NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

7/23/2010

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: Clatsop County Plan Amendment
DLCĐ File Number 002-10

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. Due to the size of amended material submitted, a complete copy has not been attached. A Copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures*

DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: Thursday, August 05, 2010

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review prior to adoption pursuant to ORS 197.830(2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

*NOTE: The Acknowledgment or Appeal Deadline is based upon the date the decision was mailed by local government. A decision may have been mailed to you on a different date than it was mailed to DLCD. As a result, your appeal deadline may be earlier than the above date specified. NO LUBA Notification to the jurisdiction of an appeal by the deadline, this Plan Amendment is acknowledged.

Cc: Jennifer Bunch, Clatsop County
Jon Jinings, DLCD Community Services Specialist
Matt Spangler, DLCD Regional Representative
Bob Cortright, DLCD Regional Representative

<paa> YA
Jurisdiction: Clatsop County
Date of Adoption: July 14, 2010
Date Mailed: March 17, 2010

Was a Notice of Proposed Amendment (Form 1) mailed to DLCD? □ Yes □ No
Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
Land Use Regulation Amendment
Zoning Map Amendment
New Land Use Regulation
Other: Transportation System Plan

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached".
The preferred alternative of the 2003 Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP) established the need for the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan. This refinement plan addresses improvements such as a bicycle and pedestrian facilities, design upgrades, turn lanes, bridge replacements, and access management. In addition the County adopted text amendments that were necessary to implement the refinement plan's recommendations. The text amendments focus on: 1) coordinated review, 2) connectivity, and 3) right-of-way improvements.

Does the Adoption differ from proposal? No, no explanation is necessary
Plan Map Changed from: n/a to: n/a
Zone Map Changed from: n/a to: n/a
Location:
Specify Density: Previous: New:
Applicable statewide planning goals:

Was an Exception Adopted? □ YES □ NO
Did DLCD receive a Notice of Proposed Amendment...
45-days prior to first evidentiary hearing? □ Yes □ No
If no, do the statewide planning goals apply? □ Yes □ No
If no, did Emergency Circumstances require immediate adoption? □ Yes □ No

DLCm file No. DLCD File No. 002-10 (18182) [16219]
Please list all affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:
Local Contact: Jennifer Bunch
Address: 800 Exchange St. #100
City: Astoria
Phone: (503) 325-8611
Fax Number: 503-338-3666
E-mail Address: jbunch@co.clatsop.or.us
BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FOR THE COUNTY OF CLATSOP

In the Matter of:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE
CLATSOP COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM PLAN AND THE TEXT OF THE
LAND AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND
USE ORDINANCE

ORDINANCE NO. 10-02

Doc #2010070014

Recording Date: 7-15-2010

RECITALS

WHEREAS, an extensive public process was conducted to create the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan as required by the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan.

WHEREAS, the refinement plan and associated text amendments were considered by the Planning Commission at a public hearing on June 9, 2010, The Commission unanimously recommended approval, which is attached as Exhibit “PC”; and

WHEREAS, consideration for this ordinance complies with the Post Acknowledgement rules of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission and the Clatsop County Planning Commission has sought review and comment and has conducted the public hearing process pursuant to the requirements of ORS 215.050 and 215.060, and the Board of Commissioners received and considered the Planning Commission’s recommendations on this request and held a public hearing on July 14, 2010, on this ordinance pursuant to law on; and

WHEREAS, public notice has been provided pursuant to law; now therefore,

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CLATSOP COUNTY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Clatsop County Transportation System Plan is modified to adopt the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan by reference.

SECTION 2. The Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance text is hereby amended to reflect the changes as recommended by Staff and contained in the Staff Report, Exhibit PC-A.

SECTION 3. In support of this ordinance, the Board adopts the findings in the Staff Report dated May 4, 2010, and associated exhibits contained in Exhibit “PC”.
Approved this 4th day of July, 2010

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR CLATSOP COUNTY, OREGON

By

John Raichl, Vice-Chair
BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR THE COUNTY OF CLATSOP

In the Matter of

THE MILES CROSSING/JEFFERS GARDEN
REFINEMENT PLAN LEGISLATIVE
AMENDMENTS TO THE CLATSOP
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
PLAN AND LAND USE ORDINANCE

RESOLUTION AND ORDER

THE ABOVE ENTITLED MATTER came before the Planning Commission on May 11, 2010, for a public hearing and consideration of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan Amendments to the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan and Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance 80-14.

The Planning Commission after reviewing the findings of fact in Exhibit “A” (Staff Report) has determined the proposed changes, except for those changes affecting LWDUO §2.045, are consistent with Clatsop County’s Comprehensive Plan and Statewide Planning Goals.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION considering all evidence and public testimony provided by the Planning Department Staff and the Applicant at the public hearing, hereby RECOMMENDS APPROVAL of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan as presented in “Exhibit A” Staff Report, and the associated Text Amendments, as modified in “Exhibit B”, attached hereto and by this reference made part hereof.

WHEREFORE, the Planning Commission finds and resolves:

To Recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments to Transportation System Plan and Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance, as modified.

SO ORDERED this 21 day of May 2010

THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR CLATSOP COUNTY

[Signature]
Cary T. Johnson, Chair
Clatsop County Planning Commission
Language recommended to be added to the County’s Comprehensive Plan or code is be indicated by underlining and language to be deleted by strike-through.

Article 5. Permit and Issue Determinations

Section 5.205 General Standards for Minor and Major Partitions

(1) Standards for partitions in resource zones (as defined in Section 1.030):

(A) Minor Partitions in Resource Zones shall meet the following standards:

1) Road approach approval from the appropriate agency shall be demonstrated.
2) Clustering in resource zones shall be subject to the standards for partitioning of non-resource lands in (2) below as well as any other applicable standards.
3) County-wide Forest Lands Policy #22 shall be applied to all AF and F-80 partitions.
4) Streets shall be provided consistent with local connectivity plans, as adopted in the County’s Transportation System Plan. The connectivity plans illustrate the general location of streets; the exact location and design of streets shall be determined during the development review process. Street location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

(B) Major Partitions in Resource Zones shall meet the following standards:
1) Standards in 5.205(1)(A)(1-34) above shall be met.

(2) Standards for Partitions in Non-Resource Zones (as defined in Section 1.030).

(A) Minor Partitions in All Zones other than Resource Zones shall meet the following standards:

1) Road approach approval from the appropriate agency shall be demonstrated.
2) Except as set out in Section 5.207(1) the boundaries of all parcels shall be surveyed and monumented.
3) Streets shall be provided according to Local Connectivity Plans included in the County’s Transportation System Plan or Transportation Refinement Plans where applicable. The Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined during the development review process. The location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).
(B) Major Partitions in Non-Resource Zones shall meet the following standards

1) Standards in 5.205(2)(A)(1-23) above shall be met.

Section 5.226 Preliminary Plat Information

The Preliminary Plat of the proposed subdivision shall include the following information:

(14) Location, width, name, approximate grade, and radii of curves of all proposed streets, their connection or relationship of such streets to any projected or existing streets adjoining the proposed subdivision. Streets shall be provided according to Local Connectivity Plans included in the County's Transportation System Plan. The Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s). The subdivider shall submit documented preliminary approval, from the County Roadmaster, of his road design.

Section 5.240. Supplementary Information with Final Plat.

(4) Improvement Plans. Improvement plans shall be submitted for various facilities that are to be constructed by the subdivider, including drainage plans, sewer plans, water plans, curb and gutter, sidewalk and street plans, and any other construction plans that may be required. Improvement plans shall indicate driveways or any other modifications in property access consistent with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan. Street plans shall conform to streets proposed in the preliminary plat, except for refinements to location and design that may need to be made given existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

These improvement plans shall indicate design criteria, assumptions and computations for proper analysis in accordance with sound engineering practice. Where such plans are or would be the same as those included in the County's Standard Specifications, they may be submitted by reference to such Standard Specifications.


Every lot shall abut a street, other than an alley, for at least twenty-five (25) feet. Lots which were created prior to adoption of Ordinance No. 66-2 which do not meet this provision may be built on if it is determined by the Community Development Director under a Type I procedure that: (1) (2)

(1) Access to be provided is adequate to handle the types and amount of traffic expected for the use.
(2) Access width is adequate for fire protection vehicles.

(3) Access is consistent with applicable access management plans or strategies that are adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan.

Section 6.025. Local Street Connectivity.

Local street improvements proposed as part of a land development or land use proposal shall be consistent with the development standards and local connectivity plans of the adopted County's Transportation System Plan. Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined during the development review process. The location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

Section 5.240. Supplementary Information with Final Plat.

(4) Improvement Plans. Improvement plans shall be submitted for various facilities that are to be constructed by the subdivider, including drainage plans, sewer plans, water plans, curb and gutter, sidewalk and street plans, and any other construction plans that may be required. Improvement plans shall indicate driveways or any other modifications in property access consistent with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan. Street plans shall conform to streets proposed in the preliminary plat, except for refinements to location and design that may need to be made given existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

These improvement plans shall indicate design criteria, assumptions and computations for proper analysis in accordance with sound engineering practice. Where such plans are or would be the same as those included in the County's Standard Specifications, they may be submitted by reference to such Standard Specifications.


Every lot shall abut a street, other than an alley, for at least twenty-five (25) feet. Lots which were created prior to adoption of Ordinance No. 66-2 which do not meet this provision may be built on if it is determined by the Community Development Director under a Type I procedure that:

(1) Access to be provided is adequate to handle the types and amount of traffic expected for the use.

(2) Access to be provided complies with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan.

(3) Access width is adequate for fire protection.
Staff Report

REPORT DATE: May 4, 2010
HEARING DATE: May 11, 2010
APPLICANT: Clatsop County
REQUESTS: Legislative Amendments to the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP) and the Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION: Refer to study area map attached as Exhibit 3.
LOCATION: The study area is located along Highway 101 Business in the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden area of Clatsop County. The study area extends from the Highway 202/Highway 101 Bus intersections within the City of Astoria to the Highway 101 Bus/Pt. Clatsop Rd/Airport Lane intersection near the City of Warrenton.
CURRENT ZONING: RCC – Rural Community Commercial
RCR – Rural Community Residential
RCI – Rural Community Industrial
RA-1 – Residential Agriculture 1
STAFF: Jennifer Bunch, Planner

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the findings of this report and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners

EXHIBITS:
1. Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan (CD)
2. Proposed text amendments to the Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance (LWDUO), Sections 2.045, 4.108, 5.205, 5.226, 5.240, 6.020, and 6.025 (new) [deletions are struck through and additions are underlined]
3. Study Area Map
4. Notice of Public Hearing and Mailing List
I. Overview

In December 2002, Clatsop County adopted the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens Rural Community Plan. The plan created new rural community zones and supports a rural community sewer system that will allow the area to accommodate more development. The Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP), completed in 2003, recommends upgrades to the “Astoria-Warrenton Parkway” (US 101 Business or Highway 105) through the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens Rural Community. The Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens Transportation Refinement Plan ("Refinement Plan") was undertaken to address these issues, as well as to maintain local and regional mobility on US 101 Business, particularly as it may serve as an alternate route to US 101.

Objectives of the Refinement Plan include identifying improvements such as sidewalks, bicycle facilities, access management, intersection safety, design upgrades, bridge replacements, and turn lanes to support mobility, safety, and transportation alternatives to the automobile.

The Refinement Plan began in January 2005, was temporarily suspended in November 2005, was resumed in June 2008, and was completed in June 2009. The Refinement Plan was developed through the involvement of a Project Management Team (PMT), Project Advisory Committee (PAC), and the members of the public. PMT members included Ingrid Weisenbach, ODOT; Ed Wegner and Jennifer Bunch, Clatsop County; Carol Parker, City of Warrenton; Brett Estes, City of Astoria; and Laren Woolley and Matt Crall, DDCD. PAC members included: John Raichl, Clatsop County; Mark Kuja, City of Warrenton; Russ Warr, City of Astoria; Jack Crider, Port of Astoria; John Riedskola, Area Resident; Fred Mestrich, Area Business Owner/Water District; Linda Brim, Area Business Owner; Tom Tietow, Sewer District; Klyde Thompson, Miles Crossing Volunteer Fire Department; Tom Bergin, Clatsop County Emergency Services; Craig Hoppes, Astoria School District; Jim Gedenburg, Logging Truck Representative; Captain Peter Troedson, Coast Guard; Larry McKinley, ODOT; Skip Hauke, Chamber of Commerce; and Cindy Howe, Sunset Empire Transportation District. The process included two PMT meetings and two PAC meetings to review technical information and provide guidance to the consultant team, and four public workshops on October 28, 2008 and January 22, 2009 to gather a broad range of comments and suggestions included. A project website, hosted by ODOT, was used to provide information about the project to members of the public, including opportunities for participation and feedback. The product is a Final Refinement Plan (Exhibit 1) and proposed code amendments that accompany and implement the plan (Exhibit 2).

Improvement projects that are recommended in the Refinement Plan and this proposal were designed to accommodate traffic that uses US 101 Business as an alternative to US 101, without changing the functional classification or mobility standards for US 101 Business. Recommended improvements include the following projects.

- Three lane cross-sections on US 101 Business, with two travel lanes, a center turn-lane, and sidewalks and bicycle lanes on both sides
- A roundabout at the Miles Crossing intersection in the long-term (with improved signage and striping in the short-term)
- A local connectivity plan
- An access management strategy.

Amendments to the County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance that are proposed in order to implement the Refinement Plan and its recommendations address the following topics in Sections 2.045 (Pre-application Conference), 4.108 (Application Procedure), 5.205 (General Standards for Minor and Major Partitions), 5.226 (Preliminary Plat Information), 5.240 (Supplementary Information with Final Plat), 6.020 (Access), and 6.025 (Local Street Connectivity [new]).

Coordinated review
• Connectivity of the local street network
• Right-of-way improvements, particularly driveways/access control.

For detailed information about the recommended improvements and proposed amendments, refer Exhibits 1 and 2.

The proposal before the Planning Commission is to recommend adoption of the Refinement Plan by reference into the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP), an element of the County’s Comprehensive Plan, and to recommend adoption of the proposed amendments to the County’s Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance (LWDUO).

II. Applicable Criteria
This staff report has been developed pursuant to Section 2.330, Planning Commission Recommendation, of the Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance (LWDUO):

In preparing its recommendation the Planning Commission shall do the following:
(1) Identify the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan that govern the decision and prepare findings describing how the proposal complies or fails to comply with these Plan provisions.
(2) Review the nature of the proposal and describe whether the proposal warrants processing as a legislative matter.
(3) State reasons for the recommendations and make the recommendations. Recommendations may include policy advice of the Planning Commission in addition to determinations described in (1) and (2) above.

Clatsop County’s Comprehensive Plan is acknowledged by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) as being consistent with the 19 Statewide Planning Goals. Proposed amendments to the acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and its implementing ordinances must be supported by findings that demonstrate how the proposed amendments are consistent with current Statewide Planning Goals and associated regulations. The Clatsop County TSP is an element of the County’s Comprehensive Plan; adopting the Refinement Plan by reference into the TSP will amend the Comprehensive Plan.

