

To: Jeff Adams

From: Charles Bennett

Subject: My comments on the proposed TSP

Jeff: After considering the discussion at the last PC meeting relative to the proposed TSP, I would submit the following comments:

- To me the TSP is more of a “plan for a plan” – really for a number of detail plans to follow. As such, it should be in summary form and not in great detail, and should allow for much flexibility. Seemingly, unlike the discussions that I heard at the meeting, I think that the proposed TSP pretty well fits the bill.
- Any effort as complex and as encompassing as this will require some compromise. We should try to not get caught up in minutia or we will never reach an acceptable end product.
- As to comments made regarding the outreach efforts, I am not sure how to improve on what we have done. I personally often feel “surveyed out”. It seems that every doctor’s visit or on line order comes with a follow up survey. I certainly would not want to do another survey on this topic. I would be curious as to what might be considered better methods of outreach.
- My preference would be to keep as many options as possible. If it’s not an option, then it’s not an option available. And then let the process evolve. And, personally, I like to see as many choices on the menu as I can get.

So, that’s my 2 cents worth (maybe 1.5 cents with the current inflation).

1. Rewrite of Section 3.1, Goal 4 as follows:

“Goal 4. Improve resident and visitor satisfaction.

4.1 Move automobiles off the road;

4.2 Maximize opportunities for walking and biking;

4.3 Improve efficiency of existing parking solutions;

4.4 Restrict short-term parking on residential streets; and

4.5 Devise and implement a plan to move short-term parking to a remote location with mass transit options between remote parking and beach access.”

2. Move existing text of Section 3.1, Goal 4, to Section 3.2.2.**3. Rewrite Section 3.3 Goal 4 as follows:**

<u>“Objective</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Measurement</u>
Cars off the road	Count	Year over year comparison
Opportunities, walking/biking	Count and survey	Year over year comparison
Efficiency, existing parking	Number of stalls/ turnover	Inventory/year over year comparison
Parking on residential	Signs/ warnings and citations	Inventory/Year over year comparison
Remote parking	Project Management	Project review”

4. Add to Section 4.1, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvement

<u>“ID</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Priority</u>
PB-?	Close Ocean avenue between ? and ? to automobile traffic	\$\$	Near”

Jeffrey Adams

From: Mike Bates <mike.bates57@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Katie Hillenhagen; Jeffrey Adams
Subject: RE: Special Meeting Agenda 6/7/2022

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sorry. One other thing. The policies set forth in Section 3.3 should be limited to general policies set forth in Section 3.2.1, including those that used to form the basis of Goal 4 that I am recommending be moved to general policies.

See you in a few days.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Mike Bates](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 2, 2022 2:49 PM
To: [Katie Hillenhagen](#); [Jeffrey Adams](#)
Subject: RE: Special Meeting Agenda 6/7/2022

Recommended changes to the TSP for our discussion, in addition to the language Bill rewrote for our last meeting from my poor attempt at legalese

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Katie Hillenhagen <hillenhagen@ci.cannon-beach.or.us>
Sent: Friday, July 1, 2022 3:28:33 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@ci.cannon-beach.or.us>
Subject: Special Meeting Agenda 6/7/2022

Dear Commissioners,

Attached is the agenda for next week's TSP Work Session.

Let us know if you have any questions and enjoy the holiday weekend!

Best,
Katie

Katie Hillenhagen

Administrative Assistant – Planning Department

City of Cannon Beach

p: 503.436.8054 | **tty:** 503.436.8097 | **f:** 503.436.2050

**Cannon Beach Transportation Strategic Plan
Planning Commission Public Comment
Randy Neal, P.O. Box 1092**

Agenda:

- (1) Plng Commission assumes responsibility to make TSP “acceptable”... have tech data, community responses?
- (2) Can it be modified to become a Strategic Plan -- A Common Vision?
- (3) Dump the obvious: Warren Way 4 way stop, “Yukon” as the defined bypass endpoint, Paving Surfcrest
- (4) Add the obvious: Neighborhood ROW Parking Goal / Strategy, Tolovana/Ecola joint vision/strategies,
Where should employees be able to park? (permits?) What is a ‘successful’ shuttle plan?
- (5) Could use clarification: What does an enhanced crossing look like? Where should they be? If we have them, do we
do we need all the 4-way stops? What ‘is” a mobility hub? (is it worth the \$, prime locations?)
Current plan does not seem to address 2nd & Spruce or Gower? Why bike big \$’s for Hemlock?
- (6) Controversial Topics: This TSP excludes options for paid parking (do people know?) It includes an evacuation tower
(do people know?) No strategic direction defined for: Downtown config, more remote parking,
this TSP lacks clear specifics on how to deal with managing / limiting(?) incoming cars

Next Steps - options?

(1) PLNG COMMISSION APPROVES T LANGUAGE THAT 'ALL PROJECTS GET

- Gets it off of Plng Commission plate
- Puts onus back onto Council / Staff
- But there is still no vision, or community buy-in
- Have any city projects gone thru DRB?

Plng Comm took Option #2
(but w/o access to the orig
tech data, community input)

(2) PLNG COMMISSION TRYs TO MAKE ENOUGH ADDS AND DELETIONS TO MINIMIZE EMBARRASSING ELEMENTS

- Same as above – but less awkward looking
- How many need changing? Several?

(3) SEND IT BACK FOR 30-90 DAYS OF REWORK!

- Some items, sections are easily modified
- Some sections need more analysis still
- Some items are tough! ...but a vision still needed
- Set priorities! (not timeframes)
- Fix phrasing to tell a better story; vision & buy-in
- Not a critical delay to any current projects...

(a) Sending it back the right thing to do. It accomplishes original TSP objectives. It respects the inputs of community. We get a vision.

(b) Approving TSP bends to a new objective: "Check Box to Apply for Grants." Puts budgets & money over community. There is no vision. Instead of vision – stream of ad hoc, funded projects getting raised. And 'Anchor Bias' = means what is on paper get best emphasis...

MY OPINION: SEND IT BACK

What are good, 'meaty'
solutions to solve these
kinds of things?

Create a List of Top 'Priority' Items (ignore the tin

1. Reduce the flow of cars (not people) w/ transit options; travel agency partnerships?
2. Identify methods to warn entrants of congestion (signs?); speed up flow thru town.
3. Work the best appropriate Downtown & Hemlock/Spruce configuration
4. Simple Haystack/S-curve bypass for resident bike & ped use
5. Strong EV shuttle plan – Park Once for residents/hotel/STR.
6. Neighborhood ROW parking philosophy (how dense? For whom?)
7. Employee / employer permit parking locations & process / Biz & Private Lots Util
8. Reduce congestion: intersection controls, pedestrian signals, directional flows
9. Suggested key actions to/with OR-Parks: Tolovana (park), Ecola (access road)
10. The right accessibility options/offering for: Whale Park, Gower Beach, Tolovana

Can any strategic decisions be made – or recommended?

- Plaza, couplet, remote Lots, rideshare/scooters, paid parking, RV's

What about Strategic items not defined: Evac Tower, Emergency Vehicle Bypass, Fir Street Bridge, Use/Access of Southwind or other UGB issues in next 20 years?

Drop Irrelevant / Tactical Items; De-emphasize nice to haves; reduce levels of details, cost estimates that are low priority, some items too confusing -> clarify.

Do some technical analyses on areas we need more info on:

shuttle, passes, permits, freight, reduce/streamline traffic flow options.

Collect some small subgroups: inputs/details, decide, help w communications

- Trails/pedestrian, bicycling, freight zones, employee parking, enhanced crossings

TSP LINE ITEMS: What to Approve?

(What is In? What is still unclear? What is missing?)

The TSP Projects Details = 59 Line Items

These are in the TSP Plan...

85%
of the
\$'s

- 35 have \$'s assigned & some level of detail (\$8M)

- ☒ Mini Roundabouts (2x) = \$1.848M → *No community appetite for these!*
- ☒ Bike marking/shoulder fixes (7x) = \$1.4M → *Better uses of our \$'s; low volume use*
- ☒ Haystack / Spruce Bypass (2x) = \$2.3M → *Strategic, but no clear vision still*
- ☐ Enhanced Crossings (4x) = \$722K → *TSP gives no recommended example*
- ☐ Mini Transportation Hubs (4x) = \$572K → *EV/Bike charging, ride share @ prime locations?*
- ☒ 4 way Stops on Hemlock (4x) → *Zero favorable community inputs*

These are in the TSP Plan...

- Listed items but w/no detail or \$... No vision, or lower priority?

- ☒ Shuttle / employee / bus service (3x) → *no data collected, new ideas?*
- Vertical Evacuation Structure (1x) → *community appetite? location?*
- Build more remote parking (visitor or employee) → *community appetite*
- Delivery loading zones (2x) → *no data collected, no biz communication*
- 3 hour timed parking, enforcement → *no biz communication; how to enforce?*
- ☒ Employee parking/permit plans → *no data collected, no strawman options*
- Curb painting/stripping/signage (4x) → *lowest community feedback; reconcile?*
- Prevent / Communicate Parking Overload (4x) → *general concept, no strawman*

These are in the TSP Plan...

- Unlisted, but included as "City may also want to"

- Implement a pedestrian plaza
- Implement a downtown couplet concept
- Remove parking to create car-free zones
- Adopt policies for ride-hailing services (Uber, Lyft), ~~micro-vehicles~~
- Create a permit program for on-street parking
- Invest in EV charging stations
- Create additional remote parking lots

2019 Lancaster Engineering Review for Warren Way Intersection



Tolovana, Ecola
two of largest
parking lots in city;
get no mention...

...it appears add'l capacity could be created by striping in a more efficient manner & reduce on-street parking

- Topics not even addressed...

- ☒ Tolovana Parking → *re-line for stalls? Consistent parking rules?*
- ☒ Ecola Access Road → *work w State to re-route; old road as trail?*
- ☒ Neighborhood ROW → *Max it out? Permit / or no park one side?*
- Paid Parking → *Despite many community comments, no mention?*
- RV Parking → *community concerns, not addressed*
- Fir Street Bridge → *no action in next 20 years?*
- Parking / pedestrians on Haystack Hill → *safety concerns?*
- Southwind → *no action in next 20 years?*

None are in this TSP

***Various cut & pastes of web articles on good strategic planning practices ...or typical mistakes made.*

Is the Vision Clear enough so people can Buy-in?

What do we want the city to look like in 20 years.
If the vision doesn't make sense, the people can't buy in

A Plan Leaves Too Much Room for Interpretation

If there is ambiguity in the way the items are explained, they will be easily misinterpreted by the group. Starting with a clearly defined outcome will lead to clearly defined expectations.

The Definition of Strategy

This is the act of choosing what to focus on.
Choose the key things to that will lead to success.
It is as much about what we say "no" to, as it is about what we say "yes" to.

Too Many Strategic Goals

Organizations often have a long wish list of desires, ranging from pie-in-the-sky to mundane. Dreaming up options is generally not an issue. Instead is there the discipline to narrow down and prioritize. A long list of items can inhibit implementation success. Good strategy focuses on doing a few things well while letting go of many other potential options.

IS THIS THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN WE WANT?

IS IT READY TO BE APPROVED NOW?

- (1) TOWN RESIDENTS, OWNERS, EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS WANT A CLEAR PICTURE AND PLAN FOR HOW THE CITY WILL DEAL WITH FUTURE TOURISM CONGESTION & PARKING, A SEAMLESS LINKING OF THE CITY TOGETHER, A SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR ALL AND WITHIN THE LOOK & FEEL WE WANT.



Expectation of stakeholders in the beginning of this TSP process...?

- (2) CITY STAFF NEEDS TO HAVE A TSP DOCUMENT IN PLACE TO QUALIFY FOR FUTURE FUNDING. IT SHOULD INCLUDE A FULL LIST OF PROJECTS.



... this now appears to be the new, primary goal?

- (3) CONSULTANTS PROBABLY JUST WANT TO DELIVER A QUALITY PRODUCT ON TIME AND WITHIN BUDGET THAT MEETS THE "CITY'S" NEEDS



...should be useful to deliver "both", but seems leaning to #2?

A Strategic Plan is not Concrete

Plans often lack clarity and concreteness. A by-product are rather fluffy pieces of text, abstract "strategy speak: and general figures and trends. The reader becomes confused. Clarity energy for you to go for it; whereas vague plans do not.

A Strategic Plan is not Coherent

Plans often contain a lot of different ideas that may be useful in themselves, but don't add up to a coherent whole that fits together. The reader becomes lost and overwhelmed. Strategy need to be simple. Simple enough so that people understand it. But not dumbed down or so generic that is not actionable.

A Strategic Plan is not Convincing

Writing the strategic plan itself should not be the main goal – at least it shouldn't be. At their core, strategic plans are written for on reason: "change." The plan should convince people of the importance and meaning of the key choices and why some were chosen but not others.

A Strategic Plan must be for the Reader

It is like an essay, with a clear plot – beginning, structure and end. Is it written with the reader in mind, taking them from one step to the other in a natural, logical way. Convince the reader that this is the right way to go.

TSP Recommended Roadway Changes:

	<u>Automobile Controls</u>		<u>Pedestrian Controls</u>
	<u>Near Term</u>	<u>Long Term</u>	
Hemlock & 2 nd	4-way Stop ⁴	Mini Roundabout ²	'Enhanced' Crossing
Hemlock & 1 st	4-way Stop	Mini Roundabout	No info/no change?
Spruce & 2 nd		No info ³	No change? ⁵
Hemlock & Monroe			Marked Crossing
Hemlock & Gower	No Change?	No info ³	No info/no change? ⁵
Hemlock & Coolidge			'Enhanced' Crossing
Sunset & Hemlock	3 way Stop	No info ³	No info/no change?
Sunset & Spruce			'Enhanced' Crossing
Hemlock & Haystack			Marked Crossing
Hemlock & Yukon			Marked Crossing
Hemlock & Delta			Marked Crossing
Hemlock & Warren ¹	4-way Stop	No info ³	No info (completed!)
Hemlock & Coos/Orford			'Enhanced Crossing
Hemlock & Braillier			Marked Crossing
Hemlock & Maher			Marked Crossing

(1) Warren Way already installed; why is it listed in this 'strategic plan any longer?'

(1) But why is Warren Way not listed as long term roundabout candidate, like others?

(2) Mini Roundabout Cost Estimates = \$924,000 each

(3) Plan states "City may implement mini-roundabouts along Hemlock"; Spruce too?

(4) Stops & crossings estimate at only \$2,000-7,000 each; Enhanced = \$150-300K

(5) Why wouldn't Spruce & 2nd or Gower also be 'Enhanced crossings?'

What is an Enhanced Crossing at Hemlock & 2nd look like?

Related Topics & Questions:

TSP includes 'Conflicting Projects' w/o Recommendation

- Downtown Pedestrian-Only Plaza? Hemlock from N 3rd St to S 1st St.
- Hemlock – Spruce One Way Couplet
- Hemlock/Spruce Lane Configurations
 - One lane of traffic or two?; include bike lane in config?
 - Parallel parking? Angled? Head in/out? Remove parking?
 - Elimination of left turns onto/off side streets?

No Changes Recommended for Gower or Spruce/2nd St?

- No change to Gower intersection seems based on auto traffic
 - What about impacts due to pedestrian crossings?
 - What about bike crossings as Gower is targeted as bike route?
 - Gower has had 3x more accidents than any other intersection
- Doesn't Spruce / 2nd St warrant consideration for 'enhanced' crossing?
 - Could we close 2nd St from Spruce to Hemlock to thru traffic?
 - This would remove many left turns; congestion?

Big \$'s & Questionable Value on Non-Bypass Improvements

- Better to discourage use of Hemlock, S-curve, Spruce at tourist time?
- Separate cars & bike/people? → these streets are too congested
- Bikes = very low volumes! (10-12/hour?) Locals only (not day trippers)
- Encourage the back paths: Ocean Ave + goat trail; Elm, S. Pacific
- Not big \$'s on paint, sharrows, shoulders → just a few trail maps.
- Many people echo that Yukon intersection is problematic – let's listen.

Paving Surfcrest for Mobility? It leads nowhere; use Delta/Hemlock crossing