposition he wanted to see the no vehicle option go forward as an option so they could investigate it at the time they are going to do the project. Springer would add notes on this.

Berman noted that an executive summary gave a high level overview of what was happening. He didn't think the tables were a good use in the summary, rather than a reformatting of projects later on or an appendix. Berman thought they should leave the maps in and move the table somewhere else. Springer noted they didn't normally put a project list in a summary and could relocate it. Breitenstein agreed and thought anything they could cut out would be reasonable. Neigebauer, McCornack, and Woodcock agreed. Tokos suggested it be placed in an appendices.

Springer reviewed Chapter 7, implementation actions. Tokos noted they needed to make sure to add verbiage that they updated the public facilities chapter of the Comprehensive Plan to align it with the goals and objectives of the legislature. They needed to emphasize that the city would take into consideration the larger parcel impact of right-of-way acquisitions for transportation projects and provide fair market compensation for such impacts. This was required by law but there was no reason

why they wouldn't want to say this. While they took care with a lot of the projects to come up with concepts in the existing rights-of-way, there was room to add verbiage to say this was what they were thinking about when it was unavoidable. They also needed to add language to say the city would support and promote emerging transportation technologies that are feasible, including the roll out of infrastructure for electric vehicles. Tokos explained the commercial core areas would have some policy options. The choice between a short couplet or maintaining a two way US 101 alignment in the commercial core area was something that needed to be sorted out through the public hearing process. Policy options would be developed and there would be some language added in respect to Nye Street and Oceanview Drive. They needed to emphasize that whatever solution they came up with for the commercial core area, they must promote economic revitalization of those areas, including traffic flow and the broader transportation needs. They also needed to identify the geologic considerations when doing projects in the Agate Beach area.

Mattson noted that the "Intersection Int 4" didn't have a map on the Committee's preferences and asked why this wasn't included. Springer reported the diagram for the intent for the US 101 and US 20 intersection had only ever been in the presentations, not the TSP. He could include this in the appendices of the TSP. Mattson thought it was important to include it as the preference. Berman cautioned to add just one preference. They should add both of the options and note that there was discussion on them. Tokos thought it was wise to add them to the appendices. This would capture the thought process on how the lanes could be added in the future. It wouldn't represent a final alignment but show what could be done in the future. Mattson agreed.

Woodcock noted that the Nye Beach Neighborhood Association had concerns about the new classification of streets in the plan for neighborhood traffic strategies. They wanted to make sure the key streets in the Nye Beach neighborhood was included in streets that were appropriate for neighborhood traffic strategies. These streets were Coast Street from SW 2nd up to SW 8th. The streets that fed into Coast Street which were NW 3rd, Olive, SW 2nd. He noted that a lot of locals would cut through and speed on Neff Way up to 11th Street to avoid traffic on US 101. The Nye Beach Neighborhood Association wanted to generally have it not be an arterial where traffic didn't have an impediment to go as fast as they wanted to. The Association wanted to make sure the streets were included in the classification of those that were being considered. Tokos thought all of these streets had been considered. He thought that Coast Street might need clarification, but acknowledged it already had traffic calming measures. The side streets of 3rd, 2nd and Olive Streets were already qualified. Springer would check on this and noted all of these streets were included as neighborhood collector streets. Tokos confirmed they were eligible.

Berman suggested that the executive summary table of contents have sub chapters shown in bullet points.

Tokos reviewed the list of potential changes with the Committee. He asked if everyone was comfortable with what was in the list. Berman thought they should have a project for San-Bay-O Drive specifically added for signage. Springer noted this was hard to do. Feldman noted they wouldn't want to put themselves in a corner with the description of the project. Jebousek interjected that she was told to work with the TSP to solve the problems she had on San-Bay-O Circle. Tokos noted that there was language on the list of changes under number 5. He asked if they could add clarification language. Springer suggested saying San-Bay-O Circle was an illustration of a problem and a location for a potential solution. Feldman wanted to be clear that they couldn't guarantee that the process would be done because the traffic analysis made it clear that it wasn't appropriate at this location. Berman suggested saying that this intersection had no other way out onto US 101. Tokos asked for Feldman's input. Feldman suggested that they reduce the number of signs at the location because they were very distracting. Jebousek thought that the pedestrian lane that ODOT put in this location made things

exponentially worse. Tokos asked if the language should be to add a project to coordinate with ODOT to develop signage, but make it clear that it wasn't clear it was the right solution, and emphasize intersections where there were no other points of access. Feldman agreed in general and but couldn't come up with specific language at that time. Springer suggested they add more specific language but thought the fact that there was no other options for the residents was worth noting. Jebousek noted there were no other streets like theirs that only had one access. She suggested saying ones that had no alternative route. Mattson asked if the airport was similar without an alternate access. Tokos noted it was but it wasn't residential. Berman noted Golf Course Drive was as well.

Feldman asked if there was language in the TSP that picked up activities. They needed to make it clear that when they were developing a local street network they have better routes to the streets. Tokos reported there was language in the development standards. Chewuk noted there was a multi-mode section with standards required for future development for the minimum and maximum block sizes. Jebousek questioned if Golf Course Drive had multiple street access. Tokos explained there were a few streets that tied in, but the bulk of Golf Course Drive only had one access to US 101. A discussion ensued on the exit streets for Golf Course Drive.

Tokos reviewed the process going forward with the Committee so they could have a sense on where things would go next for the TSP. Berman hoped that there would be a big effort that when the hearings took place they would let people know this was their last chance to give input. Tokos reported they would do press releases and get the word out. He noted that the TSP was a living document and no one should assume once adopted there would be no changes. There would be an opportunity to add or modify projects as they became priorities.

Tokos read Carla Perry's comments to the Committee into the record. Jebousek added that she supported the public comments and hoped they were supporting ADA parking in the downtown districts.

4. **Public Comment.** Nyla Jebousek addressed the Committee and repeated that the prior Public Works Director described the San-Bay-O Circle intersection as chaos. She state this section of town had the most children on it. Jebousek felt this was a public safety issue she had been asking for changes for the last 30 years. This shouldn't be a future project and it needed attention now. Jebousek questioned the sense of entitlement to dismiss this issue and the owners were never consulted about putting in the pedestrian lane. She felt this showed a lack of concern, public participation, and public input. Jebousek felt they were skipped over for development and they were being ignored.

Jeff Beruleit addressed the Committee. He thought it seemed unfortunate that there was no mention that of development in South Beach. Beruleit thought that he would submit a petition to keep from having a couplet for Nye Street. All the proposals were expensive and they city couldn't do anything. He gave the plan a B+ grade. He noted he was frustrated by this and felt it was pointless being on the Vision 2040 Advisory Committee because of it.

#### **5. Recommendation Statement to Planning Commission/City Council.**

**MOTION** was made by Bob Berman, seconded by Bryn McCornack to recommend the February 2022 draft City of Newport Transportation System Plan, with its Executive Summary, be presented for adoption to the Planning Commission and City Council, recognizing that projects we have discussed and identified in the Plan may be further expanded, refined and/or prioritized as part of the adoption process. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

6. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sherri Marineau  
Executive Assistant