

City of Newberg

River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes

May 12, 2026

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Councilor Turgesen called the inaugural River Street Ad-Hoc Committee meeting to order at 5:30 PM on Tuesday, May 12, 2026, at the Denise Bacon Room, 401 E 3rd St, Newberg, OR 97132.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Councilor Jeri Turgesen, Ted Ebor, Bob Woodruff, Jim Talt, Steven Brittell, Jacob Hiester, Mark Seger, David Heddy, Councilor McBride arrived at 5:45 pm.

Also in attendance: Jennifer Delaney, Assistant to the City Manager; City Manager Will Worthey; TJ Centanni and Trevis Smith from Keller Engineering.

Following the formal roll call, committee members provided brief informal introductions identifying themselves and their connection to River Street and the surrounding neighborhood.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilor Turgesen.

IV. DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEE TIMELINE

Councilor Turgesen provided a historical overview of the planning efforts that led to the formation of this committee. Three prior bodies of work were identified as foundational: the 2007 Transportation System Plan (inclusive of ADA and bicycle mobility studies), the Riverfront Master Plan, and the NURA Citizens Advisory Committee. Each of these community-driven processes independently identified River Street as a critical corridor requiring improvements, with recurring themes of pedestrian safety, ADA compliance, bicycle infrastructure, traffic calming, and multimodal connectivity.

City Manager Worthey clarified that NURA (Newberg Urban Renewal Agency) functions as a funding mechanism by which other taxing districts — including the school district, PCC, and TVF&R — have agreed to redirect property tax increment financing to Newberg for a pre-approved list of redevelopment projects. The NURA board recently reaffirmed the existing plan following community engagement, and River Street ranks as a high-priority project within that framework. City Manager Worthey noted that sufficient tax increment financing has only recently accumulated to make construction feasible.

The committee was informed that no meeting schedule has been set, that the design concepts presented to date represent only 10% of the total engineering effort, and that Councilor Turgesen retains the authority to determine when the Ad-Hoc's work is complete.

V. DISCUSSION ON EXISTING BUSINESS (STAFF REPORTS)

Project width versus right of way

Transportation Engineer Centanni clarified the distinction between the platted right-of-way and actual project impacts. The existing right-of-way on River Street is approximately 80 feet wide, established over 100 years ago. However, project improvements do not necessarily extend to the right-of-way boundary; typical construction requires only approximately two feet behind the back of the new sidewalk for

constructability. Engineer Centanni noted that the most significant physical impacts tend to occur at intersections due to mandatory ADA compliance requirements, while mid-block sections offer greater flexibility to meander sidewalks inward and minimize encroachment on yards built into the right-of-way.

Review of the design concepts (ODOT pre-requisites)

Engineer Centanni presented Oregon Revised Statute 366.514, which requires the addition of a bicycle facility whenever a road undergoes full-depth pavement reconstruction. Oregon was the first state in the nation to enact such a requirement. Because River Street contains an underlying 100-year-old concrete roadway that must be fully removed and replaced to achieve a lasting result, the project qualifies as a full-depth reconstruction, thereby triggering this obligation regardless of funding source. The existing sidewalks do not satisfy this requirement, as they are narrower than the state-minimum eight-foot width required for a shared-use path under ODOT's Highway Design Manual, Appendix L.

Committee members, including Ted Ebor, raised questions about whether the statute applied in the absence of state highway funds, and cited the statute's listed exceptions — including situations where costs would be excessively disproportionate to need, or where public safety would be compromised. Engineer Centanni acknowledged the exceptions but noted that the requirement has been upheld in comparable projects statewide. City Manager Worthey offered to have the City Attorney prepare a white paper on relevant precedent if the committee wished to pursue that question further.

Discussion followed on whether bicycle facilities on an adjacent street (such as College Street) could serve in lieu of facilities on River Street. Engineer Centanni explained that while "low-stress network" approaches diverting cyclists to parallel routes exist in other Oregon communities, they require meaningful investment in wayfinding and street improvements on the alternative route, and that the data on cyclist behavior shows a spectrum of comfort levels that such designs must accommodate.

The committee discussed the character and design standards of any future improvements. Several members expressed concern that the project should reflect the historic, small-town character of Newberg and not replicate what they viewed as out-of-character elements on Elliott Road. City Manager Worthey acknowledged that the Elliott Road project had proceeded without adequate public engagement and that this Ad-Hoc process was deliberately structured to prevent a similar outcome.

Engineer Centanni presented a community-submitted design concept informally referred to as the "Tesla Plan," introduced by committee member Jim Talt. This concept features a raised bicycle lane at curb grade, separated from the travel lane, with the pedestrian walkway positioned on the outer edge — a treatment that, if properly executed, could accommodate existing power poles within the planter strip without requiring relocation. Engineer Centanni noted that while this treatment exists elsewhere in Oregon and nationally, it had not been previously proposed for this project largely due to the cautionary association with Elliott Road's execution. He indicated that the concept merits further investigation and offered to prepare photorealistic renderings and examples from other communities for the next meeting.

Engineer Centanni also introduced the concept of raised intersections as a complementary measure. Raising the full intersection to sidewalk grade can address ADA transition challenges associated with a raised bike lane, serve as a traffic calming measure, and create a boulevard aesthetic consistent with the community's stated character goals. While this approach carries additional cost, he noted that rising asphalt prices are narrowing the cost differential with concrete, making concrete intersections increasingly competitive.

Discussions around trees (tree stipend concept)

The potential impact of any reconstruction option on existing street trees was identified as a significant concern by multiple committee members, particularly Ted Ebor, who noted that large trees in front of his historic home contribute substantially to the character of the street. Engineer Centanni acknowledged that

tree impacts are difficult to assess precisely without field work and that engagement of a certified arborist would be standard practice at a later design stage. He noted that even with careful design, unexpected root conditions can result in tree loss. A public commenter requested that the city provide, at the next meeting, a list of city-approved replacement tree species suitable for a five-foot planter strip and inquired about the long-term feasibility of achieving a shade canopy over the street.

Land survey: should this be conducted ahead of other steps?

The question of whether to commission a land survey prior to selecting a final design concept was discussed. Engineer Centanni estimated the cost at approximately \$50,000 and noted that the current design drawings are based on GIS data accurate to within one to two feet, which is typical at the 10% design stage. He confirmed that a survey would be required before advancing to 30% design regardless of which concept is selected, and that the data collected would retain value as long as the project proceeds. City Manager Worthey cautioned that authorizing the survey before a concept is selected — and given the existence of an active petition opposing the project — could create a budgetary problem if the project were ultimately not approved. Following discussion, the consensus of the committee leaned toward deferring the survey until a preferred design concept is identified.

Fiscal overview — the difference between what we can do with a NURA project and TUF funds

City Manager Worthey outlined the two funding streams available. A complete street reconstruction (Options 1, 2, or 3, or a new alternative concept) would be funded through a combination of NURA tax increment financing (maximum approximately \$6 million) and System Development Charges (maximum approximately \$4 million), for a combined maximum of approximately \$10 million. A grind-and-inlay approach (Option 4) would instead draw from Transportation Utility Fee funds, which are collected through residents' municipal utility bills and are used for routine maintenance such as overlays, slurry seals, and sidewalk repairs. Engineer Centanni noted that even Option 4 would trigger ADA ramp upgrades at every intersection and would likely affect corner trees, though it would not require a formal survey.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Two public comments were received.

The first commenter requested that the next meeting packet include a list of city-approved replacement tree species appropriate for a five-foot planter strip and asked about the prospects for achieving future street-level shade canopy. The commenter also reported collecting signatures on three community petitions: (1) support for choosing Option 4 (grind and inlay only), with approximately 80% of those approached willing to sign; (2) a petition that the City Council be fully informed of project impacts on neighboring properties before approving any design, which the commenter stated had near-universal support; and (3) a petition that no yard space beyond the existing back-of-sidewalk boundary of approximately 58 feet be taken under any design option, which the commenter similarly described as receiving near-universal support.

The second commenter asked whether a single five-foot bike lane on one side could satisfy the ORS requirement in constrained areas, rather than two five-foot lanes. Engineer Centanni confirmed that a five-foot facility in each direction of travel is required. The commenter also noted that survey data suggested that fewer than 2% of Newberg residents regularly ride bicycles and asked about the practical applicability of the ORS exceptions. Engineer Centanni directed the commenter to the exceptions enumerated in ORS 366.514(2), noting that the second exception — related to disproportionate cost relative to need — is the most relevant provision for the committee to evaluate.

Following public comment, City Manager Worthey advised that, in light of the active petition circulating in opposition to the project, the committee should not authorize a land survey at this time, as doing so could expose the city to a difficult budgetary position if the project were subsequently not to proceed.

VII. SCHEDULE OF NEXT MEETING

The committee reached consensus to schedule the next meeting for Thursday, June 25, 2026, at 6:00 PM. It was noted that the meeting would run from 6:00 PM to approximately 8:00 PM.

Councilor Turgesen identified the following items for inclusion on the next meeting agenda: review of Transportation Engineer Centanni's photorealistic renderings and real-world examples of the raised bike lane / "Tesla Plan" concept; a presentation by planning staff providing context on the NURA plan and its relationship to River Street; review of the community-submitted design drawing by committee member Jim Talt; continued discussion of design options including the raised intersection concept; and further consideration of tree impacts.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:32pm.

Attested by:

Jeri Turgesen
Jeri Turgesen (May 29, 2026 17:29:34 PDT)

Councilor Jeri Turgesen Chair, River Street Ad-Hoc Committee, City of Newberg, Oregon

W E Worthey
W E Worthey (May 28, 2026 09:20:07 PDT)

Will Worthey, City Manager City of Newberg, Oregon











2026-0512 River Street AD HOC Committee Minutes

Final Audit Report

2026-05-30

Created:	2026-05-21
By:	Melissa Morris (melissa.morris@newbergoregon.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAmEQI8X4QszT_P1Se6I8ZzwgJEekUJ-Lw

"2026-0512 River Street AD HOC Committee Minutes" History

-  Document created by Melissa Morris (melissa.morris@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-05-21 - 3:58:43 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Will Worthey (will.worthey@newbergoregon.gov) for signature
2026-05-21 - 3:58:47 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov) for signature
2026-05-21 - 3:58:48 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-05-21 - 3:59:24 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Will Worthey (will.worthey@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-05-21 - 3:59:26 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-05-28 - 4:02:17 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Will Worthey (will.worthey@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-05-28 - 4:02:29 PM GMT
-  Signer Will Worthey (will.worthey@newbergoregon.gov) entered name at signing as W E Worthey
2026-05-28 - 4:20:05 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by W E Worthey (will.worthey@newbergoregon.gov)
Signature Date: 2026-05-28 - 4:20:07 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Document e-signed by Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov)
Signature Date: 2026-05-30 - 0:29:34 AM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE

✔ Agreement completed.

2026-05-30 - 0:29:34 AM GMT