

MEETING NOTES

Project: Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
Date: February 25, 2009
Location: City of Newberg Wasterwater Treatment Plant
WRG#: 2098829.00

Prepared By: Michael Cerbone

City Staff

in attendance: Barton Brierley, AICP – City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
Elaine Taylor, AICP – City of Newberg Associate Planner
David Beam, AICP – City of Newberg Economic Development Coordinator / Planner
Jessica Nunley – City of Newberg Assistant Planner

WRG: Michael Cerbone – WRG Project Manager
Ryan Givens, AICP – WRG Senior Community Planner

Distribution: City Staff and WRG

Meeting Summary:

An attendee list is attached to this meeting summary listing the names and contact information for the owners in attendance at the meeting. There were a total of eleven (11) people in attendance that represented the existing property owners. The meeting began with an overview of the planning projects that have led up to the development of the South Industrial Area Master Plan.

Three groups were formed from the attendees at the owners meeting. These groups were asked to brainstorm responses to four (4) questions. The answers to these questions were captured on large sheets of paper which were then hung on the wall. Participants were given dots to stick next to the items they thought were most important out of all of the group's answers to each question. The findings of this exercise are shown below, listing each of the responses given to each question with the number of dots each response received indicated after the response.

What type of industry or major employers should Newberg pursue in the future?

Flexibility in use and growth (8)
Large and small businesses mixed in (8)
High tech (5)
Clean industry that employs a lot of people (3)
Non-polluters – Noise, lighting, odors (2)
Nice looking – Aesthetics (2)
Large use for big chunk (2)
Family wage jobs (1)
Office park type complex (1)
Research centers (1)
Support wine industry (1)
Cold storage (1)
Food processing (1)
Renewable energy
Not heavy industry – smokestacks
Incentives – Business tax
Users that will not irritate the neighbors



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
Suite 100
Portland, OR
97221

PH 503/419-2500
FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com

Build on what already works
Preference on smaller businesses
Support to other such as dental
Global business

Do you see any constraints to developing the properties located in the South Study Area?

Opposition from some community members (8)
Natural features – topography, streams (6)
Funding of infrastructure (6)
Uncertainty about the bypass (4)
Less than attractive existing businesses (3)
Individuals are not personally ready to leave (3)
Lack of marketing plan (2)
Ensuring infrastructure occurs concurrent with development (1)
People currently live/occupy the property
Drainage issues due to flat topography
Sewer functions due to topographic features – Pump stations, cost
The required transportation corridor
Drainage

What would you like the South Study Area to look like in 20 years?

Include opportunities for a mix of uses (9)
Uniform design standards – look for successful models (9)
Small commercial to support business (9)
Compatible with local manufacturing (3)
Clean (2)
Provide cohesive campus design yet project individual choice (1)
3 stories or higher – not intrusive (1)
Biking and walking trails (1)
Long-term transportation planning (1)
Highway should project an enhanced / buffered appearance
Transportation should be interconnected with parks
Attractive
Class A type office complex
Not cookie cutter
Landscaping
Sidewalks
Utilize green areas
Well-lit

What are the core values Newberg should promote as we look to future development in the South Study Area?

Commercial, industrial, roads, stores. Live here, work here, shop here (12)
Attract businesses that want to be part of and participate in the community (11)
Diversity in the type and ownership of businesses (7)
Environmentally friendly (2)
#1 most attractive city in the State (1)
Preservation of individual's values (1)
Want to be able to see the hills (1)
Promote our attractiveness
Provide enough commercial so people can show here
Provide enough infrastructure and essential services for a complete community – Residential,
Businesses that add to the City's livability
Sustainable transportation system



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

MEETING NOTES

Project: Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
 Date: March 11, 2009
 Location: City of Newberg Public Safety Building
 WRG#: 2098829.00

Prepared By: Michael Cerbone

Project Team
 in attendance: Barton Brierley, AICP – City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
 Jessica Nunley – City of Newberg Assistant Planner
 David Beam, AICP – City of Newberg Economic Development Coordinator
 Elaine Taylor, AICP – City of Newberg Associate Planner

WRG: Mimi Doukas – WRG Principal
 Michael Cerbone – WRG Project Manager
 Ryan Givens, AICP – WRG Senior Community Planner

Distribution: City Staff and WRG

Meeting Summary:

An attendee list is attached to this meeting summary listing the names and contact information for the community members in attendance at the meeting. The meeting was open to the public and there were a total of 29 people in attendance from a broad cross-section of the Newberg community. The meeting began with an overview of the planning projects that have led up to the development of the South Industrial Area Master Plan.

