

MINUTES
Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee
Meeting #6
Newport City Hall Council Chambers by Video Conference
December 16, 2021

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

Committee Members Absent: Tomas Follett, 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: Steven Webster, Nyla Jebousek, and Jeremy Kennett.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:04 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Bob Berman noted minor changes to the minutes. Motion was made by Bob Berman, seconded by Ralph Breitenstein to approve the July 8, 2021 Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee meeting minutes with minor corrections. 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 and the project schedule through 2022.
4. **Public Outreach Summary, Phase 2.** Springer reviewed the approach to the outreach and noted that the survey participants were generally in the mid to older range and were over 45 years old. He then went over the Oceanview/Nye Street scoring results noting that there was a clear preference for a multimodal path. Springer reviewed the US 101 solutions and pointed out that there was a slight preference for two-way traffic versus the couplet options. For the US 101 solutions there were mixed preferences for two way versus couplets. Springer reviewed the other feedback that was heard during the outreach. Topics included traffic calming, shared streets designs, and priority bikeways.
5. **Revised Draft Transportation System Plan.** Springer recapped what the draft TSP contained and the highlights of the TSP document. He reminded that the way projects were picked were set forth by the goals and objectives set forth by the community.

Tokos emphasized that the TSP had recommendations for projects that didn't necessarily align with top votes in the rounds of public outreach. It wasn't that these were being ignored. They were trying to look behind the public's concerns and determine which of the different solutions best achieved mobility. Tokos also noted that they recognized that some of the online surveys only shared a limited amount of information and people didn't always have full context of what the Policy Advisory Committee had seen.

Berman asked if the infrastructure funding package that had been passed on the Federal level would come to Newport ,and how this would affect funding for some of the projects. Tokos explained that they expected additional funding to trickled down from the package, some of which might be available for these projects. He explained it was an advantage for the city to be wrapping up a TSP and to have those priorities identified, because it put the City in a position where they could move forward as funding became available. Depending on what funding came forward they would look at the best fit to leverage the grant funds available. Nebel noted the City didn't know what they would be getting from the Federal funding, but it would be a substantial amount. The City didn't know how it would work yet but it would put them in a spot to take advantage of other funding. The State of Oregon funding was also critical for a lot of the projects as well. Berman asked Feldman if ODOT had any comments on using some of these funds for the Yaquina Bay bridge. Feldman reported that since they were currently maintaining the bridge, they would not be using the funding for it at this time. The package had broader competitive programs and it was just a matter of what the City applied for.

Springer reviewed the recap of the process for TSP projects and the project funding available. There was \$37.8 million from the North Side Urban Renewal District and \$38.3 million from other City and State funding sources. Tokos pointed out that the City would have around \$3 million in South Beach Urban Renewal funds that were earmarked for transportation related projects over the next five years. These priorities would be plugged into the plan as well.

Springer reviewed the project improvement packages next. He noted that the City was free to make changes to the priority of projects over time. Berman thought that the terminology that said projects could be “potentially funded” should be called “unconstrained” instead. He thought the terminology should be the opposite of what was presented. Springer noted that “financially constrained” was what they used from industry standards and how they were labeling it.

Springer reviewed the TSP project types next and the TSP project highlights of the list. He first covered the US 20 at Harney Street/Moore Drive project first, then the US 101 at US 20 project next. Tokos noted that given how poorly this intersection was functioning, this needed to have attention in the next 20 years and should be worked into the fiscally restrained projects. He noted that one suggestion was to route traffic onto north east 1st Street by way of Harney and US 20 for vehicles looking to go north bound on US 101. Springer explained the consultants had looked at this and saw that it provided some benefits for people turning right on US 101 to head north. He reviewed the benefits for it but thought it wasn't enough to resolve the problems that has been identified. Mattson thought that the recommendations to move traffic to 1st Street and then back to US 20 prior to the stop light did not make sense. He thought they should continue the traffic down 1st Street to make a righthand turn on US 101 to help with congestion. Tokos pointed out that this was an earlier iteration they talked about in terms of a couplet where all of the traffic going both north and south on US 101 and it wasn't something that was being considered anymore. What they were looking at currently was to route traffic off of US 20 onto 1st Street for traffic that was looking to go north on US 101. Berman asked if 1st Street would be turned into a one way street as part of this concept. Tokos thought that only a portion of it would be one way close to US 101, and then a portion of 1st Street going east would be for two way traffic. He noted that this hadn't been fully sorted out in the TSP projects. Springer noted that they would also be looking at adding a turn lane going south on US 101 and using a median so traffic couldn't turn left from 1st Street to US 101.

Hollen thought that there was a serious issue with traffic going south and turning left onto US 20 from US 101. The backup was very often two blocks back when turning left onto US 20. Hollen

noted he had observed that the northbound traffic on US 101 didn't normally have this problem. He thought that rerouting traffic over to 1st Street would allow them to add a second turn lane from US 20 onto US 101 heading south. Niegebauer asked if this would require a signal on 1st Street and US 101. Springer thought that the intersection would become a left turn only from 1st Street to US 101. Niegebauer thought all the intersection streets from 1st to 6th Streets were difficult to turn onto US 101 because this stretch was bottlenecked all around. This wouldn't eliminate traffic, it was just making them stop in another spot. A discussion ensued regarding the flow of traffic and thoughts on how to utilize turn lanes to help with backups. Niegebauer requested that this be looked at further. Mattson was concerned about the change to US 101 to US 20 would take away parking for his staff. Springer reminded that the illustration that was presented was only a doodle and not a preliminary design. Tokos reminded that this would mean they would have to widen the road to add additional turn lanes. Berman agreed that this was a problematic intersection. He asked what it would take to get this project to the financially constrained list to make the numbers work. Springer noted the City and City Council would decide on this. Input from the community and those that knew the different value in the projects would also come into play. Woodcock noted that the majority of traffic at the intersection was headed west to the beach and thought that any relief heading west would be good. A discussion ensued regarding the traffic analysis that had been done, and how to try to address this and come up with solutions. Sawyer thought that putting a cement barrier to keep people from turning left from 1st Street to US 101 would be good because it was a problematic area.

Springer reviewed the US 20 circulation improvements next. Berman noted that there were comments from the public who were dead set against couplets and asked how much the public input played into instituting a couplet. Tokos explained that with public input, they always tried to keep in mind the context of the information that was presented to the public, and what was behind the comments they were receiving. Some of the comments on the two ways were under the assumption that if we simply took parking off of US 101 in the City Center area, it would make everything better there. As an interim solution this would help traffic flow but it wouldn't facilitate redevelopment of the commercial core area, which was one of their objectives. Tokos pointed out that this objective wasn't included in the public outreach. He wasn't confident the public outreach provided the full context. We did learn what the public's core concerns were and what they wanted to see addressed, whatever the solutions might be. A big fear with the couplets was that locals would lose their way to reasonably get around the neighborhoods. The reason this landed on the financial constrained was because it best meet the broad range of the goals that were identified for what they were trying to accomplish for the TSP. Removing parking would be a near term solution for traffic on US 101 and would improve traffic up to a certain point. It wouldn't help with redevelopment of the commercial and pedestrian movements. At the end of the day policy makers had to be sure that what was ultimately funded was something the public could get behind.

Niegebauer was worried about there being a signal on 9th and Hurbert Streets due to the couplet and it being in juxtaposition with the signal on US 101. She expressed concerns about what it would do to the flow of traffic. Niegebauer also asked if the parallel parking would go away. Tokos explained it would be reconfigured but there would be some parking in that area. Niegebauer expressed concerns about the couplet moving traffic out of the commercial zone and the viability of it. Hollen liked this type of plan because businesses on US 101 couldn't survive as it was currently. Mattson asked how many parking spaces would be eliminated in the commercial core zone. Tokos didn't have the exact numbers. Mattson thought that if they were to funnel traffic on 9th Street they should create a parking lot to compensate for the parking that would be taken away. Tokos noted that if they offset the parking spaces there would still be an enormous amount of traffic. It wasn't conducive and useful to require businesses to create a parking lot and wouldn't

help businesses on 9th Street. Berman asked why there were 2,000 more cars a day going north versus south bound. Springer didn't know the reason for this but felt it was small enough that it wouldn't make a difference in the type of facility they would put in place and what would perform well. Feldman noted that there would be a street scape project in Philomath in 2023 where they would be working with their couplets. They were also working on a grant to do a study of downtown Philomath to better know what a couplet would look like and what it could do. A discussion ensued regarding how the flow of traffic would work with a couplet.

Springer covered the Harney Street extension next. He noted this project was in the unconstrained projects. Tokos added that the concept of closing vehicle traffic on 31st Street would only happen in conjunction with the Harney Street extension option.

Springer reviewed the Oceanview Drive/Nye Street improvement next. Tokos noted the concept for this was to ask what people were reasonably going to do and how they would address some of the concerns with the volume of traffic on Oceanview Drive, which was an Oregon coast bike route. He explained the view was that if they just did a bike and pedestrian connection from Nye to Oceanview it wouldn't be utilized. If they did the vehicle connection, it would make a lot of sense because you would have a pretty significant volume of traffic that would go up Nye to connect to Oceanview and then tie back up to US 101. Hollen thought this was a good idea and thought that there needed to be improvements on Oceanview north to US 101 to allow better bicycle routes. Berman asked how the Lighthouse to Lighthouse Drive project fit in with this, and asked if there was another right-of-way that connected into US 101 that then it would be designated as pedestrian/bike. Tokos reminded there was a project included in the plan and an active Federal Land Access program grant in partnership with BLM that would be used to install a multiuse path on the west side of US 101 between Lighthouse Drive and Oceanview. This was a \$4 million project entirely funded by Federal dollars that would go down US 101 from Lighthouse Drive to Oceanview. Hollen thought making Oceanview a one way south would assist with concerns. A discussion ensued regarding how difficult it would be for traffic if they limited traffic going south on Oceanview. Nebel thought they needed to address the first part of Oceanview if it wasn't in the plan.

6. **Key Elements of Tech Memos 11 and 12.** Springer reviewed Tech Memo 11 alternate mobility targets. Tokos pointed out that the City didn't currently hit the existing mobility target in a number of areas. Springer confirmed that the City didn't currently meet the target. This became an issue when doing the 2040 forecasting, which triggered the analysis to be done. Tokos explained that by doing an alternate mobility target on some of the intersections they would be saying they would be accepting a higher level of congestions because we recognized we couldn't build our way out of it. This meant alternate targets would have circumstances in the future where businesses that were across from these intersections would be able to do renovations and expansions that they might not otherwise be able to do if they left the standard bond to capacity in place. Nebel asked what the downside would be for taking this designation from the State. Springer explained it would mean they would be tolerating a little more congestion.

Springer covered the code changes for Tech Memo 12. Tokos noted that one part of the code changes was to create a process for policy makers to identify when traffic calming measures were appropriate and when they should be deployed in the City. This was done by identifying which streets should be eligible for traffic calming and a code change to identify a process to address citizen requests for traffic calming measures in their neighborhoods. He pointed out that another thing included was a new "shared street" section which allowed for narrower street sections on low volume streets. This helped in the infill neighborhoods where people felt more comfortable

walking and biking in the streets. Tokos noted these were streets where there was less than 500 average daily vehicles trips. These were typically dead-end streets with lower volumes of traffic. This made it easier to work through infill projects.

7. **Public Comment.** Tokos read the public comment submitted by Nyla Jebousek to the Policy Advisory Committee.
8. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant