

Jeffrey Adams

From: les sinclair <bongobob@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:48 AM
To: Jeffrey Adams; Katie Hillenhagen
Subject: Feedback on the Draft TSP & Implementation Plans

I want to express my appreciation to Jeff, the City and the Parametrix folks who were integral to the TSP process. It felt logical, transparent and there were numerous opportunities for public awareness and input - thank you.

However, I have concerns. Two general concerns are as follows

1. The TSP is based on a slow population growth in Cannon Beach (3.4%) but in fact, the full-time population has declined in the 2020 census. How can we test the TSP recommendations to make sure they are still valid in a variety of future scenarios?
2. I feel like these recommendations have lost their “alignment” back to the starting needs and goals of the TSP. Maybe a better way to put it would be that I understand what each of the recommendations “are” but I cannot point back to a stated “need” in every case. This is probably due to the very step-wise process followed where feedback received at each step informs the next iteration. For example, there are recommendations for four “mini-mobility hubs” but I can’t tell you what need they serve.

The rationale for assigning the current priorities of Near, Medium and Long don’t make sense to me. I roughly categorized all 59 recommendations into Car Movement, Bicycle Movement, People Movement, Parking, and Policy buckets (there is a lot of overlap). My opinion is that Car Movement and Parking are of more immediate concern and should receive higher priority but that’s just my vote. I would also suggest a Cost vs Benefit analysis might be another way to think about priorities.

I have a few other recommendation-specific concerns as follows

1. I understood that there was to be a recommendation for a traffic circle at Hemlock and Warren Way? I see that the 4-way stop has been implemented.
2. I disagree with ET-1. There is no place in Cannon Beach for shared electric scooters – many other communities have learned that to their dismay. Shared bicycles might be possible with proper management, but in no case should the city be “supportive of future investment”.

*ET-1 Adopt TSP policy **supportive** of future investments in scooter and bike share*

3. The other Emerging Technologies recommendations, ET-2 and ET-4 make sense and should be acted on quickly

ET-2 Adopt policy in municipal code to regulate scooter and bike share

ET-4 Adopt policy and regulations for ride-hailing transportation network companies (TNCs, like Uber and Lyft) before they begin operating in the City