Kendall County – Boerne – Fair Oaks
Transportation Committee Minutes

31 August 2021
2:03 – 3:44 p.m.

In Attendance:

Don Durden, John Kight, Bitsy Pratt, Bryce Boddie, Northern Hendricks, Gary Louie, Del Eulberg, Ben Eldredge, Rich Sena, Jeff Carroll, Rankin D'Spain, Marcus Garcia, Bobby Balli, Steve Sharma, and Tim Bannwolf.

Not in Attendance:

Bob Manning, Jonah Evans, Henry Acosta, Josh Limmer, Kim Blohm, Stephen Zoeller.

Item 1:   OPENING REMARKS

Don Durden calls the meeting to order and welcomes everyone in attendance. He explains that Bob Manning will not be at this meeting due to a family matter and gives his condolences.

He mentions that some committee members have made some real progress since the last meeting. Durden introduces Cecelio Martinez to the committee and the public. Durden expresses his eagerness for his presentation for this meeting

Item 2:   CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES IF AUGUST 17, 2021 (IF AVAILABLE)

Durden says he has not had a chance yet to look at the minutes from the previous meeting. He will look at those and send them out for review so that the committee can vote on adoption at the next meeting.

Item 3:   PUBLIC COMMENT

Durden opens the floor for the first opportunity for public comment. There are no comments made by the public at this time.

Item 4:   CROWD SOURCING DATA ORGANIZATION – CECELIO MARTINEZ

Durden gives Martinez the floor.

Martinez thanks the committee for having him. He mentions that he is the GIS Manager for the Alamo Area MPO (AAMPO), and he is here to speak on the crowd sourcing information gathered for the Kendall County area. He says that he has met with the Projects Subcommittee to go through this presentation once before with them. He notes that what he presents here is not the final product. He says Northern Hendricks has taken what he has given her and transformed it in a way that makes it easier for lay people to understand.

He explains that the crowd sourcing information is grouped into three different categories that include sensitive areas of interest.

He notes that part of the committee's charge is to be transparent, so he took all three inputs and made a dashboard. He says initially it is a "spaghetti bowl" of information, but the format can be altered or changed. He says this is a way to look at the information and clean it up. He goes through Added Capacity Characteristics and Operational Characteristics (like traffic lights), and he notes that there was a lot of information regarding roundabouts.

Martinez then walks the committee through looking and analyzing original posts, comments, and likes for new projects ideas submitted from the public. Some of the project ideas included improving Amman Road to 3351, Little Joshua Creek and I-10, the Ranger Creek subdivision (suggested reducing the speed, adding shoulders and better street lighting), and a Sisterdale Road extension. He notes that a common theme he found among this crowd sourcing information was connectivity.

He says the committee can use the dashboard to gain information and use it as a "project bank" of sorts to get more ideas. He opens the floor for questions and comments.

Durden asks if "likes" are considered unarticulated comments. Martinez says because a like is associated with a heart icon, a like would be identified as positive feedback. He says negative feedback can be identified in the comments.

Bryce Boddie chimes in and notes the qualitative nature of the data as opposed to quantitative, which is what they hope to turn it into. He notes that there is an opportunity to like comments.

Durden notes that the point is that the committee will not make decisions solely based on likes. This just may be a source for validation on a position the committee would choose to take.

Martinez also reminds the committee that collects ideas from the community. There will not be ideas that are necessarily right or wrong, but they could find ideas that maybe have not been thought of or discussed already.

Gary Louie asks about a bike and ped proponent. Is there a way to distinguish between recreational suggestions and socioeconomic suggestions? Martinez says he would need to weed through and could potentially determine that based on the information from the comments. Martinez mentions Strava, a program that looks at trends and routes. It could possibly be used for determining recreational and economic purposes.

Durden asks if the committee will be able to tell if there are any new comments inputted as time goes on. Martinez says yes, there are time stamps on all comments. Martinez also notes that this could be a "living document" of sorts.

Durden thanks Martinez and AAMPO for their efforts and expertise.

Item 5: CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT SHEET FORMAT – NORTHERN HENDRICKS

Hendricks take the floor saying that she has compiled some of the data found from the crowd sourcing tool to present on a project-by-project basis.

Durden hopes the committee will be able to review and consider the information in exactly that way—a project-by-project basis. Is it City or County? Is it a TxDOT project? As a committee he hopes to be able to have a consensus on whether they do or do not endorse a suggestion. He says it may include some part of the crowd source data, but the thing they are approving, or disapproving is what Hendricks' is moving into the project sheets.