III. Findings

Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement

Policies
1. The Committee for Citizen Involvement shall be the Clatsop County Planning Commission, consisting of seven members. The Planning Commission shall strive to represent a cross section of affected citizens in all phases of the planning process. As an appropriate component, five Planning Commission members shall be representatives of the six designated geographic areas (with a seven member Commission, one area may have two members). No more than two Planning Commission members may reside within incorporated cities. Each member of the Planning Commission shall be selected by an open, well-publicized, public process by the Board of Commissioners.
2. The Planning Commission and active Citizen Advisory Committees shall hold their meetings in such a way that the public is notified in advance and given the opportunity to attend and participate in a meaningful fashion.
3. Active Citizen Advisory Committees may submit their comments to the Clatsop County Department of Planning and Development, Clatsop County Planning Commission and Clatsop County Board of Commissioners. These bodies shall answer the CAC request in a timely manner.
4. The Board of Commissioners, through the Planning Department, should provide adequate and reasonable financial support; technical assistance shall be available and presented in a simplified form, understandable for effective use and application.
5. Citizens shall be provided the opportunity to be involved in the phases of the planning process as set forth and defined in the goals and guidelines for Land Use Planning, including Preparation of Plans and...
Implementation Measures, Plan Content, Plan Adoption, Minor Changes and Major Revisions in the Plan and Implementation Measures.

6. Clatsop County shall encourage organizations and agencies of local, state and federal government and special districts to participate in the planning process.

7. Clatsop County shall use the news media, mailings, meetings, and other locally available means to communicate planning information to citizens and governmental agencies. Prior to public hearings regarding major Plan revisions, notices shall be publicized.

8. Clatsop County shall establish and maintain effective means of communication between decision-makers and those citizens involved in the planning process. The County shall ensure that ideas and recommendations submitted during the planning process will be evaluated, synthesized, quantified, and utilized as appropriate.

9. Public notices will also be sent to affected residents concerning zone and Comprehensive Plan changes, conditional uses, subdivisions and planned developments.

Findings – Goal 1: Citizen involvement occurred throughout the process of developing the Refinement Plan. The process involved a Project Management Team (PMT), Project Advisory Committee (PAC), and the members of the public. PMT members included Ingrid Weisenbach, ODOT; Ed Wegner and Jennifer Bunch, Clatsop County; Carol Parker, City of Warrenton; Brett Estes, City of Astoria; and Lilian Crall, DLCD. PAC members included: John Raichl, Clatsop County; Mark Kujala, City of Warrenton; Russ Warr, City of Astoria; Jack Crider, Port of Astoria; John Rickola, Area Resident; Fred Mestrich, Area Business Owner/Water District; Linda Brim, Area Business Owner; Tom Teel, Sewer District; Ralph Thompson, Miles Crossing Volunteer Fire Department; Tom Bergin, Clatsop County Emergency Services; Craig Hopkins, Astoria School District; Jim Gedenberg, Logging Truck Representative; Captain Peter Troedsson, Coast Guard; Larry McKinley, ODOT; Skip Hauke, Chamber of Commerce; and Cindy Howe, Sunset Empire Transportation District. The process included two PMT meetings and two PAC meetings to review technical information and provide guidance to the consultant team, and two public workshops on October 28, 2008 and January 22, 2009 to gather a broad range of comments and suggestions included. A project website, hosted by ODOT, was used to provide information about the project to members of the public, including opportunities for participation and feedback. Notices of meetings were provided on the website, through postcard mailings and press releases. The public involvement process is described in detail in the refinement plan and Appendix A of the Plan Appendixes.

Goal 2 - Land Use Planning

The County's land and water have been placed in one of six (6) Plan designations. They are:

1. Development

Development areas are those with a combination of physical, biological, and social/economic characteristics which make them necessary and suitable for residential, commercial, or industrial development and includes those which can be adequately served by existing or planned urban services and facilities.

In Clatsop County, the County has three types of such areas: cities and their urban growth boundaries; rural communities; and rural service areas, which are areas similar to cities (sewer and water) but lack size and a government structure.

b. Urban Growth Boundaries. See land use plans of Astoria, Cannon Beach, Gearhart, Seaside and Warrenton. Clatsop County has adopted each of the city's land use plans for areas outside of the city limits and inside the urban growth boundary. The cities and the County have adopted Urban Growth Boundary Management Agreements. Currently, all cities administer and enforce land use regulations in their respective urban growth areas.

Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments
c. Rural Communities. Clatsop County has identified and established boundaries for the following rural communities: Miles Crossing - Jeffers Gardens, Arch Cape, Svensen, Knappa, and Westport. Land use plans in these areas recognize the importance of communities in rural Clatsop County. These communities are established through a process that applies OAR 660 Division 22 requirements. Portions of land identified in the Miles Crossing and Jeffers Gardens rural community plan take an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 and Goal 4 for portions of land zoned EFU or AF. The exceptions documentation for a portion of the Miles Crossing and Jeffers Gardens rural community boundary is adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, and is located at the end of this section.

2. Rural Agricultural Lands

Agricultural lands are those lands that are to be preserved and maintained for farm use, consistent with existing and future needs for agricultural products, forest and open space. “In land use changes involving a change from Conservation Forest Lands or Rural Agricultural Lands to Rural Lands or Development designations an Exception to the Agricultural Lands or Forest Lands Goals must be taken.”

**Findings - Goal 2:** Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens is an acknowledged Rural Community in the Clatsop County Comprehensive Plan. A combination of Rural Community Residential, Commercial, and Light Industrial zoning has been adopted for Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens. There are also small areas of agricultural (EFU) and agricultural/forestry (AF) zoning within the community boundaries, for which exceptions were approved upon acknowledgement of this area as a Rural Community by the County and the State.

The recommendations made in the Refinement Plan support planned land uses in the study area. The recommended three-lane cross-section of US 101 Business, particularly the addition of the center turn-lane, will increase the safety of turn movements and improve access to businesses along the highway in the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens. Recommended sidewalks and striped bike lanes will also improve access, safety, and mobility for multiple modes in the community. The recommended conceptual local connectivity plan enhances local circulation and access to uses off of the highway.

Access management strategies that are recommended in the plan – including approach modifications, alternate access, and consolidated access – are designed to serve existing and future land uses while maintaining or improving safety on the highway mainly by limiting the number of access points and potential sources of conflict.

Statewide Goal 2 also requires coordination between affected agencies. Improvements recommended by the Refinement Plan have been developed in coordination with Clatsop County, the Cities of Warrenton and Astoria, and ODOT. Further, adoption of proposed code amendments will result in increased coordination between the County and ODOT when land use applications within 750-feet of a state highway are submitted.

**Goal 3 - Agricultural Lands**

**Goal**

To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.

**Findings - Goal 3:** The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community includes only small areas of land zoned for agricultural uses. Exceptions to this goal were approved by the State upon adoption of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community designation and zoning. Proposed amendments will enhance transportation safety and access to existing employment and residential areas within Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens and will not directly impact agricultural lands in the community.

**Goal 4 - Forest Lands**

**Goal**

To conserve forest lands for forest uses.
Findings - Goal 4: There is not land designated for forest uses in the study area for this proposal. The Goal 4 policies of the Comprehensive Plan do not apply to this proposal.

Goal 5 - Open Spaces, Scenic & Historic Areas and Natural Resources
Goal
To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.

Wetlands
1. The County will protect identified significant freshwater wetlands, for which no conflicting uses have been identified, from incompatible uses.

Findings - Goal 5: Goal 5 resources identified in the Clatsop County Comprehensive Plan include big game areas, wetland sites, quarries/pits, nesting sites, and historic sites. These resources are not found in the study area for the proposal.

The roadway cross-sections recommended for US 101 Business in the Refinement Plan can be implemented within the existing public right-of-way. However, additional pavement in the public right-of-way for the recommended cross-sections increases impervious surface and potentially impacts wetlands or sensitive lands in the north-south segment of the highway as indicated in Technical Memo 4B. Any impacts that result from improvements to US 101 Business will be identified as part of project planning and mitigated at the time of project construction. No additional impacts to wetlands, sensitive lands, or wildlife are anticipated outside the right-of-way for the recommended cross-sections.

The local connectivity plan in the Refinement Plan indicates general alignments of local roads to provide and improve local circulation. Detailed alignments must be determined at the time that development is proposed, and the specific alignments will be required to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate natural resource impacts.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Quality
Goal
To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.

Policies
1. The County shall encourage the maintenance of a high quality of air, water and land through the following actions:
   (c) cooperating with the State Highway Department to provide an efficient transportation system.

8. The County shall cooperate with DEQ, State Forestry Department, State Transportation Department and other agencies in implementing best management practices to reduce non-point pollution.

Findings - Goal 6: The recommendations in the Refinement Plan are intended to improve the safety and efficient operation of the transportation system in Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens. Specifically, the recommended center turn lane allows for turning cars to pull out of the travel lanes, allowing through traffic to travel more continuously while improving safety. The recommended roundabout also supports continuous travel along the highway, reducing queuing at the intersection. The recommended cross-sections are not projected to create any land and water impacts outside of the existing US 101 Business right-of-way in the community.
Goal 7 - Natural Hazards

Goal
To protect life and property from natural disasters and hazards.

Flood Hazard Policies
2. Through an integrated flood hazard management program, the county will implement and administer appropriate land use planning techniques and construction standards.

Policies for Streambank Erosion and Deposition
2. A buffer of riparian vegetation along streams and rivers should be encouraged in order to protect and stabilize the banks.

Findings – Goal 7: Most of the land in the study area, except for higher land along Lewis & Clark Road south of US 101 Business, is located within 100-year floodplain according to Map 2 (Hazards, Lewis and Clark-Elney-Walloskee Planning Area) in the Lewis & Clark, Youngs and Wallooskee River Valleys Community Plan. However, the recommended cross-sections and intersection treatments in the Refinement Plan do not create any additional impact on, or conflict with, identified natural hazard areas in the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community.

The local connectivity plan in the Refinement Plan indicates general alignments of local roads to provide and improve local circulation. Detailed alignments must be determined at the time that development is proposed, and the specific alignments will be required to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate natural resource impacts.

The study area borders streams and Youngs Bay and does not propose projects affecting or spanning into these water bodies.

Goal 8 - Recreational Lands

Findings – Goal 8: There are not recreational lands within the proposal study area and the recommended improvements do not impact access to recreational lands. Therefore the Goal 8 Recreational Lands policies of the Comprehensive Plan do not apply to the proposal.

Goal 9 - Economy

Goal
To diversify and improve the economy of the state and Clatsop County.

Findings – Goal 9: The economic development policies of the Comprehensive Plan address topics of forest products, fisheries, tourism, and human resources, and do not have direct bearing on the proposed adoption of the Refinement Plan and its recommendations. However, the improvements in safety, mobility, and transportation choices that the recommendations represent all support business and economic development in Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community.

Goal 10 - Population and Housing

Goal
To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.

Findings – Goal 10: The Goal 10 Housing policies of the Comprehensive Plan do not apply to the proposal. However, implementation of the recommended local connectivity plan will improve access to existing and future residential development in the community.

Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments
Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services

Public Facilities Goals

2. Outside of Urbanizable Areas -
   a. To support the provision of needed public facilities for rural areas at levels appropriate for rural densities;

Findings - Goal 11: Transportation modeling of future conditions performed for the Refinement Plan was based on population and employment forecasts that were, in turn, based on projected water and sewer system capacity (Plan Appendix G). Recommended projects were developed in response to the findings from the transportation modeling.

The sewer system currently being constructed in the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens Rural Community to address environmental and public health issues was part of the assumptions used in the population and employment forecasts. Public sewer systems are prohibited outside urban growth boundaries (UGBs) in Oregon except to protect environmental and public health. The sewer system will support levels of development greater than septic systems, however development in the area will otherwise be limited by zoning and water supply and system capacity.

Goal 12 - Transportation

Goal 1: Mobility
Develop a multimodal transportation system that serves the travel needs of Clatsop County residents, businesses, visitors, and freight transport.

Goal 2: Livability
Provide a transportation system that balances transportation system needs with the desire to maintain pleasant, economically viable communities.

Goal 3: Coordination
Maintain a transportation system plan that is consistent with the goals and objectives of local communities, the County, and the State.

Goal 4: Public Transportation
Work to improve cost-effective and safe public transportation throughout Clatsop County.

Goal 5: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
Provide for an interconnected system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout Clatsop County to serve commuters and recreational users.

Goal 6: Accessibility
Provide a transportation system that serves the needs of all members of the community.

Goal 7: Environment
Provide a transportation system that balances transportation services with the need to protect the environment and significant natural features.

Goal 8: System Preservation
Work to ensure that development does not preclude the construction of identified future transportation improvements, and that development mitigates the transportation impacts it generates.

Goal 9: Capacity
Provide a transportation system that has sufficient capacity to serve the needs of all users.

Goal 10: Transportation Funding
Provide reasonable and effective funding mechanisms for countywide transportation improvements identified in the TSP.

Goal 11: Safety
Provide a transportation system that maintains adequate levels of safety for all users.

Findings – Goal 12: The alternatives and recommendations in the Refinement Plan were evaluated against criteria that generally reflect the goals listed above under Goal 12 of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals and policies are not identified in the County’s TSP.) Refinement Plan criteria included connectivity, safety, mobility, environmental impacts, quality of life, and multi-modal solutions.

The proposal is intended to improve mobility and safety by recommending a center turn lane in the study area, allowing turning vehicles to pull out of the travel lane and through-traffic to move with minimal delay. The recommended center turn lane supports mobility and transit accessibility by allowing through-traffic to pass transit vehicles when they are stopped. The center turn lane also is intended to improve access to businesses and residences along US 101 Business. Access to uses off of US 101 Business should be improved by implementation of the local connectivity plan in this proposal.

The proposal supports livability, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and accessibility by recommending sidewalks and bike lanes for pedestrians and cyclists. Having designated pedestrian and bicycle facilities should increase not just the accessibility but the safety of walking and biking. Recommended access management strategies such as alternate access and access consolidation should also improve safety for walking, bicycling, and driving by limiting the number of access points and potential sources of conflict on the highway.

The recommended cross-sections for US 101 Business minimize environmental impacts and preserve and maximize the existing transportation system by not requiring additional right-of-way or taking residential or employment land along US 101 Business, with the exception of one of two properties that will be taken if the recommended roundabout is implemented. However, property owners of each of the two properties have responded favorably to the proposal in meetings.

The projects recommended in the Refinement Plan meet mobility (capacity) standards with the exception of one leg of the recommended roundabout, which is projected to exceed standards in 2030 (Plan Appendix C). However, the roundabout reduces queues and increases safety, which were challenges for the other alternatives being evaluated.

In terms of coordination, the Refinement Plan has been developed in cooperation with Clatsop County, the Cities of Warrenton and Astoria, ODOT, and members of the public. Proposed code amendments that implement the Refinement Plan also increase the level of coordination between the County and ODOT.

