

June 30, 2015  
2:00 P.M.  
Newport, Oregon

The Community Visioning Work Group met, for its first meeting, at the above date and time in Conference Room A of the Newport City Hall. In attendance were: Carla Perry, Mayor Sandy Roumagoux, Cathey Briggs, James Patrick, Chris Spaulding, Councilor Wendy Engler, Ken Brown, and Lorna Davis. Staff attending were Spencer Nebel, City Manager, Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director, and Peggy Hawker, City Recorder/Special Projects Director.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Nebel called the meeting to order as a chair had yet to be selected. He distributed information that included the Vision 2020 Plan and excerpts from other plans/projects that guide city activities, including: Newport Peninsula Urban Design Plan; Bayfront Plan; Agate Beach Neighborhood Plan; South Beach Neighborhood Plan; Transportation System Plan; South Beach Peninsula Transportation Refinement Plan; Coho/Brant Infrastructure Refinement Plan; North Side Local Street Plan; Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan; Public Facilities; Park System Master Plan; Comprehensive Plan; Urbanization; Library Services; Fire Emergency Services; Police Services; School Services; Entertainment and the Arts; History; Natural Resources; Newport Economic Opportunity Analysis; Lincoln County Economic Development Strategies; Newport Housing Needs Analysis; and the Newport Student Housing Study - OSU Expansion.

Nebel thanked the Work Group members for agreeing to participate in the discussion to address how the city should proceed with a community visioning process. He reviewed the task that the Work Group had been charged with, and that is how, or whether, to proceed with a visioning process; whether this time is right; how the visioning process, if the recommendation is to move forward, would be structured; the goals of the process; and that a report/recommendation is due to the City Council by mid-August.

Nebel stated that he believes it is important for the city to include a broad base of the community in providing the necessary guidance and understanding about collective visions built from individual views of what citizens would like Newport to look like at some point in the future. He noted that in a visioning process, typically there needs to be concurrence about the time period in which the long-term vision is accomplished, whether it be 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, or some other time frame. He added that once a vision is in place, it empowers community stakeholders to develop long-term goals to implement aspects of the vision.

Nebel reported that the Newport 2020 Plan, completed in 2005, was an effort coordinated by the Greater Newport Chamber of Commerce, with participation from various stakeholders.

Nebel reported that upon acceptance of the goals for the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the City Council requested a report on updating the community vision. He noted that Tokos estimates from conversations with planning consultants that a facilitated master planning process for the city could cost anywhere from \$40,000 to \$100,000 depending on the

processes that would be included as part of the visioning effort. He stated that issues that would push the cost up would be if a statistical accurate community survey was conducted as part of the process; utilization of online presence for collecting data; video work; and other similar components. He added that while the city has certain capabilities at a staff level to facilitate aspects of a visioning process, it is unlikely that staff has adequate time to conduct a highly engaged process with high citizen involvement, while continuing with other obligations that the Council has identified, without the assistance of a consultant. He reported that in checking with the City Manager's listserv, he got specific information about costs and firms utilized by a number of communities, which included; Monmouth, who was working with Barney and Worth at a cost of \$45,000; the Dallas, which conducted a 2030 vision in 2013 at a cost of \$50,000 utilizing Zenn Associates; and Lebanon which has budgeted \$50,000 to conduct a 2040 vision utilizing BDS Planning and Development. He added that The Dalles is applying for funds through the RARE Program to get a graduate student to work on a main street vision at a cost of about \$22,000 for its share of the graduate student, and the City of Donald has used the University of Oregon Green Cities Class to do some visioning work for that community.

Nebel reported that once a community vision is adopted, it will serve as a guideline for the continued processes of reviewing and adapting the city's Comprehensive Plan to make sure it is consistent with the vision. He noted that it would guide the annual goal setting process for the departments and the Council to continue moving the city toward realizing this vision.

