

MINUTES
Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting #4
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
February 25, 2021

Committee Members Present by Video Conference: Jeff Hollen, Tomas Follett, Bob Berman, Dean Sawyer, Ralph Breitenstein, Judy Kuhl, Roy Kinion, Rosa Coppola, Lyle Mattson, Roland Woodcock, James Feldman, Dietmar Goebel, and Linda Niegebauer.

Committee Members Absent: Rich Belloni (*excused*), Bryn McCornack, and Fran Matthews.

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

Consultants Present by Video Conference: Carl Springer, and Ben Weber.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:02 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Motion was made by Ralph Breitenstein, seconded by Rosa Coppola to approve the September 9, 2020 Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee meeting minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.
3. **Highlights of Fall/Winter Outreach Events.** Springer reviewed the project schedule and noted the next meeting would happen in the spring. He gave highlights of the outreach summary, and reviewed the issues related to the TSP goals relating to the themes, and common messages.

Kuhl thought they did a great job on compiling information and noticed the trend on bike lanes and walking were hot categories. Berman thought it was a great presentation to summarize comments. He voiced concerns that the written mailing outreach was limited to the senior citizens in the city and he was in under the impression that the outreach would be broader. Berman wanted to see this expanded, and thought this might have distorted some of the responses. Mattson asked how good the responses were in respect to all cross sections of the community. He asked if it was a group isolated focus or were there any groups advising memberships to make comment. Mattson thought the amount of bike responses outweighed the bicycles he saw in town. Tokos noted there had been strong participation from folks interested in bike/pedestrian issues. The younger demographics didn't participate as much as the older, which wasn't unusual. One of the things they were trying to do was to get a reasonable amount of input so they had a represented sample of the community. By in large that was in the materials. Tokos reported that 300 people participated in the online open house, and another 300 hard copies of surveys came in. They did a targeted outreach with different groups in the community. This was on top of the initial stakeholder outreach that was done to build the public input on what the key issues were. Tokos thought that they could try to reach out to other groups that might be underrepresented at this point. At the initial outreach they picked up groups that weren't heavily reflected in the community outreach through stakeholder engagement. Tokos felt they were in pretty good shape in terms of balance.

Follett reported that he was on the Bike and Pedestrian Committee and the consensus of who they talked to was that they didn't feel safe to bike in Newport because of the level of traffic safety on the streets. Hollen felt the comments were disproportionate and the bike/pedestrian was something they could comment on. He noted that he didn't see any comments about Oceanview Drive and didn't think earlier discussions focused on this. He had talked to people in the biking community who wanted biking integrated into the TSP. Mattson asked if people were looking for bike paths or a way to use infrastructure to move back and forth on the road. Follet thought visitors were looking for bike paths and residents were looking at the infrastructure. Tokos explained that the TSP was looking at addressing the needs of all transportation modes, not one mode at the expense of the other.

4. **Review of the Financial Forecast.** Springer reviewed the overview of existing revenue sources and projected funds through 2040. Berman thought there was a third Urban Renewal District that could contribute to funding. Tokos explained that this was the McClean Point District which was a smaller and almost strictly a sewer urban renewal district to get a future sewer station to handle wastewater from residential development. Outside of patching up Bay Blvd, Tokos didn't anticipate any other transportation related work in association with that district.

Springer reviewed the existing funding that was annualized. Tokos noted what was compiled in the memo was for stormwater and streets because they were typically commingled as projects. Nebel explained that there were regular maintenance expenses and they primarily used state gas taxes for day to day maintenance of the street systems. He thought it would be helpful to separate out what the day to day operational costs were to understand what was left over to do capacity increases, expansion of streets and things of that nature. Tokos noted they had begun to do this with the memo to pick up what they needed to have to meet current needs and what was expected to meet maintenance needs moving forward. He noted that as they ramped up the northside urban renewal project work they built in additional staff resources because there would be a large number of capital projects they needed to make sure they had sufficient staff resources allocated to make sure projects could be completed in the timeframe they have to be.

Springer reviewed the funds available for additional capital projects or public services. He then reviewed the illustrations of additional options for revenue. Nebel noted that increasing the local fuel tax was an item the City Finance Work Group was recommending the City Council consider before the voters to generate additional funds for rebuilding and maintenance of street systems. The Council would consider this on their March 1st meeting. This plan was for the next five years. Berman noted that every time there was a need for revenue they would start to talk about increasing fees. He felt this would likely get pushback.