The Refinement Plan identifies potential funding sources for the recommended improvements such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (grants), local gas taxes, local improvement districts (LIDs), system development charges (SDCs), developer exactions, and transportation utility fees. Access improvements, including driveways and sidewalks, will be required with private development and redevelopment in the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens according to existing County code and proposed code amendments (Exhibit 2). Similarly, local roads to be implemented according to approved plats and the local connectivity plan recommended as part of this proposal will be required as part of proposed development and subdivisions in the community.

Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)
OAR 660-012-0060
Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the

Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments
identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);

(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or

(c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:

(A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

Findings – OAR 660-012-0060: Because adoption of the Refinement Plan constitutes an amendment to the County’s Transportation System Plan (an element of the County’s Comprehensive Plan), its adoption is subject to the plan amendment provisions of the Transportation Planning Rule. However, the Refinement Plan and its recommendations do not “significantly affect” transportation facilities as defined by OAR 660-012-0060(1) because they do not change the functional classification of roadways in the study area or the standards by which they are implemented.

There is a potential significant effect where one leg of the roundabout recommended for the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens intersection exceeds the State mobility standard. However, this is offset by the larger improvements in safety and queuing length that the roundabout makes in comparison to the other alternatives, and by its better mobility/capacity performance in comparison to the “T” intersection alternative.

Goal 13 - Energy Conservation

Goal
To conserve energy.

Findings – Goal 13: There are not specific Goal 13 policies that apply to the proposal. However, the proposal generally supports energy conservation in recommending improvements for mobility, connectivity, and transportation alternatives.

Mobility will be improved (and potential congestion reduced) by providing a center turn lane for turning vehicles. The center turn lane also serves transit and mobility by allowing vehicles to pass transit vehicles as they stop. Implementation of the local connectivity plan will create more direct connections between locations on local roads off of US 101 Business. Recommended sidewalks and bike lanes improve existing conditions for walking and bicycling. Implementation of the local connectivity plan will improve

Goal 14 - Urbanization

Goal
To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.

Unincorporated Rural Communities:
Clatsop County has identified and established boundaries for the following rural communities:
Miles Crossing - Jeffers Gardens, Arch Cape, Svensen, Knappa and Westport. Land use plans in these areas recognize the importance of communities in rural Clatsop County.

Policy:
In unincorporated communities outside urban growth boundaries the county may approve uses, public facilities and services more intensive than allowed on rural lands by Goal 11 and 14, either by exception to those goals, or as provided by OAR 660 rules, which ensure such uses do not:
(1) Adversely effect agricultural and forest operations, and
(2) Interfere with the efficient functioning of urban growth boundaries.

District Agreements:
Clatsop County has adopted agreements with the service districts with respect to land use planning and coordination. These agreements are contained in separate documents located in the Clatsop County Community Development Department and the respective district offices.

Policy:
The County shall review these agreements every three to six years, or as needed and update accordingly.

Policy Implementation:
1. The type, location and phasing of public facilities and services are factors which should be utilized to direct urban expansion.
2. The type, design, phasing and location of major public transportation facilities (i.e., all modes: air, marine, rail, mass transit, highways, bicycle and pedestrian), and
3. Improvements thereto are factors which should be utilized to support urban expansion into urbanizable areas and restrict it from rural acres.

Findings – Goal 14: The Miles Crossing/ Jeffers Gardens area is an officially designated Rural Community in Clatsop County. The adoption of the Miles Crossing/ Jeffers Gardens Community Plan included approval of exceptions to Goals 3 and 4.

The Refinement Plan and its recommended improvements are designed to serve only that development that can be supported in Rural Community, as limited by the estimated 20 year-capacity of the water and sewer systems. This area is not planned for intensive or urban-level development. The recommended improvements accommodate traffic that uses US 101 Business as an alternative to US 101, without changing its functional classification or its mobility standards or “oversizing” the roadway and improvements to create inappropriate development pressure on the community.

Goal 15 – Willamette River Greenway
To protect, conserve, enhance, and maintain the natural scenic, economic, and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River as the Willamette River Greenway

Findings – Goal 15: The recommendations of the Refinement Plan do not impact the Willamette River Greenway. Goal 15 does not apply to Clatsop County or the proposal.

Goal 16 and 17 - Estuarine Resources and Coastal Shorelands
Goal 16
To recognize and protect the unique environmental, economic, and social values of each estuary and associated wetlands; and
To protect, maintain, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate restore the long-term environmental, economic, and social values, diversity and benefits of Oregon’s estuaries.
Goal 17
To conserve, protect, where appropriate, development and where appropriate restore the resources and benefits of all coastal shorelands, recognizing their value for protection and maintenance of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, water-dependent uses, economic resources and recreation and aesthetics. The management of these shoreland areas shall be compatible with the characteristics of the adjacent coastal waters; and To reduce the hazard to human life and property, and the adverse effects upon water quality and fish and wildlife habitat, resulting from the use and enjoyment of Oregon’s coastal shorelands.

Findings - Goal 16 and 17: The study area for the proposal is adjacent to the Lewis and Clark River, Youngs River, and Youngs Bay but does not impact them. If recommendations pertaining to bridge improvements included in this proposal are developed into projects in the future, detailed findings for these goals will need to be made in at that time.

Goal 18 - Beaches and Dunes
Goal 18
To conserve, protect, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate restore the resources and benefits of coastal beach and dune areas; and To reduce the hazard to human life and property from natural or man-induced actions associated with these areas.


Goal 19 - Ocean Resources
To conserve marine resources and ecological functions for the purpose of providing long-term ecological, economic, and social value and benefits to future generations.

Findings - Goal 19: The recommendations of the Refinement Plan do not impact ocean resources. The Goal 19 policies of the Comprehensive Plan do not apply to the proposal.

Lewis & Clark, Youngs and Wallooskee River Valleys Community Plan

Alluvial Lowlands Policy
Low density activities such as agriculture shall be the preferred uses in the alluvial lowlands.

Alluvial Terrace Policy
Development on this landscape unit should be encouraged to take place nearest to presently urbanized areas, in order to utilize public services most efficiently.

Coastal Foothills Policy
The predominant land use of this landscape unit should be forestry and acreage homesites. This is due to the generally poor foundation characteristics and of severe septic tank limitations of soils in this landscape unit.

[Note: There are sections of the community plan that address public facilities and transportation but do not provide policies.]

Findings - Community Plan: The study area for the proposal is comprised of alluvial lowlands, alluvial terrace, and coast range foothills according to Map 1 (Generalized Landscape Units, Lewis and Clark-Olney-Wallooskee Planning Area) in the community plan, although primarily of alluvial lowlands.

Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments
While agriculture is permitted in areas of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens community, rural residential, commercial, and industrial uses area also permitted. Exceptions to agricultural and forestry Goals 3 and 4 were approved and zoning permitting these uses was adopted with the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community boundary in 2002.

A sewer system is being constructed in the community for environmental and public health reasons, but development in the community will be limited to low-density development as allowed for by rural zoning and water system capacity. This proposal does not include recommendations to expand the community boundary and focuses recommended improvements on existing areas of development so as to make efficient use of these facilities and services in areas of the Lewis and Clark-Olney-Wallooskee Planning Area that are already developed.

IV. Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Adopt the findings of this report and recommend approval of the legislative to the Board of Commissioners.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Bunch, Planner

Miles Crossing Refinement Plan Legislative Amendments
The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Refinement Plan is available on the enclosed disk.
Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Refinement Plan – Proposed Amendments for Clatsop County
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Introduction

The objectives of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Transportation Refinement Plan ("Refinement Plan") have been to analyze improvements such as sidewalks, bicycle facilities, access management, intersection safety, design upgrades, bridge replacements, and turn lanes for the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community. Illustrations of the recommendations that have emerged from the Refinement Plan process can be found in the Refinement Plan.

The study area for the Refinement Plan generally coincides with the boundaries of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community, which includes the area around the Warrenton-Astoria Highway (US 101 Business) from the Lewis and Clark Bridge (MP 4.67) to the Old Youngs Bay Bridge (MP 7.08) in unincorporated Clatsop County. In developing recommended improvements for the Refinement Plan, however, the study area expanded to the west to include the US 101 Business/Airport Road intersection in Warrenton and to the north to include the US 101 Business/OR 202 intersection in Astoria.

The final Refinement Plan will be adopted into the County’s Transportation System Plan (TSP) by reference. The purpose of this memorandum is to propose amendments to the County’s Comprehensive Plan and Land and Water Use and Development Ordinance ("code") that are necessary to implement the Refinement Plan’s recommendations shown in Figures 13-16 and included in the narrative of the Refinement Plan. The proposed amendments focus on the following topics:

1. Coordinated review
2. Connectivity of the local street network
3. Right-of-way improvements, particularly driveways/access control.

Language recommended to be added to the County’s Comprehensive Plan or code is indicated by underlining and language to be deleted by strike-through.

This memorandum does not address amendments for the projects recommended for Warrenton and Astoria. In order to further develop and implement these projects, it will be necessary to
describe them as they are presented in the Refinement Plan in a staff report and adopting ordinance, and then to adopt them by reference into each jurisdiction's TSP. Amendments to Astoria and Warrenton’s Comprehensive Plans and codes will not be necessary.

**Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (2003)**

The Preferred Alternative in the 2003 Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP) establishes the need for the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Refinement Plan. The Refinement Plan is needed in order to facilitate regional mobility, in which US 101 Business serves as an alternate route to US 101, while allowing for local access, circulation, and livability.

The set of improvements for the area is referred to as the “Astoria-Warrenton Parkway” in the TSP. General recommended projects for the Astoria-Warrenton Parkway identified in the TSP include improvements to the Old Youngs Bay Bridge and Lewis and Clark Bridge and to the Miles Crossing intersection. The Refinement Plan addresses the bridges and the intersection among other recommended projects and improvements. The plan also provides potential roadway cross-sections for the Astoria-Warrenton Parkway.

The TSP also proposes that a change in classification of US 101 Business through Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens from a District Highway to a Regional Highway or Expressway be explored in the Refinement Plan. The Refinement Plan does not recommend that the highway classification be changed.

There are no amendments to the County’s TSP needed beyond adopting the Refinement Plan into the TSP by reference. The project lists and diagrams, cross-sections, access management strategies, and other implementation measures included in the Refinement Plan’s text and figures supplement, refine, and supercede any of those applicable to the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community in the 2003 TSP.

**Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance (2004)**

**Coordinated Review**

The State’s Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012) requires local jurisdictions to have provisions in their codes to coordinate review of land use decisions with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and other relevant agencies, when the decisions potentially have impacts on property or facilities under these agencies' jurisdiction.

Clatsop County does address coordination specifically with ODOT in the following provisions of its existing code.

- Per Section 2.110 (Mailed Notice of a Public Hearing), Subsection (2)(D), notice of public hearings must be provided: “to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for Type II A and Type III applications related to property within 750 feet of a state highway or that in the opinion of the Community Development Director may be found to have a significant impact on State facilities.” Section 2.115 (Mailed Notice for a Type II procedure), Subsection (1)(D) makes the same provision for notice to ODOT.
• In reviewing an application for minor and major partitions, Section 5.203 (Processing Minor and Major Partitions and Property Line Adjustments) requires the Community Development Director to consult with ODOT under the following conditions: “Where a partition is located within 750 feet of a state highway, the Community Development Director will notify the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) of the application and will consider its comments in taking action on the partition request. The tentative plan may be modified, if needed, to meet these standards.”

• As part of the County’s Transportation System Impact Review regulations (Section 5.350), one of the conditions under which a Traffic Impact Study must be prepared is when ODOT determines that the proposed development or land use action may have a significant operational or safety impact on a state highway (Subsection 5.352(2)(A)(2)).

In order to involve ODOT earlier in the review of proposals that may affect State facilities, it is recommended that provisions be made to include the agency in pre-application conferences. This would be done in the same cases that the code already establishes for coordinating with ODOT.

Section 2.045 Pre-application Conference. An applicant or the applicant’s authorized representative shall request the Director to arrange a pre-application conference. Unless the applicant and Director agree that a conference is not needed, the conference shall be held within 15 days of the request. The purpose of the conference shall be to acquaint the applicant with the substantive and procedural requirements of the Ordinance, provide for an exchange of information regarding applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan and development requirements, arrange such technical and design assistance as will aid the applicant, and to otherwise identify policies and proposed development. If the applicant’s proposal is located within 750 feet of a state highway, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) shall be invited to participate in the conference. The Director, if requested by the applicant, shall provide the applicant with a written summary of the conference within 5 days of the conference. The summary shall include confirmation of the procedures to be used to process the application, a list of materials to be submitted and the criteria and standards which may apply to the approval of the application.

Local Connectivity and Street Layout Plans
The Refinement Plan includes a local connectivity plan for the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community. The plan is conceptual and the general alignments shown in the plan will be refined and designed as development occurs in the general alignment areas. It is recommended that requirements for conformance with local connectivity plans be included in the County’s code for major partitions, subdivisions, and general provisions. Incorporating these requirements into the County’s development requirements will implement both this Refinement Plan and any future local connectivity plans that may be developed for other areas of the county.

Partitions
Partitions are distinguished as minor and major based on whether new roadway needs to be constructed. Major partitions involve construction of new roadways, therefore, provisions for local connectivity should apply to all major partitions. New code language addressing
connectivity is proposed below. Note: The addition of new subsections in Section 5.205 will require the renumbering of subsequent subsections.

Article 5. Permit and Issue Determinations

Section 5.205 General Standards for Minor and Major Partitions

(1) Standards for partitions in resource zones (as defined in Section 1.030):

(A) Minor Partitions in Resource Zones shall meet the following standards:

1) Road approach approval from the appropriate agency shall be demonstrated.
2) Clustering in resource zones shall be subject to the standards for partitioning of non-resource lands in (2) below as well as any other applicable standards.
3) County-wide Forest Lands Policy #22 shall be applied to all AF and F-80 partitions.
4) Streets shall be provided consistent with local connectivity plans, as adopted in the County's Transportation System Plan. The connectivity plans illustrate the general location of streets; the exact location and design of streets shall be determined during the development review process. Street location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

(B) Major Partitions in Resource Zones shall meet the following standards
1) Standards in 5.205(1)(A)(1-34) above shall be met.

(2) Standards for Partitions in Non-Resource Zones (as defined in Section 1.030).

(A) Minor Partitions in All Zones other than Resource Zones shall meet the following standards:

1) Road approach approval from the appropriate agency shall be demonstrated.
2) Except as set out in Section 5.207(1) the boundaries of all parcels shall be surveyed and monumented.
3) Streets shall be provided according to Local Connectivity Plans included in the County's Transportation System Plan or Transportation Refinement Plans where applicable. The Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined during the development review process. The location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

(B) Major Partitions in Non-Resource Zones shall meet the following standards
1) Standards in 5.205(2)(A)(1-23) above shall be met.
Subdivisions

The County's subdivision requirements also include specifications for new streets. Therefore, recommended language below requires that local connectivity plans be referenced in the preliminary and final plat requirements for streets and improvement plans. In addition, access information should also be required information in the improvement plans that are part of the final plat. Additional provisions related to access are discussed in the next section of this memorandum.

