

APPENDIX J

Public Input During The Adoption Process

Planning Commission and City Council Public Process

This section describes the public review process that was conducted by the City of Seaside prior to amending and formally adopting the Seaside Transportation System Plan (TSP). The draft TSP and the supporting appendices were reviewed during public hearings before the Seaside Planning Commission and City Council. The following table outlines the public hearing and review process conducted by the City

Table 1: City of Seaside Hearings	
Date	Description
January 18, 2011	Planning Commission Initial TSP Public Hearing & Continuance with Record Open
February 1, 2011	Planning Commission Public Hearing Continuance, Conclusion of Oral Testimony but will Accept Written Comments Until February 8 th , Continuance
February 15, 2011	Planning Commission Begins Review and Deliberation, Proposes Amendments & Continuance
March 1, 2011	Planning Commission Concludes Review and Deliberation, Lists Amendments & Recommendation to City Council
April 11, 2011	City Council Initial TSP Public Hearing & Continuance with Record Open
April 25, 2011	City Council Public Hearing Continuance, Conclusion of Oral Testimony but will Accept Written Comments Until May 2 nd , Continuance
May 9, 2011	City Council Begins Review of Commission Recommendation, Deliberation, Proposes Amendments & Continuance
May 23, 2011	City Council Continues Deliberation, Lists Amendments & Directs Staff to Prepare Final Amended Document, Continuance
June 13, 2011	City Council Begins Formal Adoption of Amended TSP

Summary of Planning Commission Proposed Amendments Based on Public Testimony

The testimony before the Planning Commission was summarized in the minutes and a matrix intended to address each issue or concern that was raised by the public. Some of these comments were used as the basis for proposed amendments to the draft TSP. The concerns and the amendments that were ultimately recommended by the Planning Commission include all of the following:

1. During the public hearing, the public offered oral and written testimony during two consecutive meetings before the Planning Commission. The City Planning Commission has reviewed all the verbal and written comments in the record and a list of responses were developed (see the attached matrix) in order to direct individuals where there issues are addressed in the TSP. In some cases, the responses include potential amendments to the TSP document, the zoning ordinance, or the comprehensive plan. Although each of the issues raised by the public is important, out of the 52 responses, a number of issues were repeated numerous times. These repeated issues are summarized below:
 - a) Need to Address Flooding South of Town
 - b) Need to include a Bypass
 - c) Avenue F & G Impacts & Alternatives
 - d) Eminent Domain & Impacts to Adjacent Properties/Businesses
 - e) Extensive Impacts from Five Lane at Broadway to Avenue G
 - f) Relocate School and Hospitals
 - g) Provide Pedestrian Crossings
 - h) Limit Impacts to Small Businesses
 - i) Table the Plan and Take No Action
 - j) Reduce Impacts from Bike & Pedestrian Facilities
 - k) Need Three Lanes Throughout Town
2. There are a number of specific changes to the TSP suggested in the response matrix. The following is a list of those supported by staff:
 - a) **Flooding-** Amend the flooding text in the TSP (Page 3-29) to include the Port of Astoria and Gearhart as contributing entities. The third to the last sentence would be revised to read, "In 2009, the Cities of Astoria, Cannon Beach, Gearhart, Seaside, and Warrenton, along with Clatsop County, the Port of Astoria, and ODOT, agreed to pool resources for a hydraulic study." The additional text suggested by the hydrologist is very specific and unnecessary.
 - b) **Bypass-** Amend the bypass text in the TSP (Page 3-29) to include regional nature of such a facility. The text preceding the steps would be revised to read, "A number of steps are required to forward a bypass. Based on the regional implications, the following steps should include the participation of stakeholders throughout Clatsop County."
 - c) **F&G Realignment-** Amend the F&G text in the TSP (Page 3-19) to include Option 4.

The last sentence in the paragraph would be revised to read, "Four options are carried through the planning phase (shown as Figure 3.13): Option 1: Realign Avenue F only; Option 2: Realign Avenue G only; Option 3: Realign both Avenues F and G; and Option 4: Retain current alignment and signalize F. If necessary, establish coordinated signalization at Avenue F & G so they operate as one light." No additional amendments are necessary to support the forth option.

- d) **Three Lane from C to G-** Amend widening project 8 in the TSP (Page 3-18) from G to Holladay by adding an additional three lane widening from C to G. The following text would be added below Table 3.9, **8a. US 101 Cross-section - Three Lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C** US 101 would be expanded to three lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C. This would create future continuity with the widening between G and Holladay and act as a preliminary phase to the F & G realignment (see project 9). This project would provide benefits similar to those previously discussed under the G to Holladay widening by providing a three lane cross section that will promote safer and smoother traffic flow along US 101 by eliminating the queues that currently develop when vehicles stop in the travel lane to turn left. Table 3.9.1 presents the cost estimate for the US 101 cross section between Avenue G and Avenue C.

Table 3.9.1 US 101 Cross-section Cost Estimate - Avenue G to Avenue C

Improvement	Estimated Cost (2010 \$)
8a. US 101 widening to three lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C	\$923,000.00

This project would also be added to Table 3.25 starting on TSP Page 3-50.

- e) **Constrained Right of Way -** Amend the available right of way in the TSP (Page 3-17) project 7 to reflect the available width. The last sentence in the second paragraph would be amended to read, "Available right-of-way through this section appears to be between 62 and 110'.

The initial response to the five lane included a timing component for this project so that it would not be considered until other projects were completed; however, due to the level of concerns expressed over the potential impacts from this project and the fact this project is considered outside the 20 year time frame, the following text should be added to the first paragraph explaining this project is outside the twenty year timeframe. *"Although this project received strong support during the development of the TSP, public concerns expressed over this project's potential impacts to the surrounding uses has removed it from the list of projects in the Very long category. This project may be reclassified as one of the Considerations for the Next TSP Update identified later in this Chapter."* The reference to this project will also need to be removed from Table 3.25 in TSP (Page 3-50). The consultants have been contacted to determine if there are any adverse impacts associated with this proposed amendment to the plan.

- f) **Minimize Impacts & Notification of Project Design -** Amend the Comprehensive Plan Policy 1 in TSP (Page G-46) to include impact reduction and design notification text. The following text would be added at the end of the policy, "and future designs must attempt to minimize impact to the abutting properties and their uses. The City and the Oregon Department of Transportation shall work cooperatively to notify property owners that about TSP projects at the time design funding is approved so they can provide input at an appropriate time."

- g) **Minimize Impacts from Shared Use Pathways** - Amend the Shared Use Pathway text in TSP (Page 3-41) to consider least impact option. The second sentence would be amended to read, "The US 101 Path should be extended north to the city limits and North Gateway Park, as well as south to the city limits unless it is shown that a more traditional sidewalk and bike lane would minimize the impacts to abutting properties due to right of way constraints."
- h) **Consideration of Modified Designs** - Amend the Table 3.1 in TSP (Page 3-4) to recognize an additional footnote that will permit modifications subject to safety and operational constraints. Footnote 5 would be added to read, "5. When proposed improvements to existing roadways are constrained by limited right-of-way or existing improvements, these standards may be further modified; provided public safety and operational concerns can be adequately mitigated." The number 5 would be noted at the Table heading.
- i) **Reclassification of Street Segment** - Amend Figure 3.2 in the TSP (Page 3-5) to reflect the Minor Collector designation for that portion of 12th Avenue between Necanicum Drive and Franklin.
- j) **Modify Avenue S Cross-section** - Amend the cross section description at the introduction of project 10 in TSP (Page 3-21) to reflect a 40' wide design. The second sentence would be amended to read, "From US 101 east to the bridge crossing Neawanna Creek, Avenue S would have a 10' wide shared pathway on the north side, two twelve foot travel lanes, and a 6' sidewalk on the south side (Figure 3.15)." Figure 3.15 would be amended to reflect the 40' wide cross-section.

In addition to the responses in the matrix, Planning Commissioners have suggested some additional modifications to the plan. The following is a modified list of those changes:

- 6a. **Chamber of Commerce Reference** - Amend the Chamber of Commerce reference in TSP (Page 3-16) so the second to the last sentence in project 6 will read, "The building in the northeast quadrant of this intersection is occupied by the Seaside Chamber of Commerce and the Seaside Visitor's Bureau; and, it has adequate setback to accommodate this widening."
- 6b. **Include Missing Cost** - Amend Table 5.1 in TSP (Page 5-2) for Project 8. This table will include the cost of "\$2,133,000".
- 6c. **Additional Bypass Policy** - This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). The policy would read, "15. While it is recognized that a bypass of Highway 101 is outside of the Seaside TSP considerations, as a interested stakeholder, the City of Seaside will actively participate with Clatsop County's efforts to consider the future development of a bypass highway that would extend from Highway 26 to Highway 30 along with other municipalities, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and the Federal Highway Administration." This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.
- 6d. **Additional Flooding Policy** - This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). 16. The policy would read, "While it is recognized that the flooding of Highway 101 south of Seaside is outside of the Seaside city limits, as an interested stakeholder, the City of Seaside will support the County wide efforts to solve

the flooding problem and seek funding to develop the solution.” This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.

