

**City of Newport
City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Minutes
December 13, 2024**

LOCATION: CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NEWPORT CITY HALL, 169 SW COAST HIGHWAY, NEWPORT
Time Start: 2:00 P.M. **Time End:** 3:59 P.M.

ATTENDANCE LOG/ROLLCALL

COMMITTEE MEMBER	STAFF
Jack Weber	Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director
Wayne Patterson	Sherri Marineau, Community Development Dept.
Jim Patrick	Rob Murphy, Fire Chief (absent)
Luke Simonsen	Tom Sakaris, Fire Marshall (absent)
Christina Simonsen	Cathey Rigby, Grant Manager
Laurie Sanders	Anna Iaukea, Urban Renewal Project Manger
Dustin Capri	Jim Hencke, DEA
Dan Butler in for Karen Rockwell (by video)	David Berniker, UrbsWorks
Brett Estes (by video)	Brandy Steffen, JLA (by video)
Rich Belloni	David Helton, ODOT (by video)
Melony Heim	Emily Picha, ECONorthwest
Eric Hanneman	Nicole Underwood, ECONorthwest
Rev. Judith Jones (by video)	Marcy McNelly, UrbsWorks
Dr. Ralph Breitenstein	
Timothy Johnson (absent)	
Bob Berman	PUBLIC
Deb Jones (absent)	Herb Frederickson
Cynthia Jacobi	
Robert Emond	

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
<p>COMMITTEE MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p>a. Roll Call</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</p> <p>a. Meeting minutes of City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Meeting on October 25, 2024</p>	<p>Motion by Berman, seconded by Breitenstein to approve the City Center Revitalization Planning Committee Meeting on October 25, 2024 as written. Motion carried unanimously with Weber, Patrick, Patterson, L. Simonsen, C. Simonsen, Sanders, Capri, Butler, Estes, Belloni, Heim, Hanneman, J. Jones, Breitenstein, Berman, Jacobi, and Edmond all voting in favor.</p>
<p>SCHEDULE REVIEW</p>	<p>Mr. Hencke reviewed the schedule for the project Berman noted edits to the document.</p>
<p>PUBLIC EVENT 1 FEEDBACK RE: MEMO #4</p>	

	<p>Ms. Berniker went over the public event covering what the public thought was important for the project; where the focus should be; affordability for housing; Highway 101 goals and barriers; Highway 20 goals and barriers; the likes and dislikes for the couplet and two-way highway alternatives for Highway 101; overview of each of the outreach meetings attendance and participation; where the funds for the project were coming from; and whether ODOT or the City would be responsible for 9th Street if the couplet was implemented.</p>
<p>CONSULTANT'S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.</p>	<p>Mr. Hencke covered the Consultants' analysis and recommendations. The Committee discussed the project goals; Urban Renewal funding; development opportunities; light signals and bike routing; the couplet at Fall Street; Highway 101 and 9th Street couplet drawings; illustrations of the street transformation sections; drawings of the couplet at Angle Street; clarification on the location of the bike routes on the couplet along 9th Street; and the couplet parking map.</p> <p>Ms. McNelly reviewed the urban design and development code concepts, covering the scenarios for traffic, pedestrian and bike lanes for the two alternatives; housing improvements for the two scenarios; vertical and horizontal separations for the couplet scenario; side street right of way parking opportunities; zoning approach for housing development; housing types; and the consultants' recommendation for the implementation of the couplet scenario.</p> <p>The Committee gave their thoughts on the couplet option.</p> <p>Motion by Berman, seconded by Patrick moved to have a nonbinding vote to get the Committee's thoughts on the two options. Motion carried in a voice vote with Patterson, L. Simonsen, C. Simonsen, Sanders, Capri, Butler, Estes, Belloni, Heim, Hanneman, Breitenstein, Berman, J. Jones, Jacobi, and Edmond all voting in favor. Weber abstained.</p> <p>Motion by Patrick, seconded by Breitenstein seconded to recommend that the city do a short couplet. Motion carried in a voice vote with Weber, Patterson, L. Simonsen, C. Simonsen, Capri, Butler, Estes, Belloni, Heim, Breitenstein, Berman, J. Jones, Jacobi, and Edmond all voting in favor. Sanders and Hanneman were a nay.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the reservations for implementing a couplet; the Farmers' market location; the feeling a one-way versus a two-way traffic flow</p>

	would give to the community; and the need to have a multi-use space for events that would benefit businesses.
DISCUSSION	<p>Ms. Picha reviewed the implementation of the project discussing who was involved; what they were trying to accomplish; the timeline for the implementation happening over six years; Highway 101 goals to transform the city center and give it a unique feel; and enhancements for the Highway 20 corridor.</p> <p>Capri requested there be drawings for pedestrians for the Highway 20 and Harney Street areas, and the areas between Benton and Coos Streets on Highway 20 brought to the next meeting. He asked for information on development opportunities to promote the fairgrounds.</p>
NEXT STEPS	Steffen covered the next meeting for the Committee; the definition of a Multi-Modal Impact Assessment; and the grant availability for funds to designate the branding for the City Center after the decision for the direction of the project was determined.
PUBLIC COMMENT	Herb Frederickson addressed the Committee. He thought the city needed to think about providing bicycle facilities that didn't compete with traffic. Frederickson thought the couplet caused roads to fail and took many years to be completed at high costs. He also thought that ODOT should do infrastructure work before a couplet was done.

Submitted by:



Sherri Marineau, Executive Assistant