

MINUTES
Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting #1
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
October 16, 2019

Committee Members Present: Rosa Coppola, Dean Sawyer, Bob Berman, Jeff Hollen, Roland Woodcock, Lyle Mattson, Bryn McCornack, Tomas Follett, Judy Kuhl, Ralph Breitenstein, Roy Kinion, Linda Niegobauer, and Rich Belloni.

Committee Members Absent: Fran Matthews.

City Staff Present: Community Development Director, Derrick Tokos; and Executive Assistant, Sherri Marineau.

Consultants Present: Andrew Parish, and Carl Springer.

Public Members Present: Frank Geltner, Dietmar Goebel, Spencer Nebel, C.M. Hall, Nyla Jebousek, and Jacob Osborne.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:03 p.m.
2. **What is a Transportation System Plan?** Tokos gave an overview of the Transportation System Plan (TSP), the history of TSP planning, and funding for projects. He noted the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) would be committing to the next 4-6 meetings over the next 2 years and encouraged them to attend the targeted community outreach meetings, which weren't mandatory. Tokos reported that there had been a video made on the TSP by the City that was available on the City's website. He explained that the PAC's job was to provide feedback on whether projects were going in the right direction or not.

Nyla Jebousek asked if this TSP was for all streets in Newport. Tokos explained that it was for streets north of bridge. Jebousek asked if engineers would be available to the public for questions. Tokos reported they would.

Carl Springer addressed the PAC and reviewed the primary focus of a Transportation System Plan, the key questions for communities, and the project schedule. Springer explained that the process would take two years and was designed to have the PAC spend the first part understanding the community and then they would get into evaluating and plan adoption. Tokos noted that over the summer the consultants and the City looked at all the plans developed over the years and reconciled them. Updated traffic counts were done in July 2019 and the information would be fed into the models to forecast future use. Springer pointed out that the next meeting would be held in February and he would make sure the PAC was comfortable with the first series of outreach to the community. The feedback from the outreach would be brought back to the PAC to see if there needed to be any adjustments.

Jebousek asked how citizens could bring forward problems they saw in a more interactive way with the PAC. Tokos noted there was a plan to have an interactive mapping tool for public to identify which streets needed improvements and to log comments. The City and ODOT would be providing comments on these. Jebousek wanted there to be more personal contact. Tokos said the City and ODOT were always available for interaction but there wasn't a process for direct interaction with the consultants.

3. **Public Involvement Program.** Springer reviewed the public process, flow of outreach, and adoption of the TSP. He noted there would be specific targeted interactions with stakeholder groups. Tokos handed out the list of stakeholders that would be targeted. Berman thought the Planning Commission should be included in the stakeholder list so there weren't any surprises.

Springer reviewed who the current PAC members were and the upcoming PAC meetings that would be happen in February 2020, fall 2020, and winter 2021. Dietmar Goebel asked for clarification on what

“growth” was. Springer said it was mainly land for development and redevelopment. Goebel reported that transportation was continually increased by tourists every year. Tokos said one thing they looked at was picking up growth with background traffic. This included reviewing people who were driving through Newport and people staying. A discussion ensued regarding the increase of traffic from tourists that were coming from all over the world, tour buses bringing more people into the community, and the intensity of demand on the system.

Springer noted that the model used in Newport was unique in the State because the amount of travel between tourists and residents was significantly different. Mattson asked if the consultants looked at trucking and the impact on traffic from deliveries. Springer said they didn't. Jebousek was concerned that the TSP was more about routing traffic through town and not about the local residents. Springer noted that the model identified traffic demand. Tokos said this was something that needed to be balanced when going through the process to develop solutions. Woodcock asked what the implications were for vehicles that were powered by electricity instead of gas. Springer said the power issue was about how vehicles were powered and the distance a vehicle could go on a charge. Parish noted that he would be talking later in the meeting about land use implementation on how cities provided charging stations as a TSP piece.

Jebousek asked if all documents would be available for review. Tokos reported everything would be posted on the project website. Berman suggested the PAC consider prioritizing goals. Springer said they could look at doing this.

Springer reviewed the stakeholder list and gave an overview on what would be covered in interviews. He noted it would be a few weeks before interviews started. Results would be cataloged and they would be brought back to the PAC anonymously. Berman suggested adding Samaritan Hospital to the list. Tokos explained that there wasn't a budget to go to a lot of groups. The thought was that the hospital group would be represented by Breitenstein who was on the PAC. He noted how other groups would be combined and included in the different stake holders listed. Jebousek asked if the hospitality industry had representation. Tokos wasn't sure but said they could bring business owners together on a targeted basis.

Berman noted that the Georgia Pacific chip trucks were another demand on traffic to consider. Jebousek asked if emergency vehicles were considered. Tokos said the Fire Department would be a part of the technical project management team along with the police and City engineer. Goebel suggested considering the hearing and audio impaired when it came to signals. He also suggested getting the arts community involved. McCormack explained they would be working with the PAC for input on the stakeholders that weren't on the list.

Berman suggested creating a meeting in a box for the PAC to use to be able to bring to other groups. Tokos explained there was a limited budget for these things. Mattson asked if notices for the outreach could be included with the City utility billing. Tokos confirmed this would be done and noted that they were looking at other ways to get the word out. Tokos requested the PAC reach out to him by email if they thought of anyone else to add.

4. **Review of Work Completed to Date.** Springer reviewed the work completed to date and what was in progress currently. Parish reviewed the regulatory review technical memo, the State and local plans and regulations, specific issues, and the key findings. Tokos explained they recognized the challenge of the cost of street improvements, looked at ways to do improvements that would reduce the costs of what was required, and what the tradeoffs would be to do them. Jebousek noted that boats and trailers being driven around town was also an impact. Tokos reviewed what was included when a traffic impact analysis was done. Parish asked the PAC to give feedback on issues in the TSP that they missed.

Springer reviewed the nine goals and policies next. A discussion ensued regarding whether or not goals should be set. Tokos thought that the goals would be pulled in when solutions were put on the table. Kuhl thought that Goal 6 of supporting health living was something that fell under all the goals. Springer said Goal 6 could be redundant and they would be reorganizing these to figure out how things should fit. Jebousek suggested moving the environment higher on the list. Springer noted that the goals weren't listed

in order of importance. He would look at using bullet points instead of numbers. Springer suggested the PAC weigh in on the components of the goals and then share their thoughts. Tokos suggested being more clear on what was being referenced to as far as Goal 2, Mobility and Accessibility.

Springer reviewed the supplemental strategies next. Tokos wanted to see the work done on the supplemental strategies for the Agate Beach area worked into the goals. Nebel asked Tokos to explained how the process for the commercial core and Agate Beach would be worked into the plan. Tokos explained that the commercial core would include looking at how to improve mobility and revitalize the area for redevelopment. As far as Agate Beach, it was a neighborhood that had been annexed into the City with substandard infrastructure and hadn't received the level of investment as other areas for things like streets, and drainage systems. They would looking at how to build out Agate Beach to meet these needs without exacerbating the geological challenges of the area. Berman wanted it noted that the TSP was for north of the bridge and the Bayfront was another challenge that should be addressed the same way as the commercial core.

Springer reviewed the measurable evaluation criteria next. He then gave an introduction on how the current transportation system worked in Newport. He reviewed the key transportation issues, pedestrian facilities, bike facilities, transit facilities, motor vehicle and freight facilities, existing traffic operations, and safety next. A discussion ensued regarding the Harney Street bypass and the need to relooked at it.

A discussion ensued regarding bike facility options for the Yaquina bridge. Feldman noted that ODOT was looking at the Oregon Coast Bike Route and the bridge. A discussion ensued regarding the high congestion on Highway 101, side street delays, and how locals utilized turn lanes on Highway 101 to do left turns. There was concern about placing structures in the turn lanes that impeded traffic making turns. Belloni noted the traffic for the school on Harney Street and Highway 20 needed to be addressed. Hollen wanted to see the PAC discuss different areas of concern in more detail. Mattson asked if there would be anything the PAC could look at for failed intersections. Springer said this was a part of the process for the PAC and they were asking the PAC to come up with a list of areas that needed to be looked out. Tokos noted they would be working on a refined list that would be brought back to the PAC, then the PAC would refine this and it would be brought to the public. He noted the projects would be looked multiple times. Feldmann noted that the TSP would identify areas that needed to be addressed but would not be giving solutions. Tokos noted their plan was to try to identify solutions. Springer cautioned the City to give themselves some flexibility and not paint themselves into a corner by agreeing to specific designs. Tokos explained that any significant constructability issues should be ferreted out as part of this process with the consultants. Kuhl asked when the PAC would know what the target streets were for the plan, and when they should bring target streets to the process. Tokos said the PAC should now start thinking about this at this time and it would be brought back to them at the next meeting.

A discussion ensued regarding thoughts on implementing roundabouts. Tokos noted that there had been discussions regarding implementing a roundabout on SE 40th or 50th Streets on Highway 101.

5. **How We Set Performance Targets and Standards.** Springer reviewed the performance targets next. He noted that the ODOT standards for volume capacity ratio for peak season should fall around 0.80 to 0.90. Newport was over 0.90 during the summer. Tokos noted the City needed to work through this. He encouraged the PAC to take a look at the website and noted that all the information would be posted there. Tokos requested that the PAC let him know any suggestions they had or things they felt the consultant should look at. He would be the conduit between the PAC and the consultants. Tokos noted they would need input on the stake holder list as well. Belloni questioned if the School District should be on the list twice since he was already on the PAC. Coppola requested the Latino community included. Tokos would work with her to come up with a focus group.
6. **Next Meeting – February 2020.**
7. **Public Comment.** None were heard.

8. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant