

MINUTES
Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting #8
Newport City Hall Council Chambers by Video Conference
February 24, 2022

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

Committee Members Absent: Dean Sawyer, 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: Carl Springer, and Kevin Chewuk.

Public Members Present by Video Conference: Nyla Jebousek, Janet Webster, Cynthia Jacobi, Ryan Parker, Shamus Gamache, Jami Ivory, and Rex Capri.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:05 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Motion was made by Ralph Breitenstein, seconded by Lyle Mattson to approve the January 27, 2022 Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee meeting minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.
3. **TSP Decision-Making Process Ahead.** Springer covered the agenda for the evening's meeting and the project schedule through 2022.
4. **Review Adoption Draft TSP - Major Changes Since PAC Mtg #7.** Springer reviewed Chapters 2 and 3, and asked for comments. None were heard. Springer reviewed Chapter 4, System and Design, and Management principles and no comments were heard.

Springer reviewed Chapter 5, Project Development and Evaluations. He then reviewed the Concept A, Hwy 101 two-way improvements and US 101 circulation improvements slides. No comments were heard.

Springer reviewed Chapter 6, Projects and Priorities next. He showed the Option 1 map to widen the turn lanes on US 101 and shift them to the east side. Springer noted they would have to come up with a solution that was less impactful to the Walgreens property and noted that the illustration wasn't a final answer but a rendition on what it could look like. Springer noted that this illustration gave a second space for a southbound turn lane on the north leg and provided space for bike lanes on the street. Berman asked if the red lines on Option 1 were what the impact on the west side would be. Springer explained red lines represented the front and back sides of the sidewalks. The sidewalks that were consistent to ODOT standards currently were wider than the existing sidewalks. These would have to be rebuilt as part of a project like this. Springer pointed out that to reduce the impacts to the southeast corner they were looking at a northbound right turn at Benton Street. This would be considered in the preliminary design process and was shown to give the general concept.

Mattson asked how much of US 101 had bike lanes. Springer explained there were two miles of bike

lanes on US 101. Mattson asked if the bike lanes on the Option 1 map would be connecting to anything. Springer explained they wouldn't initially. The policy was when doing an improvement to the highway those incremental improvements needed to be done. They could also end up with something parallel to the highway such as using NE 1st Street as a bike lane instead of US 20. Mattson thought this made more sense and didn't think bikes should be on US 101. He asked if there were any options to take pedestrian crosswalks away from heavily used intersections. Springer reported this could be addressed in the process of design. He felt it was too early to say if they should be taken out. Mattson thought this would be worth talking about.

Berman asked for the next steps on what the public component of the design and approval would be. Tokos explained for the city side their would be public engagement on an design of this level. As the design evolved they would wind down the public input to get to the end design. Once there was general agreement on the design the outreach piece would shut down somewhat to move toward a preferred design that would come out of the process. Feldman added that this would be scoped first and they would have a view of what the scoping results were before it went any further.

Belloni asked if both designs would go to the City Council. Tokos pointed out that all they had in the TSP document was the project in terms of costs. There were no specific diagrams in the TSP. Springer noted that as part of the engineering work they did an alternative design process to figure out the best way to address the problem. They would need to do a survey on the intersection to know where the property lines and utilities were, and what the impacts created would be by whatever solutions that were imposed on it. There would be an alternative design process for this and it would happen later on. Belloni didn't want to show up at a hearing and hear that they didn't like either design option. He thought more people would be interested in Option 1. Springer thought there was no harm in saying there was a preference for one but cautioned on locking into a solution. Belloni just wanted it noted that most were in favor of Option 1. Springer reminded again that this would be part of the design process to get a better understanding of how it would be laid out.

Springer reviewed the typical timeline for implementation for the TSP and the TSP lifecycle for project planning. He then reviewed Chapter 7, Implementation. No comments were heard.

5. Public Comment. Tokos reviewed the comments submitted by the public during the meeting through Zoom. He read Jan Kaplan's comments verbatim to the Committee. Ryan Parker asked what was being proposed for pedestrian and bicycle improvements on Neff Way. Tokos reported it was included as a bike route improvement project.

Janet Webster asked if there were projects included that could put a bike lane along all of US 101. Tokos explained there were projects that would implement this. They were projects SBL 2 and SBL 3. There were also parallel route projects included. The master plan was about keeping options open. The projects on Neff Way were on the fiscally constrained list and what they expected to fund. They didn't expect to fund the projects on US 101, but there was a dollar figure for these projects should they be a priority at some time.