Five groups were formed from the attendees at the community visioning meeting. These groups were asked to brainstorm responses to five questions. The answers to these questions were captured on large sheets of paper which were then hung on the wall. Participants were given dots to stick next to the items they thought were most important out of all of the group's answers to each question. The findings of this exercise are shown below, listing each of the responses given to each question with the number of dots each response received indicated after the response.

What type of job opportunities do you think the City should be planning for in the future?

- Retain and grow existing businesses (6)
- Clean / green (4)
- Respectful of existing Ag/users (3)
- Those that support local agriculture (3)
- Skilled manufacturing (not heavy) (2)
- Support companies for local industries (2)
- Jobs for existing residents (2)
- Low water use (2)
- Complements environment (2)
- Value added sectors (1)
- Complementary industries (2)
- Manufacturing in general (1) – needs good I-5 access
- Mix of opportunities (2)
 - Skilled
 - White collar



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

Manufacturing

Reflective of Newberg character (1)
 Growth potential
 Storage – large and small
 Candy factory
 Jam production
 Distribution center
 Furniture manufacturing
 Dairy related
 Clean industry
 Cannery
 Research/design
 Industrial suites
 Truck-served industries – no land locked, unsignalized intersections, steady flow
 Not enough land
 Phase development concurrent with transportation and interim improvements
 Cooling, pooling, shipping for wine industry
 Warehousing for specific industries
 Will be an attraction for industry – infrastructure
 Short distance to I-5
 Smaller, incubator industries
 Flexibility in size
 Alternate energy
 Clean industry, high wages
 Training facilities
 Heavy industry
 Focus on small businesses
 Sustainable energy industry
 High density of employment
 Living wage jobs
 Higher education required / educated workforce

What amenities should be provided in the overall design of the area to make it attractive to prospective businesses and an enjoyable place to work?

Dark sky friendly (4)
 Transportation system to bus around town (3)
 Bike/walking pets (2)
 Natural areas preservation – enhanced natural areas (2)
 Gas stations, hotels (2)
 Build the development you want to live next door to (2)
 Easy infrastructure access (1)
 Continued activity past working hours (1)
 Integrated and maintained green space areas throughout the plan area (1)
 Neighborhood commercial to support area – does not draw from larger area (1)
 Mitigate hydrologic impacts/ Low Impact Design Techniques (1)
 Green space
 Walking and biking trails
 Bus stop
 Bike lanes
 Safe bikeways to rest of town
 Small cafes/restaurant/coffee shop
 Child care
 Security/public safety
 Surface stormwater treatments
 Transportation



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



LAND PLANNING



CIVIL ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE



LAND SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
 Suite 100
 Portland, OR
 97221

PH 503/419-2500
 FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com

Support retail: sandwich, copy store, gas
 Trail system/buffering
 Campus needs landscape treatment, manufacturing needs less burdens – less landscaping, less expensive, no street trees
 Develop green space guidelines that allow flexibility in location
 Minimal support commercial service (minimize travel out of park during work day)
 Open space (riparian corridors)
 No commercial
 Public transportation
 District focus/hub = mini city center with mix of uses
 Trails
 Connectivity of alternative modes
 Connection to existing parks
 Security provisions
 High quality design standards
 Signage design standards
 Branded character
 Feeling of arrival



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

Provide input on the Guiding Principles

Industry that is friendly to surrounding uses (4)
 Ensure existing Ag users can continue (4)
 Flexibility – size of property, shape of buildings / ability to re-use buildings (2)
 Provide a variety of parcel sizes to accommodate a variety of businesses (2)
 Energy efficient – LEED – building materials (2)
 No housing (1)
 Support growth of existing businesses (1)
 Discourage solicitation of heavy industrial and large employers (1)
 Sustainable is OK, if cost is controlled and does not discourage business (1)
 Consistent, moderate design standards to help protect property values (1)
 Should not convert area from Ag users – “don’t cut our #1 industry” (1)
 Identify industry clusters and what are their needs
 Affordable infrastructure
 Provide land opportunities for expansion of local businesses
 Streamline development process
 Focus on industry that supports Ag
 Adopt draft principles

What steps/actions are important to stimulate job growth and development in this area? What issues need to be addressed and what opportunities are available?