Springer reported that when they were done with their solutions analysis and feedback from the Committee and public, they would have a comprehensive list of services and programs to augment the process. For each of these things they would then come up with the funding that was required to make them happen. This analysis would allow the City to come up with what they would most likely be able to afford. Nebel asked if the Urban Renewal funding was the component for transportation or if it was the entire Urban Renewal annual amount in the analysis. Tokos believed he had pulled out the transportation amounts but would check on this.

Berman asked of the information that was listed on the additional funding was for significant sources of funding. Springer explained that these were listed as opportunities for the city to use but they were not counting on them for investments. The Statewide improvement program was the typical process the State went through with the highway system to make decisions on where to make investments. Springer explained how cities competed for funding and noted that these were fairly modest amounts of money. Feldman noted that if this was for the pavement conditions on Hwy 101 it would score well for a STIP project and there could be funding for the project. This could possibly be a good opportunity to pursue some bike and pedestrian funding for enhancements. A lot of the STIP programs were based on formulas and it depended on the condition of the roads. Tokos noted that it was his understanding that in the ODOT memo they were assuming \$10.8 million coming through the program that would land with the STIP. He sensed this might be a little low. The project on the signal relocation about to go under construction in South Beach had \$4.5 to \$5 million of State and Federal funds tied into the project that had \$2.5 million from the South Beach Urban Renewal District. They were able to work a cost sharing into the STIP and those tended to be the big projects with big cost figures and a significant State/Federal match. This depended on the changing landscape with Federal funding, how it trickled down through ODOT, and how funding was made available. It was a hard thing to project and it was safe to go with the \$10.8 million in the report. Nebel suggested they put together a grid of the funds in categories of what they could potentially fund to understand how the funds might be used.

Berman asked if the Federal Grants Access Fund could be used for things like the improvements on Lighthouse Drive. Tokos explained it could for mainly the north end. They were working on the Bureau

Land Use Management on a separate study focusing on the intersection on Lighthouse Drive and the access to the outstanding natural area. The results of this work would be targeted for this fund.

5. **TSP Decision Making Process Ahead of Us.** Springer reviewed the project schedule. He explained the milestones ahead for the TSP adoption. They would be confirming the direction of the solution analysis in response to the technical work and public feedback at this meeting.

Dietmar asked if there could be another work session before the hearings. Springer thought they could do that but noted the alternative would be to move the work session to a later date. Goebel wanted the Planning Commission and City Council to have the same thinking after the recommendation. Tokos explained they could do a joint work session meeting with the City Council and Planning Commission before the Committee's Meeting #6 and the first hearing. It would be good to have the policy making bodies take a look at this before it went to a public hearing.

Hollen thought that when they had the details on the plan they should have another meeting. Nebel thought the joint meeting was a good place for this and they should circle back with the Council and Commission before the open house in case there were specific direction, questions or input they would like to obtain from the process. This could be done internally depending on the budget for the consultant's commitment, which could be discussed. Goebel reiterated that what he wanted was for the Council and Commission to get together a discuss any community concerns and iron them out before the public hearing. Nebel thought they could do this without necessarily having the full support they had for the committee meeting. This was something they could talk about. Goebel didn't think the consultants needed to be in attendance.

Coppola asked about the proposal for raising taxes. She asked if this was just a suggestion or if it was already happening. Nebel explained that these were just ideas. This was a recommendation at that point and nothing formalized. These were potential sources of revenue. Nebel reported that the City Finance Work Group identified that the Council should consider a gas tax adjustment. The change would have to be voted on by the citizens of Newport. Nothing beyond this was planned.

6. **Initial Findings of Solution Evaluations.** Springer reviewed the project maps. Follet pointed out that there was a big gap between NE 12th and NE 20th Streets that had a 100 foot elevation difference.

Springer reviewed the evaluation summary sheets and the proposed priority pedestrian network. He noted that there were some enhanced crossings for Agate Beach and US 20. Tokos noted the intersection at NE 60th Street and Highway 101 would be an enhanced crossing. The US 20 enhanced crossing was at US 20 and Eads Street. There had been a discussion to add something in the vicinity of the Agate Beach Wayside where surfers crossed Highway 101 by the surf shop. Springer noted this was on the list for the next round of edits. Tokos reported that they anticipated the Bike and Pedestrian Committee taking a look at this to give their comments. Kuhl asked what the enhanced crossing at the surf shop would be. Tokos explained it could be a flashing beacon or something that would catch people's eyes so they had enough time to respond. Feldman noted that the TSP would call for an enhanced crossing and engineering studies in the development of this, but the TSP didn't get into the fine details. Tokos reported that they would anticipate having a refuse island at the NE 60th Street and Highway 101 location.

Springer reviewed the proposed priority bike network. Follet suggested making a google map people could zoom into so they could see the details better. Springer could provide that on the next iterations.

