

**Klamath Falls Urban Area Transportation System Plan
TAC and CAC Meeting #1, November 15, 2010**

3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**City of Klamath Falls - Conference Room
500 Klamath Avenue, Klamath Falls, OR 97601**

The dark blue text below are the meeting minutes; the text in black are the agenda items.

Meeting Invitees:

TAC Members

CAC Members

Darci Rudzinski (Angelo Planning Group)

Marc Butorac, Matt Kittelson, and Erin Ferguson (Kittelson & Associates, Inc)

Meeting Attendees:

Rodger Lindgren

Bud Hart

Tim Thompson

Randy Bednar

Cole Chase

Mike Moore

Clidia Gibson

Ernie Palmer

John Longley

Mark Willrett

Stan Strickland

Bill Adams

Dennis Nelson

Devin Hearing

Marc Butorac

Darci Rudzinski

Matt Kittelson

Erin Ferguson

Note: Randy needs a name tag.

Meeting Agenda:

3:00 to 3:05 Introductions

3:05 to 3:20 Desired Project Outcomes/Definitions of Success for Project (see discussion below under Public Involvement Plan)

3:20 to 3:30 Remaining CAC Positions

- Parking Board – This position may be combined with the Downtown Renewal representative (Mike Moore)
- City School District – Mark Willrett to follow-up on this seat.
- Public Safety (Fire/Police) – Mike Willrett to follow-up on this seat.

- Add Klamath Community College to CAC – Mark Willrett to look into this seat.
- Add Chamber of Commerce representative - Mark Willrett to look into this seat.
- Add railroad representative – Devin Hearing to look into this seat.

3:30 to 3:45

Project Overview

- Some interest in perhaps taking an approach to the TSP update that falls between the universally progressive approach and the traditional growth driven approach.
- a) Project Scope and Schedule
- b) Roles and Expectations
- c) Public Project Website (<http://klamathfallstsp.com>)

3:45 to 4:00

Review/Discuss Draft Public Involvement Plan

- Mark Willrett – Strive for public and staff agreeing on the final adopted plan.
- Randy Bednar – Uniform direction from the City and County in accomplishing bike and pedestrian improvements.
 - Collaboration between City and County.
 - Consistency in plans, policies, and standards.
- Tim Thompson – Inform public that bike and pedestrian improvements can have public health benefits. Provide opportunities for the public to bike and walk more.
- Bud Hart – Transportation system development charges are very important. They should be uniform throughout the urban area. Otherwise, development would be pushed to the urban areas or fringes where development charges are the lowest.
- Devin Hearing– Alternatives and potential funding have to match in the future.
- John Longley – Transportation to and from the airport and train station needs to be considered.
- Stan Strickland– TSP should evaluate whether or not people in Klamath Falls will use alternative modes prior to significant multimodal recommendations being made.
 - Marc Butorac commented on directing bike improvements towards 75 percent of the community who are interested in biking but concerned – they would bike but aren't comfortable on the current system. When investing in bike improvements will get the biggest return on investment if we focus on changes that will address this portion of the populations concerns.
 - Mike Moore – Risky areas currently exist in the community that could result in a bad crash involving bikes or pedestrians particularly near some schools. He is glad bike and pedestrians will be a focus of the plan.
 - Stan Strickland – County is trying to build bike and pedestrian facility on Foothills Boulevard between Crater Lake Parkway & Homedale. Certain properties required for completion have not been acquired. Either properties will be acquired or Foothill Bike Path won't be built.

- Clidia Gibson – Improvements to continue ADA enhancement of the transportation system are desired. Also, large signs and other enhancements for seniors should be considered.
- Roger Lindgren – Two college campuses exist in Klamath Falls, but are at opposite ends of the urban area. The area around the college campuses should be a focus to encourage students to live near campus and walk or bike to school and also to make the campuses a more cohesive part of the community. This could include zoning changes or transportation system improvements. Public transit’s role should also be considered.
- Cole Chase – Klamath Falls is still a car based community. Bike and pedestrians should be integrated in the future. City and County should coordinate future goals and projects.
- Bill Adams – Land use drives the community and the transportation system supports that land use. As such, land use should be the focus. Nodal redevelopments that transportation can support should be considered and there should be a focus/emphasis on two or three critical, feasible projects.
- Ernie Palmer – Public will always claims that there was not adequate public outreach. One way to mitigate this could be to hold TAC & CAC meetings in City Council chambers so that meetings can be videotaped and potentially broadcasted. TSP should be pragmatic. Final plan should make sense to the average citizen in Klamath Falls. Consider splitting jurisdiction within urban growth boundary (Does it make sense to have two jurisdiction control area within UGB?). Development fees add burden to developers. The TSP serves the citizen of Klamath County, not the agencies that govern it (Should be user friendly).
- Mike Moore – Adequate capacity inside and outside of downtown. Businesses bring resources to City and County.
- Dennis Nelson - Use common sense, not pie in the sky. Shouldn’t have to be changed in 5 or 10 years. Should have longevity.

Marc Butorac – City, County, and ODOT receive documents first. TAC and CAC then are provided opportunity to review documents and provide comments. Comments are due the Friday following the TAC and CAC meeting. City, County, and ODOT are tasked with dealing with discrepancies in comments.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 4:00 to 4:20 | <p>Discuss Technical Memorandum #1: Review of Plans, Policy, Rules and Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klamath Falls Airport is not an international airport any longer. • PMT is looking for consistency and consensus between County and City facilities, policies, and codes. |
| 4:20 to 4:40 | <p>Discuss Technical Memorandum #2: Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Longley - Integrate intermodal goals and objectives. • Bud Hart - Concerned about goal 4. At an increasing frequency it seems ODOT roads are transferred to the City in exchange for projects, which is not desirable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marc Butorac - Goal 4 is not encouraging that activity, it is aimed at reducing motorists’ dependency on state highways for local trips. |

- John Longley - Highly interested in accessible transportation in the community; concerned about availability in terms of connectivity. Perhaps expand goal 2 to include availability.
- Clidia Gibson – Please generate an acronym list for the groups.
- Several CAC and TAC Members - Concerned about heavy vehicles/large vehicles and accommodating freight movement so as not to take away from street capacity and functionality.
- Mark Willrett – City often struggles with access on Washburn Way. The primary question is: How best to protect access along this street – through medians, RIRO driveways, limit number of driveways?
- Stan Strickland - Maywood Drive behind Washburn Way seems under utilized and could be a good parallel route to Washburn Way.
- Roger Lindgren - Not sure if Goal 7 would be/will be widely accepted in Klamath Falls now.
- Marc Butorac – We also want to consider how far we are planning into the future – need to be aware of the balancing act between being progressive and practical.

4:40 to 4:50

Upcoming Work Activities

- Existing Conditions Analysis – Technical Memorandum #3
- Future Conditions Analysis – Technical Memorandum #4
- Public Workshop #1

4:50 to 4:55

Key Near Term Dates

- November 19 – Comments on Public Involvement Plan, Technical Memorandum #1, Technical Memorandum #2 are DUE
- January 19 – TAC/CAC Meeting #2 and Public Workshop #1
 - Discussing Existing and Future Conditions
- Generally Monday afternoons are good for the joint TAC/CAC meetings.

4:55 to 5:00

Additional Comments/Questions and Summary of Identified Action Items

- Note: Bring a few extra copies of materials to future.