Issues

Prime agricultural land (3)
 Structure stability of soils (3)
 Noise and lighting (2)
 Water quality (2)
 Protect aquifers for existing rural users (2)
 Public perception of need/location (1)
 Job growth should not happen here (1)
 Cumulative impacts community-wide (TSP) (1)
 Need industrial land now
 Employer education (PCC)
 Streamline development process
 Retain/enhance “quality of life” – schools, recreational opportunities
 Shovel-ready up-front cost initial investment
 Define shovel-ready

Define initial public investment
 City lacks funds for capital improvements
 Identify future industrial growth after build out
 Define transportation/character of hwy219
 Infrastructure (transportation/water use/storm)

Opportunities

Good transportation network (2)
 Best prospect to bring business
 Buffered from rest of city
 Identified as state “shovel-ready” site
 Identify future industrial growth after build out
 LEED/Earth Advantage

Actions

Balance community benefits with incentives (3)
 Streamline permitting process through clear guideline while protecting public input possibilities (1)
 Wilsonville Road – coordinate Clackamas County/City of Newberg/Yamhill County (1)
 Identify prospective layouts/infrastructure locations early
 Funding mechanism
 Marketing outreach
 Establish master/overlay area
 City decisions should be consistent

1. Transportation
 - Truck friendly
 - Access to I-5
 - Congestion
 - Access for all properties
2. Stream Corridors
 - Not developable – net out
 - Natural buffer
 - Boundary should follow stream line
 - Trails not feasible in creek, but upland OK
3. Parcelization
 - Need group effort
4. Workforce Training
 - Build partnership with PCC and George Fox
 - On-site lab facilities
5. Provide plenty of inventory of available land
6. Industry supported retail – sandwiches, copy center
7. Showrooms/tasting rooms
8. No Metro

What should the area and subsequent development look like (Design Guidelines)?

Setbacks from stream corridor (2)
 Regulate light pollution (2)
 Prefer campus style (2)
 Greenery/Limit pavement (2)
 Parking in rear (1)
 Green design buildings: (1)
 Energy efficiency
 Insulated
 LEED standards? Principles



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



LAND PLANNING



CIVIL ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE



LAND SURVEY

Site design
Stormwater management
Protect Creeks

Height limitations (1)
Bicycle storage
Designed streetscapes and public areas
Campus layout
Landscape burms instead of fences/walls
Pro-metal siding (adaptive)
Frontage facing nicer designs
Mix of campus and site-specific sites
Avoid steel / prefabricated structures
Greenways/extension of City parkland
Visibility and openness to parks and path



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
Suite 100
Portland, OR
97221

PH 503/419-2500
FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com

Meeting Notes
City of Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
Collaborative Design Workshop # 1 – Introduction / Kickoff

Meeting Date: Wednesday March 25, 2009

Meeting Time: 11:00 to 3:30pm

Meeting Location: 401 E Third Street (Public Safety Building)

Group Activity: Opportunities & Constraints

The group identified the following opportunities and constraints:

Opportunities:

- City has ample water rights
- City has reuse water available (purple pipe)
- City is planning for a water treatment plant expansion and is planning to add new wells
- Connect with existing and planned trails
- Willamette River for transfer/barging of goods
- Consider Utility Corridor
- Site is serviceable with gas and power
- Proximity to the airport
- Owner/community support
- Rail access
- Large parcels (existing)
- 10 minutes to interstate 5

Constraints:

- Access to Hwy 219, approximately 1,600 feet from proposed Bypass on-ramps
- Wetlands/riparian areas on-site
- Opposition from 1,000 Friends of Oregon and others
- Existing transportation capacity of hwy 99W and Hwy 219
- Existing capacity of the wastewater treatment plant
- Transitioning the area from agriculture to industrial
- Interchange at I-5 needs improvements
- Infrastructure financing

Small Group Activity: Plan Components / Schematic Concept Plan

Each team is identified below along with a summary of what occurred.