Nebel reported that a community vision needs to be a living document that has flexibility and is easily updated. He added that it should be reviewed annually by the City Council and other key stakeholders, particularly at the time of goal setting and/or budgeting, to make sure that the direction is complementing the vision of where Newport wants to be at some point in the future. He stated that he believes that the final document should not be a highly technical document, but should convey a sense of those areas where there is community buy-in for moving the city in a forward direction. He noted that over time, the Comprehensive Plan should provide the roadmap to direct the community toward those concepts that have been accepted through this process.

Nebel reported that the city has a lot of very positive things going for it, including: the successful effort of the community to attract the NOAA facility; the announcement that OSU will be creating an undergraduate marine studies program at the Hatfield Marine Science Center; OMSI establishing a coastal discovery camp in South Beach; the community's effort to retain the U.S. Coast Guard Air Facility; and other efforts show how closely this community can work together on common goals. He stated that he believes that a community vision would foster further direction and cooperation to move the community forward in other areas as well.

Engler asked whether money was budgeted for a visioning process, and Nebel reported that there is sufficient capacity in contingency to fund this effort.

## INTRODUCTIONS

Everyone introduced themselves.

## ELECTION OF CHAIR

Briggs nominated Perry. There were no other nominations, and Perry was declared chair.

## REVIEW OF THE TASK OF THE WORK GROUP

Nebel reiterated that the Council is looking for a recommendation on how to proceed with this issue by August 15. Engler noted that she would like to hear more about the visioning efforts of other communities.

## REVIEW OF EXISTING PLANS AND DOCUMENTS GUIDING CITY DEVELOPMENT

Nebel noted that this information was included in the handout distributed at the outset of this meeting. He asked that Work Group members review this information prior to the next meeting. It was suggested that a discussion of Vision 2020 and why it is not happening should be an item on the next meeting agenda.

## DISCUSSION OF A VISIONING PROCESS FOR THE CITY

Perry stated that it is critical to weave a process that keeps the vision on the forefront with a scheduled annual review. Nebel noted that the vision could be reviewed annually prior to the Council goal setting session. Davis noted that there was an economic development study in 2012 on which the City Council adopted goals. She added that the goals were eliminated with a new Council.

Tokos suggested reviewing the planning initiatives that are underway or planned in the next few years, and how the vision fits with these plans. He suggested that an overarching and broad vision conceptually works best, but that structurally, must be developed to define how the plans underway fit with the vision. Engler noted that she hopes that the vision could be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as a “go-to” document.

A discussion ensued regarding the potential duration of a visioning plan. Perry suggested a maximum duration of 50 years, noting that the goal could be to make sure the city is livable in 50 years. Engler agreed that 50 years is a good plan duration. Brown noted that a 50 year plan would require broad changes throughout the duration. Davis suggested a duration in between noting that no one would have any idea where the city will be in 50 years. She noted that this group has great hindsight, but needs to keep in mind that the planning is for the next generation. Briggs suggested a strong public process which would include engaging people on the heart, quality, and values level. Nebel noted that determining the community’s core values should be a part of the process in creating a vision. Patrick noted that a broad outline is needed, but that bigger plans are a necessity.

Nebel asked how the Work Group envisions the process, and asked what should be discussed at the next meeting. Items suggested for discussion at the next meeting include: geography of area; budget; elements in the visioning process (what do we focus on); process strategy; and how to start the process. Nebel reported that he would bring information from other cities. Engler reported that she is planning to attend a League of

Oregon Cities training on visioning on July 14, and suggested that if others wish to attend, to let staff know for registration purposes. Briggs noted that she would like a quick overview of the other plans and proposed plans.

### **DEVELOP AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed to include the following items on the next agenda:

Other planning issues;  
Continued discussion on geography;  
Past planning efforts;  
Lessons learned from the Vision 2020 Plan;  
Update on other city's visioning efforts.

### **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Staff will distribute a doodle poll for use in scheduling the next meeting.

### **WORK GROUP COMMENTS**

Perry suggested that a heavy marketing effort be made to kick-off the visioning process.

Each Work Group member discussed their personal interest in this process.

A discussion ensued regarding the length of the meetings, and it was the consensus of the group that the meetings last no longer than two hours, and preferably approximately one and one-half hours.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:22 P.M.