Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Meeting #2

DATE: January 28, 2009

ATTENDEES: Mark Labhart, Willard Berry, Carolyn Decker, Mark Elston, Claudine Rehn, Shawn Reiersgaard, Don Averill, Tom Weber, Norm Myers, Jan Stewart, Mark Gervasi, Butch Parker, Tony Snyder, Ingrid Weisenbach, Joanna Ridgway, Liane Welch, Larry McKinley, Kristin Hull, Linda Girard, Andra Henriques

GUESTS: Gus Meyer, Alene Allen, Gary Hanenkrat, Matt Mumford

LOCATION: Tillamook City Library, 1716 3rd Street

Welcome and Introductions

Kristin Hull welcomed the group and asked for self-introductions. She briefly summarized the agenda which will include an explanation of the ODOT planning framework, an overview of the existing and future traffic and transportation report and discussion about the draft problem statement and draft goals. The meeting summary from the first meeting was approved with no corrections or additions.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

ODOT Planning Framework

Ingrid Weisenbach explained ODOT’s integrated transportation planning model which informs the Oregon Transportation Plan. The process includes planning, developing projects, and implementing them. Higher priority measures are implemented first unless a lower priority measure is clearly more cost-effective or unless it clearly supports better safety, growth management, or other livability and economic viability considerations. The four priority categories are:

- Protect the existing system
- Improve efficiency and capacity of existing highway facilities
- Adding capacity to the existing system
- Add new facilities to the system
Ingrid further explained that the lowest category is the one under which a bypass would fall and so could only be considered in this study if priorities one, two and three couldn’t improve the problem. She concluded that a bypass is probably off the table at this point.

**Existing and Future Traffic and Transportation Report**

Andra Henriques presented a summary of the existing and future no-build traffic analysis which includes both an environmental and traffic study area. Key findings of the analysis were:

- Queues create system gridlock
- A few intersections lack sufficient capacity to handle demand

The traffic analysis measured traffic congestion in 2008 and 2030 and included a study of intersection volumes, queue analysis and crash analysis. Andra explained that queuing becomes a problem when cars back up through the next intersection and the analysis showed three problem intersections in 2008 and a predicted eight problem intersections in 2030. It also showed a number of lights and short blocks contributed to the back ups.

The crash analysis showed that the city crash rate is higher than the statewide average and problem areas include the area on US 101 between Hoquarten Slough to between 1st and 2nd streets and the intersection of Main Avenue and 4th Street. Committee members commented on concerns about pedestrian/automobile conflicts, poor visibility at some intersections, automobiles and trucks forced too close together and the importance of trucks to the local economy and the need to figure out how to accommodate them. Andra noted that every project strives to improve safety and reducing queuing and congestion will certainly help in this project. It is imperative to look at the mobility issues in the study area.

**Draft Problem Statement**

Kristin reviewed the draft problem statement and the list of problems the Project Management Team had identified:

- Gridlocked traffic
- Congestion
- Safety
- Freight movement

She asked if the SAC had other issues they wanted to add and all agreed that the list was complete as it was presented. Larry McKinley responded to a question about how right-of-way issues will be handled and said that once an alternative is identified for the project, ROW agents will negotiate with affected property owners who ultimately will be compensated. Impacts to both the built and natural environment will be considered.
Draft Evaluation Framework

Kristin then reviewed a proposed set of goals and objectives whose purpose is to guide the evaluation of concepts for the US101/OR 6 Alternatives Study. They were developed after reviewing notes from stakeholder interviews, the first Project Management Team meeting, and the first Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. They were also based, in part, on the 2006 Tillamook Transportation Refinement Plan. The purpose of this review is to finalize the goals and objectives and the general public will also have an opportunity to weigh in at the first project open house on February 4th. The proposed goals and objectives are:

- **Goal 1**: Improve mobility in downtown Tillamook for all users including cars, trucks, bicyclists and pedestrians.
- **Goal 2**: Provide for improved safety for all users in the study area.
- **Goal 3**: Support economic vitality in Tillamook and the coastal region.
- **Goal 4**: Construct a project that is sensitive to the community and natural environment.
- **Goal 5**: Provide for a cost-effective solution that can be implemented in phases.

The SAC offered a number of suggestions and comments:

- Should all goals be reflected in the problem statement?
- Should “economic vitality” be added to the problem statement?
- In Goal 2, add an objective: “Enhance safety for transit users.”
- In Goal 1, make it more explicit that we are “fixing” for 2030.
- Consider customer access and parking (which doesn’t feel convenient, safe enough, or plentiful) in Goal 2.
- In Goal 3, add OR 131.
- In Goal 4, use the same word (avoid, minimize, or mitigate) to begin each bulleted item.

Public Comment

Matt Mumford, General Manager of the Tillamook County Transportation District, introduced himself and will join the SAC as a member at their next meeting. Gary Hanenkrat introduced himself and will be Shawn Reiersgaard’s alternate.

Conclusion and Next Steps

We will poll the committee about the best date for the next meeting to be held the first week of March.

The first open house will be Wednesday, February 4 from 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. at the Tillamook City Library. All SAC members were encouraged to attend.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.