Section 5.226 Preliminary Plat Information

The Preliminary Plat of the proposed subdivision shall include the following information:

(14) Location, width, name, approximate grade, and radii of curves of all proposed streets, their connection or relationship of such streets to any projected or existing streets adjoining the proposed subdivision. Streets shall be provided according to Local Connectivity Plans included in the County's Transportation System Plan. The Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s). The subdivider shall submit documented preliminary approval, from the County Roadmaster, of his road design.

Section 5.240. Supplementary Information with Final Plat.

(4) Improvement Plans. Improvement plans shall be submitted for various facilities that are to be constructed by the subdivider, including drainage plans, sewer plans, water plans, curb and gutter, sidewalk and street plans, and any other construction plans that may be required. Improvement plans shall indicate driveways or any other modifications in property access consistent with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan. Street plans shall conform to streets proposed in the preliminary plat, except for refinements to location and design that may need to be made given existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

These improvement plans shall indicate design criteria, assumptions and computations for proper analysis in accordance with sound engineering practice. Where such plans are or would be the same as those included in the County's Standard Specifications, they may be submitted by reference to such Standard Specifications.

General Provisions

General provisions provide a way of globally addressing land use proposals in Clatsop County. It is recommended to include requirements related to local connectivity plans for land divisions in these provisions, not as a primary way of implementing the plans but as reinforcement for the requirements proposed in the amendments above.


Every lot shall abut a street, other than an alley, for at least twenty-five (25) feet. Lots which were created prior to adoption of Ordinance No. 66-2 which do not meet this provision may be built on if it is determined by the Community Development Director under a Type I procedure that: (1) (2)

(1) Access to be provided is adequate to handle the types and amount of traffic expected for the use.

(2) Access width is adequate for fire protection vehicles.

(3) Access is consistent with applicable access management plans or strategies that are adopted as part of the County’s Transportation System Plan.

Section 6.025. Local Street Connectivity.

Local street improvements proposed as part of a land development or land use proposal shall be consistent with the development standards and local connectivity plans of the adopted County’s Transportation System Plan. Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined during the development review process. The location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

Right-of-Way Improvements and Access Management

There are several sections of the code that require improvement plans, including street improvements, and that address access. Requirements for subdivisions, Site Design Review Overlay zones, conditional uses, and site plans, already include provisions either for improvement plans or identification of access points. According to County staff, access to County and State roadways is always evaluated during land division and development application procedures. Existing access points are reviewed for compliance with standards and new access points must go through a permit process. Combined access for properties is implemented wherever possible.

The amendments proposed below implement the Refinement Plan by clearly identifying the TSP, including Refinement Plans that are adopted by reference into the TSP, as a document for guiding and regulating access, and specifying compliance with access management plans or strategies as conditions of approval. Proposed code language will allow for the implementation of the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Gardens Refinement Plan and any future access management plans or strategies that the County adopts through a refinement plan or TSP update.

Subdivisions

Improvement plans for facilities are required for final subdivision platting pursuant to Section 5.240(4); Section 5.242 regulates the agreements that implement and guarantee those improvement plans. Sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and streets must be included in an improvement plan as applicable. Proposed amendment language adds the requirement to identify driveways.
and other access features or changes according to adopted access management plans or strategies.

**Section 5.240. Supplementary Information with Final Plat.**

(4) Improvement Plans. Improvement plans shall be submitted for various facilities that are to be constructed by the subdivider, including drainage plans, sewer plans, water plans, curb and gutter, sidewalk and street plans, and any other construction plans that may be required. Improvement plans shall indicate driveways or any other modifications in property access consistent with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan.

Street plans shall conform to streets proposed in the preliminary plat, except for refinements to location and design that may need to be made given existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).

These improvement plans shall indicate design criteria, assumptions and computations for proper analysis in accordance with sound engineering practice. Where such plans are or would be the same as those included in the County's Standard Specifications, they may be submitted by reference to such Standard Specifications.

**General Provisions**

General provisions related to access only apply to particular cases in which a lot has less than 25 feet of roadway frontage. These may be rare instances, but should include references to access management plans and strategies as well.

**Article 6. General Provisions**

**Section 6.020. Access.**

Every lot shall abut a street, other than an alley, for at least twenty-five (25) feet. Lots which were created prior to adoption of Ordinance No. 66-2 which do not meet this provision may be built on if it is determined by the Community Development Director under a Type I procedure that:

(1) Access to be provided is adequate to handle the types and amount of traffic expected for the use.

(2) Access to be provided complies with access management plans or strategies adopted as part of the County's Transportation System Plan.

(2) (3) Access width is adequate for fire protection.
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

~ ORDINANCE 10-02 ~
Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan Amendment
to the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan and Related Text Amendments to the
Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance 80-14

You are receiving this notice because you own property within the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden study area that serves as the subject of the land use action described in this letter or you are considered to be an affected state or federal agency, local government, special district, or interested party. A vicinity map for study area included in this notice.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Clatsop County Transportation & Development Services, 800 Exchange Street, Suite 100, Astoria, Oregon 97103, will be holding a public hearing to consider legislative amendments to the County’s Transportation System Plan and the Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance. Pursuant to Section 2.035 of the Clatsop County Land and Water Development and Use Ordinance (LWDUO), the Department Director has scheduled a public hearing on this matter before the Planning Commission on Tuesday, May 11, 2010, at 10:00 AM in the Judge Guy Boyington Building located at 857 Commercial Street in Astoria, Oregon.

All interested persons may testify in person by attending the hearing, or they may testify in writing by addressing a letter to the Clatsop County Planning Commission, 800 Exchange Street, Suite 100, Astoria, OR 97103. Written comments may also be sent via FAX at 503-338-3666. Written comments must be received in this office prior to 5PM on Monday, May 10, 2010 in order to be considered at the public hearing.

NOTE: Failure of an issue to be raised in a hearing, in person or by letter, or failure to provide statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue.

THE APPLICATION DESCRIBED:
In December 2002, Clatsop County adopted the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Rural Community Plan. The plan created new rural community zones and supports a rural community sewer system that will allow the area to accommodate more development. The Clatsop County Transportation System Plan (TSP), completed in 2003, recommends upgrades to the “Astoria-Warrenton Parkway” (US 101 Business or Highway 105) through the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Rural Community. The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens Transportation Plan (“Transportation Plan”) was undertaken to address these issues, as well as to maintain local and regional mobility on US 101 Business, particularly as it may serve as an alternate route to US 101. Objectives of the Transportation Plan include identifying improvements to improve mobility, safety, and connectivity through the rural communities of Miles Crossing and Jeffers Gardens.

The Planning Commission will hear a proposal to adopt the Miles Crossing Transportation Plan as an amendment to the Clatsop County Transportation System Plan and text amendments to the following LWDUO zoning regulations, which may have an effect on future development: §2.045 Pre-Application Conference, §5.205 General Standards for Minor and Major Partitions, §5.226 Preliminary Plat Information, §5.240 Supplementary Information with Final Plat, §6.020 Access.
In general, the procedure for conduct of the public hearing is as follows:

- Introductory statements by the Planning Commission Chair
- Planning Commission disclosures
- Staff report
- Testimony in favor and in opposition
- Staff comments
- Closure of hearing
- Planning Commission deliberation
- Planning Commission decision (in this case, a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners)

A copy of the application, all documents and evidence submitted by or on behalf of the applicant and applicable criteria are available for inspection at Clatsop County Transportation and Development Services Office during normal business hours (M-F, 8-5) at no cost and will be provided at reasonable cost. These materials can also be viewed at:

http://www.co.clatsop.or.us/default.asp?deptid=12&pageid=22

A copy of the staff report will be available for inspection at no cost at least seven days prior to the hearing and can be viewed in the office or be provided at a reasonable cost.

If you have questions about this land use matter or need more information, please contact the Clatsop County Planning representative for this matter, Jennifer Bunch, Clatsop County Planner, at (503) 325-8611 or jbunch@co.clatsop.or.us.

Notice to Mortgagee, Lien Holder, Vendor or Seller: ORS Chapter 215 requires that if you receive this notice it must promptly be forwarded to the purchaser.
Mailed Notice Of Hearing
Clatsop County Planning Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER_LINE</th>
<th>OWNER_LL_1</th>
<th>STREET_ADD</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYGAARD ANDREW MARTIN</td>
<td>NYGAARD DORIS</td>
<td>PO Box 100</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE CHERI D</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1016</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESTER &amp; LETHIN PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1020</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE GOOSE PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1067</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVERSON VIOLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1076</td>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARCIA JULIO LOPEZ</td>
<td>GARCIA ANTONIA GARCIA</td>
<td>PO Box 1094</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN LYAL L/ELIZABETH M</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1103</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSTEIN TERESA</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1112</td>
<td>Ben Lomond</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON BRIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1136</td>
<td>Goldendale</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAUPPI KENNETH H</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1168</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMPEA JOANN/BRIAN E</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 129</td>
<td>North Plains</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKINGHAM POLLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1406</td>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUGH GEORGE D/SHIRLEY I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 204</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES FRANK W/SYLVIA P</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 207</td>
<td>Ocean Park</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHALEY CURTIS L/DEBRA</td>
<td>PERDUE RONALD J/SUSAN M (C)</td>
<td>PO Box 215</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGAN JAY L</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 2207</td>
<td>Gearhart</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARLING DAVID</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 2442</td>
<td>Gearhart</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVENSEN FISHING INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 274</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEVES JEANNE M</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 304</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCW PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 312</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRUEGER RICHARD A</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 32</td>
<td>North Plains</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDS JIMMIE K/DELORES (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 334</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELDON RICHARD N/RUTH E</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 365</td>
<td>Ocean Park</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNES PEGGY JOHANSEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 385</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHNKE EDWIN J JR</td>
<td>SHUMAN BEHNKE HEIDI</td>
<td>PO Box 4</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNERS BETTY JEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 508</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADONAU NORMAN/PATSY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 513</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S CULLEN LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 521</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGG ELIZABETH M</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 567</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGG ELIZABETH M TR</td>
<td>TAGG DONALD L TEST TRUST</td>
<td>PO Box 567</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTCHER JAMES/KATHRYN L</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 571</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT RICHARD E/DAPHNE J</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 7</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILLIPAKIS CONSTANTINE</td>
<td>PHILLIPAKIS FAMILY TRUST</td>
<td>PO Box 741</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUBLE B INVESTMENTS LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 766</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMONIS CHARLES A/MARCENE K</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 776</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENGESTEG FAMILY LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>HENGESTEG PETER O TRUSTEE</td>
<td>PO Box 779</td>
<td>Lake Oswego</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALL MATTHEW LEON</td>
<td>PO Box 793</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIKES THOMAS R</td>
<td>PO Box 804</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULLEN SALLY A</td>
<td>PO Box 809</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESTRICH BRYAN C/TARA R</td>
<td>PO Box 846</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNICK JOSEPH</td>
<td>PO Box 949</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERGHOLM COREEN</td>
<td>PO Box 971</td>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>89503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONAL ACCEPTANCE CO</td>
<td>QUASHNICK DAVID C/ KARI (C)</td>
<td>PO Box 980</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEMI ED OIL CO INC</td>
<td>PO Box 989</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HAMMERS LLC</td>
<td>615 Village Terr</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A TO Z COMPANY</td>
<td>301 Spruce Ave</td>
<td>Gearhart</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE WATER INVESTMENTS LLC</td>
<td>1545 SW 14th Pl</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRAHAM'S MIKE T/MICHELE D</td>
<td>4880 Ash St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS CRAIG/CARRIE L</td>
<td>92319 Stoner Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHOLA KAI A</td>
<td>35089 5th Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN EDLA E</td>
<td>92253 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDERMAN JERRY L/MARY L</td>
<td>92168 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN EDLA</td>
<td>92253 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN EDLA/HAROLD B</td>
<td>92253 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTIERI CYNTHIA K</td>
<td>92041 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBER DAWN FISHERIES LLC</td>
<td>2324 NW 90th St</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON JOAN D</td>
<td>92203 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARFANIS JOHN</td>
<td>7353 SW 9th Ct</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTMAN BETTY JEAN</td>
<td>92387 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPMO BEVERLY J TR</td>
<td>ASPMO EDSELL G TRUST</td>
<td>2705 Mill Pond Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSEMBLIES OF GOD OREGON DIST</td>
<td>1775 7th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORIA AUTO WRECKING/RADIATOR</td>
<td>34522 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORIA CITY OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORIA MARINE CONST CO</td>
<td>92134 Front Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORIA PORT OF</td>
<td>422 Gateway Ave #100</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZEVEDO FRANK E/BEVERLY</td>
<td>92278 Willow Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILEY RICHARD L</td>
<td>92476 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANHOLZER JOHN A/ELIZABETH A</td>
<td>1556 Coxcomb Dr</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT PERCY LEON/BONNIE</td>
<td>1814 4th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAUMANN LAWRENCE R</td>
<td>414 Silversgate Ave</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE APARTMENTS OREGON LTD</td>
<td>1301 Dove St #1080</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYVIEW BAPTIST CHURCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINGHOM BEVERLY K (LEMPKE)</td>
<td>34590 Hwy 105</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISH TIMOTHY</td>
<td>35242 Orchard Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAIR JANENE L</td>
<td>89322 Hwy 202</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOMQUIST JOSHUA R</td>
<td>35384 Highway 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDIETTI JOYCE</td>
<td>1036 Grand Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWERS MARY/STEVE F</td>
<td>92254 Front Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWERS STEPHEN F/MARY I</td>
<td>92254 Front Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANDON BERNARDINE O</td>
<td>BRANDON JIM L</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANDON VIRGINIA</td>
<td>92152 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREWER NANCY JUNE</td>
<td>35208 Orchard Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS MARY L</td>
<td>89503 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS CHARLES R</td>
<td>91932 Lewis and Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN FRANK J JR</td>
<td>80971 Hwy 101 #63</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN MICHAEL L/LYNN J</td>
<td>35188 Laila Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNING J M LOGGING INC</td>
<td>92450 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNING JAY</td>
<td>92232 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNING JAY M</td>
<td>34755 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGHER BARBARA</td>
<td>41901 Hwy 30</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNS FRANK A</td>
<td>74638 Olson Rd</td>
<td>Clatskanie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNS ANGEL K</td>
<td>35269 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABALLERO FELIX G</td>
<td>35363 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain Leland N/LORENA R</td>
<td>92266 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALENT DOUGLAS G/SANDRA</td>
<td>867 Madison Ave #1</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLISLE ROBERT E</td>
<td>35207 Fick Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLSON DARRENT E/ KAREN L</td>
<td>35363 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTER DIRK/ AMBER</td>
<td>92385 Carnegie Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSON JAMES R/VIRGINIA G</td>
<td>92356 E St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARY MARK</td>
<td>344 Pleasant Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTRO-CHAVEZ GERARDO A/</td>
<td>3528 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTRO TARA M</td>
<td>35072 Jefferson Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAZAREZ VERA RAMON</td>
<td>867 Madison Ave #1</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>344 Pleasant Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATTICK MICHELLE</td>
<td>92375 E Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILSON BETTY LUCILLE</td>
<td>92356 E St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANCY ANGELA MARIE</td>
<td>35255 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLATSOCP COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>LEE RICHARD LESSEE</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLATSPO COUNTY</td>
<td>35255 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAY CHRISTA L</td>
<td>2702 SE Lakewood Dr</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAYTON FREDERICK M</td>
<td>8170 SW Vlahos Dr #223</td>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTAL WOODS INC</td>
<td>36608 Valley Vista Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLE JOHN D/HAZELANN</td>
<td>4433 38th SW Rd</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLE ROBERT F</td>
<td>35182 Orchard Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLMAN RONALD C TR</td>
<td>34662 Airport Ln</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDON ROBERT F JR</td>
<td>92290 Willow Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK WILLIAM M/DEBORAH L</td>
<td>91998 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORLETT DONNA J</td>
<td>1309 Reetz Rd</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWDER DEBORAH R/ JOSHUA I</td>
<td>92270 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMMINGS ROBERT W</td>
<td>92233 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM JAMES H</td>
<td>35303 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM WILLIAM R/BETTY ANN</td>
<td>92241 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTLIP EUGENE F/E MARIE</td>
<td>91882 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIDSON RACHEL M</td>
<td>35335 Schwab Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS JAMES A JR/VIRGINIA</td>
<td>35349 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS NANCY L</td>
<td>869 SW Main</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAW KEVIN G</td>
<td>92301 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWLEY EARL M</td>
<td>DAWLEY LORETTA S</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN JOHN MICHAEL</td>
<td>DEAN PAULA JEAN</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAY JEREMY J</td>
<td>DELAY AMY M</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODSON CHARLES</td>
<td>DODSON SANDRA</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUBB PHYLLIS S</td>
<td>1864 4th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUPUY GABRIEL LEE</td>
<td>DUPUY MAILE ALLISON</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EICH JOHN R</td>
<td>92492 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELTZROTH KIMBERLY</td>
<td>GUSTAFSON MARY ELLEN</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWAN CHERLY M</td>
<td>HICKS RANDY K</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALLEUR DONALD R/HELEN A</td>
<td>32315 Ivyoo Acres Ln</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARRIS MERLE/TAMELA</td>
<td>1867 4th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICK CLIFFORD A/ROXANNE</td>
<td>35228 Fick Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILLIGER ARTHUR JARDITH M TR</td>
<td>FILLIGER FAMILY LIVING TRUST 1/2</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISKAL LAWRENCE M</td>
<td>31 NE 83rd</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLK JOHN M</td>
<td>FOLK CAROL T</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNAS WILLIAM J</td>
<td>92376 Stoner Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEMAN HELEN L</td>
<td>125 W Lexington Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEMAN ROY D/NANCY M</td>
<td>1815 5th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRISCH LARA R</td>
<td>35369 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/3/2010
Mailed Notice Of Hearing
Clatsop County Planning Commission

GALEOTTI JOSEPH F TR
GALLAGHER DANIEL P/MARY E
GARDNER GREGORY/ SUZANNE
GATES PATRICIA MALCOLM TEST TRUST
GEDENBERG JAMES F/SHARON
GERTTULA RICHARD L/PAULA R
GIPSON CHRISTOPHER J
GNIAZDOWSKI TOM/CHARLOTTE D
GOICOCHEA HERIBERTA/JOSE R
GOLIGHTLY JEFFERY W
GRAF JUDY K
GRAF NATE F
GRAF NOEL
GRAHAM ARLENE D
GRAXIOLA JOHNATHAN W/NICOLA C
GROSS ELFRIDE
HAGREN JOSEPH MICHAEL
HAGLUND GORDON D/JANICE E
HALEY KYLE A/CHRIS M
HAMILTON WILLIAM F/REBECCA S
HANSEN EVA JEAN
HANSON AMANDA
HARNY PATRICIA ORA
HARRIS STEPHEN D/ALETA C
HARTLEY JOAN
HARTZELL CHARLES T III
HATCHER JIM/ BETTY
HATLEN JAMES RICHARD
HAUER ROBERT L/JUDY K
HAZELETT HOWARD H/DEBRA R B
HEDLUND GARY M/CHRISTINA M
HEIN DONNA M EST
HELGISO LARRY L/DEANNA M
HELGISO NOEL M/JAN S
HERMAN JOSEPH M/ JEAN M
HERREN DAVID L/DEBRA D
HESS DANIEL R/ CAROL M

GALEOTTI JOSEPH F LIVING TRUST
35198 Lyngstad Heights Ln
92307 Willow Rd
89374 Saddle Mtn Rd
351382 Lyngstad Heights Ln
92283 Clover Rd
91775 Lewis & Clark Rd
155 W Bartlett Rd
35071 Hwy 101
92227 Lewis & Clark Rd
91775 Lewis & Clark Rd
34570 Hwy 101 Business
92235 Clover Rd
92506 G Rd
1157 Winchester Ave
771 Nehalem Ave
35304 Lyngstad Heights Ln
35302 Lyngstad Heights Ln
35133 Hwy 101 Business

HAGGREN JOSEPH MICHAEL
92346 Willow Rd
92215 Front St
34707 Production Ln
92215 Front St
35048 5th Ln
1157 Winchester Ave
92384 G Rd
92384 G Rd
34570 Hwy 101 Business
92253 Clover Rd
1157 Winchester Ave
34707 Production Ln
92384 G Rd
92253 Clover Rd
92215 Front St
35048 5th Ln
1157 Winchester Ave

HAGLUND GORDON D/JANICE E
HAKN BONNIE M/LORI M
HAGLUND GORDON D/JANICE E
HARKER JAMES R/JOAN D
HARMON MARVIN L/PESSIE A
HARMON MARVIN L/PESSIE A
HLEEP W/DELAHAY S
HILL KENNETH T/ALICE R
HILL KENNETH T/ALICE R
HILDEBRANDT ROBERT R/JOAN M
HLEDEDA M/CHARLES H
HELDENBERG WARREN F/HELEN G
HELDENBERG WARREN F/HELEN G
HENDRICKS ROBERT M/CHARLOTTE R
HENDRICKS ROBERT M/CHARLOTTE R
HENDRICKS ROBERT M/CHARLOTTE R
HENDRICKS ROBERT M/CHARLOTTE R

HEDLUND GARY M/CHRISTINA M
35198 Lyngstad Heights Ln
92307 Willow Rd
89374 Saddle Mtn Rd
351382 Lyngstad Heights Ln
92283 Clover Rd
91775 Lewis & Clark Rd
155 W Bartlett Rd
35071 Hwy 101
92227 Lewis & Clark Rd
91775 Lewis & Clark Rd
34570 Hwy 101 Business
92235 Clover Rd
92506 G Rd
1157 Winchester Ave
771 Nehalem Ave
35304 Lyngstad Heights Ln
35302 Lyngstad Heights Ln
35133 Hwy 101 Business

5/3/2010
HESS RICHARD O/ALICIA A
HILL TRISHA
HILLARD DAVID C/MICHELLE L
HILLARD JOSEPH ALAN
HILLARD ROBIN
HINES TRENT E
HOAGLAND RICK M/SANDI A
HOFMANN JEFFREY D/ LISA C
HUGHES DORIS M
HUMPHRIES WILLIAM D/WENDY R
IHANDER MARK L
ISRAEL KATHY E
IVERSON THOMAS A
JAALO FIETRI K
JACOBSON ROBERT C
JANES MATTHEW R
JC & K PROPERTIES LLC
JENSEN BERNICE/BRIM BETTY/ JENSEN CARL ALAN
JENSEN JOHN TERRY
JIROCH MICHAEL LJENNIFER E
JMS PROPERTIES LLC
JOHANSEN JAMES E
JOHNSON BRAD M/MELINDA
JOHNSON CHERYL A
JOHNSON DALE
JOHNSON KEVIN B/JUDITH C
JOHNSON ROBERT ALLEN/TARA LYNNE
JONES JESS A
JONES JUNE E
JOYCE MARGARET A/JOYCE JANET L
JUNES FLORENCE M
JUNES WARREN L/ PEGGY J
JYHLA ARNE/MARILYN E
JYLHA ARNE
KAALINEN JOHN W/JOANNA M
KALANDER JOHN R

92081 Lewis & Clark Rd
92220 Lewis & Clark Rd
92287 Front Rd
92157 Clover Rd
92224 Front Rd
90918 Lewis & Clark Rd
92216 Youngs River Rd
92392 G Rd
35237 Orchard Ln
34495 Hwy 101 Business
92146 Lewis & Clark Rd
90256 Lewis Rd
34837 Hwy 101 Business
35141 Hwy 105
35021 Hwy 105
1896 5th St
4629 SE Arden St
345 Nehalem Ave
35345 Woodland Ln
43654 Hansen Ln
1824 4th St
89469 Lewis & Clark Rd
11111 NE Morris
92158 Lewis & Clark Rd
42015 Hillcrest Rd
92395 G Rd
4131 N Overlook Terr
4975 Cedar St

5/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KALANDER SANDRA K</td>
<td>4975 Cedar St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMM MARY JANE</td>
<td>15608 S Spangler Rd</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANKKONEN MARY L</td>
<td>1805 4th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARN KATHERINE M</td>
<td>92230 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEE ROBERT A/ELIZABETH</td>
<td>91103 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEN JENETTE A/DARYL E</td>
<td>92385 F Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEERAN DAVID R/ LISA M</td>
<td>35440 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLEY FAY</td>
<td>92277 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERYAN JAMES L/MOLLY M</td>
<td>92663 Wireless Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINDRED THOMAS A TR</td>
<td>3939 E Renee Dr</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLEPP DIANNE L</td>
<td>37211 Labiske Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOMPAC LLC</td>
<td>90290 Peter Johnson Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOTANIEMI MICHAEL P</td>
<td>3480 Franklin Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KREPKY SEYMOUR</td>
<td>633 Nehalem Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURRUS GEORGE C/ CAROL E</td>
<td>88700 Wadsworth Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURRUS ALEXANDER 1/2 INT</td>
<td>92253 Nowlans Dr</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGER RUTH WEST</td>
<td>91687 Sunnyside Rd</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGERQUIST SCOTT R JR/ TAMMY L</td>
<td>176 W Franklin Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCE MARY J LIVING TRUST 1/2</td>
<td>92353 Willow Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIRD MARY J</td>
<td>6645 SW Alfred St</td>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMM MARY J</td>
<td>92471 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE CORA E</td>
<td>35366 Woodland Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSON DAVID/ ANGELA GAYLE</td>
<td>1168 Knottingham St</td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSON DEAN P/ EVELIND</td>
<td>90198 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSON W LOUIS/ MARY ANN</td>
<td>2907 Irving Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEACH DONALD S/JOANNE F TR</td>
<td>92550 Ft Clatsop Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEACH DONALD/JOANNE REV LVG TR</td>
<td>92257 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE RICHARD HENRY</td>
<td>9945 SW Lumbee Ln</td>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE RICHARD HENRY</td>
<td>92283 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS &amp; CLARK OREGON BUYER LLC</td>
<td>The Campbell Group LLC</td>
<td>One S.W. Columbia Suite 1700</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS &amp; CLARK RFPD</td>
<td>34571 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS &amp; CLARK SEED COMPANY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS &amp; CLARK SEED COMPANY 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LINDBERG LISA SUE</td>
<td>35383 Schwab Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDBERG RONALD E</td>
<td>35064 Jefferson Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDROS JEANNETTE A</td>
<td>92228 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDROS MARION</td>
<td>35200 Orchard Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK BONNIE L</td>
<td>LINK TERRY L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOFDAHL LAURA L 1/2</td>
<td>LOFDAHL LEROY J/LAURA TRUST 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOFDAHL LEROY J/LAURA TRUST</td>
<td>LOFDAHL LAURA L TRUSTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG JOHN C/ KENDAL M</td>
<td>1851 6th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUGO ISMAEL</td>
<td>92423 Carnegie Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUGO ISMAEL/BETTY L</td>
<td>92423 Carnegie Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYKINS MICHELINE ANNE</td>
<td>92368 E Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNGSTAD BRUCE A/CAROLE A</td>
<td>275 Waldorf Pl</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDERMAND BERYL</td>
<td>92283 Front Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLEAN JEFFREY C/CHERYL A</td>
<td>92513 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGNUSON EDNA L</td>
<td>2011 53rd Ave SE #83</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK CARY INC</td>
<td>620 Olney Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MART STEVEN B</td>
<td>34764 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN JORDAN L</td>
<td>35220 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LAURIE ANN</td>
<td>1105 Commercial St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEWS GLEN</td>
<td>35326 Hwy 101</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEWS RICHARD/DIANE</td>
<td>1173 SW Pine Dr</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCBRIDE CHARLES A/MARIAN H</td>
<td>92095 Youngs River Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAD SANDRA K</td>
<td>35046 5th Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEECH WILLIAM L/KARA</td>
<td>1133 Niagara Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGRATH PAUL</td>
<td>92160 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGRATH PAUL J/NENITA H</td>
<td>92160 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEINERS DARWIN LEW</td>
<td>90562 Logan Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESTRICH FRED C/ANN B</td>
<td>35525 Little Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESTRICH FREDERICK C/ANN B</td>
<td>35525 Little Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILES CROSSING SANITARY SEWER DIST</td>
<td>34583 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINER WALTER C/DEBRA KAY</td>
<td>35224 Orchard Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL DENISE R</td>
<td>92173 Clover Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHSTOLL RICHARD A</td>
<td>665 30th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARKAUS KENNETH R/BETTY</td>
<td>1320 Tiburon Ct SE</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGHERBON RICHARD E JR/JEANNE</td>
<td>91824 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIKES DAVID</td>
<td>305 W Lexington Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMOR LLC</td>
<td>92778 Walluski Lp</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNELL CHARLES S/BEVERLEY J</td>
<td>35176 Laila Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW KEITH A</td>
<td>92324 Willow Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW TRACEY A</td>
<td>35124 Old Bridge Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODERVICK RAYMOND L</td>
<td>92187 Lewis &amp; Clark Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPICKA JOHN W</td>
<td>34742 Hwy 101 Business</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARIE ERIN F</td>
<td>92364 Willow Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEINMAN BYRON MARK/BELINDA D</td>
<td>35070 5th Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKER JAC</td>
<td>35274 Lyngstad Heights Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREHL JERRY R/CLEO S</td>
<td>566 Olney Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUBER KENNETH DJOYCE M</td>
<td>1840 5th St</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSHINE DAIRY FOODS MANAGEMENT LLC</td>
<td>801 NE 21st Ave</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGGART GLENN P AND</td>
<td>TAGGART CHARLES A DBA</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGGBRO INC</td>
<td>264 W Marine Dr</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANQUAY MARK S</td>
<td>35122 7th Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAGUE CHARLES R/PATRICIA H</td>
<td>92548 Fort Clatsop Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAGUE TERRY N</td>
<td>92516 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAGUE TERRY/BRENDA</td>
<td>92516 G Rd</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TETLOW THOMAS E/LORI P</td>
<td>35072 Jefferson Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON (HOLTHUSEN) BARBARA L</td>
<td>35576 Dow Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON DAVID W</td>
<td>35576 Dow Ln</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON DELBERT W/HARRIET I</td>
<td>35359 Hwy 105</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON HARRIET I</td>
<td>35359 Hwy 105</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON JAMES W/DORIS J</td>
<td>562 Nehalem Ave</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
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<td>Ken Kerr</td>
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Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan

PREPARED FOR
Clatsop County, City of Astoria, and City of Warrenton
The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan identifies ways to balance the needs of:

- Residents
- Long-Distance Travelers
- Bicyclists
- Pedestrians
- Freight

This plan was led by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Clatsop County, in coordination with the cities of Warrenton and Astoria.
Planning Process

- Project Management
- Public Involvement
- Goals and Evaluation Criteria
- Existing and Future Traffic Conditions Analysis
- Development and Evaluation of Alternatives
**Project Management**

**Project Management Team (PMT)**

Clatsop County * ODOT  
City of Astoria * City of Warrenton  
State of Oregon – DLCD

- Reviewed Technical Materials and Provided Comment  
- Attend Advisory Committee Meetings & Public Workshops  
- Discussions with Community Members
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Local Residents, Business Owners, Public Officials

Public Workshops
October 2008 & January 2009
Criteria Based on input from PMT and PAC:

- Connectivity
- Safety
- Mobility
- Constructability
- Environmental Impacts
- Quality of Life
- Multimodal Solutions
Under no build.

Mobility (future) operates above mobility standard under high land use scenario.

Intention operates above mobility standard (1.36, 1.44).

Old Youngs Bay Bridge sufficiency rating is 42.1 out of 100.

No sidewalks, inconsistent shoulders, and no bicycle lanes throughout.

Lewis and Clark River Bridge sufficiency rating is 51.5 out of 100.

The vertical curve, or "hump", on the bridge limits sight distances.

Bridges are narrow—two large trucks cannot pass at the same time.

Traffic backs up during school year congestion when buses and parents drop off kids.

Uncontrolled access between Clover Lane and Miles Crossing.

"Near misses" at this intersection.

Traffic backs up during school year congestion when buses and parents drop off kids.

There are many "near misses" at this intersection.

Mobility (future) Intersection operates above mobility standard (0.83) under high land use scenario.

Mobility (future) Intersection operates above mobility standard (1.02, 1.24) under high land use scenario.

Mobility (future) Intersection operates above mobility standard (1.36, 1.44) under high land use scenario.

Legend:
- Geometric/structural issue
- Access issue
- Mobility issue
- Safety issue
Future Traffic Conditions and Deficiencies

Projected traffic conditions to 2030 - Key Findings

• Continued safety hazards and Miles Crossing and Hwy 101 Bus/Hwy 202 intersections.

• Hwy 202/Hwy 101 Bus intersection does not meet ODOT standards.

• With a high growth scenario Hwy 101 Bus /Airport Road does not meet ODOT standards.

• Under the expected growth scenario all intersections fail mobility standards.
Overview of Recommended Alternatives

1. US 101 Business & Fort Clatsop Road / Airport Lane
2. US 101 Business & Clover Lane
3. US 101 Business & Youngs River Road / Lewis and Clark Road
4. US 101 Business & Wireless Road
5. OR 202 & US 101 Business

Miles Crossing / Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan
If approved, the Refinement Plan will be adopted into the County’s TSP by reference.

The project also includes text amendments that focus on:

1. Coordinated Review
2. Connectivity of the local street network
3. Right-of-way improvements, particularly driveways/access control

Text Amendments are listed in Exhibit #2, pgs 3-7
LWDUO
Section 2.045 Pre-application Conference.

An applicant or the applicant's authorized representative shall request the Director to arrange a pre-application conference. Unless the applicant and Director agree that a conference is not needed, the conference shall be held within 15 days of the request. The purpose of the conference shall be to acquaint the applicant with the substantive and procedural requirements of the Ordinance, provide for an exchange of information regarding applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan and development requirements, arrange such technical and design assistance as will aid the applicant, and to otherwise identify policies and proposed development. **If the applicant’s proposal is located within 750 feet of a state highway, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) shall be invited to participate in the conference.** The Director, if requested by the applicant, shall provide the applicant with a written summary of the conference within 5 days of the conference. The summary shall include confirmation of the procedures to be used to process the application, a list of materials to be submitted and the criteria and standards which may apply to the approval of the application.
LWDUO
Section 5.205 General Standards for Minor and Major Partitions
(1)(A)(4) and (2)(A)(3)

Streets shall be provided according to Local Connectivity Plans included in the County’s Transportation System Plan or Transportation Refinement Plans where applicable. The Connectivity Plans illustrate the general location of streets, and the exact location and design shall be determined during the development review process. The location and design shall be determined with consideration for existing and other planned streets, significant natural resources, topography and other environmental constraints, accessibility, safety, and existing and planned land uses to be served by the street(s).
Adopt the findings of the staff report and recommend approval of the legislative amendments to the Board of Commissioners.
May 10, 2010
Number of Pages to Follow: 2

To Jennifer Bunch

Here is a letter for the Planning Commission Hearing on Tuesday May 11, 2010. Stating my concerns over the proposed roundabout.

Thank you,

Cheri Temple
Short Stop Grocery
318 Olney
Astoria, OR 97103
503.325.3683
May 9, 2010

My name is Cheri Temple, and I am the owner of the Short Stop Convenience Store, located at 318 Olney St, Astoria, OR.

I am writing in response to the letter I received from the Planning commission pertaining to my property.

I am in opposition to the roundabout. I believe it will be congested just like the one crossing the New Youngs Bay Bridge. I go thru there twice a day, and many times it is backed up strictly because of too much traffic. There have also been many wrecks in this area. I believe lights would be a much safer and better way to handle this intersection, with a cross walk, so that the people from the apartments will have a safe way off crossing the highway.

I have been at my store since 1981 and can honestly say I have rarely seen traffic backed up, unless they were working on the bridge.

I believe a roundabout would be a hazard to our community creating traffic problems that do not exist now. With a roundabout in place when the bridge traffic gets stopped for any reason it will put a complete stop to all traffic going east as both lanes would come to a halt, just as they do with our existing roundabout.

Many of the people that live in the Apartments across the highway do not drive or have cars, we provide a service for them and to our community because of our location and easy access to it.

I have been on line and looked at the proposed roundabout map. With the changes you are wanting to do the people from the apartment complex across the highway will have a much harder time crossing the road but it looks as if there will be more danger to them as well.

Our freight and delivery trucks would have to go thru a residential area to deliver to us, increasing hazards on these side streets. Not only for traffic but also children and anyone walking.

Whenever there has been a function at the 4-H fairgrounds there is a lot of extra traffic, busses, motor homes, RV’s, ect., and there has not been any problems.

I feel the real problem in this area is the old bridge and until it gets replaced or widened there will be traffic backed up when anything is happening on the bridge, such as repairs.

I think that option #2 with the signals would be the best for this area.

Also I am wondering why a public meeting is being held at 10:00 AM, versus an evening meeting when more people could attend. Since many people work during the day.

Respectfully,

Cheri Temple
DBA Short Stop Grocery

318 Olney St.

Astoria, OR 97103
Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan

PREPARED FOR
Clatsop County, City of Astoria, and City of Warrenton

Oregon Department of Transportation

CH2M HILL

Kittelton & Associates, Inc.

Angelo Planning Group

JUNE 2009
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The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan identifies ways to balance the needs of local residents, long-distance travelers, bicyclists, pedestrians, and freight along US 101 Business through the unincorporated rural communities of Miles Crossing and Jeffers Garden, given expected land use development in the area. This plan was led by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Clatsop County, in coordination with the cities of Warrenton and Astoria.

The objectives of the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan are to:

- Identify highway and intersection improvements to allow local and regional through traffic to flow smoothly along US 101 Business
- Develop ways to improve safety for and encourage more bicycle and pedestrian travel
- Consider potential road connections to serve future development
- Explore potential access management measures to improve safety and protect the capacity of US 101 Business
- Develop potential safety and design improvements at the Miles Crossing intersection, the OR 202/US 101 Business intersection, the Old Youngs Bay and Lewis and Clark River bridge areas, and along US 101 Business

The Miles Crossing and Jeffers Garden rural communities are located in the northwest corner of Clatsop County. US 101 Business enters Miles Crossing from the north, curves to the west at the Miles Crossing intersection and then continues through Jeffers Garden. This segment of US 101 Business, classified by ODOT as a District Highway, serves as an alternate to US 101 and the New Youngs Bay Bridge between Astoria and Warrenton. The land use and zoning in the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden rural community is primarily single-family residential with commercial and light industrial uses and zoning fronting portions of US 101 Business. Logging trucks and other large vehicles use US 101 Business to access Astoria and Warrenton.

The study area, shown in Figure 1, generally includes US 101 Business between the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridges. However, the study area extends west of the Lewis and Clark River Bridge to include the intersection of US 101 Business and Airport Road in Warrenton, and it also extends north of the Old Youngs Bay Bridge to include the intersection of US 101 Business and OR 202 in Astoria.

This project assumes that US 101 Business remains a District Highway to serve the mobility and access needs of the community.
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This section describes the five elements of the project’s planning process: project management; public involvement; goals and evaluation criteria; existing and future traffic conditions analysis; and development and evaluation of alternatives.

**Project Management**

A project management team (PMT) consisting of staff from the Cities of Astoria and Warrenton, Clatsop County, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and ODOT provided guidance and policy direction for this plan. The PMT reviewed and provided comments on all technical materials, participated in advisory committee meetings and public workshops, and met with community members to discuss elements of this plan. Two PMT meetings were held as part of this process—one in September 2008 and the second in December 2008. Agendas and summaries for these meetings can be found in Appendix A, Public Involvement.

**Public Involvement**

Miles Crossing and Jeffers Garden community members, stakeholders, and other interested parties actively participated in the development of this plan. A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) made up of local residents, business owners, and public officials met twice, in September 2008 and again in January 2009, to provide input on the project needs, existing conditions and deficiencies, possible transportation improvements, and to recommend project improvements. Two public workshops were held at the Lewis and Clark Elementary School in the study area (October 2008 and January 2009) that allowed substantial input and feedback from the public.

Project background information, the project schedule, open house announcements, along with meeting summaries and technical materials were all available on a project website ([www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION2/MilesCrossingJeffersGarden.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION2/MilesCrossingJeffersGarden.shtml)). Public comments were also collected via phone conversations, targeted outreach to affected property and business owners, and email. Documentation of the public involvement process is included in Appendix A, Public Involvement.

**Evaluation Framework**

The project team developed evaluation criteria based on input from the PMT and PAC. The goals and evaluation criteria are provided in Table 1. They establish a framework to assure that the plan responds to the goals and desires of the community. The draft alternatives were developed to address and were subsequently evaluated by these criteria.
### TABLE 1
Alternative Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Improve street and path connectivity</td>
<td>Out-of-direction travel, travel time, access to local and regional destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create an interconnected local street system that provides the opportunity for off-highway local circulation.</td>
<td>Change in trip travel distance along US 101 Business, access to local and regional destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Address known safety issues</td>
<td>Ability to address or divert traffic away from known safety concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce potential conflicts between vehicles, and between vehicles and bicyclists and/or pedestrians</td>
<td>Width of approaches, number of potential conflict points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the structural integrity of the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay bridges</td>
<td>Address identified structural deficiencies on the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Maintain local and regional through traffic mobility</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio (mobility), vehicle delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Assessment of cost efficiencies during construction; comparison of project alternative with other projects in the area for funding competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction methods</td>
<td>Ability of the concept to be built in phases, ability to use existing pavement, impacts during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimize impacts to natural environmental resources</td>
<td>Wetland impacts, encroachment on known fish habitat, impact to identified threatened and endangered species habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize impacts to built environment resources</td>
<td>Number of businesses and residences impacted, ability to appropriately mitigate impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Maintain consistency with the Miles Crossing/Jeffer Garden Rural Community Plan</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of projected future development compared to the Rural Community Plan goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain livability</td>
<td>Local business redevelopment potential, and support from the majority of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain buy-in and support from local community and region</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of likelihood of project to garner support from the local community and region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Solutions</td>
<td>Address needs of bicyclists and pedestrians</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of alternative’s provision of services to users of all modes, improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and improvements geared toward future transit routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Conditions and Deficiencies

Prior to the first PAC meeting, the project team reviewed and documented existing and future conditions on US 101 Business within the study area, identifying issues that would serve as the basis for the evaluation framework and development of alternatives. A review of relevant area plans and policies is included as Appendix B, Plan and Policy Review. A
full summary of existing and future conditions is included as Appendix C, Traffic Methodology, Existing and Future Conditions. Key findings are below:

- There are variable shoulders widths, no sidewalks, and no bicycle facilities along US 101 Business. Throughout the study area, the roadway shoulder serves as the pedestrian and bicycle facility, but shoulder widths are inconsistent. Parking is not allowed along US 101 Business; however, vehicles regularly park illegally on the shoulder (Exhibit 1). Pedestrians use dirt paths and gravel shoulders throughout the two communities.

- During peak travel periods, vehicles back up in intersections, creating delays and safety issues at two study area intersections. Specifically, vehicles traveling north through the Miles Crossing intersection, vehicles turning south onto US 101 Business from OR 202, and vehicles continuing south from OR 202 onto US 101 Business through the intersection north of the bridge back up onto the highway and create potential safety issues.

- Analysis of crashes in the study area did not identify a specific safety problem, though sight distance is inadequate in several areas, and potential safety issues were identified during conversations with the public at all study intersections, especially at the US 101 Business/OR 202 intersection.

- Local street connectivity is limited throughout the study area; residents need to use US 101 Business for short local trips.

- Driveway spacing in the study area, especially along the east-west section of US 101 Business, do not meet ODOT access spacing standards. There are a number of very wide driveways and parcels with multiple driveways, which affects safety (Exhibit 2).
EXHIBIT 2
Example of Wide Driveways and Uncontrolled Access along US 101 Business

- Travel lanes on both the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay bridges are too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other in opposite directions. Vertical rises in the middle of both bridges restrict the ability for drivers to see oncoming traffic. This is particularly problematic when two trucks are approaching at the same time and one must yield due to the narrow lanes.

- The sufficiency rating for the Old Youngs Bay Bridge (Exhibit 3) is 42.1 out of 100. Bridges with a sufficiency rating less than 50 are considered deficient. The PAC and public cited frequent crashes or near misses on or near the bridge. An updated load rating was performed on the bridge in the fall of 2008. The recommendations for the Old Youngs Bay Bridge from this analysis were to replace or reconstruct the main span to accommodate modern vehicles.

- The sufficiency rating for the Lewis and Clark River Bridge (Exhibit 4) is just above the deficiency threshold, at 51.6\(^1\). The PAC and public cited frequent crashes or near misses on or near the bridge. The summary of bridge condition is documented as Appendix D, Bridge Condition. An updated load rating was performed on the bridges in the fall of 2008. The recommendations from that rating were to restrict vehicle weight on the Lewis and Clark River Bridge, and rehabilitate the bridge approaches.

\(^{1}\) From ODOT Bridge Inspection reports conducted in October 2007
Future Traffic Conditions and Deficiencies

Projected traffic conditions for the future planning horizon year (Year 2030) were analyzed to help identify projects that would help meet the future travel needs in the study area. The review of future traffic conditions can be found in Appendix C, Traffic Methodology, Existing, and Future Conditions. The analysis of future traffic conditions included three separate growth scenarios:

1. Expected level of development with no changes to the transportation network;
2. Higher than expected level of development with no changes to the transportation network; and

3. Expected level of development under a scenario where US 101 or the New Youngs Bay Bridge is closed between Astoria and Warrenton.

Key findings of the 2030 future conditions analysis were as follows:

- Traffic stopped near the intersection remains a concern at both the Miles Crossing and the OR 202/US 101 Business intersections. In scenarios 1 and 2, current problems will continue to be safety hazards, and the US 101 Business and OR 202 intersection will have vehicles backed up into the next intersection. In addition to the existing problems, the Miles Crossing intersection will have vehicles back up into the roadway on three legs.

- The OR 202/US 101 Business intersection is congested and does not meet ODOT mobility standards.

- Under the high growth scenario (Scenario 2), the US 101 Business/Airport Road intersection is congested and does not meet ODOT mobility standards.

- In Scenario 3, all intersections fail mobility standards from highly congested conditions and long backups. Traffic demand will exceed the capacity of the travel lanes. It was determined that this plan would not use scenario 3 to create alternatives because a New Youngs Bay Bridge and US 101 closure is not expected to be a regular occurrence. This plan focuses on addressing expected growth scenarios, and recognizes that in the event of a closure on US 101 or the New Youngs Bay Bridge that there is no way to avoid severe congestion, and therefore the alternatives do not address the scenario.

The basis of the first PMT, PAC, and public meetings were to review and discuss existing and expected future conditions for the study area, and identify issues related to traffic, circulation, access, and safety. Personal experience was also gathered on existing conditions to supplement the technical analysis.

Figure 2 shows an overview of project needs identified through the technical analysis and conversations with the PMT, PAC, and public.

---

2 Scenario 2 assumed a full build-out of available land to the capacity of the new water and sewer systems.
Insert Figure
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Development and Evaluation of Alternatives

Following the first PMT, PAC, and public meetings, the project team developed alternatives to respond to the project needs, purpose, and goals. This process is documented as Appendix E, Alternatives Development and Evaluation. Key steps in the alternatives development process were as follows:

1. Develop a range of alternatives that seek to meet project goals and evaluation criteria, incorporating input from the project team, the PAC (September 2008), and the public (October 2008).

2. Evaluate each potential improvement to illustrate how it addresses each project goal.

3. Present draft alternatives to ODOT, Clatsop County, the City of Astoria, and the City of Warrenton for review against adopted state and county policies and standards (December 2008); revise draft alternatives to respond to comments.

4. Present draft and preferred alternatives to the PAC and the public (January 2009).

5. Incorporate feedback from the PAC and public workshop into the recommended alternatives.
2 PLANNING PROCESS
3 Recommendations

The Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden Transportation Plan recommendations are organized into four sections: (1) US 101 Business cross sections; (2) study area intersections; (3) access management strategies; and (4) local connectivity recommendations. An overview of recommended improvement concepts are illustrated in Figure 3. Conceptual designs of each of the proposed improvements are included at the end of each recommendation.

**US 101 Business Cross Section**

For the improvement development process, US 101 Business was divided into two sections: north-south and east-west. The north-south section extends from the Miles Crossing intersection north to the Old Youngs Bay Bridge, and the east-west section extends from the Miles Crossing intersection west to the Lewis and Clark River Bridge. The north-south section is currently more rural in character with fewer businesses and residences along the highway, while the east-west section has a more commercial feel, with many of the area’s businesses. Alternatives for these two sections were evaluated separately, however, the same cross section was ultimately recommended for both segments.

The PMT at the onset of the project determined that US 101 Business would remain a District Highway and that a change in designation to an expressway would not be considered. Keeping US 101 Business as a District Highway balances mobility, access, and capacity, rather than focusing more on mobility along US 101 Business through the area.

**Recommendation: Three-lane Traditional Cross Section**

For both sections of US 101 Business, the recommendation is to modify the existing two lane facility to three lanes to accommodate left turns into existing and future businesses. This would be an urban section with curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and an enclosed drainage system. The total cross section would be 62 feet wide and include two 6-foot sidewalks, two 6-foot bike lanes, two 12-foot travel lanes, and a 14-foot center continuous center turn lane (Figure 4). The center turn lane would allow for emergency vehicles to pass vehicles, traffic to move around disabled vehicles, and left turning traffic to maneuver out of the travel lanes while waiting to take a left turn. The section was also selected for its ability to improve safety and mobility along US 101 Business, and its provision of separate facilities for both bicyclists and pedestrians, though mobility along the highway in two of the three future scenarios was not an identified need. The curb-gutter-sidewalk cross section would delineate driveways by providing a cut in the curb to allow vehicular access to businesses and residences along the highway. This cross section mainly fits within the available right of way, which is 80 feet. There is one parcel on the east-west section of US 101 Business near the Miles Crossing intersection that narrows the available right of way to approximately 63 feet. In the north-south section, right of way data north of Miles Crossing were not available. Therefore, tax lot data were used to estimate the available right of way and may not accurately reflect the actual right of way available in that section.
3 RECOMMENDATIONS
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Areas of Concern

While there appears to be adequate right of way along most of both sections of US 101 Business, the road shoulders are used informally and illegally for parking or other frontage. This occurs more often in the commercial east-west section and near the Miles Crossing intersection. Construction of a 62-foot cross section could eliminate these informal uses and locate the roadway closer to businesses and residences along US 101 Business.

On the north-south cross section, the existing roadway is located on a levee at a different level from the surrounding landscape. Widening the roadway would require additional fill to construct the recommended cross section. This raises concerns for possible increased cost and impacts to wetlands or sensitive lands within the right of way and may impact approaches along the road that are already short and steep. The current road is offset to the west within the available right of way, and expansion is possible east of the current roadway. However, it may be possible to construct the bicycle lane and sidewalk separate from the roadway, at the same level as the surrounding landscape. Wider cross sections also increase the amount of asphalt surface within the right of way, which could increase stormwater runoff.

The cross section assumes an enclosed drainage system consistent with an urban highway section. However the current drainage system is open (Exhibit 5). The highway may be constructed in several sections and implementing an enclosed drainage system piecemeal may cause some concern as it relates to water quality treatment. Clatsop County and ODOT would coordinate about drainage and development in this area to ensure that the section is constructed to water quality standards and requirements.
EXHIBIT 5
View of Current Drainage along the North-South Section of US 101 Business

Cost Estimate
It is expected that the new cross section would be built upon development or redevelopment of adjacent parcels. Table 2 shows the cost by segment for the cross section. Development is expected in the medium term (5-10 years). It is possible that the enclosed drainage system assumed from the highway cross section would be built either prior to the construction of the full highway cross section, or constructed in part upon development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-south cross section</td>
<td>$5.47 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-west cross section</td>
<td>$4.04 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.51 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost estimate includes engineering, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage, adding new roadway, illumination and a five foot average fill depth to widen the roadway along the existing embankment (for the north-south section only). The estimate does not include right-of-way acquisition, environmental permitting, or utility relocation costs.
Figure 5  Three Lane Traditional Cross Section
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Study Area Intersections

Improvements are recommended for three of the five study area intersections: Airport Road/Fort Clatsop Road and US 101 Business, the Miles Crossing intersection, and the OR 202/US 101 Business intersection. These recommendations are described below. No changes were deemed necessary at Wireless Road or Clover Road.

*Airport Road/Fort Clatsop Road and US 101 Business*

The Airport Road/Fort Clatsop Road and US 101 Business intersection exceeds mobility standards in the future analysis growth scenario 2 (high growth) for southbound left turn movements. Vehicles turning east onto US 101 Business from Airport Road will back up waiting for a gap in oncoming traffic.

Furthermore, in conversations with the PAC and public during the open houses, an additional potential safety issue was identified at the Airport Road/Fort Clatsop Road and US 101 Business intersection. The speed limit along US 101 Business at the intersection is 55 miles per hour, and vehicles traveling west on US 101 Business and making the right turn onto Airport Road need to slow down considerably to make the sharp turn. This creates a traffic hazard for through vehicles.

Two improvements are recommended at this intersection: A deceleration lane for right turns north to the airport, and a southbound left turn lane from Airport Road to US 101 Business. It is assumed that both of the following alternatives would be implemented at the same time, and the cost estimate includes both components.

**Recommendation: Deceleration Lane for Right Turns North to the Airport**

The 485 foot deceleration lane would allow westbound through vehicles to maintain highway speeds while allowing turning vehicles to move out of the way. Exhibit 6 shows the existing configuration at the intersection. This concept could be built completely within existing right of way (Figure 6).
RECOMMENDATION: SOUTHBOUND LEFT-TURN POCKET

This concept would add a 150-foot southbound left turn pocket on Airport Road for vehicles turning left towards Miles Crossing and Jeffers Garden. Adding the turn pocket would decrease congestion, improve mobility, and allow left turning vehicles to maneuver out of the through travel lane for vehicles continuing south. Exhibit 7 shows the existing intersection with US 101 Business at Airport Road. This concept is completely within the available right of way (Figure 7).

EXHIBIT 7
Airport Road at US 101 Business Looking South

FIGURE 7
Southbound Left-turn Pocket from Airport Road to US 101 B
Areas of Concern

There are no areas of concern for these two improvements.

Cost Estimate

Table 3 shows the cost estimate for both alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbound deceleration Lane</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound left turn lane</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost estimate includes road material, engineering, aggregate base, embankment, striping and signage improvements, with a 12-foot pavement widening associated with the lane.
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Airport Road Deceleration Lane for Right Turns and Southbound Left Turn Pocket
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**Miles Crossing Intersection**

Two concepts are recommended by the project team and endorsed by the public for this intersection: improved signage in the short-term, and a roundabout in the long-term. Currently the intersection is free flow for travel along US 101 Business and includes a sharp turn from the east-west alignment of US 101 Business to the north-south alignment. There are stop signs at the Lewis and Clark Road and Youngs River Road intersection. Vehicles continuing east towards Youngs River Road must stop at the intersection of Lewis and Clark Road, and vehicles entering US 101 Business in either direction must stop before entering the highway (Exhibit 8). The current configuration of the intersection is confusing for visitors, and the community noted that congestion from the Lewis and Clark Elementary School causes traffic to back up at the intersection. The existing curve requires vehicles to slow, does not meet existing highway design standards, and future mobility standards under all scenarios would not be met.

**Exhibit 8**
Miles Crossing Intersection Looking East

**Improved Signage—Short-term Recommendation**

The community expressed a desire for lower-cost options that could be implemented on a short timeline, and agreed on the benefits of additional signage. The short term recommendation is to improve signage through the intersection area. This would reduce driver confusion and enhance safety for vehicles traveling through the intersection. Currently directional signs for the intersection are located in the middle of the intersection. Additional signage would be located in advance of the intersection to alert drivers of the complex intersection and to reduce confusion for drivers unfamiliar with the area. Figure 9 is an example of a new sign.
Areas of Concern

The signage option would not address mobility, connectivity, or bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the study area.

Cost Estimate

Signage for the Miles Crossing intersection is estimated to cost approximately $50,000, which includes signs and posts to replace the existing signs and to add new signs.

**ROUNDABOUT—LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATION**

The recommended long term solution at Miles Crossing is a roundabout. The roundabout would be a single lane with a slip lane. The slip lane would allow southbound through traffic to continue towards Warrenton without passing through the roundabout. Lewis and Clark Road and Youngs River Road would be slightly realigned (Figure 8). The roundabout’s location could be shifted to the east or west of the existing intersection. Figure 8 shows the roundabout shifted to the east. Comments from the public and PAC suggested when funds become available, the design should be refined and affected property owners should be involved to determine the best placement of the roundabout. The benefits of this alternative are increased safety by decreasing vehicle conflict points, alleviated traffic backup issues on US 101 Business, and decreased vehicle travel speed at the intersection, which reduces the severity of any conflicts that do occur. The roundabout improves mobility for traffic along Lewis and Clark and Youngs River Roads, and accommodates bus and freight traffic. The roundabout could also be a “gateway” feature to enhance the center of the community.

**Areas of Concern**

The roundabout could potentially displace one business, and access to businesses near the intersection could be adversely impacted. However, as stated previously, the location for the roundabout is flexible. Two concepts were developed for the roundabout, each showing a separate business displacement. The design and size of the roundabout was minimized to avoid or reduce property impacts. Further refinement is recommended during design to minimize impacts to local businesses. The roundabout would slightly decrease traffic mobility along US 101 Business from Warrenton towards Astoria as traffic would need to navigate around the roundabout to make the eastbound to northbound movement.
However, the projected mobility is within 10 percent of the mobility standard, and the increased visibility and navigability of the roundabout, along with acceptable mobility on the remaining three legs, provide benefits for the intersection that outweigh the decreased mobility for the east-north movement. Special attention needs to be used to address pedestrians and bicyclists through the roundabout. Adequate right of way exists to implement pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, crosswalks and proper navigations, which would improve conditions over what exists today.

**Cost Estimate**

It is expected that the roundabout, while not contingent upon the roadway cross section, would be best implemented after the three lane cross section is constructed. Table 4 shows the cost for the roundabout and includes curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage, new roadway, illumination and concrete islands, but does not include right of way for property acquisition and encroachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles Crossing Roundabout</td>
<td>$2.78 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 RECOMMENDATIONS
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OR 202/US 101 Business Intersection

There are several identified deficiencies at the OR 202 and US 101 Business intersection. First, sight distance is a concern, as turning vehicles from US 101 Business have trouble seeing oncoming traffic from OR 202. Second, traffic queues exceed available storage for the westbound left turning traffic traveling from OR 202 onto US 101 Business. Third, the intersection operates above the applicable mobility standard in the future (Year 2030) horizon year.

Recommendation: Roundabout

The recommended improvement for this intersection is a roundabout (Figure 9). The roundabout option allows this intersection to meet the mobility standard, except for a slight mobility concern with the vehicles traveling westbound on OR 202 to southbound US 101 Business (within 10 percent of the standard). The safety benefits of a roundabout include reduced vehicle conflict points and a reduction in the severity of crashes due to lower vehicle travel speeds. There is adequate right of way available at this intersection to provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian path, and a roundabout could also be a “gateway” feature to enhance the center of the community.

The roundabout would impact access and circulation for some roads and driveways between Hanover Street and 7th Street, predominantly along the north side of OR 202. Suggestions to address circulation needs near the intersection include constructing a platted but unbuilt street (3rd Street) and relocating existing driveways to access affected properties.

Areas of Concern

The roundabout would require acquisition of one parcel with one business, removal of several mature trees (fir and deciduous) that are in the middle of the existing intersection, and the closure of 4th Street at OR 202. Access to businesses near the intersection could be adversely impacted due to their proximity to the intersection. Special attention needs to be used to address pedestrians and bicyclists through the roundabout. Adequate right of way exists for a bicycle and pedestrian path to the southwest, improving bicycle and pedestrian circulation over existing conditions.

Cost Estimate

It is expected that the OR 202/US 101 Business Roundabout would be built in the medium term (5-10 years). Table 5 shows the cost and includes curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage, new roadway, concrete islands, illumination, landscaping and retaining walls. The cost estimate does not include right of way impacts for property acquisition and encroachments,
or off-system developments to maintain circulation in the OR 202/US 101 Business intersection for properties whose access may be affected.

**TABLE 5**
**OR 202/US 101 Business Roundabout Cost Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR 202/US 101 Business Roundabout</td>
<td>$3.79 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13 OR 202/US 101 Business Roundabout
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OLD YOUNGS BAY AND LEWIS AND CLARK RIVER BRIDGES

The Old Youngs Bay and Lewis and Clark River Bridges are historic structures that connect the communities of Miles Crossing and Jeffers Gardens to Astoria and Warrenton. They are also located along US 101 Business, the alternate route for the New Youngs Bay Bridge and US 101. The following deficiencies on the bridges were mentioned repeatedly by the PMT, the PAC, and by the public at both open houses.

- Narrow lanes may restrict the size of trucks traveling in opposite directions
- The vertical rise on both structures limits the ability to see oncoming traffic
- There are many near misses for crashes, and vehicles often scrape the structure of the bridges by driving too closely
- The PAC was concerned about actual and "near miss" crashes on the bridges, especially on the Lewis and Clark River Bridge
- United States Coast Guard personnel, located in Astoria, use the bridges to access the airport in Warrenton
- The area's emergency shelter and emergency food supplies are located in Warrenton
- Emergency vehicles have trouble driving across the bridges due to the narrow lanes
- There are no bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Lewis and Clark River Bridge, and narrow sidewalks on the Old Youngs Bay Bridge, creating a disconnect between the Astoria River Trail and the Warrenton Trail System.

RECOMMENDATION: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS TO REHABILITATE OR REPLACE OLD YOUNGS BAY AND LEWIS AND CLARK RIVER BRIDGES

The project team recommends that an alternatives analysis and environmental review process start in the near-term for rehabilitating or replacing both bridges. This work would include an alternatives analysis, engineering background study environmental studies (noise, archaeological, historical, natural resources, floodplain, wetlands, and others), preliminary engineering, cost estimating, and mapping.

Areas of Concern

Existing deficient conditions of both bridges make this project a near-term priority. The bridges are historical structures, and replacement or enhancement of the bridges could impact residents in the Miles Crossing and Jeffers Garden communities, as the bridges are the most direct way of accessing Astoria and Warrenton. This project is the County's highest priority of all recommendations in this plan.

3 The Old Youngs Bay Bridge is number 128 in the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and the Lewis and Clark River Bridge is HAER 127. Both were built in the early 1920s.
**Cost Estimate**

**TABLE 6**
Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridges Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridge Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated costs to perform alternatives analysis and an environmental review for the replacement of the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridge were developed from previous similar work. The estimate includes environmental studies, engineering studies, conceptual engineering, cost estimating, and mapping. An environmental assessment process was assumed. The cost estimate includes a 30 percent contingency recognizing the site geography, proximity to Youngs Bay, the fact that both Youngs River and Lewis and Clark Rivers are navigable and would have to be raised enough to allow boats under or accommodate lift span type bridges, and the historical significance of the surrounding area.

**TRAIL CONNECTING WARRENTON AND ASTORIA**

The need for a better recreational bicycle and pedestrian link between Warrenton and Astoria arose several times during the Transportation Plan's alternatives development and evaluation process. Although on street bicycle lanes and sidewalks are recommended on both sides of the highway along US 101 Business, this did not address the need for a scenic, recreational route for the community and for visitors. Several members of the public pointed to the levee system as a potential alignment for a multi-use trail. However, sufficient concerns and questions about the feasibility of building a trail along the levee system through the study area exist that the PMT felt this could not be forwarded as an outright recommendation. Instead, the plan recommends a trail study to more closely consider potential alignments for this trail connection.

**RECOMMENDATION: TRAIL STUDY**

A trail study would analyze the demand for a trail connecting Warrenton and Astoria off the highway through the study area. This study would include potential alignments, width, security, wayfinding details, construction materials, costs, and funding sources.

**Areas of Concern**

Identifying a feasible alignment for an off-highway multi-use trail is likely to be difficult due to environmental sensitivities.

**Cost Estimate**

The timeline for the alignment study would be in the short term (0-5 years). The order-of-magnitude cost estimate for this study is shown in Table 7.
**TABLE 7**

**Multi-Use Trail Study Cost Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Study for Trail Connecting Warrenton and Astoria</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access Management Strategies**

The Access Management Strategy inventoried the existing approaches and street network in the study area and suggested strategies for ODOT and Clatsop County to preserve and improve mobility along US 101 Business. Constraints were first identified through the access inventory, and existing approaches were compared to the applicable state and county access spacing standards. A variety of Access Management Strategies are recommended throughout the study area, as described in the paragraphs that follow.

**RIEKKOLA ROAD/E ROAD INTERSECTION OFFSET**

The current offset of Riekkola Road and E Road in the study area results in potential conflicts between left turning vehicles entering US 101 Business from the minor streets simultaneously, and motorists crossing from Riekkola Road to E Road, and vice versa. Figure 14 shows the current offset and possible realignment to address the concern.

**FIGURE 14**

Possible Realignment of Riekkola Road and E Road

**TWO-WAY LEFT TURN LANE**

The center turn lane of the proposed cross section for US 101 Business would allow left-turning vehicles to enter and exit approaches and side streets in stages if necessary. The center lane would provide an opportunity to increase safety and travel times for through and turning vehicles.
**APPROACH WIDTH MODIFICATIONS AND DELINEATION**

The curb and gutter configuration of the proposed roadway would result in definition of driveways along US 101 Business, addressing existing open frontages and wide driveways. An absence of non-delineated driveways creates a safety hazard along the highway. ODOT guidelines for approach widths for the different types of properties are:

- Single family residential: 16 feet
- Commercial: 24 feet
- Industrial: 24 feet

For higher volume commercial and industrial properties, separate lanes for exiting and entering the property is recommended.

**SHARED ACCESS AND CROSSOVER EASEMENTS**

Shared access and parcel crossover easements would allow multiple properties to access US 101 Business. Usually shared access is located at the property line of two adjacent properties. Accesses and parcel crossovers would only be applied when properties along the highway are developed or redeveloped. Consolidating approaches or providing easements would increase the distance between access points, which would reduce conflict points and improve safety and operations on US 101 Business.

**PROPERTY SUBDIVISION AND PARTITION**

Upon development in the study area, it is possible some of the larger lots will be subdivided or partitioned into smaller parcels to accommodate additional land uses. These new properties will require access to the road network, which could increase the number of driveways on US 101 Business. New developments would be limited to one approach to US 101 Business or local street per parcel. The County and ODOT will review all development proposals to ensure they are consistent with spacing standards.

**ALTERNATE ACCESS AND LOCAL CONNECTIVITY**

Providing alternate access to properties and closing some of the existing approaches on US 101 Business would help achieve access management goals. Some properties on US 101 Business front a side road to US 101 Business. In cases where the frontage is on a private road, an easement is needed for alternate access. The County also has platted, but not constructed, roadways in the study area north of US 101 Business in the Jeffers Garden Community. If the streets and lots are developed, development would identify opportunities to remove driveways on the highway and provide alternative access on the minor street connection based on site specific information to address the areas of need.

**ACCESS CONSOLIDATION**

Fourteen properties along US 101 Business have multiple driveways. There are opportunities to consolidate the driveways into one driveway for each property, which would reduce the number of driveways along US 101 Business.
**Ensure Adequate Sight Distance**

In some driveways, a vehicle stopped waiting to turn onto US 101 Business cannot see far enough in one or both directions to determine a safe gap to maneuver onto the highway. Strategies to improve sight distance include trimming vegetation, modifying existing buildings obstructing sight distance, altering the grade of driveways to match the highway, increasing building setbacks, and enforcing no parking along US 101 Business.

These access management strategies could be implemented when parcels are development or redeveloped in the study area. Detailed access management strategies can be found in Appendix F, Access Management Strategy.

**Local Connectivity Recommendations**

Local street connectivity is limited throughout the study area, requiring that local trips use the highway even if traveling short distances. Limited environmental data were available to inform the project team where constraints exist to locating new roads. Therefore, alignments for local road connections were not prepared, but the project team identified general connections that should be constructed as development occurs. These connections are shown in Figure 15 and would be constructed upon development or redevelopment of parcels either through easements or on existing county right-of-way.
This page intentionally left blank.
Insert Figure

15 Local Connectivity Recommendations
11 x 17
Conceptual Level Cost Estimates

The cost to design and construct the various improvement concepts was estimated at a planning level for the recommended alternatives. The total sum for recommended improvements is approximately $18.18 Million (2009 dollars). Table 8 below shows the breakdown of costs for each of the project alternatives and the recommended phasing.

The recommendations listed below would be phased over the 20-year planning horizon. The team identified three phases - short term (0-5 years), medium term (5-10 years), and long term (10-20 years). The short term recommended improvements include the alternatives analysis for the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridges, Miles Crossing signage improvements, the Airport Road left turn lane and deceleration lane, and the identification of roadway grades, storm sewer grades / alignments, and water quality treatment needs for US 101 Business. Medium term improvements include the north-south and east-west cross sections for US 101 Business and the OR 202/US 101 intersection roundabout. The Miles Crossing roundabout is the only project identified as long term.

Clatsop County identified the Lewis and Clark River and Old Youngs Bay Bridge alternatives analysis as the highest priority recommendation in this plan.

TABLE 8
Improvement Concepts and Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Concept</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Documentation for Lewis and Clark River and</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Youngs Bay Bridges Replacements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Crossing Intersection Signage Improvements</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road Turn Lane and Deceleration Lane</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify roadway grades, storm sewer grades and alignments,</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and water quality treatment needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail plan to consider bicycle/pedestrian connections between Astoria and Warrenton</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Business North-South Three Lane Cross Section</td>
<td>Upon Development/Redevelopment (Medium Term)</td>
<td>$5,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Business East-West Three Lane Cross Section</td>
<td>Upon Development/Redevelopment (Medium Term)</td>
<td>$4,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 202/US 101 Business Intersection Roundabout</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>$3,790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Crossing Intersection Roundabout*</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>$2,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$18.18 Million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Even if the priority of this project shifted, it may need to be constructed at the same time or following construction of US 101 Business segments due to possible roadway grade issues.
The costs in Tables 8 and 9 only include preliminary engineering and construction. Based on the conceptual design of each alternative, a 40 percent contingency has been included in the construction cost estimate to account for potential unknowns typically identified during preliminary and final engineering design. The estimates are in 2009 dollars, and do not include right of way, potential environmental permitting, engineering design fees, or utility relocation costs. See Appendix G, Financial Plan and Cost Estimates for more detailed cost estimates of each improvement concept.

**Funding**

A variety of local, state, and federal funding sources can be explored to help fund the recommended improvements. Most of the federal and state programs are competitive and require clear documentation of the project needs, costs, and benefits. Local funding for the projects in this transportation plan would typically come from ODOT, Clatsop County, the Cities of Astoria and Warrenton and/or potential future bond or other local revenues. Other local funding sources might include grants and private funds. Please see Appendix G, Financial Plan and Cost Estimates for a more detailed discussion of funding sources.

Table 9 summarizes potential public funding sources for the recommended improvements. Some of these funds are restricted to the type of improvements that qualify for assistance. Typically, state and federal funds require projects to comply with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines for accessibility.
### TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Concept</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009$)</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Documentation for Old Youngs Bay and Lewis and Clark River Bridges</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>STIP – Bridges Funding&lt;br&gt;STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;Federal Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (From the Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization)&lt;br&gt;Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners (OTIA, phase III—all funds are currently programmed, but more funding may be authorized.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Crossing Intersection Signage Improvements</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>STIP – Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road Turn Lane and Deceleration Lane</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>City of Warrenton Gas Tax&lt;br&gt;County Road District Funds&lt;br&gt;SDC/Developer Exactions&lt;br&gt;Transportation Utility Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify roadway grades, storm sewer grades and alignments, and water quality treatment needs</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;LID&lt;br&gt;SDC/Developer Exactions&lt;br&gt;Transportation Utility Fee&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail plan to consider bicycle/pedestrian connections between Astoria and Warrenton</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Business North-South Three Lane Cross Section</td>
<td>Upon Development/ Redevelopment (Medium Term)</td>
<td>$5,470,000</td>
<td>STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program&lt;br&gt;LID&lt;br&gt;SDC/Developer Exactions&lt;br&gt;Transportation Utility Fee&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Business East-West Three Lane Cross Section</td>
<td>Upon Development/ Redevelopment (Medium Term)</td>
<td>$4,040,000</td>
<td>STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program&lt;br&gt;LID&lt;br&gt;SDC/Developer Exactions&lt;br&gt;Transportation Utility Fee&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 202/US 101 Business Intersection Roundabout</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>$3,790,000</td>
<td>STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Crossing Intersection Roundabout</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>$2,780,000</td>
<td>STIP – Modernization&lt;br&gt;LID&lt;br&gt;SDC/Developer Exactions&lt;br&gt;Transportation Utility Fee&lt;br&gt;TE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STIP** = Statewide Transportation Investment Program<br>**LID** = Local Improvement Districts<br>**SDC** = System Development Charges<br>**OTIA** = Oregon Transportation Investment Act<br>**TE** = Transportation Enhancement
Phasing
It is not expected that the funds to construct all the proposed project improvements would be available at the same time or necessarily in the short-term. To address this, the project recommendations could be implemented in phases, beginning with any component that is stand-alone and that has an identified funding source.

The project team recommends that the environmental review to replace the Old Youngs Bay and Lewis and Clark River Bridges, the improvements to the Airport Lane intersection, signage at the Miles Crossing intersection, identification of roadway grades, storm sewer grades and alignments, and water quality treatment needs be completed before the US 101 Business cross section is improved. Some components of the project can be funded by, or in association with, development or redevelopment of private properties. Sidewalks and related features, for example, are often required to be constructed and paid for by a property owner at the time of property redevelopment.

Next Steps
Recommendations in this Transportation Plan will be considered by Clatsop County, the City of Astoria, and the City of Warrenton for adoption within their Comprehensive Plans. Draft plan amendment language and staff reports for each jurisdiction are provided as Appendix H, Plan and Code Amendments.

Additional design and engineering will be needed to construct any improvement concept identified in this plan. Design and engineering would occur when improvement concepts are selected for implementation through the state and city capital funding process. There will be opportunities for additional public input on the design of the improvement concepts.
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MILES CROSS/JEFFERS GARDEN TRANSPORTATION PLAN
Plan Amendment Spec.
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