MEETING NOTES



Project #: 24113 August 20, 2020 Date:

Devin Hearing, ODOT Region 4 To: Jeremy Morris, Klamath County

Ashleigh Ludwig, AICP, PE, Jacki Gulczynski From:

Klamath County TSP Update Project: PAC Meeting #3 Notes Subject:

The third Public Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting for the Klamath County TSP Update was held virtually on August 20th, 2020 from 3 to 5pm. Attendees signed into the meeting online and participated using audio. Attendees were able to view prepared slides and were asked to provide their feedback on the Draft Solutions Analysis and Funding Program Technical Memorandum (tech memo) #4, which PAC members received prior to the meeting. These documents and a recording of PAC Meeting #3 are available online at the project website.\

Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (Kittelson) was tasked with facilitating the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to provide PAC members with an overview of key the key projects and historic spending and to gather feedback from the group on the projects and priorities of those projects.

ATTENDEES

PAC Meeting #3 participants and the agency or interest that they represent are provided below:

- Mark Barrett (ODOT Region 4 Traffic Manager)
- Chris Cheng (ODOT Region 4 Active Transportation Planner)
- Dave Hirsch (ODOT Region 4 Traffic Operations Engineer)
- Theresa Conley (ODOT Regional Transit Coordinator)
- Michael Zarosinski (Klamath County Road Department Representative)
- Jeremy Morris (Klamath County Public Works Director)
- Joe Wall (City of Klamath Falls City Planner)
- John Barsalou (Klamath Falls Airport)
- Chrys Dawes (Klamath Falls Schools District)
- Rachel Zakem (Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council Representative)
- Mark Willrett (City of Klamath Falls Public Works Representative)
- Erik Nobel (Klamath County Planner)
- Bob Stolle (ODOT Rail Representative)
- Kelsey Mueller (Blue Zone Projects)

Kittelson & Associates, Inc., Portland, Oregon

¹ The project website is updated regularly at this address: http://klamathcountytsp.com/

- Scott Souders (City of Klamath Falls)
- Kay Neumeyer (City of Malin Representative)

MEETING AGENDA

The meeting provided an overview of the following items:

- 1. Virtual Meeting Etiquette Reminder
- 2. Project Overview
- 3. Solutions Analysis and Funding Program (Tech Memo #4)
- 4. Virtual Open House Walk Through
- 5. General Discussion
- 6. Next Steps

The notes of each agenda item are detailed in the following sections.

1. Virtual Meeting Etiquette Reminder

Ashleigh Ludwig (Kittelson) discussed the new GoToMeeting platform. All attendees introduced themselves and were made aware of the polling and question box functions. Meeting were informed that the meeting was being recorded.

2. Project Overview

Ashleigh Ludwig (Kittelson) briefly described the purpose, schedule, and next steps of the TSP. Polling results indicated that all participants had either attended one or two of the previous PAC meetings.

3. Solutions Analysis and Funding Program (Tech Memo #4)

Ashleigh Ludwig (Kittelson) and Jacki Gulczynski (Kittelson) presented on the draft solutions, priorities, and historical funding. PAC members were encouraged to give their feedback via live discussion or the question box during the meeting. Polling questions were asked at the end of each section to better understand the PAC's stance on the projects and priorities. Polling results indicated 42% of participants had read the memo, 8% had not, and 50% had partially read the memo prior to the meeting.

The following poll results and comments were provided.

- Roadway Plan
 - Polling question: Do you support the projects and priorities in the roadway solutions?
 - 62% Yes, I generally support as presented
 - 15% Yes, I support but think priorities need adjusting
 - 23% Unsure at this time
 - Consider priority of alternate route project
- Safety Plan
 - Polling question: Do you support the projects and priorities in the roadway solutions?
 - 71% Yes, I generally support as presented
 - 14% Yes, I support but think priorities need adjusting
 - 15% Unsure at this time
 - Had widening on OR140 been considered as a safety project?

- It is included in the bike projects and the County has an ongoing effort to widen.
- Were programmatic safety solutions considered?
 - Yes, included in TSAP and non-infrastructure projects.

Pedestrian Plan

- Polling question: Do you support the projects and priorities in the roadway solutions?
 - 58% Yes, I generally support as presented
 - 8% No, I think you are missing key projects
 - 34% Unsure at this time
- Need emphasis on crossings of roads as well. It's not emphasized in policies or projects It is included in the bike projects and the County has an ongoing effort to widen.
- Several projects in particular (Keno) ODOT is applying to SRTS grant for sidewalks and crossings.
- Consider adding additional crossing projects or policies in locations such as US97 in Chemult.
- Consider how projects fall within the BUD guidelines.
- Did you look at other connections to activity centers and socioeconomic lands to consider people who rely on transit?
 - We did look at improving pedestrian facilities in areas where there are grocery stores and post offices, etc.
 - We would like feedback if we missed any though.
 - We looked at access to transit and those gaps.
 - We took a high level look at where disadvantaged populations are and account for that in some solutions
- Were programmatic safety solutions considered?
 - Yes, included in TSAP and non-infrastructure projects.

Bicycle Plan

- Polling question: Do you support the projects and priorities in the roadway solutions?
 - 60% Yes, I generally support as presented
 - 40% Unsure at this time
- There is a section along US97 and OR58 that is part of the Willamette adventure cycling route. Consider shoulder widening in this area.

Transit Plan

- Polling question: Do you support the projects and priorities in the roadway solutions?
 - 40% Yes, I generally support as presented
 - 10% No, I think you are missing key projects
 - 50% Unsure at this time
- Is this an opportunity to highlight future coordination between basin transit and development review at county level? (or even city level?) it's effective for getting bus stops installed or enhanced.
- Understanding that basin transit capital need Kittelson should reference TDP or transit tribes planning documents if we don't account for that here.

- Compare ITS plan to transit projects. There were some technology solutions to add to transit features including conveying wait times/ride times, shared faring, etc. looking at signalized corridors, etc.
 - We will note them in one of the two locations (ITS or transit)
- Funding Plan
 - Consider adding a matrix to show projects that could be grouped into several project types. This may be helpful in the prioritization of projects.
 - Why is the cost of the bicycle plan so high?
 - Extensive shoulder widening is required to improve the bicycle network in the county. Widening, particularly on long segments, can be costly.

4. Virtual Open House

Ashleigh Ludwig (Kittelson) explained and walked through how to access and use the virtual open house platform. This includes interactive commenting maps and general comment forms.

5. Next Steps

Ashleigh Ludwig (Kittelson) provided the next steps of the TSP:

- ▶ PAC members are invited to provide input on Tech Memo #4 until September 3rd.
- ▶ PAC members were encouraged to attend the Live Virtual Public Meeting and invite others to attend.
- ▶ PAC Meeting #4 will be held in November/December 2020, followed by another Public Open House.
- ▶ Technical Memorandum #5: Preferred Plan will be available in October/November 2020.