Hendricks tells the committee she got the information from the public input and placed it into several tables. Looking at the issues raised by the public, she wanted to look at each project on a single page. According to the format she has begun using, everything on the left shows the information from the public. The information on the right is from other supplemental tables. She explains that she is basically connecting the information that matching between the tables and putting them together on one sheet of paper per project. She notes that the main point was to get information off the map to discuss it line by line. She says there are 198 inputs from the public regarding *only* relevant automotive transportation information. There are 143 bike and ped suggestions. She asks the committee collectively how they would like to review the information.

Bobby Balli clarifies with Hendricks: the left side of the sheet contains the crowd sourcing information; the right side contains the municipal-related solution? Hendricks responds saying that one section pulls from the City of Boerne table and another pulls from the subcommittee projects, and there is another table related to sensitive features in the area that the program pulls from. The program pulls from the sources (tables) and creates the one-sheet document she was envisioning.

Balli asks about projects that may be the solution and the problem that has developed and presented by the agency. There weren't any complaints about it and there was not any crowdsourcing data, but he asks if those will be on that list? He thinks they should be because they may not know the problem, but once it is brought up, they could realize it is not a priority problem. He says he could see how it is burdensome though.

Durden says that is a good point. A good example is Highway 46 West. That should be mentioned in the transportation documents. He says it is important for people to see how it all fits together.

Hendricks notes that she made a table for the projects subcommittee, another table for the interim report projects, and she will continue to follow that format to pull more information into the report as needed.

Bitsy Pratt chimes in and asks if everyone will individually read through the information, or is there a way to separate the less helpful information from the critical information that needs to be addressed?

Hendricks responds saying that the information can be sorted through quickly, but she needs information on how to best present it.

Boddie notes it could be helpful to have other eyes looking at it. He asks what program she is using to sort the information. Hendricks says Air Table. She says the data can be converted into Google data eventually. Boddie asks if someone like Jeff Carroll would be able to look at it and make connections. Hendricks notes that she thinks they should wait on ROW and jurisdiction questions until after looking through the information.

Balli says that given the information collected, the next step is to overlay that with the sensitive areas and see how it all fits together with the City Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the County CIP, and TxDOT's CIP. Balli offers his assistance to her. Hendricks notes that she would like to have another set of eyes on the information in case she was to miss anything. She says she will email some things out and see if anyone can make connections.

Ben Eldredge asks about making the presentation more meaningful. Durden notes that he is hoping to get Jeff's presentation and they would get into that.

Item 6:   PRESENTATION OF CITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN – JEFF CARROLL

Before giving Carroll the floor, Durden notes that he would like to get a list of projects from TxDOT so that they can make rational decisions while also considering that information.

Carroll begins by saying that the City of Boerne uses a 5-year CIP plan. The prepare it every fall/winter season, so the hardcopy documents he has handed out are nearly a year old.

Looking at last year's CIP, he notes that some projects need to be removed because they have been done or are being addressed. This will allow them to move new projects onto the list. He explains that they do their best to project the needs for finance planning. Sometimes project do not have an immediate time frame and so they continue to be pushed back based on urgency.

He says there are two stacks of handouts: one is for roadway, and another is for drainage—sometimes they get intertwined.

The first project in the roadway stack is the 5-points traffic circle. Since the time they prepared the last CIP, they have found a consultant that has been able to give them a further schematic level. Some have a decent schematic background, but he notes that this is a planning tool and not a final document for a project that is ready to be built. He explains that there has been lots of conversation with TxDOT, but they are working through different alternatives.

Carroll goes on to discuss the second item, which is Buc-ee's Way improvements. He notes that because of the development between Buc-ee's and the City of Boerne contractually requires them to build a road.

Marcus Garcia chimes in and asks if the development to the south of that road will tie into the segment of the road that Carroll is referring to. Carroll responds and says that the two gaps are owned by the same landowner and if the property is ever sold, it could require them to build that road because it is on the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Carroll moves on to Cascade Caverns, which he says was a separately submitted MPO project. He explains that the limits do not exactly match what was sent to MPO (because the CIP is just a planning tool). He says that this portion was for the roundabout and for the Scenic Loop intersection. He says the project was selected by MPO to be funded, but there is no timeline yet. He says they will know within the next month.

Lance Kyle, a public attendee, chimes in and asks Carroll why there are 4 lanes planned for Cascade Caverns down to Southglen. Carroll responds and says it is because the road section calls for it according to the Major Thoroughfare Plan. Pratt also notes that it is to help traffic flow more freely.

Carroll moves on to the next project which is Enterprise Parkway on Scenic Loop. The plan is to implement turn lanes to help trucks get in and out.

The next project is a continuation of Enterprise Parkway and a cul-de-sac. There was a conversation many years ago to extend it out to I-10. Now with the bridge improvements, it has reached the 5-year CIP.

The next project is the portion of Scenic Loop between I-10 and Cascade Caverns. Following that up is the south side of Scenic Loop and the entrance into that neighborhood to I-10.

Carroll moves on to the next pile of handouts, which is the drainage category (part of the street budget). The first project he mentions are two culverts on Adler Road. In the CIP, the plan is to improve the low water crossings and make them drivable. That will make it easier to access the Sheriff's office and the connecting road.

The next project in the pile is Cascade Caverns and Old San Antonio which total at around 9 million dollars in improvements. Initially the thought was that it was be a series of multiple projects, but they were able to submit a lot into the AAMPO submittal for review to make it one project.

Kyle chimes in again and asks about rerouting to slow the flow of water down. Carroll responds and says yes. Carroll notes this area is inside the city limits. He says there is a lot of fill in the tract near the hotel and the goal is to restore it to its natural condition.

Carroll moves on to Johns Road which is the next project. This project includes a lot of underground drainage improvements. The plan is to divert the water from flooding into houses.

The bridge at Menger Creek is the last project. There is a low water crossing in that area. The plan is for an even bigger bridge that will allow stream bank restoration in the area and avoid future accidents and fatalities.

Carroll finishes his presentation by saying they will begin working on the next CIP soon. In the spring, they will begin working on the following year's budget.

Item 7:   CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT FINAL REPORT TABLE OF CONTENTS AND SCHEDULE

Durden begins this item by saying that he is looking for feedback on the agenda listed in the handout packet given at the beginning of the meeting. Are there any improvements the committee can see that need to be made?

It reads:

I. Introduction (preliminary draft 8/31)
        a. Purpose
        b. Participants

II. Background (a.-d., preliminary draft 9/21)
        a. Kendall County Background

b. *Kendall County Transportation system*
  i. *Ownership*
  ii. *Modes*
c. *Kendall County Transportation Planning History*
d. *Regional Transportation Context*
e. *Principles and Processes (preliminary draft 9/21)*
  i. *Community Based solutions*
  ii. *Transparency*
  iii. *Minimizing adverse environmental impacts*
  iv. *Maximizing aesthetics*
  v. *Costs and funding*
  vi. *Addressing Latent Demand*

III. *Technical Foundation*
  a. *Demographics (preliminary draft done 9/7)*
    i. *Population*
    ii. *Socio-economic*
  b. *Traffic Counts and Travel Demand Trends*
  c. *Influence of primary and secondary school traffic*
  d. *Crowd sourcing Data*
  e. *Economic Development Factors*

IV. *Short Range Program*
  a. *Goals of Shore-range program*
    i. *Addressing congestions*
    ii. *Improving Pedestrian Safety*
  b. *List of Projects (each project to have Project/Policy Description, a statement regarding what the project/policy will solve and/or improve, and order of magnitude costs, and a summary of public support, relying on crowd-sourcing summary data)*
    i. *TxDOT*
    ii. *County*
    iii. *City of Boerne*
    iv. *City of Fair Oaks*
  c. *Effect on congestions and Levels of Service*

V. *Long Range Program*
  a. *Goals of Long-range Program*
    i. *Addressing congestion*
    ii. *Preserving Rural Character of Rural Kendall County*
    iii. *Avoiding latent traffic demand*
  b. *List of Projects (each project to have Project/Policy Description, a statement regarding what the project/policy will solve and/or improve, and order of magnitude costs, and a summary of public support, relying on crowd-sourcing summary data)*
  c. *Other things that might help*
    i. *Mass Transit/ Public Transportation*
    ii. *Regional Mobility Authority*

VI. *Policy Recommendations*

a. Preserving the Hill Country Environment
b. Preserving the Hill Country Character
c. Residential Density
d. Access Management
e. Interconnectivity
f. Preference for acquiring land along existing Right of Way vs.
Greenfield alignments

VII. Other Recommendations
a. Coordinated roadway geometric standards for Rights of Way and
Roadways
b. Coordinated Major Thoroughfare Plans
c. Pedestrian Infrastructure
i. Countywide bicycle mobility plan
ii. Sidewalks

VIII. Acknowledgements
a. Boerne ISD
b. City of Boerne
c. AAMPO
d. Presenters
i. City of Carmel, Indiana
ii. Dr. George Veni
iii. Kimley Horn (Jeff Whitacre and Amy Avery)

The floor is opens for comments from the committee. Balli asks when the deadline for items 4 and 5 are due. He says it would only be fair for the committee to have a chance to discuss.

Durden notes that there are other projects that have still not be discussed. His approach is to get this completed as soon as they can, but he notes that he does not want to be too hasty and end up not having a good report.

Pratt chimes in and says she would like to get something together for the projects subcommittee and see how it fits in with the thoughts they had. Durden says it is important to know about the things that will affect mobility, but it will not necessarily be of influence. He notes that he would lie to make sure the critical infrastructure is linked with the transportation system. A recommendation is needed for how to get through the Herff Road and Highway 46 intersection.

Pratt asks Martinez about getting access for inquiries on that through AAMPO. Martinez explains that information can be found and accessed online. There is a planning model on TxDOT's website as well.

Tim Bannwolf chimes in regarding 2E on the drafted report. He asks if this is meant to be consistent with 5A. Durden clarifies that his opinion is that they want to *avoid* latent demand.

Eldredge notes that he has a bias with making infrastructure as efficient as they can, noting that cost efficiency is important too. If a node is efficient, the cost will be too.

Del Eulberg chimes in with a comment about constructing a design that doesn't include overbuilding. Balli agrees noting costs. Eldredge chimes in remembering John Kight's comments in previous meetings that 2 lanes with a center turn lane can be very efficient.

Pratt makes a motion to adopt this outline with the addition and Eulberg seconds the motion.

Before the draft is adopted, Eldredge notes that he would like to include information regarding equity. If a transportation system is built only around cars, that will not necessarily work for everyone. He generally asks the committee if keeping equity in mind as they add solutions is something they want to do.

Carroll notes that if there were not bike/ped lanes being proposed that this section probably would not have been considered.

Durden says it is legitimate, but he feels that for the committee to get into the nuances of transportation equity is a lot on top of what they are already doing. He does not see this as a driving principle. He worries about getting in the business of choosing priorities.

Kight notes that they did try the public transportation system years ago. Equity eventually balances itself out. If you do not make enough money to work or do certain things in Boerne, do not live in Boerne.

Bannwolf says he thinks it would fall into the Economic Development category. Rich Sena chimes in, agreeing.

Louie speaks up and says that this would be a different discussion for the community.

Balli asks if the bike/ped section is an opportunity to include what Eldredge is talking about. Northern says it could be included in the table.

Eldredge insists this is relevant. He thinks it would be unwise to assume that everyone can afford a car for transportation. As cities grow, and Boerne is growing quickly, they tend to diversify.

Louie says to move that statement to Economic Development.

Durden notes that the committee is comfortable not listing it in the table of contents but perhaps mentioning it in the body of the report. Boddie chimes in with a suggestion to move it to Policy Recommendations.

Eldredge contends, saying he does not understand why it would not have a piece in the outline. Durden notes the objection. Eldredge makes a motion for there to be language that addresses and proposes issues surrounding equity.

Kight chimes in and says that he has sat on several committees about affordable housing, and people are not interested in equity. He asks if Eldredge is suggesting throwing in to pay for other's situations.

Eldredge responds and says that he is unsure why cars take precedent.

Hendricks speaks up and says that as the density within the city increases, there could be an increased focus on bikes and pedestrian walkways.

Sena says that the committee can avoid controversy by pointing out significant support for other modes of transportation. The subcommittee report had a lot of recommendations that fall in line with what Eldredge is pushing for.

Pratt notes that this could be a size issue within Kendall County. To acknowledge the information in the report would be as far as they would go at this point in time, but she thinks a statement would be part of the parcel report. It would be good to consider in the future, but current conditions do not warrant it.

Eldredge notes that he is just trying to ensure that the committee is not making biased decisions.

Bannwolf makes another suggestion for placing it under non-vehicular infrastructure (thinking of those people who may not be able to afford a car).

This is a generally more agreeable option among the committee members.

Eulberg notes that the word "equity" can mean something different to everyone.

Durden considers Eldredge's first motion as not seconded and goes back to the original motion to adopt the outline. Bannwolf makes a motion to put the issues of equity under "Non-Vehicular Infrastructure". Rankin D'Spain seconds the motion. There are no objections, and the report outline is adopted.

Durden asks what the committee thinks about having a list of people who were involved with the committee. Should they include who the committee started with? Ended with? Or just list them all? Is there any preference on who would go first? A consensus for mentioning those who were first in office and those appointed next for those members should be mentioned. There are no objections.

Item 8:   CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT SECTION I AND II (IF AVAILABLE

This will be addressed and considered at the next meeting.

Item 9:   PUBLIC COMMENT

Durden opens the floor for public comment.

Kyle asks about how many more meetings the committee plans to have. Durden responds and says as many as it takes to get it right.

Eldredge asks for clarification on what the next steps are.

Hendricks responds and says that she can start pushing out comments and ideas for the committee to begin sifting through. Each project has a specific ID number, and she asks that the committee make a list of those numbers. She says she should be able to get some things together for review by the next meeting.

Martinez chimes in offering help to Hendricks in whatever way he can but he is hoping to avoid duplicate work. He says the committee has everything they need from AAMPO at this point. Durden notes that Martinez is welcome anytime.

Durden notes that if there are specific suggestions that anyone would like to make to the committee, please bring them forward. It is important to give

suggestions a voice. As a committee, he thinks they have a responsibility to hear others out on their ideas. They reserve the right to vote things down, but still welcome ideas.

Item 10:   ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.