Webster asked if the freight routing to and from the Bayfront should actually be reviewed by people who drove trucks. Chewuk explained the freight routes were developed by looking at the industrial based lands and the general routes to it. Typically they were trying to follow the collector street system and how they were developed. Tokos noted that Naterlin Drive was included as the freight route to access US 101 from the Bayfront. Drivers would sometimes use 13th Street and Harbor to get to US 101. Parker commented that he thought 13th Street was better than Naterlin Drive. Springer agreed that it was something they could look at. He asked if freight routes have been designated by the city. Tokos didn't think they had been designated. Feldman noted that the design requirements impacted

the lane widths and was a local requirement when doing the cross sections. Tokos explained if they were doing new work on these streets that were showed on the TSP as freight routes they would have to plan for wider travel lanes. Springer reminded that the purpose here was to try to guide future improvements on the routes rather than directing traffic one way or the other. Woodcock asked if Neff Way was being considered a freight route. Tokos reported it wasn't and explained it was for bike routes.

Springer noted that Janet Webster's comments saying that US 101 wasn't the best for bikes was generally true. Most of the bike lanes in the city were predominantly off the highway. Springer explained that when they were doing the improvement projects on the highway the state was also asking for accommodations for bikes as a part of those projects. For the segments they are doing they were trying their best to provide bikes in those segments. This was mainly for segments that were going to be targeted for some scale of improvement and the rest would stay the same.

Tomas Follet commented that they should try to keep bikes off the highway on US 101 and US 20. Springer explained that if they took the bike lanes off it gave 14 more feet off the width. This would be a decision through the design process. Feldmann explained that ODOT would start with bike lanes and then if they couldn't accommodate them they would move to parallel networks routes.

Berman thought it would be better to group the projects by geographic area or function. He asked if they had put together group of projects, such as an Oceanview group, and if they had the same priority constraints. Berman thought it would be a shame to end up with more traffic on Oceanview and not improve the intersection of Oceanview Driver and US 101. They needed to make sure that a group of projects were either all financially constrained or all unconstrained. Berman would volunteer to do this but thought it would be very time consuming. He also noted that there were several instances where there were bike routes to residential neighborhoods on dead end streets and questioned the value of this. Springer thought they should look at a more useful way to organizing the projects because they currently were in order of their project type code definition. They could group them with an index map to help to make it easier to find a project. The other way was to have them all on the same funding level. Berman thought projects needed some sort of grouping with the same funding level and priority. Tokos knew there was a thought to include this, and he had used the US 20 and Moore Drive to do this but hadn't gone through all the potential alignments that could make up projects. They would have this in a digital format and produce maps of any alignment. They also could adjust a project from unconstrained or fiscally constrained. Berman thought having a random assignment of the codes didn't really add to the document in that order. He thought putting them in a geographic order and, where appropriate, put in a group of projects that made up an effort.

Parker asked if the the Light House to Light House Trail was included in the plan. Tokos reported it was included and there was a grant application pending on this. Chewuk explained there were two projects that tied into this which were TR-3 and TR-8. Springer thought they should make it more obvious.

Berman expressed concerns about the bike routes that were included that led to nowhere. Chewuk noted that a lot of these bike routes connected to neighborhoods. This was a way for people to know there was a possibility of cyclist on the streets, especially for higher density housing areas and why there were identified in the first place.

Bryn McCornack enter the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Tokos reviewed the comments that had been received by Rex Capri, and an email from Mark Desmond. He reviewed a letter received from Aaron Bretz from the Port of Newport in support of the

work to date and noting they were working with the City on projects that affected their facilities. Tokos then read an email received from Jan Kaplan into the record.

Nyla Jebousek addressed the Committee. She reported she had brought up the intersection at San-Bay-O Circle at every meeting she attended. Jebousek noted that Springer had said they would add it to the list and Tokos stated that they weren't doing a signal at this intersection. She wanted to know who the "we" were that said they weren't doing it. Tokos explained that the signal at San-Bay-O Circle and US 101 was not in the plan because it would not meet State guidelines for it and didn't fall under the high priorities relative to other intersections along US 101. Jebousek asked who the "we" were that made the decisions. Tokos noted the decisions came through this process and why it was not in the plan. Jebousek asked if her request had been discussed by the group. Tokos reported that her comments have been considered by the group and the comments have been made a part of the record. The consultants had them and considered them as well. Jebousek noted it had not been discussed by the group and she didn't think there had been any public discussion about her project request. She felt it had been dismissed repeatedly. Tokos noted that the group had discussed it at the last meeting specifically and shared the specific reasons it was not on the list. He had spoken on the request and so had others on the Committee. Hollen acknowledged that Jebousek's issues had been raised since their first meeting and it was not considered a priority. He remembered discussing it at several meetings and addressing it at several meetings. Hollen noted that Jebousek was the only neighbor who had raised issues. Jebousek reminded there had been no vote on this. She thought that Springer said they would add it to the list and her point was she thought there had been no engagement with the entire group. Jebousek pointed out that it was hard to participate in the remote committee meetings. She felt her issue has been dismissed and ignored.

Rex Capri addressed the Committee. He asked if the preferred plan was to route pedestrians and bikes to Nye Beach. Tokos explained that this was the existing Oregon Coast Scenic Coast Byway and there were improvements to Oceanview Drive that would allow cyclists to route down to Nye Beach. Capri noted there used to be a lot of visitors down to Nye Beach and it wasn't very accommodating for bikes at that time. He recommend that routing bikes to Nye Street was the most logical choice and routing bikes and pedestrians to Oceanview Drive made the most sense. He felt this was better than going down to Nye Beach instead. Tokos noted they had Nye Street included. Both Nye Street and Oceanview Drive were programed for bike/pedestrian improvements. They were on the fiscally restrained list and they could expect to build them within the 20 year plan period. There was also a project included that would connect Nye Street to Oceanview Drive to provide a US 101 bypass. Capri asked what the priority was. Tokos explained they were tier designated and something they expected to be able to fund. He didn't know the timing of the projects yet.

- 6. Next Steps March / May 2022.** Springer reviewed the project critical success factors. Berman noted that the transit needs of the community rarely mentioned the Lincoln County Transit. He asked if there would be a discussion in the final document on recommending transit improvements. Tokos explained that there would be and it was in the plan. Tech Memo #12 had the code language that referenced it. They were cross referencing over to the County's Transit Plan that was last updated in 2018. The code language required that as new development or redevelopment happened where the plan called for improvements they would get addressed at that time. Berman asked if they were proactively suggesting any improvements as part of the project list. Tokos reported they were not relying on what was already identified in the Transit Plan that the County developed. The County had different pull of funds they drew from for updating and enhancing the transit system. Chewuk noted that one way the TSP addressed transit was by providing more transit access. They weren't physically changing routes but improving the system to allow people to get to a location.

Tokos noted the project list didn't come out of a vacuum and came out of input from public and other

outreach with an analysis done by the consultants and different committees. There were a number of projects that were pulled in as well. Tokos noted the question on parking was more a function of the Parking Advisory Committee to work on for the Bayfront, Nye Beach, and City Center specifically. They had a separate package of parking regulations that dovetailed with land use regulations and what level of intensities were allow in areas for residential development of commercial/industrial. The TSP didn't delve into parking as much but it was a valid concern that had been raised. Tokos reminded the Parking Advisory Committee was a better forum to work through the issues.

Berman found it difficult to support the draft being forwarded for consideration without seeing an entire document that included an executive summary. He wanted to see the entire document that was the TSP that they would be recommending. It was hard to make a recommendation when they didn't know what they were forwarding. Tokos explained the executive summary couldn't contain things not in the plan and would summarize what the key elements of the plan would be. Berman thought there were some open items and a recommendation depended on how these were presented in the next summary. He thought it would be nice to know it was a fair representation on those things they didn't have unanimous agreement on. Berman suggested the document be distributed first, and then do a motion by doodle poll.

Breitenstein thought Berman brought up a good point about the executive summary. Woodcock agreed. Tokos asked if the Committee was okay with scheduling another meeting to make a recommendation. The Committee was in general agreement to do so. Tokos would set up a poll to schedule another meeting to do so. Feldman asked if they had to have another in person meeting or if they could do it electronically. Tokos confirmed they needed to have another meeting where the group could discuss the executive summary and see if they might have changes.

Tokos requested that the project list be done geographically. Springer would work on this. Tokos would get a scheduled for the executive summary and potential dates for another meeting. Hollen suggested the Committee provide comments in advance of the meeting so they weren't surprised at the meeting and could get a recommendation out.

7. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant