

# Seaside Transportation System Plan

---

## **ODOT Technical Review Meeting**

Tuesday, December 2, 2008

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

ODOT Region 2 (Salem), RROC

455 Airport Road, Bldg B, Room 101

## Meeting Summary

### ATTENDEES

---

#### **ODOT**

---

Matt Caswell	Rod Thompson
Deryl James	TPAU
Angela Kargel	David Warren
Tim McGinnis	Ingrid Weisenbach

---

#### **Consultant Team**

---

Theresa Carr, CH2M HILL  
Darren Hippenstiel, CH2M HILL  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL

---

This memo summarizes the items discussed during the December 2<sup>nd</sup> technical review meeting for the Seaside TSP at ODOT. The purpose of the meeting was to review alternative concepts under evaluation by the consultant team and identify fatal flaws before recommendations are fleshed out in detail. The meeting packet included the following items:

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Study Area Map
3. Project Timeline
4. Project Needs Maps (3)
5. Cross Section Alternatives
6. Intersection and Local Roadway Alternatives
7. Bike/Ped Recommendations

8. Transit Recommendations
9. Evaluation Framework

### 1. Welcome and Goal of Meeting

Ingrid Weisenbach opened the meeting, welcoming the group and leading introductions. The objective of this meeting was to discuss concepts currently being reviewed for the Seaside TSP to identify any concepts that were fatally flawed, to identify any new concepts that should be considered, and to discuss what additional information would be needed.

### 2. Project Overview

Theresa Carr led an overview of the project purpose and timeline. The goal of the Seaside TSP is to establish a system of transportation facilities, services, and policies to meet long-range (20-year) local transportation needs.

The TSP will be developed consistent with applicable TSPs and the TPR. Preparation of this TSP will be in accordance with TSP guidelines. It is intended to serve as the transportation element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The TSP must address the various transportation facilities within the City's UGB, including, but not limited to:

- Roads
- Bicycle Lanes or Paths
- Sidewalks
- Transit Routes
- Airports
- Rail Facilities
- Pipelines

The project began in March 2008 and is expected to continue through April 2009.

### 3. Description of Need

Sumi Malik described the project needs, including congestion, bike/ped, connectivity, safety, and geometric. For more information, refer to the three needs graphics.

### 4. Alternatives Discussion

Theresa led a discussion of the alternatives under consideration. Following are comments and recommendations from the technical review team.

#### US 101 Cross Sections

- Width of landscaped median could be reduced to 14' if needed. Also, for the modified five lane section ODOT could consider as narrow as 8' though this is at their discretion. Further a design exception (DE) may be required however the group's opinion was that a DE would be feasible. There was some concern over having a cross section of varying width through the corridor, though some members of the group thought it would be fine. Suggestion was made that median could be utilized for stormwater treatment but regardless maintenance would prefer landscaping kept to minimum.

- Discomfort over 11' travel lanes in the modified five lane cross section alternative. Desire to increase the width to 12' and take the 1' from the bike lane as bikes will shy less than vehicles, specifically trucks (i.e. 12' travel and 5' bike).
- Discussion over feasibility of three-lane section due to mobility concerns especially at north and south ends. Conclusion to keep three lane on the table for discussion purposes but that congestion appears higher for this alternative than what would be considered acceptable.
- Additional discussion over what impacts would be avoided under a three-lane option. As all options would include access management provisions, some of the access impacts associated with a five lane option would also exist under a three lane option.
- Alternate mobility standards were discussed. It was pointed out that an exception to the mobility standards could be for the study period.
- Design speed selected for standards selection is 40mph.
- Action: CH2M HILL to conduct a qualitative assessment of built environment impacts associated with a three- versus a five-lane alternative.

### Intersection Alternatives

- North end – graphic showing improvement options at the north end is confusing
- Added structures over the Neawanna Creek would be expensive
- Possible “very-long-range” solution at Lewis & Clark and Hwy 101 would be a grade separated connection
- Structures might be able to clear span the creek
- Roundabout doesn't operate as well as signal
- Question: What software was used to analyze the roundabout? Response: The TPAU roundabout analysis spreadsheet was used.
- Question: Was a westbound right turn pocket analyzed at 12<sup>th</sup> Street? Response: No. The team has since added it and it reduces overall v/c but not by very much (about 0.04 total). Overall delay remains about the same as without the westbound right turn pocket.
- Interest from the group in improving local streets such as Wahanna, 12<sup>th</sup>, and Broadway.
- Some discussion from the group about the potential signal project at Broadway
- Discouraged Avenue F/G Option 4 where intersections remained at the current alignment and signals placed at each. There was concern over mobility impacts from longer phase needed for local streets. This wasn't taken off the table though.
- Traffic had a concern over too many signals being added to the network. TSP could end up recommending four new signals, making seven total. Desire to look at reducing need for signals where possible. TPAU was less concerned with number of signals and

suggested that existing and future signals could be synchronized to reduce delay associated with adding signals.

- New project idea: construct flyover of US 101 on Holladay, bringing the street back down to current grade south of the current intersection and east of the highway. Run along railroad right of way to Avenue U with a stop controlled or roundabout intersection at Avenue S. Tie back in to highway at Avenue U signal. Remove concepts of signals at Holladay and Avenue S.
- New project idea: Connect Holladay with Avenue S either along railroad right of way or east of railroad right of way.
- NOTE: Good signage would be needed to alert northbound traffic that they should turn east for access to Holladay, whether at Avenue U or Avenue S.
- NOTE: A reference should be added to the TSP if signals are recommended that State Engineer approval is needed for all signals on state highways and its inclusion in the TSP does not guarantee approval.

The group did not discuss bicycle, pedestrian, or transit options.

## 5. Next Steps and Adjourn

Ingrid closed the meeting at approximately 3:30pm. The next steps are for the consultant team to analyze the concepts suggested by the technical review team, conduct an evaluation process, and present to the Project Management Team in December and the public in January.