Berman noted the Yaquina Heights Drive was not recommended as a bike route but seemed more practical than US 20. Follett would add it as a route. Goebel asked how the bike and pedestrian routes would change when they determined the couplets. Springer explained that it depended on what they chose to do, and these needed to be adaptive to respond to that. Tokos added that the next outreach would be to look at the types of solutions that could address the needs of the community. Goebel thought that if they were doing couplets on Highway 101 or US 20 it would set the tone for pedestrian ways and bike lanes there. Springer explained if they went ahead with a couplet the bikes and pedestrians would be a part of the solutions and would have to be adjusted later. They would have that information by the next meeting.

Springer reviewed the North Newport/Agate Beach map. Hollen noted that 73rd Street had very little residential traffic there. He advocated for a signal at 60th Street because there was a new housing project there which was a major issue traffic. Hollen didn't think there needed to be a crossing at 55th Street. He thought there was little or no pedestrian problems near the surf shop at 52nd Street and thought they just needed directions on crossing the highway.

Berman thought something should be done at 60th Street. There was a lot of commercial traffic on 73rd Street to cross Highway 101. Berman didn't think they should rule out a signal at 73rd Street. Kuhl noted she lived near the area and used this intersection. Having a turn lane was helpful and she was more concerned that it was in a 50 MPH speed zone. Kuhl was concerned that 73rd Street was too narrow for the big trucks. Kinion thought that something eventually needed to be done at 73rd Street.

Springer reviewed the Central Newport map. Hollen was in favor of signals at 36th and 31st Streets. 31st Street could be maintained as a one way road heading east instead of having all the traffic going up to 60th Street. Goebel noted that the previous City Manager, Don Davis had a proposal to use the old traction right-of-way available for bike and pedestrians and asked if this was still available. Tokos noted this was the Spruce railroad right-of-way on the west side of Highway 101 and confirmed it was on the list. Berman thought it would be nice to have a bike/pedestrian route that tourists could use and thought this should be resurrected. Hollen thought that if there was a signal at 36th Street to stop the traffic intermittently it would make it easier to get out from Oceanview Drive heading north. Tokos wanted to emphasize that they wanted to reflect the UGB amendment on the maps. The numbers on housing were about half of what they expected with the UGB amendment. They wanted to make sure to pick them up all the new housing developments as background assumptions when assessing if it was viable or not. Springer reported this would be included in their analysis.

Berman questioned what was included in the changes for the Oceanview Drive. He thought the road needed a full reconsideration and he would vote to close the road to make it a bike and pedestrian route. Hollen noted that there didn't seem to be a way to widen Oceanview without going in the gullies. He liked the idea of continuing a bike and pedestrian lane parallel to Highway 101 from Oceanview down to where it hit Big Creek Park. Goebel thought closing Oceanview to a one way and making a dead-end was counterproductive and felt there would be a lot of pushback. He thought the route needed a lot of work such as sidewalks. Goebel noted that the north end was used a lot as an alternate route.

Springer asked what the other Committee members thought of a one-way approach for Oceanview. Hollen was opposed to this. Woodcock liked the idea of pushing traffic off of Oceanview and onto Highway 101 for bikes and pedestrians. Follett reminded that this would only be a small part of Oceanview. Goebel asked what area would be one way on Oceanview. Follett explained it would be between 15th and 12th Streets. Goebel noted this was a local street used all of the time and there would be a lot of pushback on this. Nebel thought there has been a lot of discussion on Oceanview. He thought it was important to gauge what the options were and try to come to some sort of closure on this. Nebel wanted to see more input from public before they made a decision to leave it as is or make changes. If they didn't do this, it would come back to them. Tokos noted that the one way was linked to a related project to swing Oceanview over to Nye Street. Hollen thought that the extension of Nye Street to Oceanview Drive at 15th Street did provide an alternative for bikes to go down Nye Street to the post office. He thought this would be a safer route than going through Nye Beach.

Springer reviewed the downtown Newport map. Hollen noted that businesses in this area didn't have sufficient parking and improvements might revitalize the area. Goebel asked if they were looking at a lane change in the morning and afternoons at the middle school on 7th and Harney Street. There was a lot of traffic congestion in this area. Berman thought they should reconsider the closing of Eads Street at the High School when there were kids present. This was why people went up 7th to get to Harney because they couldn't get through to US 20. Berman suggested a controlled cross walk there instead. Follett thought a roundabout at Harney and 7th would be good, along with a covered breezeway. Sawyer noted there was a tunnel underneath Eads Street to the high school that was used for utilities. Nebel thought the Moore Drive

and US 20 intersection had a lot of turning movements that didn't allow cross traffic to go through. He thought that a roundabout at that location would help the traffic flow.

