

City of Newport
City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Minutes
February 28, 2025

LOCATION: CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NEWPORT CITY HALL, 169 SW COAST HIGHWAY, NEWPORT	
Time Start: 2:00 P.M.	Time End: 4:02 P.M.

ATTENDANCE LOG/ROLLCALL

COMMITTEE MEMBER	STAFF
Jack Weber	Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director
Wayne Patterson (absent)	Sherri Marineau, Community Development Dept.
Jim Patrick	Rob Murphy, Fire Chief (absent)
Luke Simonsen (absent)	Tom Sakaris, Fire Marshall (absent)
Christina Simonsen (absent)	Cathey Rigby, Grant Manager
Laurie Sanders	Anna Iaukea, Urban Renewal Project Mgr. (by video)
Dustin Capri	Jim Hencke, DEA
Karen Rockwell (absent)	Ashley Balsom, JLA (by video)
Brett Estes (by video)	Brandy Steffen, JLA
Rich Belloni (absent)	Mayrangel C Juarez, JLA (by video)
Melony Heim	David Helton, ODOT (by video)
Eric Hanneman	Emily Picha, ECONorthwest (by video)
Rev. Judith Jones (by video)	Marcy McInelly, UrbsWorks
Dr. Ralph Breitenstein	City Manager, Nina Vetter
Timothy Johnson (absent)	
Bob Berman (absent)	PUBLIC
Sofia Tamayo for Deb Jones	Gary Lehman
Cynthia Jacobi	Paul Zemin
Robert Emond (absent)	Steve Hickman

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
COMMITTEE MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS a. Roll Call	None.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES a. Meeting minutes of City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Meeting on December 13, 2024	Motion by Breitenstein, seconded by Patrick, to approve the City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Meeting on December 13, 2024 as written. Motion carried unanimously with Weber, Patrick, Sanders, Capri, Estes, Heim, Hanneman, J. Jones, Breitenstein, Tamayo, and Jacobi all voting in favor.
PURPOSE, GOALS, SCHEDULE	Ms. Steffen reviewed the project vision, project goals, schedule heading into the public outreach round 2.
PROPOSED CITY CENTER PLAN	Mr. Hencke reviewed the land use and transportation relationship in the City Center, what was new, and the traffic diagrams. He covered the project and reiterated that the drawings were not final designs but examples of how they could be designed.

Capri wanted to see a more diagrammatic maps that helped the public understand that the drawings were just one way the couplet could be developed. He also wanted the festival streets explained at next public event.

Weber wanted the consultants to be prepared to answer how businesses could address loading on these streets.

Capri asked to add a legend on the district potential map for the red dotted lines for the bike routes. He suggested they move the enhanced pedestrian crossing from Fogarty Street to Eads Street due to bicyclists not wanting to use Fogarty.

Capri suggested removing the long couplet on the Development and Context slide map. He asked if they also wanted to call out the hospital area on the Development and Context slide map and call it "Hospital District." The Committee determined they should keep it as is, but just take out the long couplet on the map.

Capri noted on the Signals and Bike Routing slide map they should change the key bike route from only Fogarty Street, and change it to Eads Street for the north route and Fogarty Street for the south route.

Jones pointed out there were no flashing beacons on 9th Street and asked what would happen at that location. Hencke reported this would be revisited but they only wanted to note on the diagram that they were looking at the intersections, and they needed a new look. ODOT would make decisions on traffic signals and would be fully flushed out with the design. The Committee discussed adding pedestrian crossing signs on the District Potential Maps, including on Hurbert Street.

Jacobi pointed out another advantage of the couplet was that traffic was just one way. She thought this should be listed on the Pedestrian / Vehicle Conflicts slide.

Heim wanted it made clear for the public why they chose the short couplet instead of the long couplet.

Capri wanted the process the group worked through to get to the short couplet idea explained to the public. He also wanted it clear that there had been extensive discussions over the last months and they would be moving on with the short couplet.

Weber thought they should mention that the streets would be repaved and resurfaced to get public buy in. He also noted that he loved "bus mall" ideas, and suggested the bus stop at City Hall be a bicycle and pedestrian hub meeting place, such as a mini bus mall.

Jacobi thought the public needed to know there was financial help for businesses to help during construction. Tokos reminded as the

	<p>project moved forward the details for the funding would be flushed out.</p> <p>Sanders was concerned about residents living in a housing development with highways on both sides of them. She preferred having a busy highway on one side and keeping 9th Street more pedestrian friendly, family friendly, and quieter. She pointed out that 9th Street wasn't constructed for heavy traffic and suggested they investigate the costs involved to update the road.</p> <p>Hanneman wanted to see utilities put underground to beautify the area. He also wanted to see a bike rack mandate be implemented for every major retail store in Newport. Hanneman wanted to see some of this work be spread out more to the US 101 corridor north. He also thought that green ways could be placed down the middle of the street instead of the current "suicide" left turn lanes. Hanneman wanted the group to think in broader terms.</p>
POLICY, PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT CODE CONCEPT	<p>Ms. McInelly covered the policy, plan and development code concept. She questioned if the proposed city plan achieved the project goals, and how they could make the concept clear for the public.</p> <p>Breitenstein suggested they consider more than three stories for the housing concepts. Tokos described the costs and restrictions for building higher building. Capri expressed concerns about limited off-street parking for taller buildings. McInelly noted they factored 1+ parking space per dwelling unit in their scenarios. Some were provided by on-street parking and most were by parking lots. They would want to manage time control for the parking so every resident of the area had a dedicated parking space.</p> <p>Sanders asked if the housing format could only be done with a couplet. McInelly confirmed it wouldn't be possible to have residential ground floor units without a better pedestrian realm that the couplet would provide. Sanders questioned what could happen if there wasn't a couplet. McInelly noted it there most likely be residential over commercial. It was difficult to support retail on US 101 because there wasn't large areas of on-street parking. They needed to make a decision and develop the code accordingly. The Committee discussed how difficult it would be to move buildings back to accommodate a better pedestrian scenario.</p> <p>Rigby suggested they visually address emergency vehicle uses, and delivery zones on the street.</p>
PUBLIC INVESTMENTS / INCENTIVES / PARTNERSHIPS	<p>Ms. Picha discussed partnerships, business assistance, and anti-displacement strategies.</p> <p>Mr. Helton discussed how ODOT funding worked, and how projects were funded and awarded.</p>

	<p>Rigby suggested looking at all city leased owned properties and increasing fees. She also suggested the city create their own land trust so deed restrictions could extend from 30-40 years to up to 99 years to create more interest and leverage in development.</p> <p>Tokos requested a graphic timeline to give people the sense of where we were at in terms of the plan adoption, what the next steps would look like, and what period of time some of the pieces be plugged in. Capri suggested this be a 14 year timeline. Vetter suggested they talk to the city's communications manager to see if there were any concerns about putting out a 14 year timeline and to help strategize.</p> <p>Webber asked how much of the \$11.7 million for the couplet was federally funded. He expressed concerns that federal funding for grants wouldn't be available in the coming years for the project due to the current administration. Tokos explained that US 101 and Hwy 20 wouldn't be planned all at once. They would start with some funding to get plans to do the work and then begin to work it. Getting it lined up with grants might not happen for 3-4 years. ODOT had state funds they could throw at projects as well. There were many different funding sources that would come together for projects.</p> <p>Capri reminded that keystone projects would need to be cost effective to make developers interested in the City Center.</p>
NEXT STEPS	<p>Capri noted the public meeting would happen on April 3rd. Steffen reported the next committee meeting would include input from the round 2 public event, and the final comments received for the draft final plan.</p>
PUBLIC COMMENT	<p>Gary Lehman thought there should be a model of the project created to show to the public. He also thought it would be nice to have a specific person at the city who would be a couplet czar to be the main contact to focus on activities. Lehman noted the hospital and NOAA were looking for housing staff, and it was hard for builders to bring in a workforce to Newport to do projects.</p> <p>Paul Zemin encouraged the city to look at what they had control of currently, instead of looking down the road 7-10 years to construct a couplet. He suggested they look to address the hospital and a parking lot there. Zemin also thought they should think bigger than just moving the bus stop, and consider getting a transportation stop off US 101. He suggested they provide lockers for bicyclists and pedestrians, instead of just offering a rack. Zemin also wanted the light at US 101 and Hwy 20 to be shortened.</p> <p>Steve Hickman thought that the messaging to the public needed to emphasis any elements of the plan that came from the public to help get buy-in.</p>

Submitted by: Sherri Marineau

Sherri Marineau, Executive Assistant