- 6e. **Additional Transportation Policy** – This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). 17. The City of Seaside shall establish a Transportation Advisory Commission that will conduct a public review of transportation projects identified in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) at the time project design funding is programmed or secured. This Commission is intended to provide affected parties a venue to provide early, open, continuous, and meaningful opportunity to influence decisions about proposed transportation activities within the urban growth boundary. It would also be the Commission’s responsibility to provide input concerning periodic updates and major revision to the adopted TSP. This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.
- 6f. **Shorten Zoning Ordinance Amending Text** – Pages G-9 through G-19 all include a reference to Section 3.022 6 for a General Transportation Facility Improvement and 3.023 13 for a Significant Transportation Facility Improvement. The original intent was to define these in the definitions Section 1.030 (Page G-8 and G-9) so it could simply be referenced in each zone. Each zone should include the text in Section 3.022 6 under the permitted uses and the text in Section 3.023 13 under the conditional uses in an effort to remove the redundant text being proposed in each zone.
- 6g. **Correct the Removal of Needed Text** – Page G-26 proposed the elimination of Zoning Ordinance Section 10.080. This entire section needs to be retained and should not be deleted from the Zoning Ordinance.
- 6h. **Clarification of Significant Traffic Review Trigger** – Amend the text in Section 3.404 (Page G-31) to clearly recognize prior demand by adding more text. The last sentence in the third paragraph would be amended to read, “An evaluation of compliance with the standards of this Overlay Zone shall be conducted by ODOT and the Seaside Planning Commission, and shall comply or be brought into compliance prior to the issuance of any permits or approvals; if any of the following circumstances will generate a significant number of additional trips over the prior use.”
- 6i. **Recognize Public Input** – Provide an additional Appendix that recognizes the amendments made to the draft TSP based on concerns expressed during public testimony and deliberation by the Planning Commission.

Summary of City Council Proposed Amendments Based on Public Testimony

The testimony before the City Council was also summarized in the minutes and a matrix intended to address each issue or concern that was raised by the public. Some of these comments were used as the basis for proposed amendments to the Commission’s original recommendation, while others initiated new amendments that were not previously addressed in the draft TSP or the Commission’s recommendation. The amendments ultimately included in the City Council’s final decision included all of the following:

Revisions and New Amendments: The following is a list of the revised findings based on the City Council’s review during their meeting on May 9th & May 23rd. Newly deleted information is highlighted in yellow while newly added information is highlighted in green.

- a) **Flooding-** Amend the flooding text in the TSP (Page 3-29) to include the Port of Astoria

and Gearhart as contributing entities. The third to the last sentence would be revised to read, "In 2009, the Cities of Astoria, Cannon Beach, Gearhart, Seaside, and Warrenton, along with Clatsop County, the Port of Astoria, and ODOT, agreed to pool resources for a hydraulic study." The additional text suggested by the hydrologist is very specific and unnecessary.

- b) **Bypass-** Amend the bypass text in the TSP (Page 3-29) to include regional nature of such a facility. The text preceding the steps would be revised to read, "A number of steps are required to forward further a bypass. Based on the regional implications, the following steps should include the participation of stakeholders throughout Clatsop County other municipalities, Clatsop County, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and the Federal Highway Administration."
- c) **F&G Realignment-** Amend the F&G text in the TSP (Page 3-19) to include Option 4. The last sentence in the paragraph would be revised to read, "Four options are carried through the planning phase (shown as Figure 3.13): Option 1: Realign Avenue F only; Option 2: Realign Avenue G only; Option 3: Realign both Avenues F and G; and Option 4: Retain current alignment and signalize F. If necessary, establish coordinated signalization at Avenue F & G so they operate as one light." No additional amendments are necessary to support the forth option.
- d) **Three Lane from C to G-** Amend widening project 8 in the TSP (Page 3-18) from G to Holladay by adding an additional three lane widening from C to G. The following text would be added below Table 3.9, 8a. **US 101 Cross-section – Three Lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C** US 101 would be expanded to three lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C. This would create future continuity with the widening between G and Holladay and act as a preliminary phase to the F & G realignment (see project 9). This project would provide benefits similar to those previously discussed under the G to Holladay widening by providing a three lane cross section that will promote safer and smoother traffic flow along US 101 by eliminating the queues that currently develop when vehicles stop in the travel lane to turn left. Table 3.9.1 presents the cost estimate for the US 101 cross section between Avenue G and Avenue C.

Table 3.9.1 US 101 Cross-section Cost Estimate – Avenue G to Avenue C

	Improvement	Estimated Cost (2010 \$)
8a.	US 101 widening to three lanes between Avenue G and Avenue C	\$923,000.00

This project would also be added to Table 3.25 starting on TSP Page 3-50.

- e) **Constrained Right of Way -** Amend the available right of way in the TSP (Page 3-17) project 7 to reflect the available width. The last sentence in the second paragraph would be amended to read, "Available right-of-way through this section appears to be between 62 and 110'.

The initial response to the five lane included a timing component for this project so that it would not be considered until other projects were completed; however, due to the level of concerns expressed over the potential impacts from this project and the fact this project is considered outside the 20 year time frame, the following text should be added to the first paragraph explaining this project is outside the twenty year timeframe. "Although this project received strong support during the development of the TSP, public

concerns expressed over this project's potential impacts to the surrounding uses has removed it from the list of projects in the Very long category. This project may be reclassified as one of the Considerations for the Next TSP Update identified later in this Chapter." The reference to this project will also need to be removed from Table 3.25 in TSP (Page 3-50). ~~The consultants have been contacted to determine if there are any adverse impacts associated with this proposed amendment to the plan.~~

- f) **Minimize Impacts & Notification of Project Design** - Amend the Comprehensive Plan Policy 1 in TSP (Page G-46) to include impact reduction and design notification text. The following text would be added at the end of the policy, "and future designs must attempt to minimize impact to the abutting properties and their uses. The City and the Oregon Department of Transportation shall work cooperatively to notify property owners that abut TSP projects at the time design funding is approved so they can provide input at an appropriate time."
- g) **Minimize Impacts from Shared Use Pathways** - Amend the Shared Use Pathway text in TSP (Page 3-41) to consider least impact option. The second sentence would be amended to read, "The US 101 Path should be extended north to the city limits and North Gateway Park, as well as south to the city limits unless it is shown that a more traditional sidewalk and bike lane would minimize the impacts to abutting properties due to right of way constraints."
- h) **Consideration of Modified Designs** - Amend the Table 3.1 in TSP (Page 3-4) to recognize an additional footnote that will permit modifications subject to safety and operational constraints. Footnote 5 would be added to read, "5. When proposed improvements to existing roadways are constrained by limited right-of-way or existing improvements, these standards may be further modified; provided public safety and operational concerns can be adequately mitigated." The number 5 would be noted at the Table heading.
- i) **Reclassification of Street Segment** - Amend Figure 3.2 in the TSP (Page 3-5) to reflect the Minor Collector designation for that portion of 12th Avenue between Necanicum Drive and Franklin.
- j) **Modify Avenue S Cross-section** - Amend the cross section description at the introduction of project 10 in TSP (Page 3-21) to reflect a 40' wide design. The second sentence would be amended to read, "From US 101 east to the bridge crossing Neawanna Creek, Avenue S would have a 10' wide shared pathway on the north side, two twelve foot travel lanes, and a 6' sidewalk on the south side (Figure 3.15)." Figure 3.15 would be amended to reflect the 40' wide cross-section.

In addition to the responses in the matrix, Planning Commissioners have suggested some additional modifications to the plan. The following is a modified list of those changes:

- a) **Chamber of Commerce Reference** - Amend the Chamber of Commerce reference in TSP (Page 3-16) so the second to the last sentence in project 6 will read, "The building in the northeast quadrant of this intersection is occupied by the Seaside Chamber of Commerce and the Seaside Visitor's Bureau; and, it has adequate setback to accommodate this widening."
- b) **Include Missing Cost** - Amend Table 5.1 in TSP (Page 5-2) for Project 8. This table will

include the cost of "\$2,133,000".

- c) **Additional Bypass Policy** - This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). The policy would read, "15. While it is recognized that a bypass of Highway 101 is outside of the Seaside TSP considerations, as an interested stakeholder, the City of Seaside will actively participate with Clatsop County's efforts to consider the future development of a bypass highway that would extend from Highway 26 to Highway 30 along with other municipalities, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and the Federal Highway Administration." This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.
- d) **Additional Flooding Policy** - This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). 16. The policy would read, "While it is recognized that the flooding of Highway 101 south of Seaside is outside of the Seaside city limits, as an interested stakeholder, the City of Seaside will support the County wide efforts to solve the flooding problem and seek funding to develop the solution." This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.
- e) **Additional Transportation Policy** - This policy would be added to the Comprehensive Plan TSP Appendix G (Page G-47). 17. The City of Seaside shall establish a Transportation Advisory Commission that will conduct a public review of transportation projects identified in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) at the time project design funding is programmed or secured. This Commission is intended to provide affected parties a venue to provide early, open, continuous, and meaningful opportunity to influence decisions about proposed transportation activities within the urban growth boundary. It would also be the Commission's responsibility to provide input concerning periodic updates and major revision to the adopted TSP. This text is supported by the written comments proposed by Commissioner Carpenter.
- f) **Shorten Zoning Ordinance Amending Text** - Pages G-9 through G-19 all include a reference to Section 3.022 6 for a General Transportation Facility Improvement and 3.023 13 for a Significant Transportation Facility Improvement. The original intent was to define these in the definitions Section 1.030 (Page G-8 and G-9) so it could simply be referenced in each zone. Each zone should include the text in Section 3.022 6 under the permitted uses and the text in Section 3.023 13 under the conditional uses in an effort to remove the redundant text being proposed in each zone.
- g) **Correct the Removal of Needed Text** - Page G-26 proposed the elimination of Zoning Ordinance Section 10.080. This entire section needs to be retained and should not be deleted from the Zoning Ordinance.
- h) **Clarification of Significant Traffic Review Trigger** - Amend the text in Section 3.404 (Page G-31) to clearly recognize prior demand by adding more text. The last sentence in the third paragraph would be amended to read, "An evaluation of compliance with the standards of this Overlay Zone shall be conducted by ODOT and the Seaside Planning Commission, and shall comply or be brought into compliance prior to the issuance of any permits or approvals; if any of the following circumstances will generate a significant number of additional trips over the prior use."
- i) **Recognize Public Input** - Provide an additional Appendix that recognizes the amendments made to the draft TSP based on concerns expressed during public testimony and deliberation by the Planning Commission **& City Council.**

The following findings identify additional amendments that are based on comments that were made during the City Council's public hearing. These are referenced in the matrix that was provided during the Council meeting on May 9, 2011.

- 7a. Lifeline Routes-. In an effort to formally address the added evacuation benefits provided by pedestrian bridges, the following sentence should be added after the first sentence on page 3-44, "These facilities will also provide seismically resistive emergency evacuation routes."
- 7b. Plan Emergency Access Routes- Add the following paragraph at the bottom of Page 3-29 under the heading "**Other Considerations Outside the TSP Process**"

"Emergency Connection to Forest Access Roads

Seaside's close proximity to the Cascadia Subduction Zone makes it susceptible to major earthquakes and tsunami inundation. The occurrence of such an event would cause significant damage to conventional transportation facilities and it could force the City to utilize alternative high ground routes out of town. Based on this recognition, Seaside needs to work with the surrounding forest land owners to plan emergency access routes that will connect to the existing network of forest access roads. It is recognized the emergency accesses would be outside the City's Urban Growth Boundary and access would need to be limited in order to avoid adverse impacts to the surrounding forest lands. This acknowledges that a number of routes would advance the City's ability to evacuate during an emergency and these same routes would improve fire apparatus along the urban forest fringe.

Flooding South of Seaside"

- 7c. Administrative Consideration of Overlay Zone Trigger- Allow administrative safeguards that would address situations that would be ignored by the ITE table. For example, Off Street Parking Section 4.100 states, "Where square feet are specified, it will be the customer accessible area". This allows staff to exclude space devoted to dead storage space, bathrooms, freezers etc. Although our zoning ordinance allows the city to make reasonable adjustments to parking requirements based on how areas are utilized, the new definition does not appear to allow such adjustments. The additional language noted below in **bold** will help avoid oversights created by sole reliance on a table.

Section 3.403 Definitions

- *Development* - All improvements proposed on a previously unimproved site, including buildings, other structures, parking and loading areas, landscaping, paved or graveled areas, and areas devoted to exterior display, storage, or activities. New development includes improved open areas such as plazas and walkways, but does not include natural geologic forms or unimproved land.
- *Redevelopment* - means the act or process of changing existing development including replacement, remodeling, or reuse of existing structures to accommodate a new use.
- *Significant number of additional trips*- The generation of more than 5 peak hour trips or 30 average daily trips. Trip volumes are to be based upon the most recent edition

of ITE's *Trip Generation*, inclusive of all pass by trips unless the Planning Director finds that a significant number a trips are unlikely to be generated based on a detailed review of the site's building area utilization.