Team #1: Utilities. This group examined the design of the general sewer, water, storm drainage, and dry utilities for the area.

- Rich Boyle (WRG)
- Howard Hamilton (CoN)
- Ryan Van Gordon (Northwest Natural)
- Dallas Melcher (PGE)

Utilities – The group discussed the concept of a “corridor” or “common trench” for utilities. The team identified a 12” high pressure natural gas line within Wynooski that can be extended to service the area. It was noted that a “high pressure reduction facility” may need to be

developed to serve the area, the building would need to be approximately 20' x 40' and provide for parking.

The group identified the Springbrook Substation which can provide for the power needs of the site. Overhead transmission lines currently exist along Springbrook and Wyooski, PGE noted that "High Need" users can be accommodated. The service area may need multiple "Power switches" which can be accommodated within a 30' x 20' easement.

Water – The group discussed potable water delivery to the site, there was concern regarding high pressure which may need to be reduced. Water lines are currently within Wyooski and Springbrook and will need to be extended to serve the site.

Sanitary Sewer – Sanitary sewer service is feasible to the area but will require the development of a pressurized system to connect in with the existing service line within Wyooski. It may be possible to extend the gravity line along Wyooski to Highway 219 where a force-main can connect in.

Stormwater – The group discussed how stormwater will be dealt with within the area. They discussed a regional approach that will utilize three (3) basins; the first basin will be west of Hwy 219, the second basin will be the northern portion of the east side of Hwy 213, and the third basin will be the southern portion of the east side of Hwy 213. The group discussed the concept of putting detention/treatment facilities adjacent to or within the riparian corridors.

Team #2: Transportation: This group examined various layouts for the major streets, access and internal circulation patterns, rail access, and regional transportation issues.

- Mimi Doukas (WRG)
- Barton Brierley (CoN)
- Tim Potter (ODOT)
- Susan Mundy (YC Roads)

Access – The group noted that Hwy 219 has ¼ mile spacing standards from the proposed interchange of 219 and the Bypass. With the current bypass design, two signalized access points are possible within the study area.

Options – The group prepared several design concepts for the transportation system (see attached drawings). A frontage road system along Hwy 219 was ruled out due to the inefficient use of land and poor aesthetics. The internal secondary roadway systems could run through the center of the east and west pods, to create a 'double frontage' design, or the roads could follow the natural resource boundary, in conjunction with the trail system.

The team also looked at a variety of options for Wilsonville Road. One option kept Wilsonville Road in the existing location, a second moved it slightly to the south, and third option shifted the roadway south to bisect the eastern pod of the plan area, providing 'double frontage' lots.

The team discussed the cross section design for Highway 219. A detached bike lane was discussed, but the team believed that the resource trail system was the priority for bike users. A planted median was discussed and was considered too much maintenance. Rail service directly

to the district appears too difficult from a design standpoint, however the close proximity to SP newsprint campus may provide opportunities for future users.

Team #3: Amenities, streetscape, and design standards: This group examined trails, building design standards, streetscape and landscaping designs.

- Ryan Givens (WRG)
- Jessica Nunley (CoN)
- Mike Gougler (local developer)
- Don Clements (CPRD)
- Dennis Gaibler (at large property owner)

Design Fundamentals - The group noted that the amenities for the South Industrial Area Master Plan should serve, complement, and involve the intended end users. The ultimate amenities should be appropriate for an industrial park and not impose standards, designs, or even users that are not conducive to the intended business use. Amenities should consider security concerns and safety conditions between users and the anticipated heavy truck traffic. There was also an overarching concern to limit development costs and concerns about hindering basic industrial business operation.

Streetscape Standards – The group also discussed the possibility to provide two specific roadway types; one intended to serve building fronts and automobile traffic, the second intended to serve loading areas and heavy truck traffic. The group noted that street cross sections should be designed to accommodate heavy truck traffic while still projecting an attractive streetscape. Specifically, rolled-curbs and curb-tight sidewalks should be the preferred design to allow for maximum flexibility in truck maneuvering. Street trees and landscaping should be placed to the outside of the sidewalks. The group recommended that Hwy 219 retain a similar cross section design as it is today while adding landscaping enhancement along its edges; however, appropriate setbacks should be administered to allow for future widening. Finally, it was recommended that sidewalks within the district be constructed with extra width to accommodate bicycle traffic to separate cyclists from truck traffic.

Building and Site Design - The probable users will be manufacturing in nature although they may produce *green* products. There was also a strong desire to limit the design requirements for buildings and site design to lessen the financial burden on future investors. The team recommend several simple design elements that should be incorporated on each site and include: create an attractive building façade and street frontage, site loading and storage to the rear or buildings, screen loading and storage areas with vegetation, allow executive and guest parking to the front of building while placing the majority of worker parking to the side of rear of buildings. The group also advised against restrictions pertaining to outdoor storage and assembly.

Land Uses - Commercial Node – The team noted that a commercial node is an essential *amenity* that will achieve a more sustainable site design. Specifically, the commercial node will capture vehicular trips and create a district focus. The commercial node should be sited with high visibility to ensure businesses are not entirely dependent on the emerging industrial uses. The node is recommended to be located at the cross roads of Hwy 219 and the future Wyooski Road crossroads. Specific uses could include a bank, gas station, day care, urgent care, and

restaurants. There was discussion to explore an alternative to allow truck traffic to enter the industrial district without entering the commercial node (i.e placing the district entrance just north of the actual commercial areas).

Land Uses – Industrial - The team acknowledged the need for sites for small emerging buildings, large-scale manufacturing activities, and class “A” offices. The team suggested that small, light industrial businesses be planned along Hwy 219 to capitalize on the existing infrastructure. Larger-scale manufacturing could be placed to the interior of the district where adequate room was available for buildable sites and truck facilities. Offices could be placed to the far southeast adjacent to Springbrook to capitalize on the resource views.

Parks and Trails – The group engaged in a limited discussion that a linear trail network should be constructed within the stream corridors. Some limited pedestrian connections should be provided to link development sites to the overall trail network. Concerns were voiced regarding the security of individual development sites.

Conceptual Plans - Three conceptual plans were created to convey some of the ideas that were discussed in the group.

Concept A suggests a new commercial node at the future Hwy 219 / Wynyoski cross roads approximately 1,200 south of future Bypass interchange. The concept recommended multiple local roadway connections to Hwy 219 while limited full traffic movements. Light industrial is proposed along Hwy 219 with more intense industrial uses to the district’s interior. A Research and Development/Office is proposed along the district’s southeastern portions adjacent to the Springbrook corridor. A loop road is recommended to radiate from the commercial node and align along the stream corridors. A service road intended for truck traffic is proposed to the rear of the development sites.

Concept B is similar to A whereas the plan assumes a simple roadway crossing/connection to Hwy 219. Specifically, the commercial node is situated further south along Hwy 219 and the future Wynyoski connection is stretched southward. The land uses and general internal road layout remains similar.

Concept C is intended to be sensitive to truck maneuvering from Hwy 219 into the industrial district. Specifically, Hwy 219 expands as a couplet round the next commercial node. This arrangement allows for better left turning movements. The concept also includes multiple roadway connections into the district from the couplet portions of Hwy 219.

Team #4: Zoning, land Use: This group discussed what uses should be allowed/not allowed, small lot vs. large lot areas, phasing of the transition from URA to UGB, infrastructure finance and the zoning/tax transition from the County to the City.

- Michael Cerbone (WRG)
- David Beam (CoN)
- Steve Oulman (DLCD)
- Marguerite Nabeta (Governor’s Office)

Phasing – The group discussed phasing and noted that a north to south approach would work well. The group noted that it will be important to ensure that a diversity of sites are available as

property is brought into the UGB. The group discussed the phasing of the area to include portions within the City’s UGB. The consensus of the group was to pursue a UGB expansion as a separate track from the current URA work being reviewed by DLCDC. The group noted that there was an immediate need for additional employment lands within the UGB and that separating the two processes could lead to the inclusion of portions of the area in a timelier manner. It was noted that the group should look at improvement to land values to assist in making decisions regarding phasing.

Uses – It was noted that the group should take a look at the Economic Opportunity Analysis that is currently being prepared for Yamhill County. The group noted that the area should be designed to accommodate uses that are keeping with the community’s strengths and those that are consistent with the City’s adopted EOA. The group discussed the concept of including commercial uses within the area; two options were discussed, the first was a the provision of an area specifically zoned for commercial support services and the second option was to provide the flexibility in where the uses locate while controlling the size and scale of the uses through zoning standards. It was noted that the City may want to consider a “trip cap” on commercial uses to ensure there is adequate capacity within the transportation system to allow for full build out of the area. It was suggested that the City look at the City of Salem’s Mill Creek industrial area for an example. Concern was expressed regarding the City’s agreement to allow residential uses along the eastern edge of the area, the inclusion of residential can complicate the ability to expeditiously include the area within the UGB, there was also concern identified in regards to compatibility.

Farm Deferral – The group discussed how properties can be included within the UGB and City Limits while limiting impacts to existing agriculture uses and associated farm deferral. The concept of an interim “holding zone” was discussed. The City will need to follow-up with the Yamhill County Assessor to determine how property will be assessed as it transitions into the UGB and City. It was suggested that the City contact Jim Johnson from the Oregon Department of Agriculture to discuss the process in more detail and understand how other communities have dealt with this issue.

Funding Mechanisms – The group discussed how improvements would be funded. Several options were discussed including Urban Renewal (Tax Increment Financing), Local Improvement Districts (LID), System Development Charges (SDC’s) and Reimbursement Districts.

MEETING NOTES

Project: Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
Meeting: Collaborative Design Workshop #2
Date: April 21, 2009
Location: City of Newberg Library Annex
WRG#: 2098829.00

Prepared By: Michael Cerbone

Project Team
in attendance: Barton Brierley, AICP – City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
Jessica Nunley – City of Newberg Assistant Planner
David Beam, AICP – City of Newberg Economic Development Coordinator

WRG: Michael Cerbone – WRG Project Manager
Ryan Givens, AICP – WRG Senior Community Planner

Distribution: City Staff and WRG

Meeting Summary:

An attendee list is attached to this meeting summary listing the names and contact information for the community members in attendance at the meeting. There were a total of 15 people in attendance. The meeting began with an overview of the three design alternatives for the South Industrial Area Master Plan as refined from the first design workshop.

Three groups were formed from the attendees at the design workshop. These groups were asked to provide their feedback on the three design alternatives. The responses were captured on large sheets of paper which were then reported back to the overall group. The comments from this exercise are shown below, listing each of the responses given to each of the design alternatives (A, B, and C).

Small Group Activity

Alternative A

- Verify access point spacing – where can first access point be?
- Plan should try to follow property lines to some extent
- Phasing strategy – what needs to happen for building to begin? Roads, etc.
- Don't like alignment of Wilsonville Road
- Provide a better bike connection from Wynooski to Wilsonville Road

- This alternative has no defined commercial area
- Initial major investment for Wilsonville/Wynooski
- Wilsonville extension could align to intersect with existing Wynooski intersection
- Southernmost intersection may be a design challenge given grades

- Large sites are good
- West side (single loaded street) increase infrastructure cost
- Like connection to the south
- Look at pushing connection to south further from hwy 219 (250 – 500 feet)



- Wilsonville Road (connect to 219 via Springbrook) – concern about east-bound truck traffic
- Might look at shared travel lane for some facilities (bike/vehicle)

Alternative B

- Align Wilsonville Road along property lines
- Don't encourage truck traffic to Wilsonville Road – too much \$ burden to do the bridge crossing on this project. Why bother with that section now when the rest of the road is bad.
- Keep the Wilsonville Road current alignment into town for local access (under Bypass to Springbrook).
- Commercial is too far off the main road to benefit from pass-by trips.
- Concern over the environmental issues for new bridge (\$\$)
- Concern over the high costs of the new bridge for Wilsonville realignment
- New road “feels” more integrated with east side
- Neighborhood center “nice” location but may not be economically viable
- Not enough trips to keep Neighborhood Center uses alive
- Neighborhood Center may be too large
- Limit commercial uses
- S-curve along Wynooski is inefficient (Alternative A is better)
- Neighbor Center is “reasonable” off of highway corridor
- Concern regarding scale/type of use/trips
- Wilsonville alignment is good, less out-of-direction travel
- Bridge concern: funding/permitting
- Local access to Hwy 219 – may have difficulty with southernmost access
- Look at using awkward/remainder parcels for smaller parcels (Light Industrial)

Alternative C

- Large lot layout provides most flexibility
- Intuitive place for gas station/service commercial
- Needs an easy access interchange
- Need better bike/pedestrian connectivity from Wilsonville Rd to Wynooski over 219
- Like not having a loop road in SW corner
- This plan gives flexibility in lot sizes
- Neighborhood Center at good location
- Add west side southern connection
- Add temporary roadway connection for Wilsonville at Wynooski
- Include phasing strategy for transportation
- Possible through alignment for Wynooski
- Possible southern entrance on south side
- Concern about concentrating trips at a single intersection
- Concern about spacing distance between Wilsonville and hwy 219 – may need dual lefts
- Need two (2) connections to hwy 219
- Look at “interim” pre-bypass connection near interchange
- Provides flexibility for large lots
- Pull LI into remnant parcels / preserve large areas for 20+ acre site



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

- Least desirable location for Commercial
- Park may be a good use for active uses as opposed to passive
- Show looped connection to trail system – use intersections for crossing hwy 219

Questions/Global Comments

- Connection between jobs and parcel size?
- Is Wilsonville Road a designated truck route?
- Can we plan for Wyooski/Wilsonville connection without bypass? Add an interim solution?

Group Discussion: Implementation

The entire group discussed potential funding options, phasing options and next steps. Below is a summary of each of these discussions.

Funding Options:

Several funding options were identified and described to the group. Discussion ensued regarding some of the potential financing mechanisms, it was suggested that the City coordinate directly with Marguerite Nabeta from the Governor's Office.

Phasing Approaches:

The group collectively discussed the phasing option for the project, the following comments were noted:

- Maximize the initial public investment by developing areas adjacent to infrastructure such as the Northeast area of the plan area
- Look at a north-south approach to inclusion in the UGB
- Look at estimates for water, sewer, storm and transportation improvements
- Wyooski realignment does not need to occur until the Bypass is constructed
- Need to address the regional analysis of the transportation system; coordinate with counties and other affected cities.
- Consider using natural areas as boundaries for phasing

Next Steps:

The group collectively discussed the steps necessary to implement to the plan, the following comments were noted:

- Consider a City-initiated annexation approach once land is within the UGB
- TPR analysis can be deferred until the actual zoning changes (annexation)
- Determine financing package for improvements prior to UGB expansion
- Include an education component to the process
- Include step for "shovel-ready" designation after annexation (state certified industrial sites program)
- Include step for natural resource inventory (ESEE)
- Look at options to reuse existing buildings for future employment uses
- Look at different options for inclusion of sustainability principles such as LEED or earth Advantage designations



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

MEETING NOTES

Project: Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
Meeting: Collaborative Design Workshop #3
Date: May 18, 2009
Location: 401 E Third Street (Public Safety Building)
WRG#: 2098829.00

Prepared By: Michael Cerbone

Project Team
in attendance: Barton Brierley, AICP – City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
Jessica Nunley – City of Newberg Assistant Planner
David Beam, AICP – City of Newberg Economic Development Coordinator

WRG: Michael Cerbone – WRG Project Manager
Ryan Givens, AICP – WRG Senior Community Planner

Distribution: City Staff and WRG

Meeting Summary:

The objective of this workshop was to review the preferred alternative that resulted from the refinement of the three concepts and to review the draft zoning code for the City's new M-4 District.

Preferred Alternative:

The meeting began with an overview the preferred alternative for the South Industrial Area Master Plan as refined from the first two design workshops and community outreach. The group reviewed the alternative and discussed the different aspects of the plan. A suggestion was made to provide for an interim connection to Highway 219 across from where Wynooski currently connects in. The group discussed the Sprinbrook Road/Wilsonville Road intersection and the possibility of have a connection post-bypass. It was noted that the geometry of the proposed Bypass would likely not allow for this connection.

Draft M-4 Zoning Code:

An overview of the draft M-4 Zoning code was presented to the group. The group discussed the allowed uses and made recommendations to the "permitted" and "conditional use" sections of the code. The group discussed the concept of allowing certain "non-permanent" uses to occupy areas identified for the future Bypass interchange. The consensus was to allow uses that do not include the development of permanent structures such as storage areas and staging areas.

The group reviewed the proposed development standards that would apply to the area. The group discussed the concept of allowing a truck stop within the district noting the proximity of the proposed Bypass. Discussion ensued and the group decided to look include opportunities for a fueling station such as those operated by Pacific Pride with cardlock facilities. The group discussed "heavy manufacturing" and noted that we may want to allow those uses that enclose their manufacturing process and do not result in adverse impacts to adjacent users. A suggestion was made to allow for the development of wineries, breweries and distilleries as these types of uses will support local agriculture.



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
Suite 100
Portland, OR
97221

PH 503/419-2500
FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com

MEETING NOTES

Project: Newberg South Industrial Area Master Plan
Date: May 5, 2009
Location: City of Newberg Public Safety Building
WRG#: 2098829.00

Prepared By: Michael Cerbone

Project Team
in attendance: Barton Brierley, AICP – City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
Jessica Nunley – City of Newberg Assistant Planner
David Beam, AICP – City of Newberg Economic Development Coordinator

WRG: Michael Cerbone – WRG Project Manager
Ryan Givens, AICP – WRG Senior Community Planner

Distribution: City Staff and WRG

Meeting Summary:

The open house #2 was intended to reveal the three conceptual master plan alternatives to the general public and obtain opinions and recommendations relating to each plan. Three people from the general public were in attendance, as well as, the project team including the Consultant, City Staff, and appointed officials. An attendee list is attached to this meeting summary listing the names and contact information for the community members in attendance at the meeting.

The open house was organized to provide a self-guided review of the project concepts and planning components at individual work stations. Specifically, the stations included Project Timeline, Design Elements, Concept Plan Alternative A, Concept Plan Alternative B, Concept Plan Alternative C, and Project Implementation (with emphasis on urban growth boundary phasing). There was also a final station for written public comments. Participants visited each station, and in some cases, provided written comments and attached to the project exhibits. No formal comments were provided on the project comment forms. The Roadway Cross Section – Local Alternative exhibit included two comments that read:

“This would be my choice [Alt B1]” and

“Like Alt B1, ample area for traffic, bike, and pedestrians. Also ample bio-swale least intrusive on environment”.

The following lists the written comments for each exhibit.

- Alternative A included a written comment that read “I like the commercial area spread throughout the area and the light industrial along [the] roadway”.
- Alternative B included two written comments that read “Don’t like extension of Wilsonville Road – chews up farmland” and “Like straighter Wilsonville Road”.
- Alternative C included two comments that read “Like this alternative best, smallest asphalt coverage, good use of green areas” and “Light industrial area on Wynooski, Love green space trail head idea”.



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
Suite 100
Portland, OR
97221

PH 503/419-2500
FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com

Michael Cerbone, of WRG Design, provided a formal presentation to attendees. Specifically, he reported the work to date, presented each of the three design alternatives, discussed anticipated design standards, revealed possible local street cross section designs, discussed funding options, and explained the future steps to the project's implementation. There was no discussion or questions from the attendees.



DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES



LAND
PLANNING



CIVIL
ENGINEERING



LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE



LAND
SURVEY

5415 SW Westgate Dr.
Suite 100
Portland, OR
97221

PH 503/419-2500
FX 503/419-2600

www.wrgd.com