

River Street AD-HOC Committee Agenda May 12th 2026 – 5:30pm

Location of Meeting – Denise Bacon room, 401 E 3rd St, Newberg, OR 97132

- I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- IV. DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEE TIMELINE
 - Part of a chain of meetings that came from the 2007 ADA and mobility study and continued with the NURA committee meetings, see: https://www.newbergoregon.gov/business_detail_T2_R411.php
 - No set schedule has been determined for River Ad Hoc meetings
 - Design concepts seen thus far represent only 10% of the engineering effort
 - River Ad Hoc will productively work through concerns
 - Councilor Turgesen will assess when this work is complete
- V. DISCUSSION ON EXISTING BUSINESS (STAFF REPORTS)
 - Project width versus right of way
 - Review of the design concepts (ODOT pre-requisites)
 - Discussions around trees (tree stipend concept)
 - Land survey should this be conducted ahead of other steps (this is feasible from an Engineering perspective)
 - Fiscal overview - the difference between what we can do with a NURA project and TUF funds
- VI. PUBLIC COMMENT
- VII. SCHEDULE OF NEXT MEETING
 - Options may include Thursday June 4th, or June 25th
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

ACCOMMODATION OF PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENTS: In order to accommodate persons with physical impairments, please notify the City Recorder's Office of any special physical or language accommodations you may need as far in advance of the meeting as possible and no later than 48 business hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please contact the City Recorder at (503) 537-1283. For TTY services please dial 711

Fast Facts on River Street Options

First, any River Street rebuild would also replace primary water and storm drain lines under the street, upgrade lateral connections etc. This includes several hundreds of thousands of dollars of HB 2001 project potable water pipe.

Second, the “doing nothing” option 4 (below) is not free. The city has been holding off on throwing away grind and inlay money for several years while preparing to do the River Street rebuild. Option 4 has us re-initiating that grind and inlay work, and many trees would still need to come out to correct ADA deficiencies, particularly at intersections where corners must be rebuilt to install ADA compliant pedestrian ramps. Any overlay project will trigger the requirement to replace ramps and correct existing ADA deficiencies, at a minimum.

Before presenting some quick facts on individual options, here are some general Q & A points covered in our last public meeting:

Are the high-power utility poles relocated in Alternative 1? Yes, they would be. The City-adopted typical section is wider than the width of existing River street, resulting in improvements conflicting with the existing power poles. Poles would need to be relocated an average of 5’ to the east to construct alternate 1. Existing poles carry both high-voltage transmission lines and lower-voltage distribution lines. Relocating transmission poles comes with major cost and schedule implications due to power company coordination and design requirements.

Will the 1st Street / River Street intersection be improved? Several cited concerns regarding the bicyclists / vehicular movements at this intersection. This will need to be considered as part of the design work. Work at this intersection brings increased challenges due to it being an ODOT-owned intersection with non-standard geometry. All proposed changes to this intersection would require ODOT review and approval, which increases time and cost. ODOT would have no involvement in this project outside of that intersection.

Will trees be removed? If so, will they be replaced? Several cited that the trees are what gives River Street its character and why they wanted to live there in the first place. Yes, the trees will need to be removed to carry out any of the three suggested reconstruction options. Even with Option 4, it is likely mature trees at corners and intersections would be impacted by ADA ramp construction as well.

Comment that strong consideration needs to be given by City regarding "apparent" yard takes, with the understanding that many residents have landscaped, fenced, or have driveways that extend into the city ROW. Design work will need to do its best to minimize these impacts. The current options are only 10% concepts, which are intended to show the public the worst-case impacts. During the remaining 90% of design, the actual design will take efforts to minimize the impacts. Impacts may be reduced by meandering sidewalk/pathways and strategically placing stormwater treatment facilities in key areas to name a couple examples.

Comment that a wider multi-use path will decrease some driveway lengths, potentially making them unusable, and there are some driveways short enough that cars already park over the existing smaller sidewalk. Here also design work will need to try to take account of this factor; there will be some flexibility in the exact course of the final street.

Comments by a few people that they don't want to see bike lanes on River Street, that it's not really a "Newberg" thing. State law requires bicycle improvements for this class of street, and it will benefit the future river front district and recreation possibilities.

Comment that a multi-use path on River Street is very forward-thinking and will create connectivity with the ODOT bypass multi-use path, making this a much more usable travel way for bicyclists and pedestrians. Staff agree with this assessment.

Several comments related to the existing trees, their condition, and the 'feel' they give the area. Staff noted that many are end-of-life trees and that repairs cannot occur without removal. Even the "do nothing" option (Option 4, below) will require the removal of some trees.

If the road is the same width, how much green space beyond existing sidewalks will actually be taken? Staff noted this will vary based upon the exact location and chosen cross section design.

Is an 11-foot multi-use path the minimum width? Staff noted this is a safe option for strollers and bikes to share the same space. It could be narrower but that would be less safe.

Concern regarding proposed street section width - it was noted that the preferred Alternative 3 is least impactful of 3 options. Staff agree as this section may be narrower overall.

Why do we need to add Bicycle Improvements for Collector Streets? The statute is ORS 336.514 - https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors366.html

Here are some new Questions that have come up since the first meeting:

What can NURA pay for versus city funds? Any of the full re-build options can be paid for with a combination of NURA debt (raising up to \$6M), and city System Development funds (SDCs) - (up to about \$4M). Thus, the project needs to be at or about \$10M or less to be fundable. Option four below would involve a lower quality repair that would not be eligible for NURA or SDC funding. For example, a grind and inlay might cost \$400K to \$500K initially and would need to come from TUF funds since that city does not have any other streets funds in reserve at this time.

Why are you taking 80 feet right of way? None of the designs proposed will be 80 feet wide, a total cross section of 5X feet is more accurate. X varies depending upon location and design type chosen.

Here are quick facts about each of the possible design cross sections:

Option 1

The standard city cross section requires an extra two-year delay and +10% or more cost escalation on top of PGE fees.

The power poles would need to move.

Real world cost likely at \$11M by the time we get construction started in 2029. Planning estimate 2025 dollars is at \$9,600,000. This is at the absolute edge of what we can afford.

Some corner section land would still need to be built upon due to ADA work.

The trees would need to be removed because cutting the roots to make a curb-to-curb build possible will kill them and / or make them dangerously unstable.

Option 2

Poles would not need to move – no PGE issues.

Road would be more offset from its current position, perhaps creating a question of perceived fairness.

Bicycle improvements would share the same road surface as cars, with a separator.

Cost estimate 2025 dollars: \$7,750,000.

The trees would need to be removed because the cutting of the roots to make a curb-to-curb build possible will kill the trees and / or make them dangerously unstable.

Option 3

Poles would not need to move – no PGE issues.

The cross section would be more centered, perhaps creating a more equitable result for folks who care about the neighborhood.

Bicycle improvements would share the same road surface as cars, with a separator.

Cost estimate 2025 dollars: \$7,740,000.

The trees would need to be removed because the cutting of the roots to make a curb-to-curb build possible will kill the trees and / or make them dangerously unstable.

Option 4 - “do nothing”

Either literally do nothing and the street continues to crumble, or in the 20-year horizon this would occur (conservative estimate on future Grind and inlay costs):

HB 2001 pipe projects (not on NURA’s dime) – perhaps \$450,000

Grind and Inlay – assumes 3 years on average to iron out mirroring

2027	\$	430,000.00
2030	\$	497,778.00
2033	\$	576,241.00
2036	\$	667,071.00
2039	\$	772,218.00
2042	\$	893,939.00
	\$	3,837,247.00

This assumed 5% per year G/I cost increases - in the real world it has been running at 6 – 7% over the last three years.

This assumes that each third or fourth year we would focus upon River Street again, meaning that another section of Newberg’s southern districts will be missed. Street traffic will be disrupted repeatedly over the next twenty years.

Opportunity cost – NURA funds will move on to a different project or projects, and the city will move on to different streets focuses like the gravel section. The funds will not be there later if River is bypassed now.

Grind and Inlay still comes with ADA requirements, so modern corners will still need to go in and trees will still need to come out. These are not free.

ADA costs for the base year – approximately \$150K.

Final cost of “do nothing” option: perhaps **\$4.5M**.

Upside - less pressure or threats will impact city staff.

Upside - SDC money for transportation can be used elsewhere.

Upside - some of the trees will be saved, allowing them to die naturally due to being at end of life (due to windstorms).