Mattson noted that the Deco District on Highway 101 had parking on the sides. If this was removed, it would give them the ability to have a bike lane. Springer noted they were considering reallocating the highway space and wanted to see left turn lanes on the highway. It could serve as an interim measure taken while other things were in the works such as couplets. Berman supported this but cautioned to take away the only parking for some of the businesses in this area. This might put people out of business by eliminating parking. Berman voiced his concerns about the north end of the couplets. He thought having traffic go around City Hall could create a traffic problem. Berman liked the south end of the couplet, though. Springer agreed that the north end needed to be looked at. Goebel asked if they were looking at a shorter couplet. Breitenstein noted the hospital had concerns about traffic from the couplet affecting ambulances and their staff, and thought the north end of the couplet was a concern.

Springer reviewed the Southeast Newport map. Berman asked how a traffic circle at Moore and US 20 would work for pedestrians. Springer explained they could be designed for pedestrians. They wouldn't be next to the circle and further removed. This could be done, but his concern was more about the grade approaching the highway to make sure there was enough visibility.

Springer reviewed the US 101 couplet next. Goebel had concerns with putting a couplet in front of a hospital and thought it would be problematic. Breitenstein like the shorter couplet so it didn't interfere with the hospital. The traffic going north would cut off around the Chamber of Commerce. Springer noted they haven't figured out where the north end would come back to Highway 101. Tokos noted that they needed to take a hard look at a way to bring the couplet back to US 20 to take some pressure off of the US 20 and Highway 101 intersection. They could also look at widening the turn lanes. Springer thought that if they left it as it was, they should widen the left turn lanes to US 20. Nebel asked if they would have the capabilities to direct the traffic going east bound on US 20 to continue down 9th Street and merging into Highway 101 instead of on US 20. Springer thought this was possible but noted the critical part was the north leg of the traffic turning from Highway 101 to US 20.

Berman asked if there was any consideration for a couplet where 7th Street was the northbound traffic and Highway 101 was the southbound. Sawyer didn't see how they could get it further south than Angle Street and thought this would be problematic. Goebel noted they would have to build a bridge across 9th Street with this. Springer explained this was dropped and kept the one to continue the couplet on Highway 101 on US 20 up to about 10th or 12th Streets. Nebel reminded that they needed to be thinking about how they looked at the traffic issues in this area and how to make the area viable and part of the community again. Hollen suggested closing off Olive Street from US 20 so the traffic couldn't come out of Olive Street onto Highway 101. He also thought there should be a signal near Hurbert Street and Highway 101 at the area by the Post Office. Springer noted they had the flexibility to rethink where there traffic control made more sense to provide safe options for making turns where the demand is highest.

Springer reviewed the US 20 Highway Couplet. A discussion ensued regarding if the Committee was determining which couplet they wanted at that time. Springer explained they were looking at different ideas they liked and then they would be giving the Committee different versions to look at. Sawyer thought that having two major signal lights close to each other on the 2nd Street option would be a problem. It would be hard to go through the lights when someone had to turn north on Highway 101 and there was a second signal right after it. Goebel thought this would also affected the High School parking lot on 2nd Street and creating a hazard for the kids. Breitenstein thought that they might not want to worry about couplets and look to just widen sections of Highway 101. This would be a lot less money and simpler. Tokos reminded that this was one of the options on the table. What they would be telling the public was what they could and couldn't do. Every option had positives and negatives they would have to sort through. Nebel acknowledged that sometimes the drawings were hard to understand. He thought they should use aerial images with photos of buildings for people to visualize this better. Springer thought they could do that and do a street view as well.

Mattson has questions on how the east side of the US 20 couplet would come back together. Springer thought this was going to be complicated. Mattson questioned what they were gaining with this. Tokos noted that one of the reason to do this was to get enough traffic on the other streets and get more exposure. If they added double left turns for traffic heading south on Highway 101, a couplet would add real-estate to do the extended merge onto US 20. Springer noted that if they did the 2nd Street couplet there wouldn't be an approach to the highway going westbound and meant they wouldn't need a second southbound turn lane on that east leg.

Berman asked if a traffic circle on Harney would help. Springer thought this was a possibility. They could do a roundabout at Harney and at Highway 101. It would have to be a two lane roundabout and they would have better diagrams at the next meeting. Follett asked for a rendering on what it was going to look like as well. Mattson suggested separate slides.

