

City of Newberg

River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes

August 18, 2026, 6:00 PM- 8:00 PM

1. Call to Order

The River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM on Tuesday, August 18, 2026, at the Newberg Public Safety Building, 401 E. Third Street, Denise Bacon Community Room, Newberg, OR. The meeting was also accessible online via Zoom.

2. Roll Call

Present: Councilor Jeri Turgesen, Councilor Mike McBride, Ted Ebora, Bob Woodruff, Stephen Brittell, Jacob Hiester, Mark Seger, David Heddy

Absent: Jim Talt

Staff Present: Rachel Thomas, Acting City Manager / City Recorder; Trevis Smith, Engineering Consultant; TJ Centanni (Engineering Staff)

Remote: Leanne Wagener, City Landscape and Urban Forestry Expert (via Zoom)

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the committee.

4. Public Comment

The following individuals addressed the committee during the public comment period:

Andrew Schwab commented on two items: (1) the desirability of undergrounding communication lines on the west side of River Street between 9th and 11th Streets as part of any final design; and (2) a proposed street configuration in which travel and bike lanes would remain at street level, followed by a curb and sidewalk, with all remaining space dedicated to green space. He noted this approach would allow for larger tree plantings and keep electric bikes away from pedestrians.

Karla Vargas (a River Street resident) expressed support for the concept raised by Mr. Schwab, citing the value of community interaction along the street corridor. She noted concerns about the proliferation of electric bikes on mixed-use paths and expressed preference for maintaining separate bike lanes alongside walkways that preserve neighborhood interaction.

Elizabeth Todd (a River Street resident) spoke in favor of a multiuse path design, noting that it would reduce the impermeable surface width of the street and create more green and planting space. She acknowledged concerns about a multiuse path running directly in front of homes but argued the pedestrian safety benefits outweigh those of on-street bike lanes. She referenced the Fernwood Road path as a positive example and expressed a preference for this design as the best available option for the neighborhood.

Tricia Gates Brown raised two points: (1) requesting that tree removal and replanting be conducted on a block-by-block basis concurrent with construction, rather than removing all trees at once across the full seven-block corridor; and (2) expressing opposition to Design Option 6, stating that while the option

might benefit residents on the east side, she would not support imposing a large multiuse path directly in front of west side neighbors' homes.

5. Discussion on Existing Business

5.1. Discussion and Update of Tree Plan

Councilor Jeri Turgesen provided context regarding the project timeline and noted that the committee had not reached Tree Plan Version 4 at the prior meeting. She introduced Leanne Wagener, City Landscape and Urban Forestry Expert, to provide input before opening broader discussion.

Leanne Wagener provided an overview of her background in landscape architecture and her role with the City of Newberg. She discussed the typical role of a landscape architect on a project of this nature, confirming that the RFP would include a landscape architect on the project team responsible for the tree preservation plan and final planting plans. She noted that the specific tree pick list would be finalized between the 30–70% design phase in collaboration with engineers, community members, and relevant experts. Ms. Wagener encouraged the committee to consider tree qualities such as shade type, leaf texture, fall foliage, deciduous versus evergreen character, and maintenance implications, and expressed willingness to present additional information at a future meeting. Ms. Wagener departed the meeting at approximately 6:30 PM due to a prior commitment.

Councilor Turgesen summarized staff's recommendation that the committee decouple the detailed tree species pick list—which can be refined over time—from the broader Tree Program Policy, which is needed to move forward with the RFP process.

The committee discussed several provisions of the Version 4 draft Tree Program Policy, including:

- The definition and scope of the River Street Tree Impact Zone, with a recommendation to clarify that the zone boundary would be identified in the final design rather than fixed at a static distance.
- The "n plus 2" framework (replacement of all removed trees plus up to two additional planter-strip trees per property), and the importance of co-design between homeowners and expert staff to determine appropriate total numbers and species.
- The four-year care and maintenance period, including discussion of whether the maintenance clock should restart or continue upon replacement of a tree that dies of natural causes within the warranty period. The committee agreed the four-year period should continue from the original planting date rather than restart.
- The appropriate scope of the city's maintenance obligations, confirming that ongoing watering and maintenance would apply only to trees planted in the public planter strip, not on private property.
- The removal of Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) as a required approving authority in specific provisions of the policy, replacing references with "city experts," while retaining the collaborative relationship with ODF described elsewhere in the document.
- The addition of "species" alongside "number of trees" in the provision describing final determinations made in collaboration with homeowners and experts (line 63 of the draft).
- A clarification that homeowners who opt into the Tree Program agree to the expert-guided selection process, while those not participating may plant any tree from the city's approved street tree list within the planter strip at their own expense.

Motion: Committee member David Heddy moved to approve the River Street Tree Program Policy, Version 4, with the following amendments as described: (1) the River Street Tree Impact Zone reference to be updated to reflect the zone as identified in the final design; (2) clarification of co-design language to reflect homeowner input in collaboration with expert staff; (3) addition of "species" to the language

describing the determination of the total number and species of trees in collaboration with the homeowner and experts; and (4) removal of ODF as a specified approving authority in individual provisions, while retaining the collaborative relationship language.

Second: Bob Woodruff seconded the motion.

Vote:

- Councilor Jeri Turgesen — Aye
- Councilor Mike McBride — Aye
- Committee Member Ted Eborá — Aye
- Committee Member Bob Woodruff — Aye
- Committee Member Stephen Brittell — Aye
- Committee Member Jacob Hiester — Aye
- Committee Member Mark Seger — Aye
- Committee Member David Heddy — Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

5.2. River Street Design: Option 6, Community Request for Consideration

Design Option 6 was presented - a community-submitted proposal placing an 11-foot multiuse path on the west side of River Street, with two 12-foot travel lanes and a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side. The design was created by absent committee member Jim Talt at the request of a community member.

Trevi Smith and TJ Centanni from Keller Associates noted that Design Option 6 presents connectivity challenges at both the northern and southern ends of the corridor where the path would need to transition back across the street. They identified potential conflicts with existing utility pole locations on the west side between 9th and 11th Streets, which could require costly pole relocation, and noted the design would remove the safety buffer between vehicle traffic and active transportation users. They further noted that the design eliminates the traffic calming benefits achieved through the currently approved plan.

Committee Member Ted Eborá reported that he had surveyed approximately 11 households—five on the east side and six on the west—and found that only one resident expressed support for Option 6, while three were neutral but concerned about fairness, and seven were opposed, primarily citing safety concerns related to electric bikes traveling in close proximity to front yards and driveways.

Following discussion, the committee expressed consensus that it would not move forward with Design Option 6 and would maintain the previously approved "Talt Plan" as the project's design basis.

Acting City Manager Thomas confirmed that going forward, new design proposals from the public would be received through the public comment process rather than as agenda items, to avoid continued reversal of approved decisions and to maintain forward momentum toward the RFP.

No motion was required, as no action to change the approved design was proposed.

5.3. Raised Intersections — Cost, Safety Data, and Design Implications

Travis Smith presented the engineering team's analysis of raised intersections, including a pros and cons summary (Attachment 8) and the Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) for the River & 9th intersection (Attachment 7).

Key findings presented:

Pros include: reduction in vehicle speeds through vertical deflection, enhanced multi-modal safety, improved ADA accessibility, increased driver awareness, and applicability on roadways with posted speeds below 30 mph.

Cons include: modest delays for emergency vehicles (studies indicate 2–6 seconds per raised intersection), higher upfront construction cost due to preference for concrete over asphalt, potential for drivers to seek alternate routes, and challenges for snow and ice maintenance response.

Cost Analysis: The LCCA compared asphalt versus concrete construction for a single intersection (River & 9th). The initial construction cost for an asphalt intersection was estimated at \$106,700, versus \$135,100 for concrete. Over a 50-year life cycle using a 4% FHWA discount rate, the net present value annual cost difference was approximately \$154 per year, favoring concrete when accounting for asphalt's 15-year replacement cycle at approximately \$25,000 per replacement. The engineering team noted that rising oil prices at the time of the analysis would likely widen this delta in favor of concrete.

The committee discussed the merits of concrete versus asphalt, alternative traffic calming options, the impact on emergency vehicle response times, and the broader question of how many raised intersections to include. The engineering team recommended that the RFP include design consideration for raised and concrete intersections, with the number and placement to be finalized through the design process in coordination with emergency services.

Motion: Committee Member Bob Woodruff moved that the RFP include consideration for raised and concrete intersections.

Second: Committee Member Stephen Brittell seconded the motion.

Vote:

- Councilor Jeri Turgesen — Aye
- Councilor Mike McBride — Aye
- Committee Member Ted Eborá — Aye
- Committee Member Bob Woodruff — Aye
- Committee Member Stephen Brittell — Aye
- Committee Member Jacob Hiester — Aye
- Committee Member Mark Seger — Aye
- Committee Member David Heddy — Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to Forward Recommendations to City Council: Committee Member David Heddy moved that Acting City Manager Rachel Thomas be directed to bring forward the committee's three recommendations to the City Council for approval: (1) the Talt Plan street design; (2) the River Street Tree Program Policy Version 4 as amended; and (3) inclusion of raised and concrete intersections as a design consideration in the RFP.

Second: Committee Member Ted Eborá seconded the motion.

Vote:

- Councilor Jeri Torgesen — Aye
- Councilor Mike McBride — Aye
- Committee Member Ted Ebra — Aye
- Committee Member Bob Woodruff — Aye
- Committee Member Stephen Brittell — Aye
- Committee Member Jacob Hiester — Aye
- Committee Member Mark Seger — Aye
- Committee Member David Heddy — Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Scheduling of the Next Meeting

Acting City Manager Thomas noted that the September 8th City Council meeting has been canceled and that the committee's recommendations would be presented to the City Council at the September 21st meeting. The committee discussed available October meeting dates and agreed, by general consensus, to schedule the next River Street Ad-Hoc Committee meeting for Tuesday, October 27, 2026, at 6:00 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 PM.

These minutes are a true and accurate record of the River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting held on Tuesday, August 18, 2026.

Prepared By:

Rachel Thomas

Rachel Thomas, Acting City Manager/City Recorder, City of Newberg

Attested by:

Jeri Torgesen
Jeri Torgesen (Sep 10, 2026 11:49:52 PDT)

Councilor Jeri Torgesen Committee Chair, River Street Ad-Hoc Committee

2026-0818 River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Minutes_unsigned

Final Audit Report

2026-09-10

Created:	2026-09-10
By:	Melissa Morris (melissa.morris@newbergoregon.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAADNAPV8aoD2hKGTZOZmOYWqfzPBzka9Rv

"2026-0818 River Street Ad-Hoc Committee Minutes_unsigned" History

-  Document created by Melissa Morris (melissa.morris@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-09-10 - 3:34:42 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Rachel Thomas (rachel.thomas@newbergoregon.gov) for signature
2026-09-10 - 3:34:46 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov) for signature
2026-09-10 - 3:34:46 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Rachel Thomas (rachel.thomas@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-09-10 - 3:35:29 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov)
2026-09-10 - 3:35:44 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Rachel Thomas (rachel.thomas@newbergoregon.gov)
Signature Date: 2026-09-10 - 3:59:51 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: IMAGE
-  Document e-signed by Jeri Turgesen (jeri.turgesen@newbergoregon.gov)
Signature Date: 2026-09-10 - 6:49:52 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Agreement completed.
2026-09-10 - 6:49:52 PM GMT