



## **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN POLICY ADVISORY AGENDA**

**Thursday, March 24, 2022 - 6:00 PM**

**Council Chambers, Newport City Hall, 169 SW Coast Highway**

---

This meeting will be held electronically. The public can livestream this meeting at <https://newportoregon.gov>. The meeting will also be broadcast on Charter Channel 190. Public comment may be made, via e-mail, up to four hours before the meeting start time at [publiccomment@newportoregon.gov](mailto:publiccomment@newportoregon.gov). The agenda may be amended during the meeting to add or delete items, change the order of agenda items, or discuss any other business deemed necessary at the time of the meeting.

Anyone wishing to make real time public comment should submit a request to [publiccomment@newportoregon.gov](mailto:publiccomment@newportoregon.gov). at least four hours before the meeting start time, and a Zoom link will be e-mailed.

---

### **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

#### **Meeting Agenda:**

[PAC Meeting #9 Agenda\\_24 Mar 22.pdf](#)

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Draft Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2022.**

[Draft TSP Policy Advisory Comm Mtg Minutes 02-24-2022](#)

### **1. REVIEW AND DISCUSS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CHAPTER.**

**2. RECOMMENDATION STATEMENT TO PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL.**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**3.A Comments:**

[Carla Perry 03/11/2022 Email](#)

**HANDOUTS**

**Files:**

[Draft Newport TSP Chapter 1: Executive Summary](#)

[Draft Newport TSP Revised Draft 2-22-22](#)

[Pending edits to prepare for Adoption Draft TSP document](#)

**ADJOURNMENT**



## **Newport Transportation System Plan Project Advisory Committee Meeting #9**

March 24, 2022 | 6 PM to 8:00 PM

Online Zoom Meeting & In-Person at Council Chambers

### **Meeting Objectives**

- Review PAC feedback on Executive Summary Chapter

- 1. Review and Discuss Executive Summary Chapter**
- 2. Recommendation Statement to PC/CC**
- 3. Public Comment**

### **Next Steps – April/June 2022**

- Produce Adoption Draft TSP document, Volumes 1 and 2
- Proceed to Planning Commission and City Council Adoption Hearings
- Prepare Final Draft TSP documents

### **Handouts**

- Draft TSP Chapter 1: Executive Summary
- Draft TSP, February 2022 (no changes since last meeting)
- Pending edits to prepare for Adoption Draft TSP document

### **Other Resources**

Project website: <https://sites.jla.us.com/newport-tsp>

*Draft* 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 McCormick 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



**Sherri Marineau**

---

**From:** Carla Perry  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2022 3:58 PM  
**To:** Public comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment re Transportation System Plan

**[WARNING]** This message comes from an external organization. Be careful of embedded links.

---

March 11, 2022  
To: Planning Commission - for **March 14 Planning Commission Meeting**  
Re: Public Hearings for Transportation System Plan Updates

If the Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee meets again, I would like these comments to be included for that meeting as well.

Please read the following public comment aloud, into the record, at the March 14 Planning Committee meeting. It pertains to the continuing review of Newport's Draft Transportation System Plan.

Thank you,  
Carla Perry  
Newport

=====

To: Planning Commissioners (and Transportation System Plan Policy Advisory Committee members):

Thank you for taking time to review the current draft (February2022) of the Newport Transportation System Plan and to continue fine-tuning workable transportation solutions for the City of Newport. I provided comments last year via the website survey, but I also note that public comment is still being accepted even though it is not an agenda item at the March 14 Planning Commission meeting.

It is clear that traffic congestion at the center of Newport is horrendous and getting worse, especially during peak visitor seasons (which have begun overlapping). I've read the numerous draft iterations of the City's Transportation Plan as they've become available, but the versions posted on the City's Community Development page provides the plans as they stood in early 2021. Please replace those files with the most recent draft to make it easier for the public to be aware of where thinking is now. The information contained in the Plan is complicated to decipher with improvements divided into intersection improvements, roadway extensions, roadway improvements, trail/shared use, etc., which means location names reappear in multiple sections of the plan with competing solutions.

Here are my specific comments pertaining to the Transportation System Plan:

1. I am emphatically against a couplet on Highway 101. Historically, implementing one-way streets in a city's downtown core destroys the small businesses that line main street and the side streets, as faster traffic flow deters stopping and parking. The internet is full of numerous instances of cities that had reconfigured -- at great expense -- to one-ways streets, but are now converting back to two-ways in order to encourage the return of small businesses and to improve increasingly unsafe conditions for pedestrians when crossing those speedy one-way streets that move at the pace set by street lights.

The transportation plan for Highway 101 in the City Center area is critically tied into City Center revitalization and terms

for the Transportation Growth Management plan are still being worked out. I believe a revitalization plan for City Center is imperative BEFORE something as dramatic as a couplet is imposed so that it does not limit revitalization possibilities. And certainly the City's Housing Capacity Analysis / Housing Production Strategy project could affect how City Center is rebuilt. Hopefully there will be an effort to redevelop the downtown core with abundant apartments above new small business fronts lining the streets along Highway 101. If it is possible to use a street set-back when rebuilding City Center, that might provide additional alternatives for traffic amenities. Local transit, bicycle, and pedestrian-friendly routes could be shifted to the proposed couplet streets without impacting businesses, through traffic, and property lines.

2. I am against roundabouts on Highway 20 and Highway 101. Middle school and high school students need to cross Highway 20 at Harney and a roundabout would impact their safety to a high degree. A roundabout on Highway 101 would cause chaos at that intersection as people, unfamiliar with using roundabouts, stop to ponder what to do. That intersection is also the major pedestrian crossing point for Highway 101. A roundabout at that location would make an already unsafe situation for pedestrians even more hazardous.

3. Regarding Nye Street and Overview Drive: I am in favor of clearing out the underbrush on what had been a pedestrian pathway on Nye Street from 17th Street going north, so that it reconnects with Overview Drive before Agate Beach and provides an alternative for pedestrians and bicycles. I am for keeping Oceanview Drive two-way, with the addition of traffic calming enhancements. For some reason, vehicles rarely stop for pedestrians attempting to cross Oceanview Drive (even at street corners). There are no sidewalks or marked crosswalks on Oceanview between Nye Beach and Agate Beach, so perhaps a low-cost solution to improve safety would be to install marked crossings (striping on the street) every few blocks, and install signs that say, "Yield to Pedestrians in Crosswalks" (or similar verbiage).

Thank you,  
-Carla Perry



# Chapter 1: Executive Summary

## INTRODUCTION

---

The City of Newport initiated this update to their Transportation System Plan (TSP) to address a range of challenges and opportunities that emerged since the 2012 Newport TSP. In general, the TSP update process was designed to comply with the State of Oregon guidance and requirements per the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012-0015), which includes a public outreach process, an evaluation of current and future transportation needs, and a strategic and reasonable funding program (see Figure 5, Chapter 2 for more details).

**Critical Community Issues** were developed specifically for Newport, under the guidance of city leaders and a committee of key community stakeholders, referred to as the Project Advisory Committee. This TSP update focused on the following critical community issues:

- Developing desired streetscape, urban form, and roadway alignment for downtown commercial core to spur redevelopment
- Developing transportation enhancements for the Agate Beach neighborhood that are sensitive to local geologic conditions
- Updating the TSP capital projects and planning level estimates for near- and long-term system investment priorities
- Clarifying whether the US 101 highway alignment may change as a part of the future replacement of Yaquina Bay Bridge
- Evaluating the viability and efficiency of NE Harney Street extension as north-south alternative to US 101
- Developing an integrated multi-use bike and pedestrian network
- Developing neighborhood traffic calming measures and ped safety needs

- Identifying transit needs of the community
- Refining street cross-sections requirements to provide options that address constraints
- Refining infill frontage improvement requirements that better balance cost and community needs

The outcomes and recommendations are presented in the following chapters. Technical background information that formed the basis for many of the recommendations are available in a separate volume (see Newport TSP, Volume 2). The overall structure of the 2022 TSP document is summarized below.

**Chapter 1: Executive Summary** is a high-level overview of the TSP and its findings.

**Chapter 2: Transportation System Context** introduces the local history of Newport and its transportation system. It defines the planning goals and objectives and lays out the challenges and opportunities that the city addressed through this TSP update. The stated goals and objectives are the basis for choosing preferred transportation projects (see Chapter 5).

**Chapter 3: Newport Today & Tomorrow** presents how the city is planning to grow through 2040, and how historical travel patterns could change as a result. Each component of the local transportation system was reviewed and evaluated to consider how effectively it performs its intended objectives, and to identify gaps or limitations that should be addressed. The outcomes of these evaluations provide a list of transportation system needs around the city that will be examined to develop solutions (see Chapter 5).

**Chapter 4: System Design & Management Principles** defines the preferred routes and hierarchy of the system as it relates to freight, motor vehicles, transit, bicycling and walking. In addition, the facility standards show specific design requirements regarding the overall dimensions, amenities, and provisions for individual travel modes. These facility cross-sections are used later in the process (see Chapter 6) to prepare initial estimate construction costs and right-of-way requirements for capital projects and new development plans.

**Chapter 5: Project Development & Evaluation** presents the process used to identify investments that best align with the goals and objectives, which involved a combination of technical analysis as well as feedback from the project stakeholders and the public.

**Chapter 6: Projects and Priorities** lists the outcomes of the solution development and scoring process from Chapter 5. Projects are listed in four groups, according to funding priorities. Financially constrained (Tier 1 and 2), and Unconstrained (Tier 1 and 2).

**Chapter 7: Implementation & On-Going Strategies** lays out the steps ahead to act on the TSP update, and to address on-going community issues related to transportation that are not specifically resolved by the TSP process and recommendations.

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CONTEXT (CHAPTER 2)

---

The City of Newport incorporated in 1882, and the 1910 census reported about 700 residents. Over the past century, the city has grown to just over 10,000 permanent residents today. The summertime population peaks at 25,000 because of the seasonal changes in tourist, employment, visitor, and recreational activities. As a popular Oregon Coast community and active seaport, Newport experiences its highest transportation demands during summer months when tourism and recreation are at their peak, whereas travel activity during the winter months are much lower. For example, the daily traffic counts on US 101 near City Hall drop by about 40 percent between July and January. This planning process recognizes how these seasonal swings in travel activity affect the community.

### KEY TRANSPORTATION OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Newport faces the challenge of accommodating growth while maintaining acceptable service levels on its transportation network. Some of the key opportunities and challenges noted for this TSP update are listed below:

- **US 101 and US 20** form the primary transportation network and carry most the motor vehicle traffic. Outside of the downtown core area, the geographic constraints of the ocean coast, Yaquina Bay and local hillsides have fostered a strong reliance on the state highway system both for local travel and regional service to nearby communities. These highways were built with limited walking and bicycling amenities which continues to be a challenge for residents, visitors and tourists that are traveling outside of their motor vehicles.
- **Downtown** is where many of the properties are underutilized or in economic distress with vacant storefronts and aging, poorly maintained buildings. The City has an opportunity to leverage its urban renewal district to generate funding to revitalize the downtown area, which is also referred to as the commercial core area, along with upgrading the transportation system to catalyze economic development and provide infrastructure needed to support additional density.
- **Yaquina Bay Bridge** is an integral part of Newport as well as an historic icon on Oregon's coast highway system. Since its opening in 1936, the bridge has been the only transportation link across Yaquina Bay to South Beach. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has been working to extend the functional life of the bridge, but they expect that it will eventually be replaced. The timing for its replacement is uncertain, however, ODOT has indicated that its current location would be the preferred option to minimize environmental, engineering and community impacts.
- **Natural Hazards** considered in this TSP include the potential tsunami events following earthquakes and mitigating for unstable soils and ocean bluff erosion.

## REFINED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The TSP goals and objectives define how the community's vision will shape the design, construction, operation, and management of the transportation system. This **2022 TSP update** reorganized the 2012 TSP structure and added several new goals. The plan framework now better supports performance-based planning. The new goals for the Newport TSP are listed below. For more details about the full policy framework, please refer to *Setting the Direction for the Plan* in Chapter 2.

- **Goal 1: Safety** – Improve the safety of all users of the system for all modes of travel
- **Goal 2: Mobility** – Promote efficient travel that provides access to goods, services, and employment to meet the daily needs of all users, as well as to local and regional major activity centers.
- **Goal 3: Active Transportation** – Complete safe, convenient and comfortable networks of facilities that make walking and biking an attractive choice by people of all ages and abilities.
- **Goal 4: Grow the Economy** – Develop a transportation system that facilitates economic activity and draws business to the area.
- **Goal 5: Environment** – Minimize environmental impacts on natural resources and encourage lower polluting transportation alternatives.
- **Goal 6: Support Healthy Living** – Support options for exercise and healthy lifestyles to enhance the quality of life.
- **Goal 7: Prepare for Change** – Ensure that the choices being made today make sense at a time when Newport is growing, and the transportation industry is rapidly changing.
- **Goal 8: Fiscal Responsibility** – Sustain an economically viable transportation system.
- **Goal 9: Work with Regional Partners** – Partner with other jurisdictions to plan and fund projects that better connect Newport with the region.

In addition to the goals outlined above, a set of supplemental strategies and guidelines were developed to address specific issues of concern within the Commercial Core and the Agate Beach areas of the City.

## DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE

The decision-making structure for this TSP was developed to establish clear roles and responsibilities throughout the project. The primary elements of that structure included:

- A Project Management Team (PMT) that include city staff, ODOT staff and the consultants

- A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) that included local committee, neighborhood, and business representatives, emergency service providers, and agency staff members from the City of Newport, Lincoln County, and the ODOT.
- The City Council and Planning Commission for Newport were briefed throughout the process.
- The City Council made all final decisions pertaining to this TSP. The PMT made recommendations to the City Council based on technical analysis and community input.

## **PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

Public outreach was conducted between November 2020 and August 2021 to share information about the TSP project and community members, stakeholders, and other interested parties were invited to share their ideas and feedback. The project team adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic to provide several engagement opportunities to enable community members to safely participate and provide meaningful input. Approximately 970 people were engaged through a variety of outreach opportunities.

Overall, the respondents wanted a focus on the safety and circulation for the walking, biking, and transit modes of travel. A complete summary of the outreach efforts can be found in Appendix N, Newport TSP Outreach Summary.

### **Common themes heard from public engagement included the following:**

- Pedestrian and bicyclist safety throughout the city
- Increased bus/transit/shuttle options
- Interest in improving traffic flow and reducing congestion, for through travelers and local users
- Parking improvements, especially in the downtown area
- Traffic speeding enforcement
- Preserve/rebuild the Yaquina Bay Bridge in the same location
- Strong support for emerging technology such as electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, parking solutions and solar power

## **NEWPORT TODAY AND TOMORROW (CHAPTER 3)**

---

A comprehensive assessment was made of the travel patterns and transportation system performance within Newport as it operates today, and how that is expected to change with planned growth through 2040. To make the future forecast, the designated growth areas within the city were reviewed to determine how travel activity and patterns would change based on historical demographic and travel data. The future year travel forecast was made for summertime conditions, and it was used to evaluate how effectively proposed roadway solutions would operate.

The findings of this technical analysis for all travel modes combined with input from the public engagement process formed a master list of system needs for the community. Later in the update process (see Chapters 5 and 6), the past TSP projects identified from the 2012 TSP were refined

and amended, as needed, to fully address the latest understanding of the community's transportation needs.

For further technical background information, refer to Technical Memorandums #5 *Existing Transportation Conditions*, #6 *Future Traffic Forecast* and #7 *Future Transportation Conditions and Needs* that are contained in Volume 2.

## LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND GROWTH

The city's present urban growth boundary (UGB) and adopted land use zoning maps indicate the location and type of development that is expected to occur in Newport. In addition, citywide population forecasts are coordinated with a statewide effort that is led by Portland State University. By 2040, the growth in households and employment for Newport looks are illustrated in Figures 11 through 16 in Chapter 3. In summary, they include the following planned growth:

- **Households** - About 1,000 more homes are expected throughout the city, with the highest concentrations in the recent UGB addition near NW Lighthouse Drive (NE 52<sup>nd</sup> Street), and the emerging neighborhood along SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street near the Oregon Coast Community College. Many other neighborhoods expect modest residential in-fill development.
- **Population** – About 2,400 more permanent residents are expected to reside in these new homes. In addition, visiting households during peak seasons are forecasted to increase by about 210 more than today (see Figure 19, Chapter 3).
- **Summer Employment** - About 2,700 more jobs are expected during the summer. Overall job growth will be highest in the South Beach area, especially along Marine Science Drive, and south of 40<sup>th</sup> Street, and in the very north end of the city near 73<sup>rd</sup> Street.

This combination of new housing, residents and jobs is expected to increase citywide vehicle trips by about 27% year-round by 2040.

## MOTOR VEHICLE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ISSUES

Based on technical evaluation and feedback from the community, the following operational, safety and maintenance issues were identified for the Newport motor vehicle system. ODOT has quantitative performance targets for its highways based on traffic delays, which were applied to determine if conditions were acceptable or not. A total of 20 intersections were selected for the operational analysis review.

- Six of the intersections on US 101 are expected to have major delays for motor vehicle traffic. This includes three locations that are controlled by traffic signals (at NE 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, US 20, and Hurbert Street) and three stop controlled intersections (at NE 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, Oceanview Drive, and Angle Street)
- Many other intersections along US 101 that were not specifically analyzed are expected to have limited access and severe delays during peak hours for traffic intending to turn left onto the highway. Several neighborhoods derive their only access from US 101. Public



feedback specifically noted NE San-Bay-O Circle near the Fred Meyer store as being difficult to exit during summertime conditions.

- Two of the US 20 intersections are expected to have major delays including SE Benton Street (stop sign controlled on the side street) and NE Harney Street-SE Moore Drive (traffic signal control).
- The US 20/NE Harney Street-SE Moore Drive intersection was also cited by public feedback as being problematic for serving school related traffic before/after school sessions, and for major events at the Lincoln County fairgrounds.
- Other community safety concerns included the lane merging on southbound US 101 approaching Yaquina Bay Bridge, and the irregular access spacing on US 101 near the Newport Theater.
- Three local bridges were identified as being structurally deficient including US 101 over Big Creek, the Yaquina Bay Bridge, and on Big Creek Road over Big Creek.
- In addition to its weight limited condition, the vehicle traffic using the Yaquina Bay Bridge is expected to grow and it will eventually exceed the carrying capacity.

## **WALKING AND BICYCLING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE**

Walking is an important part of local travel options, both within neighborhoods and parks as well as along and across major roadways. Provision of safe and convenient walking options can help the city move towards a complete multimodal transportation system. Today Newport has 33 miles of sidewalks, although about 70 percent of city streets lack sidewalks on at least one side.

Bicycling is common along US 101, which is part of the designated Oregon Coast Bike Route. Cyclists generally ride on the wide paved shoulders on US 101, since there is very limited designated bike lanes on the highway. Off highway, there is about 10 miles of shared-use pathways or trails available, but generally cyclists are required to share the roadway with vehicles. For both walking and bicycling system, a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) score was determined that represents the user's experience on that route.

Based on technical evaluation, field observations, and public feedback, the following walking and bicycling issues were identified:

- For walking travelers, about 25 percent of state highway and city collector street blocks were rated in the low to moderate LTS range, which is generally comfortable for the average traveler.
- For bicyclists, about 15 percent of state highway and 90 percent of city collector streets had low to moderate ratings. .
- On the other end of the LTS scale, extreme ratings were shown for 60 percent of the highways for walking travelers, and 85 percent of bicyclists. This is the highest level of stress and is considered very challenging.

- Extreme or high bike LTS was noted due to high speeds and traffic volumes and unprotected bike facilities. This includes both state highways and short segments of NE Harney Street, NE 31<sup>st</sup> Street, NE Yaquina Heights Drive, SE Bay Boulevard and SE Ferry Slip Road.
- Sixteen of the 20 intersections studied on US 101 and US 20 had extreme or high LTS scores due to non-compliant ADA curb ramps, complex elements or limited refuge or enhancements at the crossing. Bicycling LTS has similar scores at these locations.
- NW Oceanview Drive, a component of the Oregon Coast Bike Route, was rated at extreme level of traffic street between US 101 and the intersection with NW Edenvue Way, and medium level of traffic stress from there to Spring Street.

System deficiencies were noted in cases where the walking or bicycle facilities had major gaps, extreme LTS, or were near important destinations, such as parks, schools, transit stops or essential services. These were flagged to be reviewed for possible system improvements (see Chapters 5 and 6).

## TRANSIT SERVICES

Lincoln County Transit operates a city loop bus service, an intercity bus service, and a paratransit service. The loop service through Newport connects key destinations six times each day, seven days a week and in the evening. While most residents and businesses are located within one-half mile of a loop transit stops, the time between buses (up to 90 minutes) and limited-service hours (7 am to 5pm) moderates its effectiveness for residents and visitors.

The intercity transit service operates routes to Corvallis and Albany four times each day, to Lincoln City four times each day, to Yachats four times each day, and to Siletz six times a day between Monday and Saturday.

Lincoln County Transit's paratransit service provides public transportation to persons with disabilities who are unable to use regular fixed route buses. Curb to curb paratransit service, in wheelchair lift equipped minibuses, is available generally between 8:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Lincoln County's transit development plan through 2028 intends to enhance the frequency of services and add more stops on the loop to better serve more riders. This includes two new loop routes with shorter headways between more popular local destinations.

## OTHER TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

### Freight Network

US 101, north of US 20, is a designated federal truck route and US 20, east of US 101, is a designated Oregon freight route. With growing traffic volumes, six intersections along the state highways would not meet their currently adopted mobility target. These are the same six locations noted under the **Motor Vehicle System Performance Issues** section above.

Other locations with identified freight needs include Bay Boulevard is a working waterfront and is a key freight generator for the City of Newport. This area is also a tourist destination which can create conflicts between the high volume of pedestrians, passenger cars, and freight vehicles which serve Newport’s fishing industry.

- Yaquina Bay Bridge - Freight vehicles face the steep grades for northbound traffic approaching the Yaquina Bay Bridge. The recent relocation of the traffic signal from SE 32<sup>nd</sup> Street to SE 35<sup>th</sup> Street has improved this operational issue. The bridge has weight limit restrictions.

### **Airport**

The Newport Municipal Airport, owned and operated by the City of Newport, is a public-use airport located east of US 101 off SE 84th Street, approximately five miles south of downtown. This airport provides general aviation for Newport and surrounding coastal communities and is identified as a critical resource by the Oregon Department of Aviation for emergency response following a major earthquake or tsunami. Currently, the airport supports general aviation aircrafts, US Coast Guard helicopters, and air ambulance flights.

### **Waterways**

The Port of Newport maintains and operates separate commercial and recreational marinas to serve Newport’s ship traffic. The commercial marina, located on the north side of Yaquina Bay, south of Bay Boulevard includes four docks for commercial vehicles and serves a large, prolific fishing fleet and a yacht club. This marina can accommodate vessels up to 100 feet. The recreational marina is located on the south side of Yaquina Bay, near South Beach, with space for 522 vessels and includes power, water, fuel, and sanitary services as amenities. This marina also serves as a public boat launch with space for trailer storage.

## **CHAPTER 4: SYSTEM DESIGN & MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES**

---

This chapter presents several refinements to Newport’s multimodal transportation system hierarchy and facility design requirements. The recommended changes for city streets, trails, and shared-use pathways were developed to improve safety and accessibility for all users, and to directly responds to several of the critical community issues:

- Developing an integrated multi-use bike and pedestrian network
- Developing neighborhood traffic calming measures and ped safety needs
- Refining street cross-sections requirements to provide options that address constraints

This chapter also acknowledges more recent guidance from ODOT’s *Blueprint for Urban Design*, which provides a flexible approach to improvements adjoining the state highways that allow cities to better accommodate urban development that offer enhanced walking, bicycle, on-street parking, and store front amenities. For the full technical presentation of system design and management changes, please refer to *Transportation Standards (Technical Memorandum #10)* in Appendix K.

## STREET FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

The functional classification of a street or roadway defines how it is intended to be used, and its relative purpose compared to other facilities in the network. Transportation agencies that manage and maintain highway and street systems commonly use this practice, including federal, state, county, and city jurisdictions. The City of Newport chose to refine its street functional classifications for city facilities that align with local community values.

The major changes to the street functional classification designations for City of Newport Streets include the following:

- **Designating State Highways as the only Arterial Roadways** - Several city streets that were previously designated as arterials roadways were downgraded to better match their intended use today and in 2040. Arterial streets are primarily intended to serve regional and through traffic. It is determined that only the two State Highways provide that type of service.
- **Dividing City Collector Streets into Two Tiers, Major and Neighborhood Collector** - The city previously had one category for collector streets, which are intended to connect neighborhoods to each other and to arterial roadways. The top tier collector was renamed to a Major Collector. A second tier of collector roadway was introduced where it was most appropriate to apply traffic calming techniques in neighborhoods.
- **Adding Private Streets to the system map** - A new designation was added to show Private Streets, which are owned and maintained by the adjoining property owners. Typically, these are driveways or private roadway connections that serve four or fewer parcels.
- **Local Truck Routes Added** - In addition to the state and federal designated truck routes on us 101 and US 20, there are several city streets that serve as key local truck routes within the community. These routes were added to the city's freight network to highlight the need to design and manage them for serve trucks. Examples include Bay Boulevard, and SE Marine Science Drive.

## MULTIMODAL NETWORK DESIGN

Street designs are based on the functional classifications. City street improvement projects generally accompany newly developing or redeveloping areas of the city. Roadway cross-section design elements include travel lanes, curbs, furnishings/landscape strips, sidewalks on both sides of the road, and bicycle facilities. In some cases, site constraints may prevent minimum standards from being applied, and design exceptions are required.

The recommended design standards for the City of Newport presented in Chapter 4 encompass all levels of streets, trails and pathways. For full details, refer to that chapter. A summary of the key changes for network design types follows below:

- **Added Yield or Shared Streets** - A new classification for local streets was added to recognize cases where traffic volume is low (fewer than 500 vehicles daily). These cases were referred to as Yield or Shared Streets, and they allow narrower street widths (see Table 2, Chapter 4) and lower speed limits.
- **Sidewalk Minimum Width Varies** - The minimum sidewalk width was changed to be wider depending on the street classification, and fronting land use types (see Table 3, Chapter 4). For example, this allows added space for street side amenities in commercial districts.
- **Bicycle Facilities Tailored to Street Classification** - To better support an integrated bike network, the design standards were modified to better match the required bike facilities with the on-street conditions experienced by cyclists. As shown in Table 4, Chapter 4, where traffic volumes and speeds are high like on the state highways, wide and protected bike facilities are preferred. Whereas, in neighborhoods the bikes can more readily share the street with motor vehicles.
- **Minimum Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities** - These design standards apply to pedestrian trails, accessways, and shared-use pathways, showing the minimum facility width for each case (see Table 5, Chapter 4).

## ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STANDARDS AND OTHER ISSUES

A new set of standards are recommended that the City of Newport can apply during on-going development review, and when plan amendments are being considered. These new transportation standards provide staff with a quantitative basis for reviewing proposed development plans and other planning proposals that may affect local transportation conditions. The additional standards include the following:

- **Vehicle Mobility Standards** - The metrics shown in Table 6 of Chapter 4 define the thresholds of acceptable congestion on city streets for a range of intersection types. These standards can be applied to form the basis for requiring conditions of approval for pending development to ensure that the ultimate facility design matches the expected demands.
- **Multimodal Connectivity** - The spacing standards in Table 8 of Chapter 4 define the minimum and maximum spacing standards for block length, driveway spacing, setbacks, and space between ped/bike connections. The intent of these standards is to provide for efficient, safe, and timely multimodal travel, particularly in newer neighborhoods designs.

The final two sections of Chapter 4 highlight unique natural hazards facing the City of Newport, and the city's response to manage those conditions. This includes the Oregon Seismic **Lifeline Routes** that facilitate emergency evacuation and recovery routes following disasters, such as a tsunami event. This TSP includes projects that promote seismic resilience on lifeline routes, adds pedestrian or bicycle facilities on evacuation routes, and other wayfinding projects.

Also highlighted are the **street stormwater drainage management** strategies that apply to new development areas and major infrastructure improvements, such as new or expanded roadways.

These strategies are acutely important in many areas of the city, and most notably the Agate Beach neighborhood, to mitigate runoff impacts such as further erosion of coastal bluffs.

## CHAPTER 5: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

Building the updated project list for this TSP involved identifying a several new projects to specifically address new community concerns and combining them with past projects from other local transportation plans including the 2012 TSP, Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan and Yaquina Bay Recreation Site Plan. The full list of projects is referred to as Aspirational Projects.

The prioritization process was applied to the Aspirational Projects to emphasize improved system efficiency and management over adding capacity. This included four tiers (highest, high, moderate and low). These priority outcomes were then compared to city goals and objectives for the transportation investments. As a result, the higher priority solution types that address identified needs were selected unless a lower priority solution was clearly more cost-effective or better supported the goals and objectives of the city. This process allows the city to maximize use of available funds, minimize impacts to the natural and built environments, and balance investments across all modes of travel.

### PROJECT FUNDING

Each project was reviewed to assess which agency would lead the project and the likely funding source. It is important to note that these funding assumptions do not obligate any agency to commit to these projects. In general, projects were assigned to either the City of Newport or ODOT as the lead agency, with a few cases where they may jointly fund a project. Also, each project was assigned an assumed funding source, which included the City’s North Side Urban Renewal District, South Beach Urban Renewal District, and other City/State revenue. It is recognized that there may be other partnering opportunities with ODOT and Lincoln County Transit, these decisions are ultimately up to those agencies. Also, private development will also likely build TSP projects in coordination with land use actions and future development in the city.

Based on historical and forecasted funding levels, the city expects to have about \$76 million through the year 2040 for transportation projects in this TSP. This includes about \$38 million for projects in the North Side Urban Renewal District boundary and another \$38 million from other City and State funding sources for other citywide projects. And although it was not included in the TSP revenue forecast, the South Beach Urban Renewal District will also provide an additional \$3 million in funding for remaining projects in the

FUNDING SOURCE	AMOUNT AVAILABLE BY 2040
<b>NORTH SIDE URBAN RENEWAL DISTRICT</b>	\$37.9 million
<b>OTHER CITY/STATE FUNDS</b>	38.3 million
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$76.0 million</b>
<b>TOTAL ASPIRATION PROJECTS</b>	<b>\$222.5 million</b>

district boundary. This is still far below the funding required to implement all the projects in this plan, which total approximately \$222 million.

A high priority subset of the City's Aspirational Projects that are constrained to a level of funding that is expected to be available for the next 20 years is presented in Chapter 6 section of this Executive Summary. These projects are referred to as **Financially Constrained**, as they represent the city's highest value projects that can reasonably be funded with the known economic constraints through 2040.

## **SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION STUDIES**

A series of studies were conducted that provided greater depth of technical review and public engagement than is common for a TSP update. The focus of these special studies included corridor solutions along US 101 and US 20 in the downtown area, and a closer look at the feasibility, effectiveness, and cost to construct a proposed Harney Street extension. The 2012 TSP shows a proposed Harney Street extension parallel to US 101 north of US 20 to NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street that would provide alternative circulation for longer trips to relieve congestion in the downtown area.

Each of these projects represent large-scale capital investments that could significantly alter Newport's transportation network and travel patterns by increasing roadway capacity for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. In addition to mobility and access improvements, the highway corridor studies also sought to leverage economic development opportunities to revitalize the downtown commercial core area.

The following discussion summarize results of each special transportation study. Please refer to Chapter 5 and the Solutions Evaluation (Technical Memo #8) in Appendix I for full details.

**US 101 Downtown Corridor (SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street to SW Angle Street)** – Three options were considered for this corridor. Two involved forming one-way couplets with the existing highway and SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street, and one retained the highway on its current alignment. The one-way couplets would provide for southbound traffic along the present highway alignment, and northbound flow along SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The difference between the two couplets was one was longer, it began at the existing intersection of SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street and US 101, and the other was shorter, it began at SW Bayley Street. All three options would upgrade the existing roadways to meet current ODOT design standards, which would address the narrow travel lanes, and lack of bike facilities.

Based on feedback from the public and the PAC, the Long Couplet options was set aside from further review. It was agreed that the Long Couplet concept was not worth the extra investment for a longer improved facility, especially since the area around the hospital complex was already being redeveloped along the adjoining parcels nearby. The PAC suggested that the remaining two options advance for further deliberation during the public adoption process of the TSP.

**US 20 Downtown Corridor (Harney Street-Moore Drive to US 101)** – Two options were considered for this corridor. One involved forming a one-way couplet with the existing highway and NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street. In this concept, the eastbound flow would use the existing highway, while the westbound flow of traffic would use NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street. The other option was to upgrade and expand the

highway along its present alignment. Based on feedback from the public and the PAC, the preferred option was the existing two-way highway along its current alignment. However, that concept also includes provide quality bicycle facilities on parallel routes of NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street to reduce impacts to properties adjacent to the highway.

**Harney Street Extension (NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street)** – The alignment of this proposed extension was evaluated in-depth by project team engineering staff to navigate the many environmental and topographical constraints of this route. These outcomes of these engineering studies show (see Figure 38, Chapter 5) that the primary new construction would near NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street, then it bends around the hillside to the east and then connects to the existing Harney Street at NE Big Creek Road. This route was expected to carry moderate traffic volumes that would provide some relief to the US 101 corridor. However, because of the high estimated cost of the construction, at over \$40 million, the PAC recommended that this project be set aside from priority city funding at this time.

## ALTERNATE HIGHWAY MOBILITY TARGETS

As Newport grows, the mobility targets at several state highway intersections will not be met. Today, all state highway intersections comply with those mobility targets. However, by 2040, four highway intersections will exceed that target, including the US 20/US 101 intersection. For a full description, please refer to the Alternate Mobility Targets (Technical Memo #11), in Appendix L.

ODOT has a policy that allows their agency to change mobility targets within local jurisdictions to allow for higher congestion levels. To do so requires the adoption by the Oregon Transportation Commission. This policy was established because ODOT acknowledges that the limitations of its funding does not provide sufficient resources on state highway facilities to meet their preferred mobility targets. By changing the targets, the local jurisdiction can proceed with planned growth consistent with their adopted land use and transportation plans.

For Newport, the recommended change is to increase the numerical v/c ratio value to 0.99 at all state highway intersections. If enacted, this would be consistent with the numerical standard that is applied to state highway intersections in the South Beach area.

## CHAPTER 6: PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES

---

This chapter presents the transportation system improvements projects that were selected to address the system needs revealed by the technical analysis and the input from the community. The full aspirational project list that includes over 200 projects is provided in Chapter 6. For the purposes of this summary, only the **Financially Constrained** projects are shown. These represent the higher priority projects that can reasonably be funded given the available city and state transportation resources of about \$76 million through 2040.

The projects included in the Financially Constrained list are shown for each of the three major mapped areas. The list of projects is shown in a separate table for each area, and the project types are mapped separately for motor vehicle projects (auto and truck) and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The tables and maps follow this page.



- **North Map Area** – Table N.FC, Figure N.MV, Motor Vehicle Projects, and Figure N.BP, Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
- **Downtown Map Area** - Table D.FC, Figure D.MV, Motor Vehicle Projects, and Figure D.BP, Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
- **South Map Area** – Table S.FC. There were no mapped projects in this area.

TABLE N.FC: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECTS- NORTH MAP AREA

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
EXT1	<b>NW Gladys Street (from NW 55<sup>th</sup> Street to NW 60<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Improve NW Gladys Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street.	NURA	\$1,100,000	Tier 2
EXT12 **	<b>NW Nye Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Extend/Improve NW Nye Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street between NW Oceanview Drive and NW 15th Street. Cost assumes bridge will be needed, installation of a sidewalk, and signing and striping as needed to designate a shared bike route.	City/State Funds	\$3,100,000	Tier 1
REV1 **	<b>NW Oceanview Drive (from NW Nye Street Extension to NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Convert NW Oceanview Drive to one-way southbound between the NW Nye Street Extension and NW 12th Street and shift northbound vehicle traffic to NW Nye Street. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a southbound travel lane for vehicles, and an adjacent shared use path for pedestrians and bicycles. Project EXT12 must be completed before Project REV1.	City/State Funds	\$350,000	Tier 1
SW11 **	<b>SE Benton Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SE 10th Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$3,050,000	Tier 2
SW13 **	<b>NW Nye Street (from W Olive Street to NW 15th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$4,450,000	Tier 2
SW14 **	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$2,150,000	Tier 2
SW16	<b>NW Edenvue Way/NE 20th Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NE Crestview Drive)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$2,475,000	Tier 2
SW19 **	<b>NW 8th Street/NW Spring Street (from NW Coast Street to NW 11th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$1,175,000	Tier 2
SW20	<b>NW Gladys Street/NW 55th Street (from NW 60th Street to US 101)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	NURA	\$1,425,000	Tier 2

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
<b>SW21</b>	<b>US 101 (from NW 25th Street to NE 31st Street)</b> Construct pedestrian path on east side of US 101. Cost assumes 10-ft wide sidewalk with sheet pile wall.	NURA	\$3,100,000	Tier 1
<b>TR1</b>	<b>NW Oceanview Drive (from US 101 to NW Nye Street Extension)</b> Construct a shared use path on one side. The short term improvement along this segment included in Project BR15.	City/State Funds	\$4,775,000	Tier 1
<b>TR3</b>	<b>US 101 (from NW Lighthouse Drive to NW Oceanview Drive)</b> Construct a shared use path on the west side of US 101, with sidewalk infill on the east side. Shared use path project should be consistent with previous planning efforts (e.g., Agate Beach Historic Bicycle/Pedestrian Path, Lighthouse to Lighthouse Path). Cost included with Project TR8.	Federal Funds/ NURA	Included with Project TR8	Tier 1
<b>TR6 **</b>	<b>NE Big Creek Road (from NE Fogarty Street to NE Harney Street)</b> Reconfigure the roadway to provide a shared use path. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a one-way 12 ft. travel lane and an adjacent shared use path.	City/State Funds	\$450,000	Tier 1
<b>TR7</b>	<b>NW Rocky Way (from NW 55th Street to NW Lighthouse Drive)</b> Construct a shared use path and other improvements as identified by the BLM/FHWA. Cost included with Project TR8.	Federal Funds/ NURA	Included with Project TR8	Tier 1
<b>TR8</b>	<b>NW Lighthouse Drive (from US 101 to terminus)</b> Construct a shared use path on one side and other improvements as identified by the BLM/FHWA. Cost includes pedestrian/bicycle crossing improvements at the intersection of US 101/NW Lighthouse Drive, and Projects TR3 and TR7.	Federal Funds/ NURA	\$4,000,000	Tier 1
<b>BR1 **</b>	<b>NE 12th Street (from NE Benton Street to NE Fogarty Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Tier 1
<b>BR2</b>	<b>NE Harney Street/NE 36th Street (from NE Big Creek Road to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate as interim shared bike route. Long term, on-street bike lanes to be provided as part of the Harney Street extension (Project EXT4). Cost assumes interim improvement only.	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
<b>BR3 **</b>	<b>NE Eads Street (from NE 1st Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
<b>BR9</b>	<b>NW Edenvue Way/NE 20th Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW Crestview Drive)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Restripe through US 101/NE 20th Street intersection to provide on-street bike lanes between the NW Edenvue Way/NW 20 <sup>th</sup> Street intersection and the eastern Fred Meyer Driveway.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
<b>BR10</b>	<b>NW 60th Street/NW Gladys Street/NW 55th Street (from US 101 to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route through Agate Beach.	NURA	\$25,000	Tier 1
<b>BR12</b>	<b>NE Avery Street/NE 71st Street (from US 101 to NE Echo Court)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
<b>BR15</b>	<b>NW Oceanview Drive Interim Improvements (from US 101 to NW Nye Street Extension)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate as an interim bike route and implement other improvements as identified in the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan. Long term improvement along this segment included in Project TR1.	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
<b>BR16</b>	<b>NW 55th Street (from NW Gladys Street to NW Pinery Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	NURA	\$50,000	Tier 1
<b>BR19 **</b>	<b>NW Spring Street/NW Coast Street/SW Alder Street/SW Neff Way (from NW 12th Street to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
<b>BL2 **</b>	<b>NW Nye Street/SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street (from NW 15th Street to SW Hubert Street)</b> Restripe NW Nye Street to include on-street bicycle lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side only) between NW 15 <sup>th</sup> Street and SW 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street. Install signing and striping to designate SW 7th Street a shared bike route between SW 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and SW Hubert Street.	City/State Funds	\$100,000	Tier 1
<b>BL8 **</b>	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side, although on-street parking may be impacted on both sides between NW Lake Street and NW Nye Street).	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
	<b>SW Angle Street/SW 10th Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SW 9th Street to Frank Wade Park)</b>			
<b>BL11 **</b>	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side between NE 12th Street and US 20). Install signing and striping to designate NE Benton Street a shared bike route between NE 12 <sup>th</sup> Street and NE Chambers Street/Frank Wade Park. Note 5 ft. bike lanes assumed between US 20 and SE 2nd Street. Construct with Project CR2.	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 60th Street/US 101</b>			
<b>CR1</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 55th Street/US 101</b>			
<b>CR3</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 68th Street/US 101</b>			
<b>CR8</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 58th/US 101</b>			
<b>CR10</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 8th/US 101</b>			
<b>CR16 **</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>Transportation Demand Management</b>			
<b>PRO2 ***</b>	Implement strategies to enhance transit use in Newport. Specific strategies could include public information, stop enhancements, route refinement, or expanded service hours.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 2
	<b>Neighborhood Traffic Management</b>			
<b>PRO3 ***</b>	Implement a neighborhood traffic calming program.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
-------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------

Notes: Financially Constrained = projects likely to be funded.

\* "INT" represents an intersection improvement project; "EXT" represents a roadway extension project; "REV" represents an existing roadway improvement or reconfiguration project; "SW" represents a sidewalk improvement project; "TR" represents a trail or shared use path improvement project; "BR" represents a bike route improvement project; "SBL" represents an improvement project to add separated or buffered bike lanes; "BL" represents an improvement project to add standard bike lanes; "CR" represents a roadway crossing improvement project; "PRO" represents a citywide demand or system management project.

\*\* Project overlaps two of the map areas and is therefore displayed in both project tables and corresponding maps.

\*\*\* Project is not displayed on a map but applies in the north map area.

Project Horizon: Tier 1 = Years 1 to 10; Tier 2 = Years 11 to 20

FIGURE N.MV: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS- NORTH MAP AREA





FIGURE N.MV: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED MULTIMODAL PROJECTS- NORTH MAP AREA





**TABLE D.FC: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECTS- DOWNTOWN MAP AREA**

<b>PROJECT ID*</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</b>	<b>ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)</b>	<b>PRIORITY HORIZON</b>
	<b>US 101/US 20</b>			
<b>INT4</b>	Construct a second southbound left turn lane. Requires a signal modification, widening along US 101 and along the south side of US 20 to support a second receiving lane, and conversion of the US 101/NE 1 <sup>st</sup> Street intersection to right-in, right-out movements only.	NURA	\$5,000,000	Tier 1
	<b>US 20/SE Moore Drive/NE Harney Street</b>			
<b>INT6</b>	Improve the intersection with a traffic signal (with separate left turn lanes on the northbound and southbound approaches). Coordinate improvements with Project SBL1.	NURA	\$1,050,000	Tier 1
	<b>US 101/SW 40th Street</b>			
<b>INT9</b>	Improve the intersection with a traffic signal. Cost assumes installation of a traffic signal, curb ramps, striping, signing and repaving, as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan.	SBURA	\$1,550,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW Nye Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street)</b>			
<b>EXT12 **</b>	Extend/Improve NW Nye Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street between NW Oceanview Drive and NW 15th Street. Cost assumes bridge will be needed, installation of a sidewalk, and signing and striping as needed to designate a shared bike route.	City/State Funds	\$3,100,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW Oceanview Drive (from NW Nye Street Extension to NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street)</b>			
<b>REV1 **</b>	Convert NW Oceanview Drive to one-way southbound between the NW Nye Street Extension and NW 12th Street and shift northbound vehicle traffic to NW Nye Street. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a southbound travel lane for vehicles, and an adjacent shared use path for pedestrians and bicycles. Project EXT12 must be completed before Project REV1.	City/State Funds	\$350,000	Tier 1
	<b>Yaquina Bay Bridge Refinement Plan</b>			
<b>REV5</b>	Conduct a study to identify the preferred alignment of a replacement bridge, typical cross-section, implementation, and feasibility, and implement long-term recommendations from the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan.	City/State Funds	\$500,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
REV6	<b>US 101 and SW 9th Street (from SW Abbey Street to SW Angle Street)</b> Convert US 101 to one-way southbound between SW Abbey Street and SW Angle Street, and shift northbound US 101 to SW 9th Street. Cost assumes cross-sections as identified in Chapter 5 of this TSP, construction of new roadway segments to transition northbound traffic to and from SW 9th Street, and some intersection and crossing improvements. Specific treatments will be identified during design phase of the project.	NURA	\$11,700,000	Tier 1
	<b>US 20 (from US 101 to NE Harney Street)</b> Enhance the existing street cross-section with widened sidewalks and new landscape buffers. Cost assumes cross-sections as identified in Chapter 5 of this TSP, with on-street bicycle lanes only provided between SE Fogarty Street and NE Harney Street. Requires a design exception and documented public acceptance. Parallel bicycle facilities provided between US 101 and SE Fogarty Street in Project BR5, TR12 and BL3.	NURA	\$6,500,000	Tier 1
SW2	<b>NE 3rd Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Harney Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$950,000	Tier 2
SW3	<b>SW Elizabeth Street (from W Olive Street to SW Government Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$2,600,000	Tier 2
SW6	<b>NE 7th Street (from NE Eads Street to NE 6th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$2,175,000	Tier 2
SW8	<b>NE Harney Street (from US 20 to NE 3rd Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	NURA	\$700,000	Tier 2
SW11 **	<b>SE Benton Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SE 10th Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$3,050,000	Tier 2
SW12	<b>SW 2nd Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW Nye Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$1,275,000	Tier 2
SW13 **	<b>NW Nye Street (from W Olive Street to NW 15th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$4,450,000	Tier 2

<b>PROJECT ID*</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</b>	<b>ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)</b>	<b>PRIORITY HORIZON</b>
<b>SW14</b> **	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$2,150,000	Tier 2
<b>SW18</b>	<b>SE 35th Street (from SE Ferry Slip Road to South Beach Manor Memory Care)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan.	SBURA	\$750,000	Tier 1
<b>SW19</b> **	<b>NW 8th Street/NW Spring Street (from NW Coast Street to NW 11th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	City/State Funds	\$1,175,000	Tier 2
<b>SW29</b>	<b>US 101 (from SE Ferry Slip Road to SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Complete the sidewalk gaps on the east side.	City/State Funds	\$425,000	Tier 2
<b>TR6</b> **	<b>NE Big Creek Road (from NE Fogarty Street to NE Harney Street)</b> Reconfigure the roadway to provide a shared use path. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a one-way 12 ft. travel lane and an adjacent shared use path.	City/State Funds	\$450,000	Tier 1
<b>TR12</b>	<b>SE 1st Street (from SE Douglas Street to SE Fogarty Street)</b> Construct a shared use path. Cost assumes bridge will be needed.	NURA	\$2,550,000	Tier 1
<b>BR1</b> **	<b>NE 12th Street (from NE Benton Street to NE Fogarty Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Tier 1
<b>BR3</b> **	<b>NE Eads Street (from NE 1st Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
<b>BR5</b>	<b>SE 1st Street (from SE Coos Street to SE Fogarty Street), SE Fogarty Street (from US 20 to SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street), and SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (SE Fogarty Street to SE Moore Drive)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Project TR12 must be completed before/with Project BR5.	NURA	\$25,000	Tier 1
<b>BR7</b>	<b>SW 2nd Street/SW Angle Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW 10th Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Specific intersection treatments at US 101 and SW 9 <sup>th</sup> Street intersections to be determined with Project REV6.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
BR13	<b>NW 3rd Street (from US 101 to NW Cliff Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
BR14	<b>Yaquina Bay Bridge Interim Improvements</b> Install signing as needed to designate a bike route and implement other improvements as identified in the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan such as flashing warning lights or advisory speed signs.	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
BR17	<b>NW 6th Street (from NW Coast Street to NW Nye Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Tier 1
BR18	<b>NE 7th Street/NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Laurel Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
BR19 **	<b>NW Spring Street/NW Coast Street/SW Alder Street/SW Neff Way (from NW 12th Street to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
SBL1	<b>SE Moore Drive/NE Harney Street (from SE Bay Boulevard to NE 7th Street)</b> Restripe to install buffered bike lanes between SE Bay Boulevard and US 20; Widen to install buffered bike lanes between US 20 and NE Yaquina Heights Drive; Restripe and upgrade the existing on-street bike lanes between NE Yaquina Heights Drive and NE 7th Street (project removes on-street parking on one side only). Coordinate improvements through the US 20 intersection with Project INT6.	NURA	\$825,000	Tier 1
SBL2	<b>US 101 (from Yaquina Bay Bridge to SW Abbey Street)</b> Construct a separated bicycle facility on US 101. Note the specified facility design and project extents are subject to review and modification.	NURA	\$1,350,000	Tier 1
SBL4	<b>US 101 (from Yaquina Bay Bridge to SE 35th Street)</b> Construct a separated bicycle facility on US 101. Note the specified facility design and project extents are subject to review and modification.	City/State Funds	\$925,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
	<b>SW Canyon Way (from SW 9th Street to SW Bay Boulevard)</b>			
BL1	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes in uphill direction and mark sharrows in the downhill direction (project may require conversion of angle parking near SW Bay Boulevard to parallel parking).	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW Nye Street/SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street (from NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street to SW Hubert Street)</b>			
BL2 **	Restripe NW Nye Street to include on-street bicycle lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side only) between NW 15 <sup>th</sup> Street and SW 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street. Install signing and striping to designate SW 7 <sup>th</sup> Street a shared bike route between SW 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and SW Hubert Street.	City/State Funds	\$100,000	Tier 1
	<b>NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street (from US 101/NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street intersection to US 20/NE Fogarty Street intersection)</b>			
BL3	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).	NURA	\$100,000	Tier 1
	<b>SW 9th Street (from US 101 to SW Fall Street)</b>			
BL4	Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking).	NURA	\$465,000	Tier 1
	<b>SW Bayley Street (from US 101 to SW Elizabeth Street)</b>			
BL5	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).	NURA	\$25,000	Tier 1
	<b>SW Hubert Street (from SW 9th Street to SW 2nd Street)</b>			
BL6	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (existing angle parking will be converted to parallel parking on one side). Specific intersection treatments at US 101 and SW 9 <sup>th</sup> Street intersections to be determined with Project REV6.	NURA	\$25,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW/NE 6th Street (from NW Nye Street to NE Eads Street)</b>			
BL7	Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).	City/State Funds	\$775,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b>			
BL8 **	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side, although on-street parking may be impacted on both sides between NW Lake Street and NW Nye Street).	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Tier 1
	<b>NE 3rd Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Harney Street)</b>			
BL9	Widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes.	City/State Funds	\$525,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
	<b>SW Angle Street/SW 10th Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SW 9th Street to Frank Wade Park)</b>			
<b>BL11 **</b>	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side between NE 12th Street and US 20). Install signing and striping to designate NE Benton Street a shared bike route between NE 12 <sup>th</sup> Street and NE Chambers Street/Frank Wade Park. Note 5 ft. bike lanes assumed between US 20 and SE 2nd Street. Construct with Project CR2.	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>SW Elizabeth Street (from SW Government Street to W Olive Street)</b>			
<b>BL12</b>	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Tier 1
	<b>W Olive Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to US 101)</b>			
<b>BL13</b>	Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side). Note project requires modification of existing curb extensions at Coast Street; on-street bike lanes may terminate prior to the US 101 intersection to provide space for turn pockets.	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Tier 1
	<b>Yaquina Bay Road (from SE Moore Drive to SE Running Spring)</b>			
<b>BL14</b>	Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes.	City/State Funds	\$1,625,000	Tier 1
	<b>SE Coos Street/US 20</b>			
<b>CR2</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle route crossing. Construct with Project BL11.	NURA	\$200,000	Tier 1
	<b>NE Fogarty Street/US 20</b>			
<b>CR4</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle route crossing. This intersection should be designed to facilitate bicycle turn movements from US 20 on-street bike facilities to/from parallel bike facilities on side streets to the north and south. Construct with Project BR5 and/or Project BL3.	NURA	\$200,000	Tier 1
	<b>SE 32nd Street/US 101</b>			
<b>CR6</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	City/State Funds	\$100,000	Tier 1
	<b>SW Naterlin Drive/US 101</b>			
<b>CR7</b>	Improve pedestrian connections between Yaquina Bay Bridge and downtown Newport through pedestrian wayfinding, marked crossings, and other traffic control measures.	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Tier 1
	<b>NW 8th/US 101</b>			
<b>CR16 **</b>	Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PRIORITY HORIZON
CR18	<b>SW Bay/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	NURA	\$150,000	Tier 1
PRO1 ***	<b>Parking Management</b> Implement additional parking management strategies for the Nye Beach and Bayfront Areas. Strategies could include metering, permits, or other time restrictions.	City Funds	\$600,000	Tier 1
PRO2 ***	<b>Transportation Demand Management</b> Implement strategies to enhance transit use in Newport. Specific strategies could include public information, stop enhancements, route refinement, or expanded service hours.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 2
PRO3 ***	<b>Neighborhood Traffic Management</b> Implement a neighborhood traffic calming program.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 1

Notes: Financially Constrained = projects likely to be funded.

\* "INT" represents an intersection improvement project; "EXT" represents a roadway extension project; "REV" represents an existing roadway improvement or reconfiguration project; "SW" represents a sidewalk improvement project; "TR" represents a trail or shared use path improvement project; "BR" represents a bike route improvement project; "SBL" represents an improvement project to add separated or buffered bike lanes; "BL" represents an improvement project to add standard bike lanes; "CR" represents a roadway crossing improvement project; "PRO" represents a citywide demand or system management project.

\*\* Project overlaps two of the map areas and is therefore displayed in both project tables and corresponding maps.

\*\*\* Project is not displayed on a map but applies in the downtown map area.

Project Horizon: Tier 1 = Years 1 to 10; Tier 2 = Years 11 to 20

**FIGURE D.MV: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS- DOWNTOWN MAP AREA**







FIGURE D.BP: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED MULTIMODAL PROJECTS- DOWNTOWN



**TABLE S.FC: FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECTS – SOUTH MAP AREA**

<b>PROJECT ID*</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</b>	<b>ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)</b>	<b>PRIORITY HORIZON</b>
<b>South Beach Improvements</b>				
<b>TR13 **</b>	Pedestrian and bicycle priority improvements as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan. This project does not include the cost associated with Project SW18.	SBURA	\$700,000	Tier 1
<b>Transportation Demand Management</b>				
<b>PRO2 **</b>	Implement strategies to enhance transit use in Newport. Specific strategies could include public information, stop enhancements, route refinement, or expanded service hours.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 2
<b>Neighborhood Traffic Management</b>				
<b>PRO3 **</b>	Implement a neighborhood traffic calming program.	City Funds	\$475,000	Tier 1

Notes: Financially Constrained = projects likely to be funded.

\* "TR" represents a trail or shared use path improvement project; "PRO" represents a citywide demand or system management project.

\*\* Project is not displayed on a map but applies in the south map area.

Project Horizon: Tier 1 = Years 1 to 10; Tier 2 = Years 11 to 20

Each of the financially constrained projects within the South Map area are either program management investments, or a broad set of system improvements that cannot be readily mapped. Therefore, this projects do not have a specific map of locations.

## CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

---

The City of Newport TSP update incorporates several elements that require further action to facilitate full implementation of the plan.

### SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING OPTIONS

Providing adequate funding for capital investments and on-going maintenance of transportation systems and services is a major challenge. In addition to the two Urban Renewal Districts, the City is encouraged to seek more funding opportunities to advance projects sooner. In general, the best candidates are a transportation utility fee, a local fuel tax increase, and a short-term property tax levy. However, given that the city recently put a local gas tax increase on the voter ballot that failed, perhaps the other options could be further pursued.

**ACTION: Pursue and enact supplemental local transportation funding option.**

### NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TOOLS

The Transportation System Plan identifies a new classification of city streets that are the best candidates for applying neighborhood traffic management (NTM) strategies. The challenge with a NTM program is to identify a clear and objective process for collecting community inputs, assessing the prevailing concerns, and evaluating which, if any, NTM solution is appropriate to be installed. This will require developing guidelines about which NTM strategies are best for Newport, and where and how they are to be applied. In addition, many cities balance the technical review process with a consensus opinion of the affected neighbors to help ensure community satisfaction with the NTM decision.

**ACTION: It is recommended that city develop and implement a NTM program that formalizes these processes.**

### STREET CROSSINGS

Streets with high traffic volumes and/or speeds in areas with significant volume of pedestrian activity generally require enhanced street crossings with treatments to improve the safety and convenience for pedestrians. The TSP includes several crossing enhancements; however, the city should also update their development code to match the Transportation Facility and Access Spacing Standards stated in the TSP.

**ACTION: Update Municipal Code to incorporate street and access spacing standards identified in the TSP for city streets**

Similarly, on state highways enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments should be considered on high speed or high-volume roads (*e.g.* US 101, US 20). To ensure these types of treatments are considered during the development review process, the city guidelines for traffic impact studies should be updated to require these types of studies.

**ACTION: Amend the city's traffic impact analysis guidelines to include review of pedestrian crossing treatments consistent with NCHRP Report 562.**

## **VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS**

The City of Newport does not have adopted mobility standards for motor vehicles. The city should amend its mobility standards for planning and development review to establish clear guidelines for selecting intersection design solutions.

**ACTION: Amend city development code to introduce vehicle mobility standards on city streets consistent with the TSP (see specifics in Chapter 7).**

# City of Newport

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

FEBRUARY 2022



# **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

## **PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)**

Rich Belloni  
Bob Berman  
Ralph Breitenstein  
Rosa Coppola  
Tomas Follett  
Jeff Hollen  
Roy Kinion  
Judy Kuhl  
Fran Matthews  
Lyle Mattson  
Bryn McCornack  
Linda Niegebauer  
Dean Sawyer  
Roland Woodcock

## **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

Beatriz Botello, Councilor  
Dietmar Goebel, Councilor  
CM Hall, Council President  
Cynthia Jacobi, Councilor  
Jan Kaplan, Councilor  
Ryan Parker, Councilor  
Dean Sawyer, Mayor

## **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Bob Berman, Commissioner  
Bill Branigan, Commissioner  
Gary East, Commissioner  
Braulio Escobar, Commissioner  
James Hanselman, Commissioner  
Lee Hardy, Commissioner  
Jim Patrick, Commissioner

## **PROJECT TEAM**

### **CITY OF NEWPORT**

Aaron Collett, City Engineer

Chris Janigo, Acting City Engineer

Spencer Nebel, City Manager

Clare Paul, Assistant City Engineer

Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director

### **OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

James Feldmann, Senior Planner

### **DKS ASSOCIATES**

Carl Springer, Project Manager

Kevin Chewuk, Senior Transportation Planner

Rochelle Starrett, Associate Transportation Planner

Melissa Abadie, Communications Manager

### **SERA ARCHITECTS**

Ben Weber

Matthew Arnold

### **JLA**

Brandy Steffan

Ariella Frishberg

### **ANGELO PLANNING GROUP**

Andrew Parrish

Darci Rudzinski

### **HARPER HOUF PETERSON RIGHELLIS**

Chris Beatty

# CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
NEWPORT AT A GLANCE .....	2
Key Transportation opportunities and Challenges.....	6
PURPOSE OF THE TSP .....	9
SETTING DIRECTION FOR THE PLAN .....	10
Vision for the Plan .....	11
Goals and Objectives for the Plan .....	11
Supplemental Strategies .....	17
PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING PROCESS .....	18
DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE .....	18
PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT.....	19
Summary of Community Feedback .....	20
TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT .....	21
<b>CHAPTER 3: NEWPORT TODAY AND TOMORROW.....</b>	<b>22</b>
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION.....	22
POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH .....	29
TRAVEL DEMANDS.....	30
Visiting Household Trips .....	31
Commuter Trips .....	32
Commercial Activity Trips .....	32
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FACTS .....	33
ROADWAY NETWORK .....	34
Intersection Operations.....	34
Bridges and Tunnels .....	35
Parking .....	36
PEDESTRIAN NETWORK .....	37
Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress.....	37
Methodology used to Identify TSP Pedestrian Projects.....	39
BICYCLE NETWORK .....	39
Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress.....	40
Methodology used to Identify TSP Bicycle Projects.....	41
TRANSIT .....	41
Transit Development Plan.....	42
FREIGHT NETWORK .....	43
AIRPORT .....	44



WATERWAYS.....	44
<b>CHAPTER 4: SYSTEM DESIGN &amp; MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES.....</b>	<b>45</b>
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION .....	45
Arterial Streets.....	46
Major Collector Streets.....	46
Neighborhood Collector Streets .....	46
Local Streets.....	47
FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES .....	51
State and Federal Freight Routes.....	51
Local Truck Routes .....	51
MULTIMODAL NETWORK DESIGN .....	55
Travel Lanes and Parking .....	56
SIDEWALKS .....	59
BICYCLE FACILITIES .....	61
MINIMUM STREET CROSS-SECTIONS .....	62
SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES.....	66
Pedestrian Trail.....	66
Accessway.....	66
Shared Use Path.....	66
VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS .....	67
Multimodal Connectivity .....	68
LIFELINE ROUTES .....	70
STREET STORMWATER DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT .....	70
Agate Beach Stormwater Considerations .....	71
<b>CHAPTER 5: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>72</b>
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING PROJECTS .....	72
PROJECT FUNDING .....	73
SPECIAL STUDIES.....	74
US 101 Circulation Options .....	75
US 20 Circulation Options.....	79
US 101/US 20 Intersection Options.....	80
Harney Street Extension.....	80
Alternative Highway Mobility Targets .....	83
<b>CHAPTER 6: PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES.....</b>	<b>84</b>
ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS .....	84
PRIORITIZING ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS .....	85
Financially Constrained Projects .....	86
Unconstrained Projects.....	86

Aspirational Project Table and Figures .....	87
--	----

**CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION AND ON-GOING STRATEGIES ..... 122**

STEPS TO SUPPORT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION .....	122
supplemental Funding Options .....	122
Neighborhood traffic management tools .....	123
Street Crossings.....	124
Vehicle Mobility Standards.....	125
ON-GOING ISSUES AND AREAS OF EMPHASIS .....	126
Yaquina Bay Bridge.....	126
Ferry .....	126
Other issues .....	126

**VOLUME 2: APPENDIX .....**

APPENDIX A- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #1: PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY .....	III
APPENDIX B- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #2: PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY .....	IV
APPENDIX C- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #3: REGULATORY REVIEW.....	V
APPENDIX D- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #4: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA.....	VI
APPENDIX E- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #5: EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS.....	VII
APPENDIX F- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #6: FUTURE TRAFFIC FORECAST.....	VIII
APPENDIX G- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #7: FUTURE TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND NEEDS .....	IX
APPENDIX H- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #8: SOLUTIONS EVALUATION .....	X
APPENDIX I- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #9: FINANCE PROGRAM .....	XI
APPENDIX J- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #10: TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS.....	XII
APPENDIX K- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #11: ALTERNATE MOBILITY TARGETS .....	XIII
APPENDIX L- PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY .....	XIV
APPENDIX M- CITY OF NEWPORT TSP STORMWATER CONSIDERATIONS .....	XV

# LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (NORTH) ..... 3

FIGURE 2: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (DOWNTOWN) ..... 4

FIGURE 3: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (SOUTH) ..... 5

FIGURE 4: KEY DEMOGRAPHICS ..... 6

FIGURE 5: REQUIREMENTS OF A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN ..... 9

FIGURE 4: DIRECTION FOR THE PLAN ..... 10

FIGURE 7: PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING PROCESS ..... 18

FIGURE 8: NEWPORT TSP ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES ..... 19

FIGURE 9: PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT FACTS ..... 20

FIGURE 10: NEWPORT TSP DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL TASKS ..... 21

FIGURE 11: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (NORTH) ..... 23

FIGURE 12: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (DOWNTOWN) ..... 24

FIGURE 13: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (SOUTH)..... 25

FIGURE 14: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (NORTH) ..... 26

FIGURE 15: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (DOWNTOWN) ..... 27

FIGURE 16: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (SOUTH) ..... 28

FIGURE 17: NEWPORT POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH TRENDS ..... 29

FIGURE 18: NEWPORT VEHICLE TRIP ENDS (PM PEAK HOUR) ..... 30

FIGURE 19: NEWPORT VISITING HOUSEHOLDS ..... 31

FIGURE 20: NEWPORT COMMUTER MODE SHARE ..... 32

FIGURE 21: NEWPORT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FACTS ..... 33

FIGURE 22: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (NORTH) ..... 48

FIGURE 23: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (DOWNTOWN)..... 49

FIGURE 24: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (SOUTH) ..... 50

FIGURE 25: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (NORTH) ..... 52

FIGURE 26: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (DOWNTOWN) ..... 53

FIGURE 27: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (SOUTH) ..... 54

FIGURE 28: YIELD STREETS ..... 56

FIGURE 29: SIDEWALK ZONES .....	59
FIGURE 30: CITY MAJOR COLLECTOR (COMMERCIAL AREA) CROSS-SECTION .....	62
FIGURE 31: CITY MAJOR COLLECTOR (NON-COMMERCIAL AREA) CROSS-SECTION .....	63
FIGURE 32: CITY NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR CROSS-SECTION .....	64
FIGURE 33: CITY LOCAL STREET CROSS-SECTION .....	64
FIGURE 34: CITY LOCAL YIELD STREET CROSS-SECTION .....	64
FIGURE 35: CITY LOCAL SHARED STREET CROSS-SECTION .....	65
FIGURE 36: EXPECTED TRANSPORTATION FUNDING COMPARED TO PROJECT EXPENSES .....	74
FIGURE 37: US 101 SHORT COUPLET CIRCULATION OPTION .....	76
FIGURE 38: US 101 TWO-WAY CIRCULATION OPTION .....	77
FIGURE 39: PREFERRED US 20 CIRCULATION OPTION .....	80
FIGURE 40: HARNEY STREET EXTENSION CONCEPTUAL ALIGNMENT .....	82
FIGURE 41: LEVEL OF INVESTMENT BY MODE OF TRAVEL .....	85
FIGURE 42: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (NORTH) .....	116
FIGURE 43: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (NORTH) .....	117
FIGURE 44: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (DOWNTOWN) .....	118
FIGURE 45: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (DOWNTOWN) .....	119
FIGURE 46: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (SOUTH) .....	120
FIGURE 47: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (SOUTH) .....	121

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: EXPECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON THE YAQUINA BAY BRIDGE .....	36
TABLE 2: TRAVEL LANE AND ON-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS .....	58
TABLE 3: MINIMUM SIDEWALK CONFIGURATION .....	60
TABLE 4: MINIMUM BICYCLE FACILITIES .....	61
TABLE 5: MINIMUM SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITY DESIGNS .....	66
TABLE 6: VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR CITY STREETS .....	67
TABLE 7: EXISTING MOBILITY TARGETS FOR US 20 AND US 101 .....	68
TABLE 8: TRANSPORTATION FACILITY AND ACCESS SPACING STANDARDS .....	69

TABLE 9: EVALUATION OF THE US 101 ALTERNATIVES ..... 78  
TABLE 10: ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS ..... 88  
TABLE 11: SELECTED SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING OPTIONS .....123  
TABLE 12: RECOMMENDED VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR LOCAL STREETS.....125



# Chapter 1: Executive Summary

[PLACEHOLDER - TO BE WRITTEN LATER]




# Chapter 2: Transportation System Context

This chapter introduces Newport and describes what a Transportation System Plan (TSP) is and how it was developed. The process involved a formal decision-making structure, community engagement, and a structured technical analysis.

## NEWPORT AT A GLANCE

Located along the shores of the Pacific Ocean and Yaquina Bay, Newport is a dynamic City with neighborhoods that cater to residents and visitors of all ages and interests. The population of permanent residents in the City is 10,125, but that can rise to 25,000 during a summer day, as visitors are drawn to the City’s beachfront, numerous outdoor activities, attractions, eateries, shopping and more. It is home to an active fishing industry, miles of sandy beaches, Oregon State University’s Hatfield Marine Science Center, the Oregon Coast Aquarium, and the home port of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Marine Operations Center-Pacific. Several neighborhoods are within Newport including Agate Beach, the Deco District (aka Downtown Newport), Nye Beach, Bayfront and South Beach, each with its own unique character.



SUMMER POPULATION

**25,000**

PERMANENT POPULATION

**10,125**


### POPULAR DESTINATIONS

- THE OREGON COAST AQUARIUM
- HATFIELD MARINE SCIENCE CENTER
- YAQUINA HEAD LIGHTHOUSE
- NEWPORT PERFORMING ARTS CENTER
- HISTORIC BAYFRONT
- YAQUINA BAY STATE PARK
- NYE BEACH
- NEWPORT VISUAL ARTS CENTER

### MAJOR EMPLOYERS

- THE OREGON COAST AQUARIUM
- HATFIELD MARINE SCIENCE CENTER
- PACIFIC SEAFOOD
- NOAA
- ROGUE BREWING

FIGURE 1: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (NORTH)





**FIGURE 2: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (DOWNTOWN)**





FIGURE 3: KEY TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES (SOUTH)




## NEWPORT DEMOGRAPHICS

Residents of Newport have a median age of 46 years and just over half, 51%, of all residents are within the peak working age range. Also shown in Figure 4, about one-third (31 percent) of the population is over the age of 62. The City has similar demographics with the rest of Lincoln County in terms of the share below the poverty income level, 17 percent, and people with disabilities, 20 percent, while 7 percent speak limited English. These demographics are significantly different from those of the State, with the City accounting for a 10 percent larger share of residents aged over 62 and up to a 5 percent greater share of residents living below the poverty level, with a disability, or speaking limited English. The source for the Newport demographic data was taken from the American Community Survey, 2015 to 2019, as reported by the US Census Bureau.

As growth continues in the City, it will likely to show a higher share of older residents choosing to retire on the coast compared to other areas of the State, which influences the likelihood of more residents living on limited retirement incomes or having a disability. The City will also likely continue to see younger people and families choosing to visit and live in Newport, and likewise will continue to see people of all ages and abilities walking, biking and using transit.

FIGURE 4: KEY DEMOGRAPHICS



## KEY TRANSPORTATION OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Newport faces the challenge of accommodating population and employment growth while maintaining acceptable service levels on its transportation network. The transportation system must accommodate highway through traffic, residents, and thousands of tourists who are here in the summer and over holiday weekends. With limited funding for transportation improvements, and built and natural environment challenges, the City must balance its investments to ensure that it can develop and maintain the transportation system adequately to serve the City and everyone who travels in it. Some of the key transportation opportunities and challenges in the City are summarized below, with more details provided in Chapter 3 of this TSP.

### US 101 and US 20

U.S. Highway 101 (US 101) and U.S. Highway 20 (US 20) are the backbone of Newport's transportation network. US 101 runs north and south through the City, connecting coastal communities along the entire west coast of the United States, while US 20 runs east and west through the City, connecting it to Corvallis, Interstate 5 and eventually Boston, Massachusetts 3,365 miles to the east. These roadways intersect in the downtown area forming one of the most complex intersections in the City. These statewide highways serve as designated freight routes along all of US 20 and the northern portion of US 101, specifically the section north of US 20 which serves the primary commercial centers. Because these highways carry the highest levels of traffic

in the city, they present many great opportunities, but also bring many challenges. Each day these highways bring thousands of visitors and economic opportunities for the City. These visitors often arrive in a mix of large recreation vehicles or towing trailers that must traverse narrow and busy sections of streets through the City. These highways were designed and built in an era that focused on serving motor vehicle traffic, and they lag behind ODOT's current vision of a complete multimodal street facility. As a result, this creates conflicts with parked vehicles, and often leads to uncomfortable and difficult walking and biking conditions for residents and visitors along and across these highways.

## **Downtown**

US 101 runs through Newport's downtown area and the historic heart of the City, spanning both sides of US 101 between US 20 and Yaquina Bay to the north and south, and Bayfront and Nye Beach neighborhoods to the east and west. The central city is an area where many of the properties are underutilized or in economic distress with vacant storefronts and aging, poorly maintained buildings. The City established an urban renewal district in 2015 to generate funding to revitalize the area and is considering how the transportation system can be redefined to catalyze economic development and provide infrastructure needed to support additional density. The downtown area is home to many shopping, dining, cultural, and City service establishments and has emerged as a destination for residents and visitors alike. The increased energy draws many people who walk, ride bikes and take transit to and from nearby neighborhoods and along and across streets throughout downtown. Many more people drive vehicles and park within the area, and then walk or bike. Streets will need to be repurposed and reimagined to complement the street side activity, support desired economic development and balance the expected uptick in travel among all travel modes.

## **Yaquina Bay Bridge**

Just to the south of Newport's downtown area is Yaquina Bay and the iconic Yaquina Bay Bridge. Here the structure serves US 101 and spans 3,223 feet across Yaquina Bay. It opened in 1936 and provides the only crossing of Yaquina Bay and connection to the South Beach area of the City and its major employment and recreational destinations. With one travel lane in each direction, today the bridge carries nearly 17,000 motor vehicles per day during the summer and 14,000 per day during an average weekday. With narrow roadway-adjacent walkways and no separated bicycle facilities, the crossing is often uncomfortable and challenging for pedestrians and bicyclists.

In 2013, ODOT placed weight limit restrictions on this bridge considering the degraded maintenance conditions of the structure, particularly as it relates to seismic events. This weight limitation was intended to prolong the effective service life of the bridge before major reconstruction would be required. The current estimate for replacing the bridge exceeds \$200 million. Given the uncertainty of the bridge's viability long-term, the Newport City Council requested a statement from ODOT regarding their plans for this facility. In a letter dated February 4, 2021, the ODOT Director responded and indicated that the Yaquina Bay Bridge is on their Seismic Resilience Plan, and a specific date for funding major construction is uncertain at this time. However, the letter did also indicate that based on their understanding to date, retaining the bridge

essentially in its current location would be the preferred option to minimize environmental, engineering and community impacts.

### **Nye Beach**

Nye Beach was named for John Nye who claimed a 160-acre parcel in 1866. In the 1880's the property was purchased by Sam Irvin, and in the 1890's the "summer people" began coming to Newport Beach in large numbers. They came by train to Yaquina Bay, where the railroad ended, then by ferry boat to the Bayfront, and finally by the boardwalk built in 1891 to connect the Bayfront with Nye Beach.

Today, Nye Beach has become a mixed-use neighborhood with direct beach access anchored by Performing Arts and Visual Art Centers. Commercial development is concentrated along Beach Drive and Coast Street, both of which include streetscape enhancements that encourage a dense pedestrian friendly atmosphere. This area includes a mix of retail, dining, lodging, professional services, galleries, single family homes, condominiums, long term and short-term rentals.

### **Bayfront**

A working waterfront with a mix of tourist-oriented retail, restaurants, fish processing facilities (e.g. Pacific Seafood), and infrastructure to support the City's commercial fishing fleet. The Port of Newport is a major property owner, and a boardwalk and fishing piers provide public access to the bay. The area is terrain constrained, with steep slopes rising up from commercial sites situated along Bay Boulevard.

### **South Beach**

Nestled on the south side of the Yaquina Bay Bridge, Newport's South Beach provides a mix of regional institutions, recreational facilities, neighborhoods, and retail businesses, including the popular Oregon Coast Aquarium, Hatfield Marine Science Center, OMSI's Camp Gray, Oregon Coast Community College, Newport Municipal Airport, and the Port of Newport's South Beach Marina and RV Park. The City's largest residential planned development is also located in South Beach, known as the "Wilder" community.

### **Natural Hazards**

As an Oregon coastal city, Newport is at risk from a variety of natural hazards that should be considered in developing a Transportation System Plan to reduce risks to public health, facilitate emergency evacuation and prolong the serviceable life cycle of transportation infrastructure.

The first category of hazard is the tsunami events that follow earthquakes. The impacts on the Oregon coastline for a range of potential major earthquake events has been studied extensively by Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI), which is the best source of information for identifying areas that may be subject to tsunami inundation. The City and State have taken actions to prepare for these events, including developing emergency response and evacuation routes, and designating evacuation assembly areas. Establishing resilient transportation facilities and bridges along these routes is a critical element to facilitate the movement of people

during these emergency situations. The tsunami inundation and assembly areas in Newport can be found in the Appendix, Technical Memo #5, Existing Conditions.

Landslides and bluff erosion also present significant challenges to maintaining a stable foundation for roads and structures. The soil composition in many beach areas require special design considerations to adequately treat storm drainage and runoff to mitigate against degrading soil conditions. These design treatments are commonly applied in designated areas such as Agate Beach, which has experience chronic bluff erosion in recent years.

## PURPOSE OF THE TSP

---

The TSP is a long-range plan to guide future transportation investments for the next 20 years and beyond within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). It is a key resource for implementing transportation system improvements that address current deficiencies and will also serve expected local and regional growth, and ensure that they align with the community’s goals, objectives, and vision for the future. This TSP was developed through community and stakeholder input and is based on the transportation system’s needs, opportunities, and anticipated available funding. The requirements of a TSP are summarized in Figure 5.

**FIGURE 5: REQUIREMENTS OF A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN**

### REQUIREMENTS OF A TSP

A TSP is required by the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0015 defines the primary elements of a TSP. The TPR requires that a city TSP includes the following components:

- 1 Comprehensive understanding of the existing multimodal transportation system that serves the city and how well that system performs its expected function today
- 2 Reasonable basis for estimating how the city and the surrounding region might grow in its population and employment over the next 20 or more years
- 3 Evaluation of how the expected growth could change system performance
- 4 Goals, policies and transportation system improvements that address community multimodal transportation needs
- 5 Understanding of the on-going funding required to build and maintain the transportation system as the city grows

In compliance with State requirements, the City of Newport updated their 2012 TSP. This latest update provides a plan for the City to support the transportation needs from land use growth within the UGB through the 2040 planning horizon. The City’s UGB is shown earlier in Figure 1. The UGB is a land use planning line to control urban expansion and promote the efficient use of land, public facilities, and services. Land inside the UGB supports urban services such as roads, water and sewer systems, parks, schools and fire and police protection. This boundary also supports 20-years’ worth of population and employment growth, of which cities must plan for urban services.

The TSP is the City’s tool for planning transportation infrastructure for all modes within the UGB. This TSP will be used by the City to make strategic decisions about transportation system investments and will be instrumental in supporting grant applications to fund future projects, and ensuring projects are built in coordination with land use actions and future development.

### SETTING DIRECTION FOR THE PLAN

---

A transportation vision, and set of goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria (see Figure 6) were used to guide the project team in the development, evaluation, and prioritization of solutions that best fit the community and provided the basis for policies to support Plan implementation. They were established with guidance from the Newport City Council and Planning Commission, Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and general public.

Collectively, the transportation-related goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria describe what the community wants the transportation system to do in the future, as summarized by a vision statement. A vision statement generally consists of an imaginative description of the desired condition in the future. It is important that the vision statement for transportation align with the community’s core values.

Goals and objectives create manageable stepping stones through which the broad vision statement can be achieved. Goals are the first step down from the broader vision. They are broad statements that should focus on outcomes, describing a desired end state. Goals should be challenging, but not unreasonable. Each goal must be supported by more finite objectives. In contrast to goals, objectives should be specific and measurable. Where feasible, providing a targeted time period helps with objective prioritization and achievement. When developing objectives, it is helpful to identify key issues or concerns that are related to the attainment of the goal.

The solutions recommended through the TSP must be consistent with the goals and objectives. To accomplish this, evaluation criteria based on the goals and objectives were developed. For the Newport TSP, they were used to inform the selection and prioritization of projects and policies for the plan by describing how well they support goal areas.

**FIGURE 6: DIRECTION FOR THE PLAN**



## VISION FOR THE PLAN

### VISION STATEMENT

Travel to and through Newport is safe and efficient, with convenient options available for everyone. Investments in the transportation system are made in a cost-effective manner and respect the City's resources. The system supports local business activity, and all streets, including US 101 and US 20, complement a vibrant streetscape environment where people stop and visit and can travel by all modes safely and comfortably.

### GOAL 1 SAFETY

**Improve the safety of all users of the system for all modes of travel.**

*Objectives:*

- Reduce the frequency of crashes and strive to eliminate crashes resulting in serious injuries and fatalities.
- Proactively improve areas where crash risk factors are present.
- Improve the safety of east-west travel across US 101.
- Improve the safety of north-south travel across US 20.
- Apply a comprehensive approach to improving transportation safety that involves the five E's (engineering, education, enforcement, emergency medical services, and evaluation).



## GOAL 2 MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

**Promote efficient travel that provides access to goods, services, and employment to meet the daily needs of all users, as well as to local and regional major activity centers.**

*Objectives:*

- Support expansions of the local and regional transit network and service.
- Support improvements that enhance mobility of US 101 and US 20.
- Manage congestion according to current mobility standards.
- Support transportation options and ease of use for people of all ages and abilities.
- Ensure safe, direct, and welcoming routes to provide access to schools, parks, and other activity centers for all members of the community, including visitors, children, people with disabilities, older adults, and people with limited means.
- Provide an interconnected network of streets to allow for efficient travel.

### GOAL 3 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

**Complete safe, convenient and comfortable networks of facilities that make walking and biking an attractive choice by people of all ages and abilities.**

*Objectives:*

- Continuously improve existing transportation facilities to meet applicable City of Newport and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.
- Provide walking facilities that are physically separated from auto traffic on all arterials and collectors, and on streets and paths linking key destinations such as employment centers, schools, shopping, and transit routes.
- Provide low-cost improvements to enhance walking and biking on all arterials and collectors, and on streets and paths linking key destinations such as employment centers, schools, shopping, and transit routes.
- Provide safe street crossing opportunities on high-volume and/or high-speed streets.
- Provide walking access to transit routes and major activity centers in the City.
- Work to close gaps in the existing sidewalk network.
- Provide biking facilities that are comfortable, convenient, safe and attractive for users of all ages and abilities on or near all arterials and collectors, and streets and paths linking key destinations such as employment centers, schools, shopping, and transit routes.
- Provide biking access to transit routes, major activity centers in the City, and regional destinations and recreational routes.

## GOAL 4 **GROW THE ECONOMY**

**Develop a transportation system that facilitates economic activity and draws business to the area.**

*Objectives:*

- Support improvements that make the City a safe and comfortable place to explore on foot.
- Manage congestion along freight routes according to current mobility standards.
- Provide safe, direct, and welcoming routes between major tourist destinations in Newport.

## GOAL 5 **ENVIRONMENT**

Minimize environmental impacts on natural resources and encourage lower-polluting transportation alternatives.

*Objectives:*

- Support strategies that encourage a reduction in trips made by single-occupant vehicles.
- Minimize negative impacts to natural resources and scenic areas, and restore or enhance, where feasible.
- Support facility design and construction practices that have reduced impacts on the environment.

## GOAL 6 SUPPORT HEALTHY LIVING

**Support options for exercise and healthy lifestyles to enhance the quality of life.**

*Objectives:*

- Develop a connected network of attractive walking and biking facilities, including off-street trails, which includes recreational routes as well as access to employment, schools, shopping, and transit routes.
- Provide active transportation connections between neighborhoods and parks/open spaces.
- Provide for multi-modal circulation on-site and externally to adjacent land uses and existing and planned multi-modal facilities.

## GOAL 7 PREPARE FOR CHANGE

**Ensure that the choices being made today make sense at a time when Newport is growing, and the transportation industry is rapidly changing.**

*Objectives:*

- Anticipate the impacts and needs of connected and automated vehicles.
- Seek to supplement traditional transportation options with more emphasis given to walking, biking, and transit and consideration for new alternatives such as car sharing, bike sharing, driverless vehicles, ride sourcing, and micro-mobility.
- Explore opportunities to partner with state, regional, and private entities to provide innovative travel options.

## GOAL 8 FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

### **Sustain an economically viable transportation system.**

#### *Objectives:*

- Improve transportation system reliance to seismic and tsunami hazards, extreme weather events, and other natural hazards.
- Identify and develop diverse and stable funding sources to implement transportation projects in a timely fashion and ensure sustained funding for transportation projects and maintenance.
- Preserve and maintain existing transportation facilities to extend their useful life.
- Seek to improve the efficiency of existing transportation facilities before adding capacity.
- Ensure that development within Newport is consistent with, and contributes to, the City's planned transportation system.

## GOAL 9 WORK WITH REGIONAL PARTNERS

### **Partner with other jurisdictions to plan and fund projects that better connect Newport with the region.**

#### *Objectives:*

- Coordinate projects, policy issues, and development actions with all affected government agencies in the area.
- Build support with regional partners for the improvement of regional connections.

## SUPPLEMENTAL STRATEGIES

In addition to the goals and objectives outlined above, a set of supplemental strategies and guidelines were developed to address specific issues of concern within the Commercial Core and the Agate Beach areas of the City. The Commercial Core area is also commonly referred to as the Downtown. The strategies are extensions of the citywide goals and objectives to provide adequate depth and context for addressing the unique issues within these areas.

### Commercial Core

- Consider improvements that enhance the safety of US 101 and US 20 and their intersections through the Commercial Core.
- Explore options for alternative highway routing through the Commercial Core.
- Consider options to meet the future capacity needs of the Yaquina Bay Bridge.
- Explore options for improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities across Yaquina Bay.
- Explore options for safe crossing opportunities of US 101 and US 20 in the Commercial Core.
- Consider streetscape improvements that define and enhance the character of the Commercial Core and serve as attractive gateways.
- Support the economic vitality of businesses in the Commercial Core by making multi-modal access safer, more convenient and more attractive.

### Agate Beach

- Provide options for local street sections that consider the stormwater management needs of the Agate Beach area.
- Plan for local street connections adjacent to existing coastal routes given future erosion concerns.
- Evaluate safe crossing opportunities of US 101 in Agate Beach.
- Upgrade vehicle access onto US 101 to correct substandard conditions.
- Explore options to provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities on US 101 in Agate Beach.
- Explore options for a connection for pedestrians and bicyclists in Agate Beach to areas further south in the City.

## PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING PROCESS

The TSP utilizes a performance-based planning process. The community vision is distilled into the measurable goals and supporting objectives. These goals and objectives were used to identify evaluation criteria to help evaluate potential projects and to measure long-term alignment between Newport’s transportation system and the community’s vision of this system. The plan process is illustrated below in Figure 7, along with the key questions that were considered during three development stages of the TSP.

FIGURE 7: PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING PROCESS




## DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE

The decision-making structure for this TSP was developed to establish clear roles and responsibilities throughout the project. The decision-making structure (Figure 8) established a framework for broad-based community engagement for the project.

As the TSP was developed, the Project Management Team (PMT) worked with a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) that included local committee, neighborhood, and business representatives, emergency service providers, and agency staff members from the City of Newport, Lincoln County, and the Oregon Department of Transportation. The PAC was formed to provide community-based recommendations, and informed and guided the plan by reviewing draft deliverables, providing insight into community perspectives, commenting on technical and regulatory issues, and providing recommendations for the TSP.

The City Council and Planning Commission for Newport were all briefed on the development of this TSP throughout the process. The City Council made all final decisions pertaining to this TSP. The PMT made recommendations to the City Council based on technical analysis and community input.

**FIGURE 8: NEWPORT TSP ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**



**PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

The strategy used to guide stakeholder and public involvement throughout the TSP update reflects the commitments of the City of Newport and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to carry out public outreach that provided community members with the opportunity to weigh in on local transportation concerns and to provide input on the future of transportation within the City and UGB.

Public outreach was conducted between November 2020 and August 2021 to share information about the TSP project. Community members, stakeholders, and other interested parties were invited to share their ideas and feedback about how people currently get around, what can be improved, and to solicit feedback on transportation projects. Feedback received through this outreach helped the City and its consultants address planned growth and the evolving transportation needs of residents. Feedback was also used to develop a list of transportation projects to be included in this TSP.

The Public and Stakeholder Involvement Strategy for the TSP (included in Appendix A) considered the demographic makeup of the area to inform outreach activities. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, the project team adapted to provide several engagement opportunities (virtual, in-



person, by phone and by mail) to enable community members to safely participate and provide meaningful input. Approximately 970 people were engaged through a variety of outreach opportunities. These opportunities are summarized in Figure 9. These engagement opportunities were promoted through social media posts, updates on the City and project websites, postcards mailed to residents within the City, emails sent to interested parties, stakeholders, and community organizations, and press releases. In addition, a virtual workshop was held with Spanish-speaking community members.

**FIGURE 9: PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT FACTS**



**SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY FEEDBACK**

Overall, the respondents wanted to see improvements to Newport’s transportation system that will benefit all residents and visitors, with a particular focus on the safety and circulation for the walking, biking and transit modes of travel. There was also a strong call for linking the transportation improvements to the city’s land use and redevelopment opportunities. A complete summary of the outreach efforts can be found in the Appendix, Newport TSP Outreach Summary.

**Common themes:**

- Pedestrian and bicyclist safety throughout the City
- Increased bus/transit/shuttle options
- Interest in improving traffic flow and reducing congestion, for through travelers and local users
- Parking improvements, especially in the downtown area
- Traffic speeding enforcement
- Preserve/rebuild the Yaquina Bay Bridge in the same location
- Strong support for emerging technology such as electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, parking solutions and solar power



**AUGUST 2021 WORKSHOP WHERE PEOPLE COULD TALK TO STAFF AND PROVIDE INPUT ON PROJECTS**

**TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT**

Figure 10 illustrates the technical tasks involved in updating the TSP. These are categorized in three major stages: the first to understand system needs and constraints, the second to develop solutions, and the third to prepare and adopt the plan. Community input guided the TSP development through all stages.

LEARN & UNDERSTAND	ANALYZE & EVALUATE	RECOMMEND / ADOPT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce project to stakeholders.</li> <li>• Evaluate existing conditions and future growth trends.</li> <li>• Discuss community values and transportation goals.</li> <li>• Develop performance measures and evaluation.</li> <li>• Coordinate with state and regional plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine future conditions.</li> <li>• Develop alternative solutions for all modes of travel.</li> <li>• Evaluate and refine draft solutions with the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify preferred alternatives.</li> <li>• Develop draft plan for public review.</li> <li>• Hold public meetings with city boards, commissions and council.</li> <li>• City Council adopts TSP.</li> </ul>



## Chapter 3: Newport Today and Tomorrow

This chapter identifies the needs for the Newport transportation system. The needs reflect where the transportation system can better accommodate the desired activities of the community. Needs were determined based on a comprehensive multimodal existing conditions analysis and projecting future conditions through the planning horizon (2040) based on assumed growth in households and employment.

### LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

---

Land use is a key component of transportation system planning. Where people live and where they go to work, shop, or access services has a big impact on how they get around and the demands they place on the transportation system.

Household and employment information is used as the basis for estimating future transportation activity in Newport. Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize where household growth is expected, and Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize where employment growth is expected through 2040 (see Technical Memorandum #6 in the Appendix for more information). High housing growth is concentrated around Newport's urban fringe including in northern Newport along US 101, Big Creek Park, Newport Middle School, in eastern Newport between US 20 and Yaquina Bay Road, and near the Oregon Coast Community College.

High employment growth is concentrated near Avery Street, the Lincoln County Fairgrounds, the Port of Newport, the South Beach area, Oregon Coast Community College, the Newport Airport, and the Holiday Beach area. Moderate employment growth is also expected along US 101 and in Newport's downtown area.

**FIGURE 11: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (NORTH)**






FIGURE 12: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (DOWNTOWN)



**FIGURE 13: NEWPORT HOUSEHOLD GROWTH (SOUTH)**



**FIGURE 14: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (NORTH)**






FIGURE 15: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (DOWNTOWN)





**FIGURE 16: NEWPORT EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (SOUTH)**



## POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

As growth continues to the year 2040, the demands on the City’s transportation system will be influenced by changes in population, housing, and employment. These changes in travel demands will require better ways to manage the system, more choices for getting around, and targeted improvements to make the system safer and more efficient.


As shown in Figure 17, Newport is expected to add about 2,385 more people<sup>1</sup> living here by 2040. For travel forecasting purposes, the population and employment during the average summer weekday is used, which typically have higher levels than the off-season. In the City, for example, the population of 10,125 rises to 11,345 during that period. By 2040 that summertime population is expected to be 13,730. This includes an expected 1,003 new households by 2040, for a total of 6,040. Newport’s current summertime average employment of 11,251 is estimated to increase to 13,942, with 2,691 more jobs in the UGB by 2040 (see Figure 17).

FIGURE 17: NEWPORT POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH TRENDS

### POPULATION



### PERMANENT HOUSEHOLDS



### SUMMER EMPLOYMENT



SOURCE: NEWPORT TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL

<sup>1</sup> The 2017 Portland State University population forecast for Newport including its Urban Growth Boundary expansion was 2,385 more people. The 2021 PSU report showed a lower growth total of 547.

## TRAVEL DEMANDS


The number of people who choose to walk, bike, ride transit or drive and the distances they travel is important for assessing how well existing transportation facilities serve the needs of users. Available data on travel mode choice, travel demand and trip length are used to better understand travel behavior in the community and inform the needs analysis for the transportation system.

Travel demands levels are influenced by the local housing and employment, seasonal visitors, and the amount of through traffic on the highway. Each of these components were considered in forecasting how current conditions in Newport will change by 2040. The increase in the number of local households and employees in the Newport UGB increases the overall number of trips generated. Figure 18 summarizes the total p.m. peak hour motor vehicle trip ends for the Newport UGB for year 2018 and year 2040. The number of vehicle trips is expected to grow by approximately 27 percent over this period if the land develops according to the land use assumptions during both an average weekday and the summer.


Being on the Oregon Coast, Newport is also impacted by a significant number of visitors and other regional travel on US 20 and US 101. This regional recreation-based travel significantly increases traffic volumes on these facilities in the summer months when compared to an average weekday. As shown in Figure 18, this tourism and recreational activity adds approximately 900 p.m. peak hour motor vehicle trip ends today (i.e., 5,713 during an average weekday versus 6,640 during the summer) and is expected to add 1,200 p.m. peak hour motor vehicle trip ends by 2040 within the Newport UGB, an increase of over 16 percent (i.e., 7,248 during an average weekday versus 8,438 during the summer).

FIGURE 18: NEWPORT VEHICLE TRIP ENDS (PM PEAK HOUR)

### AVERAGE WEEKDAY



### SUMMER



SOURCE: NEWPORT TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL


## VISITING HOUSEHOLD TRIPS

Located within a two-hour drive from Albany, Corvallis, Eugene and Salem and a 3-hour drive from Portland, Newport is a desirable choice for getaways. Visitors arrive via US 20 and US 101 and often stay for extended periods, traveling to key attractions throughout the City. During the peak summer travel periods, more than 25,000 people may be in Newport at any time and motor vehicle volumes increase by as much as 45 percent on area roadways<sup>2</sup> compared to the winter months. These visitors are drawn to key lodging areas of the City including downtown, Nye Beach, Bayfront, South Beach and along US 101. Walking and biking is a popular travel choice for visitors among hotels or vacation rentals and the many destinations in the City, with most of the key lodging areas within a 30-minute walk or 10-minute bike ride north of Yaquina Bay. However, narrow sidewalks and lack of bike facilities on the Yaquina Bay Bridge creates a significant barrier for visitors to travel by these modes to tourist destinations located on the south side of Yaquina Bay.

Due to the importance of seasonal tourism on the Oregon Coast, the number of visiting households was also estimated. These visiting households stay in the City at area hotels and other short-term rentals. As shown in Figure 19, Newport is expected to accommodate 212 additional visiting households during an average weekday through 2040, from 1,211 today to 1,423 by 2040, an increase of 18 percent. As tourism increases during the summer, so does the number of visiting households. Today, the City accommodates 2,605 visiting households during the summer, or more than double the number during the average weekday. By 2040, Newport is expected to accommodate 493 additional visiting households during the summer, for a total of 3,098, an increase of 19 percent from today.

FIGURE 19: NEWPORT VISITING HOUSEHOLDS

### VISITING HOUSEHOLDS



SOURCE: NEWPORT TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL

<sup>2</sup> Between January and August, average daily volumes on US 101 can vary by up to 45 percent of the annual average. In January, volumes are 20 percent below the annual average, and in August they are 25 percent above it.

## COMMUTER TRIPS


Much of the traffic in Newport, especially during the more congested weekday peak periods, is related to employment. Approximately 70 percent of existing jobs in Newport are filled by people who live in another City<sup>3</sup>. Residents of Newport also contribute to travel between cities, with about 54 percent of employed residents commuting to employment locations outside of the City. Workers in Newport typically commute by single-occupant motor vehicle (about 66 percent), with about 7 percent of residents walking to work, and approximately 2 percent using transit (see Figure 20).

About 6 percent of employed residents in Newport worked from home pre-COVID, and that figure likely increased due to COVID-19. It is not yet known how many of those workers will continue to telework after the threat of COVID-19 passes, but it seems likely that a higher percentage of workers will continue teleworking, at least part time. Any increase in the remote work share will change the demand on streets. It is possible that we may see a decrease in the share of the workers that need to travel during the morning and evening peak commute times and may see an increase during off-peak times.

## COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY TRIPS

Area businesses also create demands on the transportation system. This includes customers purchasing goods and trucks servicing these businesses. Key areas of the City with commercial, retail or industry related activity includes downtown Newport, Port of Newport, historic Bayfront, Nye Beach, South Beach, and the US 101 and US 20 corridor. Residents within Newport's historic downtown core are typically within a five-minute drive, twenty-minute walk or seven-minute bike ride of these areas. Recent residential developments north of Agate Beach or in South Beach typically have limited neighborhood commercial opportunities and are located farther from Newport's historic downtown core which increases trip lengths and limits mode choices for residents of these areas. Trucks servicing these areas typically travel from major cities outside Newport and can travel over 60 miles from major distribution centers in the Willamette Valley and the I-5 corridor before using US 20 or US 101. Within Newport, freight traffic is common on US 101, US 20, Moore Drive, Bay Boulevard, and 73rd Street to serve the fishing industry, Port of Newport and businesses throughout Newport.

FIGURE 20: NEWPORT COMMUTER MODE SHARE



Source: US Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey

<sup>3</sup> US Census Bureau, OnTheMap. Home/Work Distance/Direction Analysis, 2018.

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FACTS

To address changing transportation needs within the UGB through 2040, the existing and future travel conditions were reviewed. The transportation system review documented the existing pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle infrastructure. It also identified shortfalls and limitations into how people can travel within the City (such as lack of bike lanes or sidewalks).

Figure 21 provides a summary of some of the existing transportation facilities in the City, with more details provided in the following sections. A complete summary of existing and future transportation conditions and needs can be found in Technical Memorandums #5 and #7 in the Appendix. Solutions for the transportation infrastructure that are determined to not maintain acceptable service levels for residents are identified in Chapter 6.

**FIGURE 21: NEWPORT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FACTS**



## ROADWAY NETWORK

---

The existing transportation system in the UGB includes 89 miles of roadways. Two highways under State jurisdiction bisect the City, including US 101 and US 20. US 101 runs north-south through Newport, connecting coastal communities along the entire west coast of the United States, while US 20 runs east-west just north of the downtown area of the City, connecting it to Corvallis, Interstate 5 and eventually Boston, Massachusetts 3,365 miles to the east. These roadways intersect in the downtown area forming one of the most complex intersections in the City.

Key City streets that are adjacent to or intersect US 101 and US 20 include NE 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, NW 55<sup>th</sup> Street, Lighthouse/NE 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street, NE Harney Street, SE Moore Drive, SE Bay Boulevard, SW Abalone Street, SE Marine Science Drive, SE Ferry Slip Road, 6th Street, SE 40th Street, Nye Street, Hubert Street, Benton Street, and NW Oceanview Drive.

This TSP addresses vehicle speeds, vehicle flow, and safety for all users of streets in Newport. Traditionally, agencies have widened streets to respond to traffic congestion. But widening does not always work to reduce congestion in the long term. Widening is costly, has negative effects on adjacent properties, and makes the street even less safe and inviting for walking and biking. This TSP uses widening to add capacity as only the last option to respond to vehicle congestion issues. Instead, it generally emphasizes designing streets to slow vehicles and increase safety. The design of a street influences how a person drives more than the actual speed limit.

## INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

Forecasted intersection operations were compared to currently adopted agency mobility targets to identify where significant congestion is likely to occur. Of the 20 study intersections, eight will not meet their respective mobility target during the 2040 design hour conditions. Nineteen of the study intersections met their mobility targets under existing conditions (2020); the intersection of US 101/US 20 is the only intersection that also exceeded its mobility target under existing PM peak hour conditions. All of the substandard intersections are on state highways and half are two-way stop control intersections. Increased traffic on US 101 will lead to excessive delay for left-turning traffic by 2040 at all unsignalized intersections, particularly during the summer peak.

**Intersections that are expected to exceed mobility targets under the 2040 design hour conditions, include:**

- US 101/73rd (stop controlled on side street)
- US 101/52nd (signalized intersection)
- US 101/Oceanview (stop controlled on side street)
- US 101/US 20 (signalized intersection)
- US 101/Angle (stop controlled on side street)
- US 101/Hurbert (signalized intersection)
- US 20/Benton (stop controlled on side street)
- US 20/Moore (signalized intersection)

**Other Community Concerns**

Additional intersection and roadway network concerns expressed by the community include congestion around NE Harney Street/SE Moore Drive due to school and County fairground traffic, limited access to the hospital from US 101, limited access and high delay travelling to and from residential neighborhoods whose only access is from US 101, irregular access alignments to US 101, such as near the Newport Theater and southbound vehicle speeds on US 101 approaching the Yaquina Bay Bridge as vehicles merge. In addition, several locations on US 101 were noted for challenges for pedestrians crossings, such as near NE 60<sup>th</sup> Street.

**BRIDGES AND TUNNELS**

There are 11 bridges and two tunnels within the Newport UGB. Nine of the bridges are along state highways (i.e., US 101 or US 20) and one is along a City roadway. The State Parks system also owns a pedestrian bridge and a pedestrian tunnel at Agate Beach State Park.

**Three bridges are classified as structurally deficient with poor conditions, including:**

- The bridge on US 101 over Big Creek, between NE 31st Street and NW 25th Street (maintained by ODOT)
- The Yaquina Bay Bridge (maintained by ODOT)
- The bridge on Big Creek Road over Big Creek, between NE Harney Street and NE 12th Street (maintained by the City of Newport)



## Yaquina Bay Bridge

The Yaquina Bay Bridge is a key constraint for north-south travel in Newport both today and in the future. Existing narrow travel lanes, lack of shoulders, no bike lanes, and a steep grade all contribute to a lower carrying capacity compared to similar highway segments. Traffic volumes along the bridge (shown in Table 1) are forecasted to be around 20,000 during an average weekday, and around 22,000 during the summer, based on the projected local growth in the City, and growth in regional through traffic. This means that during both average weekday and summer conditions, the forecasted volumes are expected to exceed the capacity on the Yaquina Bay Bridge. As traffic volumes grow, this congestion could impact segments of US 101 approaching the Yaquina Bay Bridge or lead to additional congestion in off-peak hours without any mitigation.

**TABLE 1: EXPECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON THE YAQUINA BAY BRIDGE**

SCENARIO	2018 AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC	2040 AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC	PERCENT GROWTH
AVERAGE WEEKDAY	14,200	19,800	39%
SUMMER	16,900	21,800	28%

Source: Technical Memorandum #7: Future Transportation Conditions and Needs, Table 3.

Like many coastal bridges, the Yaquina Bay Bridge is a designated historic structure. The ODOT Historic Bridge Preservation Plan details treatment options to extend the useful life of historic structures and maintain their original purpose. ODOT ensures that every reasonable effort is pursued to maintain transportation service for their historic bridges prior to other, more impactful decisions. The existing historic structural elements will be maintained to the maximum extent necessary, and any new elements must maintain the historical significance of the structure. Maintenance considerations could also include vehicle or load restrictions that limit traffic on historic bridges.

If in the future ODOT determines that the Yaquina Bay Bridge can no longer maintain its intended function, the bridge could be paired with a parallel crossing to lessen vehicle demands or converted to a new use. Only after these options are exhausted will ODOT consider a full closure of the bridge and replacement. All future decisions regarding the use of the Yaquina Bay Bridge will be coordinated with ODOT. This TSP recommends that the City coordinate with ODOT to prepare a Facility Plan (which would become a Refinement Plan to the TSP with City council support) for the Yaquina Bay bridge area to further clarify the alignment, cost, and impacts associated with a future replacement bridge project.

## PARKING

US 101 and US 20 serves thousands of vehicle trips each day bringing many visitors and economic opportunities for the City, which also means large recreation vehicles or towing trailers traversing narrow and busy sections through the downtown area. This leads to conflicts with parked vehicles

along US 101 due to the narrow travel lanes. In addition, the community has expressed concerns related to limited parking in tourist-oriented areas such as Nye Beach and the Bayfront, particularly during peak summer periods, and potential for parking spillover into the neighborhoods.

## **PEDESTRIAN NETWORK**

---

Walking plays a key role in Newport’s transportation network and planning for pedestrians helps the City provide a complete multimodal transportation system. It also supports healthy lifestyles and addresses a social equity issue ensuring that the young, the elderly, and those not financially able to afford motorized transport have access to goods, services, employment, and education.

In this plan, "walking" and "pedestrian" are terms that include people who walk independently or use canes, wheelchairs, other walking aids, or strollers. As noted earlier in this TSP, approximately seven percent of commuters in the City walk to work, with two percent utilizing public transportation, which often includes walking at the beginning or end of the trip. In addition to the work commute trips, walking trips are made to and from recreational areas, shopping areas, schools, or other activity generators. Continuous and direct sidewalk connections to all activity generators and along all streets, in addition to safe crossing opportunities along major roadways, are essential to encourage walking and transit use.

The existing pedestrian network in the Newport UGB is composed of 33 miles of sidewalks, and about 10 miles of shared use paths or pedestrian trails. Curb ramps are available at about 80 percent of intersections along US 101 and US 20, but many of them are not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. In addition, nearly 70 percent of streets lack a sidewalk on at least one side, including several segments of US 101 and US 20. Although there is generally good sidewalk coverage near downtown Newport, many of the residential areas of Newport were developed without sidewalks, and these sidewalk gaps will remain through 2040 without redevelopment or sidewalk infill projects as part of the TSP.

## **PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS**

The pedestrian level of traffic stress<sup>4</sup> (LTS) evaluation provides a metric to understand a multimodal user’s perception of the safety and comfort of the transportation network. This method was used to understand key gaps and barriers to walking to be addressed through targeted improvements in this TSP. In addition to the LTS evaluation, consideration was given to acknowledge cases where traffic volumes were expected to be very low, such as under 500 vehicles daily on a local or shared street. Feedback from the community indicated that under such conditions, residents were comfortable walking within the roadway given that the chance of vehicle conflicts are remote.

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Technical Memorandum #5: Existing Conditions, page 3 for a complete definition of the Level of Traffic Stress. The LTS scale ranges from LTS 1(Low) to LTS 4(Extreme).

The LTS evaluation generates a ranking (i.e., low, moderate, high, or extreme stress) of the relative safety and comfort of a segment or intersection for pedestrians based on roadway and intersection characteristics (e.g., land use context, number of lanes, travel speed and volume, intersection control, type and width of buffer, and the presence and condition of any bicycle or pedestrian facilities). The LTS rating scale recognizes that as vehicle speeds and volumes increase, enhanced pedestrian facilities are needed to maintain a system that is accessible for all users.

A pedestrian walking along roughly 25 percent of the analyzed streets (i.e., arterial and collector roadways) within the UGB will experience a low or moderate level of stress. This is generally representative of streets with low volumes and speeds where sidewalks are provided. An extreme level of stress is experienced along 60 percent of the analyzed streets, mainly those with no sidewalks or buffers and the highest speeds and traffic volumes. This includes most of US 101 and US 20 through the UGB, streets that are important for pedestrian travel. Overall, the pedestrian network near downtown has a consistent set of continuous walkways which provides a low stress environment, and whereas towards the edges of the City and in residential areas many streets lack sidewalks or walkways such that travelers walk within the roadway. Where traffic volumes and speeds are higher, the absence of a dedicated walkway can create extreme stress on the traveler.

As redevelopment and frontage improvements occur through 2040, streets will be built to align with the standards outlined in Chapter 4 of this TSP. These standards require high-quality facilities, and an emphasis on safe, convenient, and comfortable travel, and contribute towards a network wide lower stress pedestrian experience.

Equally important is the pedestrian experience crossing streets. These locations are often when a pedestrian experiences some of the highest amount of stress, particularly along major streets with high travel speeds and traffic volumes. This TSP team looked at 20 intersections in the UGB. Sixteen of the intersections, including many of those along the busiest streets (i.e., US 101 and US 20), have a pedestrian stress level of extreme or high, while only four intersections that this TSP looked at have a low or moderate level of stress for pedestrians. In general, the studied intersections lack ADA compliant curb ramps, have complex elements, or offer limited refuge or enhancements at the crossing.

## METHODOLOGY USED TO IDENTIFY TSP PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

The list of pedestrian network improvement projects shown in Chapter 6 was developed based on streets with pedestrian deficiencies. The solutions for these deficiencies were selected to support the overall goals and objectives of the TSP. For pedestrian projects that is primarily related to improvements that deliver safer, more accessible, and convenient facilities.

### **A street is considered deficient for walking if it meets one or more of the following conditions:**

- **Sidewalk Gaps**

Arterial or collector street segment without pedestrian facilities.

- **Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress**

Arterial or collector street segment with an extreme pedestrian level of stress.

- **Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress near important Destinations**

High or extreme pedestrian level of stress near parks, schools, transit stops, or other important destinations.

## BICYCLE NETWORK

---

Bicycling is important for both transportation and recreation in Newport. This includes people who bike to work and school, people biking for fun, or people just running errands by bike. Riding bicycles also plays a key role in the transportation system's ability to support healthy and active lifestyles, with suitable facilities that provide a viable alternative to the automobile. While walking tends to be a competitive choice for trips under half a mile, bicycling tends to be suited for longer trips. Bicycle trips can often work well for distances between a half mile and three miles. Newport's relatively compact size makes biking a great choice for many trips, with local jobs and housing, in addition to hotels and other tourism destinations, typically in bikeable proximity.

This TSP includes projects to provide continuous bicycle connections between activity generators and arterial/collector roadways that are essential for safe and attractive non-motorized travel options. It includes bicycle infrastructure that appeals to a wider range of people, both in age and ability. Many people want to bike, but they find riding near traffic in standard bike lanes stressful and a deterrent. This TSP includes a bicycle network of streets with facility standards designed to minimize interactions between people on bikes and car traffic (see Chapter 4 of this TSP).

The bicycle network in Newport is composed of two lane miles of bike lanes, four miles of streets with shared lane markings and one mile of shared-use pathways. Bike lanes are currently striped along portions of US 101 near the NE 52nd Street/NW Lighthouse Drive intersection and SW Naterlin Drive, and on US 101 from the bridge south to the former intersection of SE Ferry Slip Road. Sharrows are currently located along portions of NW Oceanview Drive, NW Spring Street, NW Coast Street, SW Elizabeth Street, NW-NE 6th Street and SW Naterlin Drive. However, many of

the existing facilities are not continuous. In addition, nearly 90 percent of arterial streets currently lack bike facilities, including much of US 101 and US 20. Critical gaps existing across the Yaquina Bay Bridge, along the NW Oceanview Drive corridor and the Oregon Coast Bike Route.

## **BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS**

The bicycle level of traffic stress (LTS) evaluation provides a metric to understand a multimodal user’s perception of the safety and comfort of the transportation network. This method was used to understand key gaps and barriers to biking to be addressed through targeted improvements in this TSP.

The LTS evaluation generates a ranking (i.e., low, moderate, high, or extreme stress) of the relative safety and comfort of a segment or intersection for bicyclists based on roadway and intersection characteristics (e.g., land use context, number of lanes, travel speed and volume, intersection control, type and width of buffer, and the presence and condition of any bicycle or pedestrian facilities). The LTS rating scale recognizes that as vehicle speeds and volumes increase, enhanced bicycle facilities are needed to maintain a system that is accessible for all users.

A bicyclist riding along roughly 15 percent of the analyzed arterial roadways and 90 percent of the analyzed collector roadways within the UGB will experience a low or moderate level of stress. This is generally representative of the many low volume and speed streets of the highway. Even still, an extreme or high level of stress is experienced along 85 percent of the analyzed arterial roadways and 10 percent of the analyzed collector roadways, mainly those with no bicycle facilities and the highest speeds and traffic volumes. This includes the extent of US 101 and US 20 through the UGB, and short segments of NE Harney Street, NE 31<sup>st</sup> Street, NE Yaquina Heights Drive, SE Bay Boulevard and SE Ferry Slip Road. These streets are important for bicycle travel as they connect to most businesses and services and in many cases provides the only through route for cyclists (e.g., the Yaquina Bay Bridge). NW Oceanview Drive, a component of the Oregon Coast Bike Route, was rated at extreme level of traffic stress between US 101 and the intersection with NW Edenview Way, and medium level of traffic stress from there to Spring Street.

As redevelopment and frontage improvements occur through 2040, streets will be built to align with the standards outlined in Chapter 4 of this TSP. These standards require high-quality facilities, and an emphasis on safe, convenient, and comfortable travel, and contribute towards a network wide lower stress bicycle experience. For very low traffic volume conditions on local streets, consideration was given to allow for bicycling to be done within the roadway with designations for sharing the road when separate bikeway facilities are not available. This same shared street treatment was applied for pedestrian travel in the previous section for very low traffic conditions.

Equally important is the bicycle experience crossing streets. This TSP looked at 20 intersections in the UGB, of which 15 have a bicycle stress level of low or moderate. These are mainly at signalized intersections along US 101 or US 20, or at locations with low vehicle travel speeds and narrow crossing widths for cyclists. Five unsignalized intersections along US 101 have a bicycle stress level of extreme or high. In general, these intersections are in locations with high vehicle travel speeds and wider crossing widths for cyclists.

## METHODOLOGY USED TO IDENTIFY TSP BICYCLE PROJECTS

The list of bicycle network improvement projects shown in Chapter 6 were developed based on streets with bicycle deficiencies. The solutions for these deficiencies were selected to support the overall goals and objectives of the TSP. For cycling projects that is primarily related to improvements that deliver safer, more accessible, and more convenient facilities such as dedicated bike lanes and multi-use pathways.

### **A street is considered deficient for bicycling if it meets one or more of the following conditions:**

- **Bicycle Facility Gaps**

Arterial or collector street segment without bicycle facilities or adjacent corridor with bicycle facilities.

- **Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress**

Arterial or collector street segment with an extreme bicycle level of stress.

- **Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress near important Destinations**

High or extreme bicycle level of stress near parks, schools, transit stops, or other important destinations.

## TRANSIT

---

Transit service is provided in Newport via a city loop service, an intercity service, and an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit service. All Lincoln County Transit buses are equipped with a lift to allow wheelchair access and include bicycle racks. Riders are permitted to load their bicycle inside the bus only if the bike racks are full.

The Newport city loop completes a full loop through Newport six times each day, seven days a week, and in the evening, there is an additional southbound run to City Hall. This route has 41 bus stops, providing access to key destinations within Newport including grocery stores and other shopping, restaurants, local hotels and residences, Newport City Hall, post office, Oregon Coast Aquarium, NOAA facilities, and Nye Beach. The bus stops offer limited amenities, and many are unmarked, making the transit system challenging to navigate, particularly for visitors who may be unfamiliar with it. Most Newport residents are within a half mile of a transit stop, and in the downtown core, most residents are within a quarter mile of a transit stop. Long headways (up to 90 minutes) and limited service hours (approximately between 7 am and 5pm) for the Newport city loop transit service limits the utility of this service for residents and visitors. In addition, transit service is not currently provided south of SE 50th Avenue.

The intercity transit service operates routes to Corvallis and Albany four times each day, to Lincoln City four times each day, to Yachats four times each day, and to Siletz six times a day between Monday and Saturday.

Lincoln County Transit also provides curb to curb coordinated and accessible dial-a-ride transit service that is available to everyone in Newport. The paratransit service, in wheelchair lift equipped minibuses, is available generally between 8:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

## **TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Lincoln County's Transit Development Plan will guide future changes to transit service. Identified changes through 2028 include:

- Add additional stops at Newport's Walmart and Fred Meyer as part of the Newport-Siletz route
- Add up to four additional daily runs on the Coast to Valley route which serves Corvallis and Albany and coordinate these runs to better align with work or Amtrak schedules
- Increase frequency up to 50 percent on weekdays and weekends for the Newport-Lincoln City Route
- Add additional stops at the Oregon Coast Community College as part of the Newport-Yachats route
- Extend Dial-A-Ride service hours and provide service seven days a week
- Modify the Newport City Loop route to remove the Nye Beach and Bayfront and maintain existing 90-minute headways
- Add a new Newport City Loop route which serves Fred Meyer, Nye Beach, City Hall, Bayfront, and Embarcadero with 45-minute headways
- Add a new Newport City Loop route which serves Nye Beach, City Hall, Bayfront, and Embarcadero with 30-minute headways

These transit enhancements were identified by Lincoln County Transit to address the most significant unmet needs within their transit system. Further investments will be coordinated with Lincoln County Transit. The recommended enhancements address several public concerns made during this TSP process related to transit access. Specific comments noted the need for additional stops, more bus shelters, and added tourist shuttles.

In addition, these enhancements also align with several of the goals and objectives of this TSP, including:

### TSP Goal 2: Mobility and Accessibility

- Support expansions of the local and regional transit network and service
- Support transportation options and ease of use for people of all ages and abilities

### TSP Goal 7: Prepare for Change

- Seek to supplement traditional transportation options with more emphasis given to walking, biking, and transit

### TSP Goal 9: Work with Regional Partners

- Build support with regional partners for the improvement of regional connections

## FREIGHT NETWORK

---

US 101, north of US 20, is a designated federal truck route and US 20, east of US 101, is a designated Oregon freight route. As a designate truck route, the section of US 101 north of US 20 is also identified as a Reduction Review Route, which means that any improvements within the highway right-of-way needs to consider its impact of freight truck carrying capacity. In addition, about 8.5 miles of roadways are located adjacent to or connecting to industrial lands. These roadways include portions of NE Avery Street and NE 73rd Street at the north end of the City, SE Moore Drive and Bay Boulevard in the central part of the City, and US 101, SE 35th Street, SE 40th Street, SE 50th Street and SE Ferry Slip Road at the south end of the City.

With growing traffic volumes, six intersections along Oregon Freight Routes or Federal Truck Routes would not meet their currently adopted mobility target during the 2040 design hour conditions. These intersections are shown below.

### **Intersections that might experience increased freight delay through 2040:**

- US 101/73<sup>rd</sup> (stop controlled on side street)
- US 101/52<sup>nd</sup> (signal)
- US 101/Oceanview (stop controlled on side street)
- US 101/US 20 (signal)
- US 20/Benton (stop controlled on side street)
- US 20/Moore (signal)

Note: Refer to Future Transportation Conditions and Needs, Technical Memo #7, for more information in the Appendix.

Although all these intersections are on a designated freight route, three of the intersections are two-way stop control where the side street will experience significant delay in the future. Since freight traffic is concentrated on US 101 and US 20 in Newport, high side-street delay at the intersections of US 101/Oceanview and US 20/Benton will likely have a minimal impact to freight. However, 73<sup>rd</sup> Street serves an industrial area which can generate high freight traffic, and increased side street delay at this location will negatively impact freight operations. High vehicle delay at the other three traffic signals will also increase delay for freight travel through Newport on US 101 or US 20.

Other locations with identified freight needs include Bay Boulevard and the Yaquina Bay Bridge. Bay Boulevard is a working waterfront and is a key freight generator for the City of Newport. This area is also a tourist destination which can create conflicts between the high volume of pedestrians, passenger cars, and freight vehicles which serve Newport's fishing industry. Freight vehicles can also struggle to navigate the steep grades for northbound traffic approaching the Yaquina Bay Bridge. The recent relocation of the traffic signal from SE 32<sup>nd</sup> Street to SE 35<sup>th</sup> Street



has improved this operational issue for freight vehicles. In addition, as noted previously, the Yaquina Bay Bridge has weight limit restrictions which directs heavier freight vehicles to reduce their loads below the maximum levels to comply, which increases the amount of truck activity along this segment of the highway.

## AIRPORT

---

The Newport Municipal Airport, owned and operated by the City of Newport, is a public-use airport located east of US 101 off SE 84th Street, approximately five miles south of downtown. This airport provides general aviation for Newport and surrounding coastal communities and is identified as a critical resource by the Oregon Department of Aviation for emergency response following a major earthquake or tsunami. Currently, the airport supports general aviation aircrafts, US Coast Guard helicopters, and air ambulance flights.

The airport currently supports 28 based aircraft. Other services and facilities include: hangars, tie-downs, fueling, and rental cars. The airport has two runways, and serves 19,600 annual operations (i.e., take-offs or landings).

Regional and international air service for passengers and freight is provided via Portland International Airport (PDX). The airport is located approximately 140 miles (over three hours) northeast of Newport. Eugene Airport located approximately 80 miles (or 90 minutes) southeast of Newport also provides regional air service.

## WATERWAYS

---

Newport is bounded to the west by the Pacific Ocean and is divided north-south by Yaquina Bay, a commercially navigable waterway. Yaquina Bay is a 30-foot deep basin and 300 feet across at its narrowest point; at high water, there is 129 feet of vertical clearance under the Yaquina Bay Bridge.

The Port of Newport maintains and operates separate commercial and recreational marinas to serve Newport's ship traffic. The commercial marina, located on the north side of Yaquina Bay, south of Bay Boulevard includes four docks for commercial vehicles and serves a large, prolific fishing fleet and a yacht club. This marina can accommodate vessels up to 100 feet. Marine supplies and a customs office are available for patrons. The recreational marina is located on the south side of Yaquina Bay, near South Beach, with space for 522 vessels and includes power, water, fuel, and sanitary services as amenities. This marina also serves as a public boat launch with space for trailer storage.

The Newport International Terminal provides two berths for cargo ships, research vessels, cruise ships, and fishing boats on the north side of Yaquina Bay. This terminal is one of three deep draft ports on the Oregon Coast and has traditionally been used to ship timber products. NOAA also maintains a marine operations center to the south of Yaquina Bay and serves as the home port for two research vessels in addition to supporting five ships.



## Chapter 4: System Design & Management Principles

Newport applies transportation standards and regulations to the construction of new transportation facilities and to the operation of all facilities to ensure that they are designed appropriately and that the system functions as intended. These standards enable consistent future actions that reflect the goals and objectives of the City.

### **FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION**

---


Functional classification for streets helps support the movement of vehicles and is an important tool for managing the roadway network. The street functional classification system recognizes that individual streets do not act independently of one another but instead form a network that serves travel needs on a regional, citywide, neighborhood and local level. By designating the management and design requirements for each roadway classification, this hierarchal system supports a network of streets that perform as desired.

The street functional classification system for roadways in the Newport is described below. The functional classification map (Figure 22, Figure 23, and Figure 24) shows the designated classification for all roadways in the City, including new street extensions proposed as part of this plan. From highest to lowest intended use, the classifications are arterial, major collector, neighborhood collector, and local streets. For a summary of functional classification changes from the prior TSP, see Technical Memorandum #10: Transportation Standards, in the appendix.

The federal government also has a functional classification system that is used to determine federal aid funding eligibility. Roadways federally designated as a minor collector (urban), major collector, minor arterial, principal arterial, or interstate are eligible for federal aid. Newport’s functional classification system uses the similar designations as the federal government (e.g., a City designated arterial is intended to be the same as a federally designated principal arterial, a City designated major collector is intended to be the same as a federally designated major collector, and a City designated neighborhood collector is intended to be the same as a federally designated urban minor collector). Future updates to the federal functional classification system should incorporate the designations reflected in the TSP along City roadways.


## ARTERIAL STREETS

Arterial streets are primarily intended to serve regional and citywide traffic movement. Arterials provide the primary connection to other arterial streets or collector streets. Safety should be the highest priority on arterial streets and separation should be provided between motor vehicles and people walking, and bicycling. Safe multimodal crossings should also be provided to key destinations. Where an arterial street intersects with a neighborhood collector or local street, access management and/or turn restrictions may be employed to reduce traffic delay. The only arterial streets in Newport are US 101 and US 20, which also include a Federal Classification of urban other principal arterial.



## MAJOR COLLECTOR STREETS

Major collector streets are intended to distribute traffic from arterial Streets to streets of the same or lower classification. They provide both access and circulation within and between residential and non-residential areas. Major collectors differ from arterials in that they provide more of a citywide circulation function, do not require as extensive control of access (compared to arterials) and penetrate residential neighborhoods, distributing trips from the neighborhood and local street system. Safety should be a high priority on major collectors. Where a major collector street intersects with a neighborhood collector or local street, access management and/or turn restrictions may be employed to reduce traffic delay.



## NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR STREETS

Neighborhood collector streets distribute traffic from arterial or major collector streets to local streets. They are distinguishable from major collectors in that they principally serve residential areas. Neighborhood collector streets should maintain slow vehicle operating speeds to accommodate safe use by all modes and through traffic should be discouraged, especially in areas with topography or other line of sight constraints. Where a neighborhood collector street intersects with a higher-classified street, access management and/or turn restrictions may be employed to reduce traffic delay and discourage through traffic.

## LOCAL STREETS

All streets not classified as arterial, major collector, or neighborhood collector streets are classified as local streets. Local streets provide local access and circulation for traffic, connect neighborhoods, and often function as through routes for pedestrians and bicyclists. Local streets should maintain slow vehicle operating speeds to accommodate safe use by all modes.

### Private Streets

Private streets are a special type of local street that are used to facilitate access to specific properties or small neighborhoods. Private streets can include driveways or private roadway connections that serve four or fewer parcels. The City is not responsible for maintenance on private streets.



FIGURE 22: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (NORTH)





FIGURE 23: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (DOWNTOWN)



**FIGURE 24: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (SOUTH)**



## **FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES**

---

Figure 25, Figure 26, and Figure 27 show roadways designated to help ensure trucks can efficiently travel through and access major destinations in Newport. These routes play a vital role in the economical movement of raw materials and finished products, while maintaining neighborhood livability, public safety, and minimizing maintenance costs of the roadway system.

### **STATE AND FEDERAL FREIGHT ROUTES**

Newport currently has two designated statewide freight routes. US 101 (north of US 20) is a National Network freight route while US 20 is a designated freight route in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). The National Network designates a set of highways based on geometric specifications (e.g., 12 foot wide travel lanes) specifically for use by large trucks while the OHP identifies freight routes based on the tonnage carried. Both of these corridors are also identified freight reduction review routes that requires the Mobility Advisory Committee to review and approve proposed changes to any reduction in the vehicle carrying capacity of these routes. US 101 south of US 20 is not a National Network freight route, OHP freight route, or reduction review route.

### **LOCAL TRUCK ROUTES**

The City has local truck routes designed to facilitate the movement of truck freight between local industrial and commercial uses and state highways. These roadways serve an important role in the City roadway network and should be designed and managed to safely accommodate the movement of goods. These routes require a minimum of 11-foot travel lanes.

The local truck network, shown in Figure 25, Figure 26, and Figure 27, includes NE 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, NE Avery Street, NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street, NE Harney Street, SW/E Bay Boulevard, SE Moore Drive, Yaquina Bay Road, US 101 (south of US 20), SE Marine Science Drive, SE Ferry Slip Road, SE 35<sup>th</sup> Street, and the future extensions of SE 50<sup>th</sup> Street and SE 62<sup>nd</sup> Street.



FIGURE 25: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (NORTH)






FIGURE 26: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (DOWNTOWN)



**FIGURE 27: FREIGHT AND TRUCK ROUTES (SOUTH)**



## MULTIMODAL NETWORK DESIGN

---

The design of the streets in Newport is based on the functional classifications. The designs are intended to be implemented in newly developing or redeveloping areas of the City. The City may also choose to reconstruct existing streets to meet the typical designs should right-of-way or other factors not prevent it from occurring.

Roadway cross-section design elements include travel lanes, curbs, furnishings/landscape strips, sidewalks on both sides of the road, and bicycle facilities. The following sections detail the minimum widths for each of Newport's functional classifications.

The construction or reconstruction of some streets may be constrained by various factors that prevent it from being constructed according to the minimum standards that apply. A deviation to the City street standards may be requested from the City Engineer or City Engineer's designee to consider a constrained cross-section or other adjustments. In some cases, unconstrained local streets in residential areas may also apply the yield or shared street design parameters if they serve a low volume of traffic (i.e., fewer than 500 vehicles per day).

Typical conditions that may warrant consideration of a deviation include:

- Infill sites
- Innovative designs
- Reallocation of right-of-way between modes (e.g., narrow travel lanes to accommodate wider bike lanes)
- Severe constraints presented by topography, environmental, or other resources present
- Existing developments and/or buildings that make it extremely difficult or impossible to meet the standards


Although the facility requirements along arterial streets are provided, both US 101 and US 20 are under the State's jurisdiction and are subject to the design criteria in the Highway Design Manual (HDM), other ODOT manuals, and the companion document, the Blueprint for Urban Design (BUD). The BUD supplements existing design manuals and provides enhanced design guidance until a full design manual update can be completed. The facility requirements along arterial streets are consistent with the BUD and the applicable urban contexts for US 101 and US 20 through Newport (more details provided in the Appendix). Any deviation to standards along these facilities must be approved by the State.

## TRAVEL LANES AND PARKING

The vehicle classifications and local truck routes determine the design parameters for travel lanes of each street. This is the throughway for drivers, including cars, buses, and trucks. Table 2 provides the travel lane and on-street parking requirements. The vehicle functional classification of the street is the starting point to determine the number of through lanes, lane widths, and median and left-turn lane requirements. However, Newport’s local truck routes take precedence when determining the appropriate lane width regardless of the functional classification. Streets identified as part of Newport’s local truck network may include travel lanes up to 12 feet wide, although 11 feet travel lanes are also acceptable. Wider lanes (over 12 feet) should only be used for short distances along curves and at intersections to allow trucks to maneuver. Streets that require a median/ center turn lane should include a minimum 8-foot-wide pedestrian refuge at marked crossings. Otherwise, the median can be reduced to a minimum of 4 feet at midblock locations, before widening at intersections for left-turn lanes (where required or needed).

Select low-volume local streets (i.e., fewer than 500 vehicles per day) in residential areas are also candidates for narrower roadway widths. These narrower streets, referred to as yield streets, should be designed so that moving cars must occasionally yield between parked cars before moving forward, as shown in Figure 28, allowing for the development of narrow streets, encouraging vehicles to move slower, and allowing for periodic areas where a 20-foot-wide clear area is available for parking of fire apparatus. Yield streets require placement of no-parking locations (i.e., driveways, fire hydrants, mailboxes) at appropriate intervals to provide the needed gaps for queuing opportunities. For blocks longer than 300 feet, 30-foot-long pullouts/no parking zones should be provided every 150 feet to allow for 20-foot-wide clear areas or 26-foot-wide near fire hydrants. Because fire apparatus preconnected hoses are 150 feet in length, blocks shorter than 300 feet do not require pullouts. With a connected street system and 300-foot block lengths, the fire apparatus can be parked at the end of the block where a fire is located, and the hose can reach the fire. Also, parking near intersections on narrow streets should not be permitted because it can interfere with the turning movements of large vehicles.

FIGURE 28: YIELD STREETS



Source: Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, State of Oregon

These streets may also be designed as shared streets, which also require vehicle traffic to yield to pedestrians and bicyclists within the roadway. Shared streets accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles, giving pedestrians priority over cars and bicyclists. The shared street does not have clear division between pedestrian and auto space (i.e., no continuous curb), so motorists must slow down and drive with caution.

Features of shared streets should include: 1) gateways that announce the entrance(s) to the shared street; 2) curves to slow vehicle traffic by limiting sightlines for drivers; 3) amenities such as trees and play equipment that force vehicles to slow down; 4) no curbs; and 5) intermittent parking. Cars can pass each other along a shared street, but typically only in selected locations. The speed limit is typically about 10 miles per hour.

The City consulted with the Newport Fire Department when developing the design requirements for yield/shared streets shown in Table 2, as required by ORS 368.039(3).



Shared street example with intermittent on-street parking.



Shared street example with street level pedestrian walkway.

**TABLE 2: TRAVEL LANE AND ON-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

<b>ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>ARTERIAL STREET (ODOT)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>MAJOR COLLECTOR STREET (CITY)</b>	<b>NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR STREET (CITY)</b>	<b>LOCAL STREET (CITY)</b>	<b>YIELD/SHARED STREET (CITY)<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>TYPICAL THROUGH LANES (BOTH DIRECTIONS)</b>	2 to 4	2	2	2	1
<b>MINIMUM LANE WIDTH</b>	11-12 ft. <sup>3</sup>	10 ft. <sup>4</sup>	10 ft. <sup>4</sup>	10 ft.	12-16 ft. single lane
<b>MEDIAN/ CENTER TURN LANE <sup>5</sup></b>	Required 11-14 ft. median/ center turn lane <sup>6</sup>	Required 11 ft. center turn lane near arterial intersections <sup>7</sup>	11 ft. center turn lane when needed near arterial intersections	None	None
<b>MINIMUM ON-STREET PARKING WIDTH</b>	Context dependent, 7-8 ft.	Preferred 8 ft. <sup>8</sup>	Preferred 8 ft. <sup>8</sup>	Preferred 7-8 ft. <sup>8</sup>	Required 7-8 ft. on at least one side <sup>8</sup>

Notes:

1. Although guidance is provided for arterial streets, these are under State jurisdiction. Values presented in this table are consistent with the Blueprint for Urban Design (BUD). For detailed design recommendations on US 101 and US 20, the identified urban contexts for Newport are provided in the appendix and the BUD is publicly available.
2. For use along low volume local streets in residential areas only. Requires intermittent on-street parking on at least one side to allow for vehicle queuing and passing opportunities. For blocks of no more than 300 ft. in length, and with fire access roads at both ends, a 16 ft. width may apply to local streets that carry fewer than 500 vehicles per day, or a 12 ft. width may apply to local streets that carry fewer than 150 vehicles per day. For blocks longer than 300 feet, this also requires 30 ft. long pullouts/no parking zones every 150 ft. to allow for 20 ft. wide clear areas or 26 ft. wide clear areas near fire hydrants.
3. 11 ft. travel lanes are preferred for most urban contexts within Newport. 11 ft. travel lanes are standard for central business district areas in the BUD. Adjustments may be required for freight reduction review routes. Final lane width recommendations are subject to review and approval by ODOT.
4. Travel lanes widths of 11-12 ft. are required along designated local truck routes.
5. A minimum 8-ft.-wide pedestrian refuge should be provided at marked crossings. Otherwise, a median can be reduced to a minimum of 4 ft. at midblock locations that are more than 150 ft. from an arterial (i.e., US 101 and US 20), before widening at intersections for left-turn lanes (where required or needed).
6. The BUD recommends a 14 ft. lane for speeds above 40 mph. Final lane width recommendations are subject to review and approval by ODOT.
7. Center turn lane required at and within 150 ft. of intersections with arterials (i.e., US 101 and US 20). Otherwise, it is optional and should be used to facilitate turning movements and/or street crossings; minimum 8-ft-wide median required where refuge is needed for pedestrian/bicycle street crossings.
8. On-street parking is preferred along all City streets where block spacing, and system connectivity standards are met. An 8 ft. width is required in most areas, with a 7 ft. width only allowed along local streets in residential areas. Local yield/shared streets require intermittent on-street parking on at least one side to allow for vehicle queuing and passing opportunities, with an 8 ft. width required when on only one side, and 7 ft. width allowed when on both sides. Shoulders totaling 8 ft. in collective width may also be provided in lieu of parking.

## SIDEWALKS

Sidewalks provide for pedestrian movement and access, enhance pedestrian connectivity, and promote walking. The pedestrian facilities in Newport encourage walking by making it more attractive. The street functional classification determines the appropriate pedestrian facilities along streets, including the width of the throughway for pedestrians and the buffer from the vehicle travel way. Sidewalks are typically required on both sides of newly constructed streets, but in some cases may be provided on only one side where it can be demonstrated that it aligns with the existing developed street section or that construction on both sides is not cost effective due to significant topographical constraints, as determined by the City Engineer or City Engineer's designee. A non-remonstrance agreement (i.e., agreement to participate in a future local improvement district) is also an option for infill development on streets that lack sidewalks.

The sidewalk encompasses four zones (as shown in Figure 29), including the edge, pedestrian throughway, furnishings/ landscape, and the buffer (i.e., on-street parking or bike facilities). These zones are summarized below, with the minimum configuration for each provided in Table 3. Sidewalk facilities constructed on State facilities are subject to review and approval by ODOT based on guidance from the BUD.

FIGURE 29: SIDEWALK ZONES







- The **edge** describes the section where a pedestrian interacts with the adjacent buildings or private property and includes entryways and outdoor seating. This zone is optional along City streets and may include a concrete or natural surface depending on the adjacent land use.
- The **pedestrian throughway** is the accessible zone in which pedestrians travel. It includes a minimum eight-foot-wide clear throughway along major collector streets in commercial areas, a minimum six-foot-wide clear throughway for major collector streets in non-commercial areas (e.g., residential) and neighborhood collector streets, and five-foot wide clear throughway along local streets.
- The **furnishings/ landscape** zone is the sidewalk section located between the pedestrian throughway and the curb, and includes street furnishings or landscaping (e.g., benches, lighting, bicycle parking, tree wells, and/or plantings). If adjacent to on-street parking, it should also include a clearance distance between any curbside parking and the street furnishing area or landscape strip (i.e., so vehicles parking, or opening doors do not interfere with street furnishings and/or landscaping). Streets located along a transit route should incorporate furnishings to support transit ridership, such as transit shelters and benches, into the



furnishings/landscape strip. It should include a minimum width between ½ and three feet along City streets.

- The **buffer** is the space between the pedestrian throughway and the vehicle travel way, and may consist of bike facilities, on-street parking, curb extensions, or other elements. This is also the location where users will access transit. It should include a minimum width between ½ and three feet along City streets, depending on the functional classification, and encompasses the width of on-street parking, bike facilities, and furnishings/landscape zone.

**TABLE 3: MINIMUM SIDEWALK CONFIGURATION**

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ARTERIAL (ODOT)	MAJOR COLLECTOR (CITY)		NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR (CITY)	LOCAL/YIELD STREET (CITY) <sup>3</sup>
		COMMERCIAL	NON-COMMERCIAL		
<b>MINIMUM CONFIGURATION <sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>EDGE</b>	1-4 ft.	0 ft.	0 ft.	0 ft.	0 ft.
<b>PEDESTRIAN THROUGHWAY</b>	5-10 ft.	8 ft. <sup>4</sup>	6 ft.	6 ft.	5 ft.
<b>FURNISHINGS/ LANDSCAPE (INCLUDES CURB)</b>	5.5-6.5 ft.	3 ft.	3 ft.	0.5 ft.	0.5 ft.
<b>MINIMUM WALKWAY WIDTH</b>	Variable <sup>5</sup>	11 ft.	9 ft.	6.5 ft.	5.5 ft.
<b>MINIMUM BUFFER (PEDESTRIAN THROUGHWAY TO VEHICLE TRAVEL WAY)<sup>2</sup></b>	Variable <sup>5</sup>	3 ft.	3 ft.	0.5 ft.	0.5 ft.

Notes:

1. Minimum widths may be expanded in areas with enhanced pedestrian activity, or when identified as a project in this TSP or subsequently adopted refinement plan. For instance, the edge zone may need to be expanded to accommodate outdoor seating for the adjacent land use.
2. Includes width of on-street parking, bike facilities, and furnishings/landscape zone.
3. Local streets that are also constructed as shared streets do not require curbs and may include a 5 ft. shoulder walkway at street level, with the travel lanes and shoulders satisfying pedestrian needs. In constrained cases, the shoulder walkway may be provided on only one side, or eliminated.
4. In highly constrained locations, the landscape buffer may be eliminated to meet the required 8 ft. pedestrian throughway with approval from the City Engineer, City Engineer's designee or Planning Director.
5. Desired walkway and buffer width for ODOT facilities depends on the urban context and are subject to review and approval by ODOT. Additional detail is provided in the BUD.

## BICYCLE FACILITIES

Bike facilities help support the movement of people riding bikes. Streets should be safe and comfortable for bicyclists of all ages and abilities to encourage ridership. Building high quality bicycle infrastructure can improve transportation safety, minimize public health risks, reduce congestion, and provide more equitable access to transportation. The minimum bicycle facilities can be seen in Table 4. Vehicle function classification is used to determine the appropriate facilities along streets. The minimum treatments include protected or separated facilities from the vehicle travel way along arterial streets, bicycle lanes along major collector streets, and shared streets with shared lane markings along neighborhood collector streets. All local streets in Newport are shared streets for bikes, but they do not include shared lane markings unless specifically called out in the TSP.

In general, facilities that are protected or separated from the vehicle travel way include a 10-foot two-way or 6-foot one-way cycle track, 10-foot shared use path, or 8-foot buffered bike lanes. Standard bike lanes should be a minimum of 6-feet wide, while some shared streets should include shared lane markings, with vehicle speed and volume management.

**TABLE 4: MINIMUM BICYCLE FACILITIES**

VEHICLE CLASSIFICATION	ARTERIAL (ODOT) <sup>2</sup>	MAJOR COLLECTOR (CITY)	NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR (CITY)	LOCAL/YIELD/SHARED STREET (CITY)
<b>MINIMUM BIKE FACILITY<sup>1</sup></b>	Protected or separated facilities from the vehicle travel way (e.g., shared use path, cycle track, buffered bicycle lanes)	Standard Bicycle lanes <sup>3</sup>	Shared bike streets with shared lane markings <sup>4</sup>	Shared bike streets without shared lane markings

Notes:


1. Any modification of the minimum bike facility requires justification of any constraints (e.g., topography, environmental, existing buildings) and approval of an acceptable deviation from ODOT, or the City Engineer or City Engineer's designee prior to construction.
2. Bicycle facility and buffer width for ODOT facilities depends on the urban context and are subject to review and approval by ODOT. Additional detail is provided in the BUD
3. Standard bicycle lanes require a minimum width of 6 ft.
4. Minimum treatments include shared lane markings, and wider travel lanes to encourage safe passing for motorists. May also include treatments to manage vehicle speeds and volumes.

## MINIMUM STREET CROSS-SECTIONS

The minimum cross-sections for City major collectors, neighborhood collectors, local streets, and yield/shared streets are provided in Figure 30, Figure 31, Figure 32, Figure 33, Figure 34 and Figure 35, respectively. These are based on the minimum design requirements outlined earlier in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4. In cases other than those involving needed housing as defined in ORS 197.303(1), the minimum widths may be expanded with justification, at the discretion of the City Engineer or City Engineer's designee. For instance, the edge zone may need to be expanded to accommodate outdoor seating for the adjacent land use. All cross-sections provided below assume that the street is not located on a designated Newport local truck route. Local truck routes require travel lanes widths of 11 to 12 feet.


No minimum cross-sections are provided for arterials (i.e., US 101 and US 20) in Newport since these streets are subject to review and approval by ODOT. Design guidance from ODOT can be found in the BUD and is summarized earlier in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4. ODOT's design guidance is context dependent which provides flexibility in specific element widths when determining the cross-sections.

**FIGURE 30: CITY MAJOR COLLECTOR (COMMERCIAL AREA) CROSS-SECTION**




**FIGURE 31: CITY MAJOR COLLECTOR (NON-COMMERCIAL AREA) CROSS-SECTION**


**Within 150 feet of Intersection with Arterials (i.e., US 101 and US 20)**




**More than 150 feet from Intersection with Arterials (i.e., US 101 and US 20)**




**FIGURE 32: CITY NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR CROSS-SECTION**



**FIGURE 33: CITY LOCAL STREET CROSS-SECTION**




**FIGURE 34: CITY LOCAL YIELD STREET CROSS-SECTION**



Note: For use along low volume local streets in residential areas only that carry fewer than 500 vehicles per day, with blocks of no more than 300 ft. in length. For blocks longer than 300 feet, this also requires 30 ft. long pullouts/no parking zones every 150 ft.

**FIGURE 35: CITY LOCAL SHARED STREET CROSS-SECTION**



Note: For use along low volume local streets in residential areas only that carry fewer than 500 vehicles per day, with blocks of no more than 300 ft. in length. Through lane width of yield and shared streets may be reduced to 12 ft. in areas that carry fewer than 150 vehicles per day. For blocks longer than 300 feet, this also requires 30 ft. long pullouts/no parking zones every 150 ft.

## SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES

Some pedestrian and bicycle facilities may be separated from the right-of-way of a street. These facilities include pedestrian trails, pedestrian and bicycle accessways, and shared use paths. These facilities serve a variety of recreation and transportation needs for pedestrians and bicyclists.

### PEDESTRIAN TRAIL

Pedestrian trails are typically located in parks or natural areas and provide opportunities for both pedestrian circulation and recreation. They are recommended to include a minimum width of 5 feet (see Table 5) and may include a hard or soft surface.

### ACCESSWAY


Accessways provide short path segments between disconnected streets or localized recreational walking and biking opportunities. Accessways must be on public easements or rights-of-way and have minimum paved surface of 8 feet, with a 1-foot shoulder on each side, and 10 feet of right-of-way. Accessways should be provided in any locations where the length between existing pedestrian and bicycle connections exceeds the maximum allowable length identified in Table 5.

### SHARED USE PATH

Shared use paths provide off-roadway facilities for walking and biking travel. Depending on their location, they can serve both recreational and citywide circulation needs. Shared use path designs vary in surface types and widths, although hard surfaces are generally better for bicycle travel. Widths need to provide ample space for both walking and biking and should be able to accommodate maintenance vehicles.

A shared use path should be at least 10 feet wide, with a 1-foot shoulder on each side, and 12 feet of right-of-way (see Table 5). A shared use path width of 12 feet is required along ODOT facilities and may be applied in other areas with significant walking or biking demand (e.g., Nye Beach Area, Oregon Coast Bike Route), or when identified as a project in this TSP or subsequently adopted refinement plan.

**TABLE 5: MINIMUM SEPARATED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITY DESIGNS**

FACILITY OPTIONS	PEDESTRIAN TRAIL DESIGN	ACCESSWAY OR LOW USE SHARED USE PATH DESIGN <sup>1</sup>	TYPICAL SHARED USE PATH DESIGN <sup>2</sup>
<b>MINIMUM CONFIGURATION</b>			

Notes:

- For short segments, a low use shared use path can be as narrow as 8 feet wide, with a 1-foot shoulder on each side and a total right-of-way of 10 feet.

2. A shared use path width of 12 feet is required parallel to ODOT facilities and may be applied in other areas with significant walking or biking demand (e.g., Nye Beach Area, Oregon Coast Bike Route).

## VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS

Mobility standards for streets and intersections in Newport provide a metric for assessing the impacts of new development on the existing transportation system and for identifying where capacity improvements may be needed. They are the basis for requiring improvements needed to sustain the transportation system as growth and development occur. Two common methods currently used in Oregon to gauge traffic operations for motor vehicles are volume to capacity (v/c) ratios and level of service (LOS), described below.

- Volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio: A v/c ratio is a decimal representation (between 0.00 and 1.00) of the proportion of capacity that is being used at a turn movement, approach leg, or intersection. It is determined by dividing the peak hour traffic volume by the hourly capacity of a given intersection or movement. A lower ratio indicates smooth operations and minimal delays. As the ratio approaches 1.00 (generally above 0.70), congestion noticeably increases, and performance is reduced. If the ratio is greater than 1.00, the turn movement, approach leg, or intersection is oversaturated and usually results in excessive queues and long delays.
- Level of service (LOS): LOS is a “report card” rating (A through F) based on the average delay experienced by vehicles at the intersection. LOS A, B, and C indicate conditions where traffic moves without significant delays over periods of peak hour travel demand. LOS D and E are progressively worse operating conditions. LOS F represents conditions where average vehicle delay is excessive, and demand exceeds capacity, typically resulting in long queues and delays.

City street performance standards for motor vehicles are shown in Table 6.

**TABLE 6: VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR CITY STREETS**

INTERSECTION TYPE	MOBILITY STANDARD	REPORTING MEASURE
<b>SIGNALIZED</b>	LOS D and v/c ≤0.90	Intersection
<b>ALL-WAY STOP OR ROUNDABOUTS</b>	LOS D and v/c ≤0.90	Worst Approach
<b>TWO-WAY STOP <sup>1</sup></b>	LOS E and v/c ≤0.95	Worst Major Approach/ Worst Minor Approach

Notes:

1. Applies to approaches that serve more than 20 vehicles; there is no standard for approaches serving lower volumes.

State facilities must comply with the existing mobility targets included in the Oregon Highway Plan and shown in Table 7. Alternative mobility targets have previously been adopted on US 101 in South Beach, and because constraints make meeting mobility targets along US 101 (north of Yaquina Bay) and US 20 impractical, the TSP also recommends that the Oregon Transportation Commission adopt alternative mobility targets for these highway segments. More information can be found in Technical Memorandum #11 in the Appendix.



**TABLE 7: EXISTING MOBILITY TARGETS FOR US 20 AND US 101**

ROADWAY	EXTENTS	ADOPTED V/C MOBILITY TARGET	
		SIGNALIZED	UNSIGNALIZED <sup>1</sup>
US 101	North Urban Growth Boundary to NE 20 <sup>th</sup> Street	≤ 0.80	≤ 0.80/0.90
	NE 20 <sup>th</sup> Street to SE 40 <sup>th</sup> Street <sup>2</sup>	≤ 0.90 except US 101/SE 35 <sup>th</sup> St: ≤0.99	≤ 0.90/0.95
	SE 40 <sup>th</sup> Street to south Urban Growth Boundary <sup>2</sup>	≤ 0.80 except US 101/SE 40 <sup>th</sup> St: ≤0.99 US 101/South Beach State Park/SE 50 <sup>th</sup> St: ≤0.85	≤ 0.80/0.90
US 20	Urban Growth Boundary to Moore Drive	≤ 0.80	≤ 0.80/0.90
	Moore Drive to US 101	≤ 0.85	≤ 0.85/0.95

Notes:

1. For unsignalized intersections, the mobility target is listed for major approach/minor approach.
2. Alternative mobility targets have been adopted in South Beach.

**MULTIMODAL CONNECTIVITY**

Transportation facility and access spacing standards include a broad set of techniques that balance the need to provide for efficient, safe, and timely multimodal travel with the ability to allow access to individual destinations. These standards help create a system of direct, continuous, and connected transportation facilities to minimize out-of-direction travel and decrease travel times for all users, while enhancing safety for people walking, biking and driving by reducing conflict points.

Table 8 identifies maximum and minimum public roadway intersection, minimum private access, and maximum pedestrian and bicycle accessway spacing standards for streets in Newport. New streets or redeveloping properties must comply with these standards. A deviation to the standards may be requested to the City Engineer or City Engineer's designee. The request must include appropriate documentation to illustrate why the standards cannot be met, and that, as proposed, the access can function safely and efficiently. As the opportunity arises through redevelopment, existing streets or driveways not complying with these standards could improve with strategies such as shared access points, access restrictions (through the use of a median or channelization islands), or closure of unnecessary access points, as feasible.

All arterial streets in Newport are under State jurisdiction. See the Oregon Highway Plan and Blueprint for Urban Design for spacing standards along US 101 and US 20.

**TABLE 8: TRANSPORTATION FACILITY AND ACCESS SPACING STANDARDS**

SPACING STANDARD <sup>1</sup>	ARTERIALS (ODOT) <sup>3</sup>	MAJOR COLLECTORS (CITY)	NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTORS (CITY)	LOCAL STREETS (CITY)
<b>MAXIMUM BLOCK LENGTH</b> (PUBLIC STREET TO PUBLIC STREET)	NA	1,000 ft.	1,000 ft.	1,000 ft.
<b>MINIMUM BLOCK LENGTH</b> (PUBLIC STREET TO PUBLIC STREET)	NA	200 ft.	150 ft.	125 ft.
<b>MAXIMUM LENGTH BETWEEN PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE CONNECTIONS</b> (PUBLIC STREET TO PUBLIC STREET, PUBLIC STREET TO CONNECTION OR CONNECTION TO CONNECTION) <sup>2</sup>	NA	300 ft.	300 ft.	300 ft.
<b>MINIMUM DRIVEWAY SPACING</b> (DRIVEWAY TO DRIVEWAY)	350-1,320 ft. <sup>3</sup>	100 ft.	75 ft.	N/A
<b>MINIMUM INTERSECTION SET BACK</b> (FULL ACCESS DRIVEWAYS ONLY)	350-1,320 ft. <sup>3</sup>	150 ft.	75 ft.	35 ft.
<b>MINIMUM INTERSECTION SET BACK</b> (RIGHT-IN/RIGHT-OUT DRIVEWAYS ONLY)	350-1,320 ft. <sup>3</sup>	75 ft.	50 ft.	35 ft.

Notes:

1. All distances measured from the edge of adjacent approaches. All properties are allowed one driveway, which must take access from the lowest classified roadway when adjacent to more than one roadway.
2. Mid-block pedestrian and bicycle connections must be provided when the block length exceeds 300 feet to ensure convenient access for all users. Mid-block pedestrian and bicycle connections must be provided on a public easement or right-of-way every 300 feet, unless the connection is impractical due to topography, inadequate sight distance, high vehicle travel speeds, lack of supporting land use or other factors that may prevent safe crossing. When the block length is less than 300 feet, mid-block pedestrian and bicycle connections are not required.
3. All arterial streets in Newport are under ODOT jurisdiction. ODOT facilities are subject to access spacing standards in the Oregon Highway Plan (see Table 14 of Appendix C) which vary based on posted speed, traffic volumes and setting. A summary of the current standards is provided below by segment:

**US 101:**

- North UGB to NW 66th Drive (55 mph): 1,320 feet
- NE 60<sup>th</sup> Drive to NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street (45 mph): 800 feet
- NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (35 mph): 500 feet
- NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to SW Neff Way (25 mph): 350 feet
- SW Neff Way to SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street (35 mph): 500 feet
- SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street to SE 50<sup>th</sup> Street (45 mph): 800 feet
- SE 50<sup>th</sup> Street to south UGB (55 mph): 1,320 feet

**US 20:**

- US 101 to NE Harney Street (30 mph): 500 feet
- NE Harney Street to east UGB (55 mph): 1,320 feet

## LIFELINE ROUTES

---

Newport's location on the Oregon Coast makes it vulnerable to both earthquakes and tsunamis. Statewide planning efforts have previously identified seismic lifeline routes and tsunami evacuation routes within Newport. The Oregon Seismic Lifeline Routes are a set of streets designated to facilitate emergency response and rapid economic recovery following a disaster. These routes are categorized as Tier 1, 2 and 3, with higher tier routes prioritized for seismic retrofits on existing state-owned facilities<sup>5</sup>. Within Newport, US 101 (north of US 20) is a designated Tier 1 lifeline route. Both US 101 (south of US 20) and US 20 are designated Tier 3 lifeline routes. These routes are identified in Technical Memorandum #10 in the Appendix.

In the event of a tsunami, the City's beach front, creek drainages, and the south beach area will need to evacuate. The tsunami hazard areas and identified evacuation assembly areas are also identified in Technical Memorandum #10 in the Appendix. Specific evacuation routes for each low-lying area are also available online. While much of Newport is outside of the tsunami inundation area, it is still susceptible to other hazards resulting from a seismic event (i.e., bridge failure).

Ensuring the lifeline and evacuation routes serve their intended purpose both during and following a disaster will be critical to ensure public safety and facilitate recovery. This TSP includes projects that promote seismic resilience on lifeline routes, adds pedestrian or bicycle facilities on evacuation routes, and other wayfinding projects.

## STREET STORMWATER DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT

---

The City of Newport Municipal Code states that drainage facilities should be designed to consider the capacity and grade necessary to maintain unrestricted flow from areas draining from a new land division and to allow extension of the system to serve such areas. In addition to providing conveyance capacity, improvements to City streets should incorporate stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) to mitigate the negative effects to water quality and attenuate runoff volumes and peak flows where practical. The type and extent of these BMPs will depend on the extent of the improvements, potential pollutant loading and potential for significant downstream impacts due to increased peak flows and volumes. The physical constraints of topography or environmentally sensitive, historic or developed areas that make constructing or reconstructing a roadway a challenge also apply to finding suitable space for stormwater management BMPs. See TSP Appendix M for some of the potential BMP types and where they may be suitable.

---

<sup>5</sup> The routes identified as Tier 1 are the most significant and necessary to ensure a functioning statewide transportation network. A functioning Tier 1 lifeline system provides traffic flow through the state and to each region. The Tier 2 lifeline routes provide additional connectivity and redundancy to the Tier 1 lifeline system. The Tier 2 system allows for direct access to more locations and increased traffic volume capacity, and it provides alternate routes in high-population regions in the event of outages on the Tier 1 system. The Tier 3 lifeline routes provide additional connectivity and redundancy to the lifeline systems provided by Tiers 1 and 2.

Prior to construction of any transportation improvements, a project specific stormwater investigation should be completed to determine the site specific constraints and appropriate BMPs. The ODOT Hydraulics Manual along with DEQ stormwater guidance should be consulted for specific design parameters.

A review of the downstream stormwater conveyance system should be completed as part of any modifications to ensure that the runoff is not contributing to issues with capacity or integrity of the stormwater outfall. The extent of the downstream analysis will depend on the extent of the improvements and specific site conditions.

### **AGATE BEACH STORMWATER CONSIDERATIONS**

As noted in the Geotechnical Consultation for Agate Beach memorandum prepared by Foundation Engineering, Inc. as part of the TSP update, the Agate Beach neighborhood is experiencing a high amount of coastal erosion along with potential for settlement of undocumented fill in the low-lying areas. A site-specific analysis by a certified engineering geologist is required for development within areas of high risk of erosion, settlement or landslides. These constraints make the need for stormwater BMPs that attenuate peak flows and volumes even more critical to ensuring that erosion and settlement isn't exacerbated by newly constructed transportation infrastructure. With potential for erosion and the presence of undocumented fill, facility types that rely on infiltration (drywells, soakage trenches, infiltration planters/basins) may not be appropriate due to the varying infiltration capacity and potential to increase settlement or erosion. Flow-through facilities such as swales, vegetated filter strips or mechanical treatment are likely more appropriate, with structured/mechanical treatment being the most likely approach to achieve stormwater management goals while minimizing the potential for increased settlement or erosion.



## Chapter 5: Project Development and Evaluation

This chapter describes the process followed to develop the transportation system improvement projects.

### PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING PROJECTS

---

The project team developed the recommended transportation solutions using guidance provided by the project goals and with input from three main sources:

- Stakeholders (via advisory committee meetings, in-person events, online open houses, community workshops, project website comments, and mail-in survey responses)
- Previous Plans (such as the 2012 Newport Transportation System Plan, Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan, Yaquina Bay State Recreation Site Plan)
- Independent Project Team Evaluation (Technical Memoranda #5 through #8 Existing and Future Transportation Conditions and Needs Evaluation, and Solutions Evaluation)

The full list of projects in this TSP are referred to as Aspirational Projects. Aspirational projects include all identified projects for improving the transportation network along major streets in Newport, regardless of their priority or their likelihood to be funded. This TSP focuses on streets in the City with a vehicle functional classification of neighborhood collector and higher. Additional improvements beyond the Aspirational project list will occur with private development in the UGB, including the build out of the local street network consistent with the standards in Chapter 4.

Newport's approach to developing transportation projects emphasized improved system efficiency and management over adding capacity. The approach considered four tiers of priorities that included:

1. Highest Priority – preserve the function of the system through management practices such as improved traffic signal operations, encouraging alternative modes of travel, and implementation of new policies and standards.
2. High Priority – improve existing facility efficiency through minor enhancement projects that upgrade roads to desired standards, fill important system connectivity gaps, or include safety improvements to intersections and corridors.

3. Moderate Priority – add capacity to the system by widening, constructing major improvements to existing roadways, or extending existing roadways to create parallel routes to congested corridors.
4. Lowest Priority – add capacity to the system by constructing new facilities.

The project team recommended higher priority solution types to address identified needs unless a lower priority solution was clearly more cost-effective or better supported the goals and objectives of the City. This process allowed the City to maximize use of available funds, minimize impacts to the natural and built environments, and balance investments across all modes of travel. The TSP planning process screens candidate projects to set aside those that may not be feasible due to environmental or existing development limitations. The remaining projects are a combination of new and previous ideas for the transportation system that seek to address the gaps and deficiencies in the City.

## PROJECT FUNDING

---

Each project was reviewed to consider how it might be funded during the next 20 years. In general, the primary funding agency was assumed to be the current or future facility owner, as they are responsible to oversee construction and long-term maintenance. For the TSP, all projects were assigned to either Newport or the State as the primary funding agency. In some cases, funding partnerships were identified for projects that were expected to provide mutual benefits between agencies or where there were opportunities to accelerate projects to completion. It is important to note that these funding assumptions do not obligate any agency to commit to these projects. Each project was also assigned an assumed funding source, which included the City's North Side Urban Renewal District, South Beach Urban Renewal District and other City/State revenue (i.e., Federal Funding, State Highway Trust Fund, local gas tax, System Development Charges, etc.).

This TSP also presents a high priority subset of the City's Aspirational Projects that are constrained to a level of funding that is expected to be available for the next 20 years. While there may be other partnering opportunities with ODOT and Lincoln County Transit, these decisions are ultimately up to those agencies. Private development will also likely build TSP projects in coordination with land use actions and future development in the City. While projects related to property development or re-development may occur within the TSP planning horizon, no funding was assumed from current City revenue sources since these projects will not be needed until the fronting development occurs. If the City chooses to update the local transportation system development charge in the future to incorporate the updated project list from the TSP and reassess the corresponding fees, much of the private development share will likely be included in that fee<sup>6</sup>.


Based on historical and forecasted funding levels, the City expects to have about \$76 million through the year 2040 for transportation projects in this TSP (see Figure 36). This includes about

---

<sup>6</sup> The funding analysis for the TSP assumes new private development contributions towards transportation improvements based on the current system development charge project list and fees.

\$38 million for projects in the North Side Urban Renewal District boundary and another \$38 million from other City and State funding sources for other citywide projects. And although it was not included in the TSP revenue forecast, the South Beach Urban Renewal District will also provide an additional \$3 million in funding for remaining projects in the district boundary. This is still far below the funding required to implement all the projects in this plan, which total approximately \$222 million, but may be sufficient to advance many of the higher priority projects in the City. The City may consider increasing existing fee levels, or adding new funding options to close these gaps and better prepare to accommodate growth. Refer to Technical Memorandum #9 in the Appendix for more information on the expected transportation revenue and expenditures.

**FIGURE 36: EXPECTED TRANSPORTATION FUNDING COMPARED TO PROJECT EXPENSES**



Note: \* The South Beach Urban Renewal District will also provide an additional \$3 million in funding for remaining projects in the district boundary, beyond the \$76 million shown.

## SPECIAL STUDIES

A series of special transportation studies was conducted as part of the TSP. The detailed evaluation process considered solutions along US 101 and US 20 in the downtown area, as well as a possible Harney Street extension to establish a new circulation route through the east end of the City between US 20 and US 101, near NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street. These solutions are large-scale capital investments that could significantly alter Newport’s transportation network and travel patterns by increasing roadway capacity and constructing enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Other low-cost transportation strategies were also considered to manage congestion at all highway intersections. The following sections summarize results of each special transportation study, including factors like the available right-of way or environmental constraints which could impact implementation.

## US 101 CIRCULATION OPTIONS

US 101 serves residents and visitors travelling along the Oregon Coast or within Newport. The highway, today, cuts through downtown Newport and creates a significant barrier for travel within the downtown core. High vehicle volumes on US 101 lead to significant congestion and delay on US 101 which limits access to existing local businesses and the hospital and fosters an auto-oriented downtown area. Limited existing right-of-way means that most of the roadway space is allocated to vehicle travel lanes with narrow sidewalks, narrow on-street parking, and no bicycle facilities. These characteristics limit economic development and tourism opportunities relative to other areas of the City.

Three circulation options were considered for US 101 as part of the TSP. The first option maintains the existing alignment of US 101 in downtown Newport but includes several streetscape alternatives to enhance the bicycle or pedestrian environment and increase business visibility. Two couplet options were also considered, either between SW Bayley Street and SW Angle Street or between SW Abbey Street and SW Angle Street. Both couplet options place northbound traffic on SW 9th Street while southbound traffic remains on the existing alignment of US 101. Converting US 101 to a couplet increases the total available right-of-way and allows wider sidewalks with protected bike facilities to be implemented along the corridor. These options also increase the total number of properties that front US 101 which may increase economic development opportunities for downtown Newport although extending the southern extent of the couplet to SW Bayley Street may reduce hospital access.



Each circulation option was evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively for their impact on pedestrian travel, bicycle travel, vehicle operations, hospital access, economic redevelopment opportunities, streetscape opportunities, and cost. These options were also presented to the public at a series of online open houses and advisory committee meetings to gauge acceptance of the desired approach to circulation for US 101. Through the evaluation process, two primary options emerged, including the US 101 short couplet between SW Abbey Street and SW Angle Street, seen below in Figure 37, and an enhanced two-way version of US 101, shown in Figure 38. An evaluation of these two alternatives is provided in Table 9. These evaluation criteria were derived to measure performance of the alternatives against the primary objectives of the Northside Urban Renewal Area for the Commercial Core, and to tie the economic development potential to how the funds will be potentially leveraged.

As shown in Table 9, the US 101 short couplet option scored higher under each criterion and emerged as the preferred alternative, although neither option has been eliminated from further consideration. Constructing a couplet on US 101 between SW Abbey Street and SW Angle Street better manages traffic volumes on US 101 while also improving the bicycle and pedestrian environment and supporting economic development. Converting US 101 to one-way will address the existing delay and congestion issues at US 101/SW Hubert Street and can better utilize the existing right-of-way, allowing for both wider sidewalks and protected bicycle facilities along the highway. However, the couplet option will impact some existing properties, as seen in Figure 37. Although the two-way option on US 101 is the less expensive of the circulation options, it is also likely to be less effective at addressing the identified needs, as shown in Table 9. A summary of the full evaluation for each US 101 circulation option is included in the Appendix.






**FIGURE 38: US 101 TWO-WAY CIRCULATION OPTION**



**US 101 Four Lane: Wider Sidewalk Option**

- Remove on-street parking, with parking on side streets and lots
- Provide wider 11' travel lanes (from 10' today)
- Provide wider sidewalk area with landscape



**SW 9th Street Bikeway**

- Remove parking, reduce lane width and add bike lanes

**TABLE 9: EVALUATION OF THE US 101 ALTERNATIVES**

EVALUATION CRITERIA	US 101 TWO-WAY (WITH BIKE LANES ON SW 9TH STREET)	US 101 SHORT COUPLET (SW ABBEY STREET AND SW ANGLE STREET)
<b>PROMOTES MIXED-USES AND ACTIVITY CENTERS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Traffic volume on SW 9th Street remains static; difficult to promote mixed use on US 101 due to high vehicle volume and limited separation from travel lanes, no bike facilities or parking</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>Concentrates investment in existing most active US 101 area; adds new opportunities on SW 9th Street; wider sidewalks and addition of bike lanes creates opportunities for residential over retail mixed use</p>
<b>DISTRIBUTES TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT TO THE WIDEST RANGE OF OPPORTUNITY STREETS AND SITES</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ +</p> <p>Primary benefit on SW 9th Street only; US 101 remains the same</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>Better site access, visibility, and circulation improvements in SW Fall Street to SW Angle Street corridor</p>
<b>IMPROVES OVERALL MOBILITY</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ +</p> <p>Basic traffic calming and intersection cleanup; center turn lane reduces delays, where feasible</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>New traffic pattern, bikeways, sidewalk upgrades, parking</p>
<b>IMPROVES WALKING AND BIKING NETWORK</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ +</p> <p>Dedicated bikeways on SW 9th Street only; no bikeways on US 101; Walking degraded on US 101 as motor vehicles are closer to sidewalk</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>Overall improvements provide benefits; new facilities on both street segments</p>
<b>INCREASES STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ +</p> <p>No change on US 101; new opportunities on SW 9th Street</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>Provides much space for streetscape upgrades</p>
<b>IMPROVES THE STREET GRID AND URBAN PATTERN</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Overall circulation improvements; related side-street impacts</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+ + +</p> <p>Major upgrades to highway segments and interconnected side streets</p>

## US 20 CIRCULATION OPTIONS


US 20 is the primary route that connects Newport east to Corvallis and other regional destinations along I-5. The existing three-lane section leads to significant congestion in the summer for traffic entering Newport that must turn at the US 101/US 20 intersection. The long vehicle queues approaching the US 101/US 20 signal reduce business access and increase delay for the existing, unsignalized intersections along US 20. Congestion on US 20 coupled with limited right-of-way and poor multimodal facilities also creates significant challenges for all users. Today, there are only narrow, curb-tight sidewalks for a portion of the corridor, no bicycle facilities, and limited opportunities for future widening to relieve congestion.

Two circulation options were considered for US 20 as part of the TSP. The first option maintains the existing alignment of US 20 in downtown Newport but includes several streetscape alternatives to enhance the bicycle or pedestrian environment. The second option constructs a couplet on US 20 between NE Harney Street/SE Moore Drive and US 101. This option would place westbound traffic on NE 1st Street while eastbound traffic would remain on the existing alignment of US 20; US 20 westbound would tie back into the existing alignment prior to the US 101/US 20 intersection. Converting US 20 to a couplet increases the total available right-of-way and allows wider sidewalks with protected bike facilities to be implemented along the corridor. This option also increases the total number of properties that front US 20 which may increase economic development opportunities for downtown Newport although US 20 is located outside of Newport's historic downtown core.

The circulation options were evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively for their impact on pedestrian travel, bicycle travel, vehicle operations, economic redevelopment opportunities, streetscape opportunities, and cost. These options were also presented to the public at a series of online open houses and advisory committee meetings to gauge acceptance of the desired approach to circulation for US 20. Through the evaluation process, maintaining two-way traffic on US 20, seen below in Figure 39, emerged as the preferred alternative. This option would include on-street bike facilities between NE Harney Street and NE Fogarty Street, but would include no bike facilities west of NE Fogarty Street to US 101. It would, however, be complemented by adjacent bike facilities along NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street to the north and SE 1<sup>st</sup> Street to the south, connected by an enhanced crossing at the SE Fogarty Street intersection with US 20. A summary of the full evaluation for each US 20 circulation option is included in the Appendix. Although this is the preferred cross section, US 20 is a Freight route and a Reduction Review route and will be subject to further review by ODOT.

Improving the existing streetscape on US 20 will improve segments of the bicycle and pedestrian environment at a comparably low cost. Although a couplet would increase vehicle capacity on US 20, the right-of-way needed to upgrade NE 1st Street and implement improvements at the US 101/US 20 signal outweigh the potential benefits of a couplet. Retaining the existing alignment of US 20 can improve segments of the bicycle and pedestrian environment while minimizing the negative impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

**FIGURE 39: PREFERRED US 20 CIRCULATION OPTION**



**US 101/US 20 INTERSECTION OPTIONS**

Several improvement options were considered at the US 101/US 20 intersection. This intersection experiences high delay during the peak periods today, and the delay is forecasted to worsen in the future. High volumes on each approach to the intersection limit the potential for cost effective signal timing or other minor modifications to manage congestion. Alternatives considered included a two-lane roundabout and restricting the Olive Street approach to a single direction (i.e., westbound only), but ultimately adding a second southbound left turn lane from US 101 to eastbound US 20 emerged as the preferred option. This improvement will widen the southbound US 101 approach to US 20 to include six lanes (two southbound through lanes, two southbound left-turn lanes, and two northbound lanes), will require widening along US 20 to include a second receiving lane, and will enhance sidewalks and add bike lanes near the intersection. These improvements will likely have significant impacts to properties surrounding the intersection. While the concepts have highlighted the potential property impacts, they are only illustrative at this stage of the planning process and will be fully vetted and ultimately determined during the engineering design process prior to the construction drawings. It is worth noting that the PAC prefers a widening option that focuses the US 101 widening to the east, since it had the lowest impact to adjacent properties.

**HARNEY STREET EXTENSION**

Newport does not have a parallel route on the east side of US 101 to connect northern areas of the city to the downtown core, so most vehicle trips between these areas must occur on US 101. The Harney Street Extension proposes a new minor arterial road between NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street and NE Big Creek Road before connecting to US 101 at the proposed NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street traffic signal. This extension will provide a continuous connection between US 20 and NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street with limited

access to amenities along US 101 north of NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street and allow travelers to bypass some of the most congested segments of US 101. The Harney Street extension will also provide a critical connection to serve future growth in this area.

The Harney Street extension was previously identified in long-range transportation plans, but this special study included additional refinement to understand the costs and benefits of this improvement. Figure 40 illustrates the refined project concept. The extension was evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively for its impact on pedestrian travel, bicycle travel, vehicle operations, and cost.

Due to the limited access to amenities along US 101 in Newport from the Harney Street extension, this road will primarily serve regional traffic travelling between US 20 and US 101 to the north of Newport along with future residential growth that is projected to occur along the proposed alignment. Between 4,000 and 7,000 vehicles are expected to use this extension by 2040 which will provide only modest relief for congestion on US 101 in Newport. However, this street extension will also include pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect to Newport's planned network, significantly enhancing travel for these modes. The Harney Street extension will enhance local circulation for Newport although the high project cost makes this a lower priority improvement for Newport.

FIGURE 40: HARNEY STREET EXTENSION CONCEPTUAL ALIGNMENT



## ALTERNATIVE HIGHWAY MOBILITY TARGETS

Assuming Newport grows in accordance with its current adopted land use plan and travelers continue to rely heavily on private automobiles for their trips, roadways in the City will not be able to meet ODOT’s v/c ratio-based mobility targets in the Oregon Highway Plan. In this situation (which is common in communities with roadways that experience high travel demands), adoption of alternative mobility targets is appropriate. Alternative mobility targets reflect realistic expectations for roadway performance at the end of the 20-year planning horizon, based on traffic projections. Adopting realistic alternative targets relieves the state and local governments from having to limit development or make investments to comply with targets they cannot possibly achieve.

PLACEHOLDER





## Chapter 6: Projects and Priorities

This chapter describes the transportation system improvement projects identified to address the system needs discussed in Chapter 3.


### ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS

---

The full aspirational list includes 109 projects totaling over \$222 million in total investments (see Figure 41). For the purposes of cost estimates, project design elements are identified, however, the actual design elements for any project are subject to change and will ultimately be determined through a preliminary and final design process and are subject to City, ODOT and/or other partner agency approval. The Aspirational projects were assigned to one of several categories:

- **Street Extension/Street Improvement** – these projects will improve or construct new multi-modal streets and intersections throughout the UGB, each with facilities for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. They are listed with project identification numbers beginning with “INT”, “EXT” and “REV”. The TSP includes a total of 21 projects that, as of 2021, will cost an estimated \$117.2 million to complete.
- **Pedestrian/ Bike Improvement** – these projects include stand-alone sidewalk, path and an integrated network of bicycle lanes, marked on-street routes and shared-use paths to facilitate safe and convenient travel citywide. They are listed with project identification numbers beginning with “SW”, “TR”, “BR”, “SBL” and “BL”. A total of 71 pedestrian and bicycle projects were identified that, as of 2021, will cost an estimated \$97.2 million to complete.
- **Street Crossing Improvement** – these projects will improve safety and mobility at street crossings throughout the UGB. They are listed with project identification numbers beginning with “CR”. A total of 13 projects were identified to construct new or improve existing crossings that, as of 2021, will cost an estimated \$1.8 million to complete.
- **Demand/ System Management** – these projects will encourage more efficient usage of the transportation system. They are listed with project identification numbers beginning with “PRO”. The TSP includes four projects that, as of 2021, will cost an estimated \$6.3 million.

**FIGURE 41: LEVEL OF INVESTMENT BY MODE OF TRAVEL**



**PRIORITIZING ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS**

Unless the City expands its funding options, most of the Aspirational projects identified are not reasonably likely to be funded by 2040. For this reason, projects from the Aspirational list were evaluated and ranked using a set of evaluation criteria that reflect how well it achieves the transportation goals and objectives described in Chapter 2. The prioritization score was calculated for each project using the criteria associated with 8 of the 9 TSP goals. TSP Goal 9 (Work with Regional Partners) did not have any associated criteria and was therefore not a factor in the evaluation score calculation.

There was a total of 13 criteria overall associated with the TSP Goals, as some goals had more than one criterion. The projects were initially given a score of 1 (one) for each of the 13 criteria it addressed, with each goal weighted equally, resulting in overall possible scores ranging from 0 to 8. Projects were then assigned an evaluation rank of “high” for projects with the highest total scores, “medium” for the middle one-third of project scores, and “low” for projects with the lowest total scores (see Table 10). The methodology for calculating the scores for each criterion can be found in Technical Memorandum #8 in the Appendix.

The final priority ranks listed in Table 10 were used to divide projects from the Aspirational project list into two improvement packages, referred to as Financially Constrained and Unconstrained (see descriptions of these improvement packages in the following sections). The project priority rankings do not create an obligation to construct projects in any order and it is recognized that these priorities may change over time. The City of Newport will use the priorities listed in this TSP to guide investment decisions but will also regularly reassess local priorities to leverage new opportunities and reflect evolving community interests.

The City is not required to implement projects identified on the Financially Constrained list first. Priorities may change over time and unexpected opportunities may arise to fund particular projects. The City is free to pursue any of these opportunities at any time. The purpose of the

Financially Constrained project list is to establish reasonable expectations for the level of improvements that will occur and give the City initial direction on where funds should be allocated.

### FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECTS

Financially Constrained projects are the most valued, in terms of how they meet critical needs and how well they work to deliver on community goals. Projects in this group have a total construction budget that is similar to the reasonably available funding over the planning horizon, meaning the \$76 million that is likely to be available through existing City and State funding sources. This package also includes the \$3 million in additional funding from the South Beach Urban Renewal District for remaining projects in the district boundary, beyond the \$76 million.

The projects included in the Financially Constrained list are shown in Table 10 and Figure 42, Figure 43, Figure 44, Figure 45, Figure 46 and Figure 47. These projects were grouped within the following priority horizons, based on the overall project evaluation score and available funding:

- **Tier 1:** Projects recommended for implementation within 1 to 10 years.
- **Tier 2:** Projects likely to be implemented beyond 10 years.

### UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS

Unconstrained projects are those remaining from the Aspirational list that likely will not include funding by 2040. The projects included in the Unconstrained list are shown in Table 10 and Figure 42, Figure 43, Figure 44, Figure 45, Figure 46 and Figure 47. These projects were grouped within the following priority horizons, based on the project evaluation score:

- **Unconstrained Tier 1:** Projects with the highest priority for implementation beyond the projects included on the Financially Constrained list, should additional funding become available.
- **Unconstrained Tier 2:** The last phase of projects to be implemented, should additional funding become available.

## ASPIRATIONAL PROJECT TABLE AND FIGURES

The Aspirational projects listed in Table 10 are also displayed on Figure 42, Figure 43, Figure 44, Figure 45, Figure 46 and Figure 47, with the corresponding figure shown in the column labeled "Map Area" (i.e., North, Downtown or South). Multimodal projects (i.e., "SW", "TR", "BR", "SBL", "BL" and "CR" labels) and motor vehicle projects (i.e., "INT", "EXT" and "REV" labels) are displayed on separate figures in each map area. The "north area" maps are shown in Figure 42 and Figure 43, the "downtown area" maps shown in Figure 44 and Figure 45, and the "south area" maps shown in Figure 46 and Figure 47.

The project identification numbers in the first column are coded to indicate the category of the improvement, as follows:

- "INT" to represent an intersection improvement project
- "EXT" to represent a roadway extension project
- "REV" to represent an existing roadway improvement or reconfiguration project
- "SW" to represent a sidewalk improvement project
- "TR" to represent a trail or shared use path improvement project
- "BR" to represent a bike route improvement project
- "SBL" to represent an improvement project to add separated or buffered bike lanes
- "BL" to represent an improvement project to add standard bike lanes
- "CR" to represent a roadway crossing improvement project
- "PRO" to represent a citywide demand or system management project

The improvement package for each Aspirational project is shown in the column labeled "Package", and is either Financially Constrained (i.e., projects likely to be funded) or Unconstrained (i.e., projects not likely to be funded).

**TABLE 10: ASPIRATIONAL PROJECTS**

<b>PROJECT ID*</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY</b>	<b>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</b>	<b>ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)</b>	<b>PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING</b>	<b>TSP GOALS MET</b>	<b>PACKAGE**</b>	<b>PRIORITY HORIZON</b>	<b>MAP AREA</b>
<b>INT1</b>	<p><b>US 101/NE 73rd Street</b>                      Improve the intersection with either a traffic signal or roundabout. Cost assumes installation of a traffic signal.</p>	State	City/State Funds	\$950,000	Medium	1,2,4,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
<b>INT3</b>	<p><b>US 101/NW Oceanview Drive</b>                      Widen the eastbound NW Oceanview Drive approach to include separate left and right turn lanes.</p>	State	NURA	\$225,000	Low	2,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
<b>INT4</b>	<p><b>US 101/US 20</b>                      Construct a second southbound left turn lane. Requires a signal modification, widening along US 101 and along the south side of US 20 to support a second receiving lane, and conversion of the US 101/NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street intersection to right-in, right-out movements only.</p>	State	NURA	\$5,000,000	High	1,2,4,7,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>INT6</b>	<p><b>US 20/SE Moore Drive/NE Harney Street</b>                      Improve the intersection with a traffic signal (with separate left turn lanes on the northbound and southbound approaches). Coordinate improvements with Project SBL1.</p>	State	NURA	\$1,050,000	Medium	1,2,4,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
<b>INT8</b>	<b>US 101/NE 36th Street</b> Improve the intersection with either a traffic signal (with separate left and right turn lanes for westbound traffic) or a roundabout. Cost assumes installation of a traffic signal.	State	City/State Funds	\$1,175,000	Medium	1,2,4,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
<b>INT9</b>	<b>US 101/SW 40th Street</b> Improve the intersection with a traffic signal. Cost assumes installation of a traffic signal, curb ramps, striping, signing and repaving, as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan.	State	SBURA	\$1,550,000	High	1,2,4,7,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>INT10</b>	<b>US 20/Benton Street</b> Restripe northbound approach to include separate left/through lane and right turn lane (requires removal of on-street parking).	State	NURA	\$75,000	Low	2,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
<b>INT11</b>	<b>US 101/NW-NE 6th Street</b> Realign NW 6 <sup>th</sup> Street to the north and/or NE 6 <sup>th</sup> Street to the south to create a standard 4-leg intersection. Requires right-of-way acquisition and a signal modification.	State	NURA	\$3,075,000	Low	1,2,4	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
<b>INT12</b>	<b>US 101/NE 57th Street</b> Realign approach to intersect with NW 58th Street.	State	NURA	\$1,275,000	Low	1,2	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
EXT1	<b>NW Gladys Street (from NW 55<sup>th</sup> Street to NW 60<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Improve NW Gladys Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street.	Newport	NURA	\$1,100,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North
EXT3	<b>NE 6th Street (from NE Laurel Street to NE Newport Heights Drive)</b> Extend NE 6th Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$5,200,000	Low	2,3,7	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
EXT4	<b>NE Harney Street (from NE 7<sup>th</sup> Street to NE Big Creek Road)</b> Extend NE Harney Street to create a continuous major collector street and install a mini roundabout at the intersection of NE Harney Street/NE 7th Street.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$58,600,000	High	2,3,4,6,7	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North, Downtown
EXT8	<b>SE Ash Street-SE Ferry Slip Road (from SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street to SE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street)</b> Extend SE Ash Street-SE Ferry Slip Road to create a continuous major collector street.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,275,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
EXT9	<p><b>SE 50th Place (from Emery Trailhead to US 101)</b></p> <p>Extend SE 50th Place to the entrance of South Beach State Park at US 101 to create a continuous major collector street. Cost includes the construction of a shared use path on one side and widening of US 101 to create a southbound left turn lane.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$3,375,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown, South
EXT10	<p><b>SE 62nd Street (from current terminus to SE 50th Place)</b></p> <p>Extend SE 62nd Street from the current terminus to SE 50th Place, near Emery Trailhead, to create a continuous major collector street. Cost includes the construction of a shared use path on one side.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$6,150,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown, South
EXT11	<p><b>SE Harborton Street (from SE College Way to SE 62nd Street extension)</b></p> <p>Extend SE Harborton Street to the SE 62nd Street extension intersection with SE 50th Place to create a continuous major collector street. Cost includes the construction of a shared use path on one side.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$4,000,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown, South



PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
EXT12	<p><b>NW Nye Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street)</b></p> <p>Extend/Improve NW Nye Street to create a continuous neighborhood collector street between NW Oceanview Drive and NW 15th Street. Cost assumes bridge will be needed, installation of a sidewalk, and signing and striping as needed to designate a shared bike route.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$3,100,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
REV1	<p><b>NW Oceanview Drive (from NW Nye Street Extension to NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street)</b></p> <p>Convert NW Oceanview Drive to one-way southbound between the NW Nye Street Extension and NW 12th Street and shift northbound vehicle traffic to NW Nye Street. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a southbound travel lane for vehicles, and an adjacent shared use path for pedestrians and bicycles. Project EXT12 must be completed before Project REV1.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$350,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
REV5	<p><b>Yaquina Bay Bridge Refinement Plan</b></p> <p>Conduct a study to identify the preferred alignment of a replacement bridge, typical cross-section, implementation, and feasibility, and implement long-term recommendations from the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan.</p>	State	City/State Funds	\$500,000	High	2,3,4,6,7,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
REV6	<p><b>US 101 and SW 9th Street (from SW Abbey Street to SW Angle Street)</b></p> <p>Convert US 101 to one-way southbound between SW Abbey Street and SW Angle Street, and shift northbound US 101 to SW 9th Street. Cost assumes cross-sections as identified in Chapter 5 of this TSP, construction of new roadway segments to transition northbound traffic to and from SW 9th Street, and some intersection and crossing improvements. Specific treatments will be identified during design phase of the project.</p>	State	NURA	\$11,700,000	High	2,3,4,6,7,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
REV7	<p><b>US 20 (from US 101 to NE Harney Street)</b></p> <p>Enhance the existing street cross-section with widened sidewalks and new landscape buffers. Cost assumes cross-sections as identified in Chapter 5 of this TSP, with on-street bicycle lanes only provided between SE Fogarty Street and NE Harney Street. Requires a design exception and documented public acceptance. Parallel bicycle facilities provided between US 101 and SE Fogarty Street in Project BR5, TR12 and BL3.</p>	State	NURA	\$6,500,000	High	2,3,4,6,7,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
SW1	<p><b>NW 3rd Street (from NW Brook Street to NW Nye Street)</b></p> <p>Complete existing sidewalk gaps using either standard sidewalk widths or restripe to provide a designated pedestrian walkway in-street.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,100,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	Downtown
SW2	<p><b>NE 3rd Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Harney Street)</b></p> <p>Complete existing sidewalk gaps.</p>	Newport/ Lincoln County	City/State Funds	\$950,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SW3	<b>SW Elizabeth Street (from W Olive Street to SW Government Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,600,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown
SW6	<b>NE 7th Street (from NE Eads Street to NE 6th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,175,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown
SW8	<b>NE Harney Street (from US 20 to NE 3rd Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	NURA	\$700,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown
SW11	<b>SE Benton Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SE 10th Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$3,050,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North, Downtown
SW12	<b>SW 2nd Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW Nye Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,275,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown
SW13	<b>NW Nye Street (from W Olive Street to NW 15th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$4,450,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North, Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SW14	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,150,000	Low	2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North, Downtown
SW16	<b>NW Edenvue Way/NE 20th Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NE Crestview Drive)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,475,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North
SW17	<b>NW 60th Street (from US 101 to NW Gladys Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	NURA	\$175,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
SW18	<b>SE 35th Street (from SE Ferry Slip Road to South Beach Manor Memory Care)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan.	Newport	SBURA	\$750,000	High	1,2,3,6,7	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
SW19	<b>NW 8th Street/NW Spring Street (from NW Coast Street to NW 11th Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,175,000	Low	2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North, Downtown
SW20	<b>NW Gladys Street/NW 55th Street (from NW 60th Street to US 101)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	NURA	\$1,425,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SW21	<b>US 101 (from NW 25th Street to NE 31st Street)</b> Construct pedestrian path on east side of US 101. Cost assumes 10-ft wide sidewalk with sheet pile wall.	State	NURA	\$3,100,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
SW22	<b>Yaquina Bay State Park Drive (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW Naterlin Drive)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps and install enhanced pedestrian crossings consistent with the Yaquina Bay State Recreation Site Master Plan.	Newport	State Funds	\$2,250,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
SW23	<b>SW Bay Boulevard (from SE Fogarty Street to SE Moore Drive)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,300,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
SW24	<b>NW 55th Street (from NW Gladys Street to NW Piney Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	NURA	\$1,775,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North
SW25	<b>NE Harney Street/NE 36th Street (from US 101 to NE Big Creek Road)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$5,300,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SW26	<b>NE Avery Street/NE 71st Street (from US 101 to NE Echo Court)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$2,475,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
SW27	<b>NE 12th Street (from US 101 to NE Benton Street)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$625,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North, Downtown
SW28	<b>SW Bayley Street (SW Elizabeth Street to US 101)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps.	Newport	NURA	\$325,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
SW29	<b>US 101 (from SE Ferry Slip Road to SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street)</b> Complete the sidewalk gaps on the east side.	State	City/State Funds	\$425,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	Downtown
SW30	<b>Yaquina Bay Road (from SE Vista Drive to SE Running Spring)</b> Complete existing sidewalk gaps on north side only.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,800,000	Low	2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
SW31	<b>SW Abalone Street (from US 101 to SW 35th Street)</b> Construct a sidewalk on the south side of SW Abalone Street.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$350,000	Medium	2,3,4,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
TR1	<p><b>NW Oceanview Drive (from US 101 to NW Nye Street Extension)</b></p> <p>Construct a shared use path on one side. The short term improvement along this segment included in Project BR15.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$4,775,000	High	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
TR2	<p><b>US 101 (from NW Lighthouse Drive to 600 feet north of NW 77<sup>th</sup> Court)</b></p> <p>Construct a shared use path on the east side of US 101. Sidewalk infill will also be completed on the west side south of NW 60th Street. Shared use path project should be consistent with previous planning efforts (e.g., Agate Beach Historic Bicycle/Pedestrian Path, Lighthouse to Lighthouse Path).</p>	State	NURA	\$6,650,000	High	1,2,3,6,7	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North



PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
TR3	<p><b>US 101 (from NW Lighthouse Drive to NW Oceanview Drive)</b></p> <p>Construct a shared use path on the west side of US 101, with sidewalk infill on the east side. Shared use path project should be consistent with previous planning efforts (e.g., Agate Beach Historic Bicycle/Pedestrian Path, Lighthouse to Lighthouse Path). Cost included with Project TR8.</p>	State	Federal Funds/ NURA	Included with Project TR8	High	1,2,3,4, 6,7	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
TR4	<p><b>US 101 (from SE 35th Street to SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street)</b></p> <p>Construct a shared use path on the west side of US 101.</p>	State	City/State Funds	\$500,000	Medium	1,2,3,7	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	Downtown, South
TR5	<p><b>US 101 (from SE 40<sup>th</sup> Street to South UGB)</b></p> <p>Construct a shared use path on the west side of US 101.</p>	State	City/State Funds	\$5,500,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown, South
TR6	<p><b>NE Big Creek Road (from NE Fogarty Street to NE Harney Street)</b></p> <p>Reconfigure the roadway to provide a shared use path. Cost assumes utilization of the existing roadway width to include a one-way 12 ft. travel lane and an adjacent shared use path.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$450,000	High	2,3,4,5, 6,7	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
TR7	<b>NW Rocky Way (from NW 55th Street to NW Lighthouse Drive)</b> Construct a shared use path and other improvements as identified by the BLM/FHWA. Cost included with Project TR8.	Newport	Federal Funds/ NURA	Included with Project TR8	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
TR8	<b>NW Lighthouse Drive (from US 101 to terminus)</b> Construct a shared use path on one side and other improvements as identified by the BLM/FHWA. Cost includes pedestrian/bicycle crossing improvements at the intersection of US 101/NW Lighthouse Drive, and Projects TR3 and TR7.	State	Federal Funds/ NURA	\$4,000,000	Medium	2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
TR9	<b>SE 40th Street (from US 101 to SE Harborton Street)</b> Construct a shared use path on one side to complete existing gap.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$675,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	Downtown
TR10	<b>US 101 (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW 25th Street)</b> Construct a shared use path along US 101. Note the side and extents are subject to further consideration.	State	NURA	\$5,275,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
TR12	<b>SE 1st Street (from SE Douglas Street to SE Fogarty Street)</b> Construct a shared use path. Cost assumes bridge will be needed.	Newport	NURA	\$2,550,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
TR13	<b>South Beach Improvements</b> Pedestrian and bicycle priority improvements as identified in the South Beach Refinement Plan. This project does not include the cost associated with Project SW18.	Newport	SBURA	\$700,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	n/a
BR1	<b>NE 12th Street (from NE Benton Street to NE Fogarty Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
BR2	<b>NE Harney Street/NE 36th Street (from NE Big Creek Road to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate as interim shared bike route. Long term, on-street bike lanes to be provided as part of the Harney Street extension (Project EXT4). Cost assumes interim improvement only.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BR3	<b>NE Eads Street (from NE 1st Street to NE 12th Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
BR4	<b>Yaquina Bay State Park Drive (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW Naterlin Drive)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route, consistent with the Yaquina Bay State Recreation Site Master Plan.	State	State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	Downtown
BR5	<b>SE 1st Street (from SE Coos Street to SE Fogarty Street), SE Fogarty Street (from US 20 to SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street), and SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (SE Fogarty Street to SE Moore Drive)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Project TR12 must be completed before/with Project BR5.	City	NURA	\$25,000	High	2,3,4,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BR7	<p><b>SW 2nd Street/SW Angle Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to SW 10th Street)</b></p> <p>Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Specific intersection treatments at US 101 and SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street intersections to be determined with Project REV6.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BR9	<p><b>NW Edenvue Way/NE 20th Street (from NW Oceanview Drive to NW Crestview Drive)</b></p> <p>Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route. Restripe through US 101/NE 20th Street intersection to provide on-street bike lanes between the NW Edenvue Way/NW 20<sup>th</sup> Street intersection and the eastern Fred Meyer Driveway.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
BR10	<p><b>NW 60th Street/NW Gladys Street/NW 55th Street (from US 101 to US 101)</b></p> <p>Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route through Agate Beach.</p>	Newport	NURA	\$25,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
BR12	<p><b>NE Avery Street/NE 71st Street (from US 101 to NE Echo Court)</b></p> <p>Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BR13	<b>NW 3rd Street (from US 101 to NW Cliff Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BR14	<b>Yaquina Bay Bridge Interim Improvements</b> Install signing as needed to designate a bike route and implement other improvements as identified in the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan such as flashing warning lights or advisory speed signs.	State	City/State Funds	\$75,000	High	1,2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BR15	<b>NW Oceanview Drive Interim Improvements (from US 101 to NW Nye Street Extension)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate as an interim bike route and implement other improvements as identified in the Oregon Coast Bike Route Plan. Long term improvement along this segment included in Project TR1.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
BR16	<b>NW 55th Street (from NW Gladys Street to NW Pinery Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	NURA	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BR17	<b>NW 6th Street (from NW Coast Street to NW Nye Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BR18	<b>NE 7th Street/NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Laurel Street)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BR19	<b>NW Spring Street/NW Coast Street/SW Alder Street/SW Neff Way (from NW 12th Street to US 101)</b> Install signing and striping as needed to designate a bike route.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SBL1	<p><b>SE Moore Drive/NE Harney Street (from SE Bay Boulevard to NE 7th Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe to install buffered bike lanes between SE Bay Boulevard and US 20; Widen to install buffered bike lanes between US 20 and NE Yaquina Heights Drive; Restripe and upgrade the existing on-street bike lanes between NE Yaquina Heights Drive and NE 7th Street (project removes on-street parking on one side only). Coordinate improvements through the US 20 intersection with Project INT6.</p>	Newport	NURA	\$825,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
SBL2	<p><b>US 101 (from Yaquina Bay Bridge to SW Abbey Street)</b></p> <p>Construct a separated bicycle facility on US 101. Note the specified facility design and project extents are subject to review and modification.</p>	State	NURA	\$1,350,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
SBL3	<p><b>US 101 (from SW Angle Street to NW 25th Street)</b></p> <p>Construct a separated bicycle facility on US 101. Note the specified facility design and project extents are subject to review and modification.</p>	State	NURA	\$5,915,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North, Downtown



PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
SBL4	<p><b>US 101 (from Yaquina Bay Bridge to SE 35th Street)</b></p> <p>Construct a separated bicycle facility on US 101. Note the specified facility design and project extents are subject to review and modification.</p>	State	City/State Funds	\$925,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL1	<p><b>SW Canyon Way (from SW 9th Street to SW Bay Boulevard)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes in uphill direction and mark sharrows in the downhill direction (project may require conversion of angle parking near SW Bay Boulevard to parallel parking).</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$25,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL2	<p><b>NW Nye Street/SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street (from NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street to SW Hurbert Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe NW Nye Street to include on-street bicycle lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side only) between NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street and SW 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Install signing and striping to designate SW 7th Street a shared bike route between SW 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and SW Hurbert Street.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$100,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BL3	<p><b>NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street (from US 101/NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street intersection to US 20/NE Fogarty Street intersection)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).</p>	Newport	NURA	\$100,000	High	1,2,3,4,6,7	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL4	<p><b>SW 9th Street (from US 101 to SW Fall Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking).</p>	Newport	NURA	\$465,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL5	<p><b>SW Bayley Street (from US 101 to SW Elizabeth Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).</p>	Newport	NURA	\$25,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL6	<p><b>SW Hubert Street (from SW 9th Street to SW 2nd Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (existing angle parking will be converted to parallel parking on one side). Specific intersection treatments at US 101 and SW 9<sup>th</sup> Street intersections to be determined with Project REV6.</p>	Newport	NURA	\$25,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BL7	<b>NW/NE 6th Street (from NW Nye Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).	Newport	City/State Funds	\$775,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL8	<b>NW/NE 11th Street (from NW Spring Street to NE Eads Street)</b> Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side, although on-street parking may be impacted on both sides between NW Lake Street and NW Nye Street).	Newport	City/State Funds	\$50,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
BL9	<b>NE 3rd Street (from NE Eads Street to NE Harney Street)</b> Widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes.	Newport/ Lincoln County	City/State Funds	\$525,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL10	<b>NE Yaquina Heights Drive (from NE Harney Street to US 20)</b> Widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes.	Newport	City/State Funds	\$8,075,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BL11	<p><b>SW Angle Street/SW 10th Street/SE 2nd Street/SE Coos Street/NE Benton Street (from SW 9th Street to Frank Wade Park)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side between NE 12th Street and US 20). Install signing and striping to designate NE Benton Street a shared bike route between NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street and NE Chambers Street/Frank Wade Park. Note 5 ft. bike lanes assumed between US 20 and SE 2nd Street. Construct with Project CR2.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
BL12	<p><b>SW Elizabeth Street (from SW Government Street to W Olive Street)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side).</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$75,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
BL13	<p><b>W Olive Street (from SW Elizabeth Street to US 101)</b></p> <p>Restripe to provide on-street bike lanes (project removes on-street parking on one side). Note project requires modification of existing curb extensions at Coast Street; on-street bike lanes may terminate prior to the US 101 intersection to provide space for turn pockets.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
BL14	<p><b>Yaquina Bay Road (from SE Moore Drive to SE Running Spring)</b></p> <p>Restripe or widen as needed to provide on-street bike lanes.</p>	Newport	City/State Funds	\$1,625,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
CR1	<p><b>NW 60th Street/US 101</b></p> <p>Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.</p>	State	NURA	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
CR2	<p><b>SE Coos Street/US 20</b></p> <p>Install an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle route crossing. Construct with Project BL11.</p>	State	NURA	\$200,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
CR3	<p><b>NW 55th Street/US 101</b></p> <p>Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.</p>	State	NURA	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
<b>CR4</b>	<b>NE Fogarty Street/US 20</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle route crossing. This intersection should be designed to facilitate bicycle turn movements from US 20 on-street bike facilities to/from parallel bike facilities on side streets to the north and south. Construct with Project BR5 and/or Project BL3.	State	NURA	\$200,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>CR5</b>	<b>NW Oceanview/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	State	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	North
<b>CR6</b>	<b>SE 32nd Street/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	State	City/State Funds	\$100,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>CR7</b>	<b>SW Waterlin Drive/US 101</b> Improve pedestrian connections between Yaquina Bay Bridge and downtown Newport through pedestrian wayfinding, marked crossings, and other traffic control measures.	State	City/State Funds	\$25,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>CR8</b>	<b>NW 68th Street/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	State	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
<b>CR9</b>	<b>Pacific Shores MotorCoach Resort/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing to serve existing transit stops and RV park.	State	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
<b>CR10</b>	<b>NW 58th/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing to connect to the shared-use path on the east side of US 101.	State	NURA	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North
<b>CR11</b>	<b>NW 48<sup>th</sup>/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing.	State	City/State Funds	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 2	North
<b>CR16</b>	<b>NW 8th/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	State	NURA	\$150,000	Medium	1,2,3,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	North, Downtown
<b>CR18</b>	<b>SW Bay/US 101</b> Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing.	State	NURA	\$150,000	High	1,2,3,4,6	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	Downtown
<b>PRO1</b>	<b>Parking Management</b> Implement additional parking management strategies for the Nye Beach and Bayfront Areas. Strategies could include metering, permits, or other time restrictions.	Newport	City Funds	\$600,000	Medium	2,5,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	n/a

PROJECT ID*	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRIMARY FUNDING AGENCY	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (2021 DOLLARS)	PROJECT EVALUATION RANKING	TSP GOALS MET	PACKAGE**	PRIORITY HORIZON	MAP AREA
PRO2	<b>Transportation Demand Management</b>	Newport	City Funds	\$475,000	Medium	2,4,5,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 2	n/a
	Implement strategies to enhance transit use in Newport. Specific strategies could include public information, stop enhancements, route refinement, or expanded service hours.								
PRO3	<b>Neighborhood Traffic Management</b>	Newport	City Funds	\$475,000	Medium	2,3,6,8	Financially Constrained	Tier 1	n/a
PRO4	<b>Yaquina Bay Ferry Service</b>	State	City/State Funds	\$4,750,000	High	2,3,4,6,7	Unconstrained	Unconstrained Tier 1	n/a
	Implement a foot ferry for bicyclists and pedestrians across Yaquina Bay.								

Notes: \* "INT" represents an intersection improvement project; "EXT" represents a roadway extension project; "REV" represents an existing roadway improvement or reconfiguration project; "SW" represents a sidewalk improvement project; "TR" represents a trail or shared use path improvement project; "BR" represents a bike route improvement project; "SBL" represents an improvement project to add separated or buffered bike lanes; "BL" represents an improvement project to add standard bike lanes; "CR" represents a roadway crossing improvement project; "PRO" represents a citywide demand or system management project.

\*\* Financially Constrained = projects likely to be funded; Unconstrained = projects not likely to be funded.



FIGURE 42: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (NORTH)




FIGURE 43: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (NORTH)




FIGURE 44: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (DOWNTOWN)




FIGURE 45: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (DOWNTOWN)






FIGURE 46: ASPIRATIONAL MULTIMODAL PROJECTS (SOUTH)



**FIGURE 47: ASPIRATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROJECTS (SOUTH)**





## Chapter 7: Implementation and On-Going Strategies

The foregoing chapters presented the goals, policies, plans and programs to support the city’s Transportation System Plan and its vision of growth to 2040. The City of Newport TSP update incorporates several elements that require further action to facilitate full implementation of the plan. These implementation actions are described in the following sections.

Furthermore, it is recognized that there are a host of on-going community issues related to general transportation needs that will not be resolved by this TSP process and outcomes. These issues are acknowledged in the final section along with a summary of their status, applicable on-going strategies, and the expected path forward.

### STEPS TO SUPPORT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

---

#### SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING OPTIONS

Providing adequate funding for capital investments and on-going maintenance of transportation systems and services is a major challenge. One of the unique funding features available to the City of Newport is its Urban Renewal Districts that were established in 2015 for the Northside and for the South Beach areas. These two districts augment traditional transportation revenue sources, which will enable the city to advance priority capital investments to support economic growth and other community objectives within the district boundaries.

As reported earlier during this TSP update process<sup>7</sup>, the City’s current funding programs are expected to generate about \$76 million for transportation system improvements through 2040 (with an additional \$3 million from the South Beach Urban Renewal District). This was identified as the amount that could fund higher priority projects, which were referred to as Financially Constrained projects. Compared to other Oregon coastal cities, this is a significant capital funding resource. However, when compared to the full list of improvement projects identified through this TSP update, which totals \$222 million, additional funding options are needed to fund any lower priority projects, especially those projects that are located outside of Urban Renewal Districts.

---

<sup>7</sup> Finance Program Technical Memorandum dated February 18, 2021, (see Appendix)

If the City desires to add more funding opportunities, the best candidates are a transportation utility fee, a local fuel tax increase, and a short-term property tax levy. Table 11 shows some illustrative examples of possible revenues along with actions required for implementation. The transportation utility fee is enacted by council resolution and could generate \$450,000 annually (\$8.5 million through 2040) for each \$1 charged per residential unit monthly. Other cities with such fee programs charge between \$4 and \$10 per month for a residential unit. Applying the high end in Newport, it would provide about \$85 million through 2040.

The other notable option for Newport is the potential increased local fuel tax, however voters in the City have recently turned down an increase. Given their latest rate proposals, the local fuel tax would add about \$200,000 annually, or just under \$4 million through 2040. The final option listed is a limited property tax levy, which would produce the least additional revenue.

**TABLE 11: SELECTED SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING OPTIONS**

<b>FUNDING OPTION</b>	<b>ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLE CHARGE</b>	<b>ILLUSTRATION OF ADDITIONAL ANNUAL REVENUE</b>
<b>TRANSPORTATION UTILITY FEE</b>	City Council adoption	\$1 per month for residential units and \$.01 per month per square foot for non-residential uses	\$450,000
<b>LOCAL FUEL TAX INCREASE</b>	Voter Approval	+Four cents per gallon during the winter and +two cents per gallon during summer	\$253,000
<b>PROPERTY TAX LEVY</b>	Voter Approval	\$0.20 per \$1,000 in assessed value (per year, for 5 years)	\$300,000 (per year, for 5 years)

If the City wants to supplement the transportation funding beyond what is currently available to advance lesser priority project improvements, it is recommended to further consider one of the above supplemental options.

**ACTION:** Pursue and enact supplemental local transportation funding option.

### **NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TOOLS**

The Transportation System Plan identifies a new classification of city streets that are the best candidates for applying neighborhood traffic management (NTM) strategies. The primary purpose of this new classification is to address community concerns about autos speeding through neighborhoods or diverting away from state highways while they are under severe congestion. These streets are referred to as neighborhood collector routes, and they are shown in Figure 22,



Figure 23, and Figure 24, and listed in the supporting technical memorandum<sup>8</sup>. Potential management strategies include traffic humps, traffic circles and raised crosswalks, which are illustrated in the memorandum.

The challenge with a NTM program is to identify a clear and objective process for collecting community inputs, assessing the prevailing concerns, and evaluating which, if any, NTM solution is appropriate to be installed. This will require developing guidelines about which NTM strategies are best for Newport, and where and how they are to be applied. In addition, many cities balance the technical review process with a consensus opinion of the affected neighbors to help ensure community satisfaction with the NTM decision.

**ACTION:** It is recommended that city develop and implement a NTM program that formalizes these processes.

### **STREET CROSSINGS**

Streets with high traffic volumes and/or speeds in areas with trail crossings, or nearby transit stops, residential uses, schools, parks, shopping and employment destinations generally require enhanced street crossings with treatments to improve the safety and convenience for pedestrians. The TSP includes several recommended crossing enhancements. However, going forward, it is recommended that the city update their development code to match the TSP Transportation Facility and Access Spacing Standards<sup>9</sup>.

**ACTION:** Update Municipal Code to incorporate street and access spacing standards identified in the TSP for city streets

Street crossings along US 101 or US 20 should be provided between every 250 to 1,500 feet, depending on the urban context, as summarized in Table 3-9 of the *Blueprint for Urban Design*. Exceptions include where the connection is impractical due to topography, inadequate sight distance, high vehicle travel speeds, lack of supporting land use or other factors that may prevent safe crossing. All crossings on state facilities require review and approval by ODOT.

Enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments should be considered on high speed or high volume roads (e.g. US 101, US 20) at transit stops, trail crossings, and at major pedestrian street highway crossings that connect major destinations (e.g. parks, grocery stores, schools) to residential areas. The recommended enhanced pedestrian crossing treatment should be determined using the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 562, *Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Intersections*. It is recommended that these guidelines be reviewed with all traffic studies for any potential street crossing associated with new development in the city

**ACTION:** Amend the city's traffic impact analysis guidelines to include review of pedestrian crossing treatments consistent with NCHRP Report 562.

---

<sup>8</sup> Technical Memorandum #10 Transportation Standards, June 30, 2021

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., Table 8: Transportation Facility and Access Spacing Standards

## VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS

Mobility standards for streets and intersections in Newport provide a metric for assessing the impacts of new development on the existing transportation system and for identifying where capacity improvements may be needed. They are the basis for requiring improvements needed to sustain the transportation system as growth and development occur. Two common methods currently used in Oregon to gauge traffic operations for motor vehicles are volume to capacity (v/c) ratios and level of service (LOS). For State facilities, mobility targets are v/c ratio based and listed in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). The TSP process identified alternative mobility targets on state facilities, which will be addressed by ODOT to amend the OHP.

The City of Newport does not have adopted mobility standards for motor vehicles. It is recommended that the city consider adopting mobility standards to include both a v/c ratio and LOS standard. Having both a LOS (delay-based) and v/c (congestion-based) standard can be helpful in situations where one metric may not be enough, such as an all-way stop where one approach is over capacity, but the overall intersection delay meets standards. The City of Newport should also introduce mobility standards that depend on the intersection control which can better capture acceptable levels of performance across different intersection control types.

**ACTION:** Amend city development code to introduce vehicle mobility standards on city streets consistent with the TSP, as summarized below.

**TABLE 12: RECOMMENDED VEHICLE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR LOCAL STREETS**

INTERSECTION TYPE	PROPOSED MOBILITY STANDARD	REPORTING MEASURE
<b>SIGNALIZED</b>	LOS D and v/c ≤0.90	Intersection
<b>ALL-WAY STOP OR ROUNDABOUTS</b>	LOS D and v/c ≤0.90	Worst Approach
<b>TWO-WAY STOP <sup>1</sup></b>	LOS E and v/c ≤0.95	Worst Major Approach/Worst Minor Approach

Notes:

Applies to approaches that serve more than 20 vehicles; there is no standard for approaches serving lower volumes.

## ON-GOING ISSUES AND AREAS OF EMPHASIS

---

### YAQUINA BAY BRIDGE

The Yaquina Bay Bridge is an essential component of regional mobility for Newport and the central Oregon coastal area. Existing narrow travel lanes, lack of shoulders, and a steep grade contribute to a reduced capacity compared to similar highways. Traffic volumes along the bridge are forecasted to be around 20,000 during an average weekday which is near capacity for several hours each day. As traffic volumes grow, this congestion could impact segments of US 101 approaching the Yaquina Bay Bridge or lead to additional congestion in off-peak hours.

During the Transportation System Plan process the central questions posed by the community about this historic structure were around the expected timing of a replacement, and whether the highway alignment and bridge crossing might be shifted to another location. The City Council sent a letter to ODOT with these questions. In a letter dated February 4, 2021, ODOT Director Kris Strickler replied that ODOT would continue to maintain and preserve the bridge in the best condition possible for the foreseeable future. The latest bridge replacement cost was estimated to be over \$200 million and noted that ODOT allocated about \$300 million for statewide bridge work over the 2024-2027 improvement cycle. It was further noted that this is one of 11 unique, historic, or significant in size bridges in ODOT's Seismic Resilience Plan that require major investments that is beyond the reach of current funding. As such, the State will be looking at new opportunities to secure the necessary funding for future improvements to the crossing of Yaquina Bay. The timing for a replacement is uncertain, and not expected to occur within the next 20 years.

In the meantime, ODOT will continue to strengthen the existing bridge to better endure seismic events and generally prolong the usable life of this bridge. ODOT did recommend that the city add policy to its Transportation System Plan that supports keeping the current general highway alignment for any future bay bridge. For example, a new bridge could be placed immediately adjacent to the existing bridge so that the highway is operational throughout construction. This policy statement will be important at a later date to guide further studies, which could include an ODOT led Facility Plan that conducts more in-depth preliminary design and environmental studies to select a footprint for bridge replacement.

### FERRY

Yaquina Bay Bridge congestion and the lack of certainty of a replacement has prompted alternative ideas on how to serve trips between the South Beach area and the northside of Newport. One idea stemming from the South Beach Redevelopment Plan was to provide a short-range ferry service across the bay to serve pedestrians and bicyclists during the summer months. Further studies are needed to identify likely landing points on either side of the bay for this new ferry service, and to evaluate the expected capital and maintenance costs to operate it, and the funding source to initialize it.

### OTHER ISSUES

[PLACEHOLDER - TO BE WRITTEN LATER]

# VOLUME 2: APPENDIX

# CONTENTS

**APPENDIX A- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #1: PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY**

**APPENDIX B- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #2: PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY**

**APPENDIX C- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #3: REGULATORY REVIEW**

**APPENDIX D- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #4: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA**

**APPENDIX E- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #5: EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS**

**APPENDIX F- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #6: FUTURE TRAFFIC FORECAST**

**APPENDIX G- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #7: FUTURE TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND NEEDS**

**APPENDIX H- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #8: SOLUTIONS EVALUATION**

**APPENDIX I- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #9: FINANCE PROGRAM**

**APPENDIX J- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #10: TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS**

**APPENDIX K- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #11: ALTERNATE MOBILITY TARGETS**

**APPENDIX L- PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY**

**APPENDIX M- CITY OF NEWPORT TSP STORMWATER CONSIDERATIONS**

## **APPENDIX A- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #1: PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY**

---

**APPENDIX B- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #2: PLAN  
REVIEW SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX C- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #3: REGULATORY REVIEW**

---



## **APPENDIX D- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #4: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA**

---

## **APPENDIX E- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #5: EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS**

---

## **APPENDIX F- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #6: FUTURE TRAFFIC FORECAST**

---

## **APPENDIX G- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #7: FUTURE TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND NEEDS**

---

**APPENDIX H- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #8: SOLUTIONS  
EVALUATION**

---

## **APPENDIX I- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #9: FINANCE PROGRAM**

---

## **APPENDIX J- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #10: TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS**

---

## **APPENDIX K- TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #11: ALTERNATE MOBILITY TARGETS**

---



## **APPENDIX L- PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY**

---

**APPENDIX M- CITY OF NEWPORT TSP STORMWATER  
CONSIDERATIONS**

---

The Revised Draft Newport TSP has been reviewed with City staff, ODOT and with the TSP project advisory committee. The following is a summary of requested changes that will be made to the Adoption Draft TSP.

1. Remove neighborhood collector designations along 3 short segments along SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street between SW Hurtbert and SW Bayley Street. These segments become local streets.
2. Classify the segment of Alder/Neff between SW 2<sup>nd</sup> and US 101 as a neighborhood collector and provide a sidewalk project along a single-side.
3. Add an improvement project along Eads between 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6th (adjacent to the school) to add curb extensions and improve lighting.
4. US 101/NE 73rd Street: Add to the description of the proposed signal project at this intersection about consideration of short-term pedestrian crossing needs for an interim improvement.
5. Add project to "Coordinate with ODOT to develop signage and/or pavement marking solutions where appropriate to limit side street blockage by stopped vehicles".
6. Update project INT 12, to include a striped left turn lane on the 58<sup>th</sup> Street and movie theatre driveway approaches to US 101.
7. Add a sentence in the document to acknowledge the projects from the Resiliency Plan, but specific TSP projects will not be added.
8. Remove "Other Issues" placeholder text.
9. Alternative Mobility Targets section: Add text reference to technical memo included in the TSP Appendix.
10. Minor editorial changes from ODOT.