Springer reviewed the couplet options that would be refined, and then covered the Harney Street Extension. Goebel asked if the north end of the bike path would be at the north end of the water plant. Tokos didn't think they would land there and there was still an option to do an alignment that would bring it back in between Big Creek Park and the water plant. Nebel noted that depending on what happened to the dam there might be other property east of the dam to look at to open up more options on the extension. Nebel asked if this extension was buildable because it would go through wetland and other sensitive areas. Springer noted the consultant assigned to this was working with the interim City Engineer to work through this. Follett noted there had been plans to do a bridge across Jefferies Creek and asked if the plans could be accessed. Tokos explained there was limited information on this and most was done by a developer. There might be an alignment drawing but there weren't a lot of details. Hollen asked if the extension would come in off of 36th Street to access Highway 101. Springer confirmed this. Hollen had concerns on this because there was a canyon there and he didn't see people going the Harney route to bypass Newport. Berman requested the Committee have a chance to look at the details on the maps before the public saw the final presentation. Hollen also noted that he didn't think large trucks would use the Harney extension and asked who they were targeting to use it. Nebel thought there would be use there because there was a lot of traffic that used Harney Street. If they could avoid Highway 101 they would. Nebel thought it would be more residential traffic. It wasn't intended to be a bypass but for residential use. Springer reported that he could distribute the details to the Committee before the open house.

7. **Public Comment.** Tokos reviewed the two letters between the City and ODOT. The TSP plan would include goals and polices relative to how the State would go about planning for a replacement of the Yaquina Bay bridge. One of the questions during the outreach to the State was they wanted to see it in the existing alignment. What they heard from the State was that they understood there needed to be some certainty to that given the level of investment and balance in the system would rely on that, and they were willing to frame that tactfully in the TSP. Feldman thought that if there was a goal and policy statement in the Newport TSP, and a project to the effect, it would help guide the decisions later when the time came to fund and design something.

Nebel noted that the information collected so far showed that the majority of people wanted the bridge in the same location. He didn't know if they needed to further refine this based on the second round of input or make the general assumption that there would be a statement in the plan that the community wanted the bridge to stay where it was at. Nebel asked if they needed to get further input in the second round of comments before it was included in the plan. Gebel thought the bridge was an icon for the city and replacing it would be a problem. He thought they also needed to look at a second bridge option as well rather than replacing the bridge. Nebel noted if the bridge remained, ODOT would want to donate the bridge to the city, and something he didn't think they could accept. The question was if they needed to see further input in this process to see if they needed a statement in the plan regarding the location of the bridge going forward. Feldman noted the feedback from the initial event was pretty clear on this. Tokos explained there was clear response in terms of preference to see the crossing stay in the present alignment. They needed input on what was being done in the next 20 years and their expectations on the realistic timeframe that the bridge needed to be replaced. Nebel thought that building on the communication with the Director on the bridge would be critical thing going forward. A project like this was typically several decades in the process

for it to happen and thought they needed to continue pushing ODOT to begin this process. ODOT's letter talked about ways to fund the bridge replacement, like tolls. This would be a challenge with communities connected to the bridge to get them to support the construction of a new bridge with tolls. If the Committee was comfortable with this they should state it clearly that it was the intent of the plan to have the bridge remain at that location. The next issue was to push ODOT to see what the plan for dealing with the bridge was as it approached the end of its life span.

Woodcock asked if there was any talk about making the old bridge a bike and pedestrian bridge, and then have a new bridge built somewhere else. Feldmann noted that if the city was willing to take over the bridge this would be a possibility. It would mean the city would have to maintain the existing bridge. Hollen didn't see any realistic alternatives for another bridge. He asked if the bridge started to fail and needed to be replaced, would ODOT pay for this. Feldmann explained there was a number of funding scenarios for this. ODOT was spending a lot of money over the next 20 years to maintain the bridge and the TSP was a 20 year plan. This could be a project for the next TSP. Goebel reminded the city didn't have funds to replace the bridge. Feldman reported ODOT had money but there were other bridges that were more of a priority. Nebel thought that the city and state couldn't wait until the bridge failed. A long range plan needed to be started in order to have a discussion on a solution. Goebel reminded that they were going to be spending money on Highway 101 so they needed to make a decision on where the bridge would be. Nebel noted that what he was hearing from the Committee was that they wanted to get some feedback on if the intent for the bridge was to be in the current alignment instead of another location. This would effect where couplets would be placed and why it needed to be figured out. The Committee was in general agreement with this.

8. **Public Comment.** Tokos acknowledged the public comment received from Wendy Engler that had to do with the Lighthouse Drive connection and her request for further discussion on this. He thought this was something they might be able to further vet through the Bike and Pedestrian Committee.
9. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant