

**Kendall County – Boerne – Fair Oaks
Transportation Committee Minutes**

**03 August 2021
2:04 – 3:48 p.m.**

The Kendall County – Boerne – Fair Oaks Transportation Committee convened in the Boerne City Hall First Floor Staff Training Room.

In Attendance:

Don Durden, Bob Manning, Bryce Boddie, John Kight, Jeff Carroll, Tim Bannwolf, Ben Eldredge, Jonah Evans, Northern Hendricks, Rich Sena, Gary Louie, Rankin D’Spain, Bitsy Pratt, Steve Sharma, Bobby Balli, and scrivener Erika Yount. There were 5 members of the public in attendance.

Not in Attendance:

Del Eulberg, Henry Acosta, Josh Limmer, Kim Blohm, Marcus Garcia, and Stephen Zoeller.

Item 1: OPENING REMARKS

Don Durden opens the meeting and thanks all for being present. Under Tim Bannwolf’s newly adopted attendance suggestion, there is a quorum at this meeting. Durden also introduces the newest soon-to-be member of the committee, Bobby Balli who is in attendance. He is being appointed by the Fair Oaks Ranch City Council.

Item 2: CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2021

Durden notes that the last meeting’s minutes are available in the back of the agenda handout. The vote will be postponed until the next meeting so that everyone will have time to read through them and make any suggestions or changes.

Item 3: PUBLIC COMMENT

There are no comments made by the public at this time.

Item 4: UPDATE FROM THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Bitsy Pratt begins by saying they have a lot of work to offer, although presently it is not in the best format visually. She hopes to recruit help on making it so. She explains that the subcommittee went in a very non-controversial direction in discussing recommendations to bring to the larger committee. They came up with 24 recommendations for roads. Some of the suggestions were discussed at the last meeting, but Pratt explains that the subcommittee is at a place where they now are needing technical support.

Gary Louie speaks up in response asking how the outreach committee handles information. Are they waiting on formal approval of recommendations to post them on the website? He inquires at what point will the committee begin promoting the recommendations of the projects and if they are moving forward with public entities.

Durden notes that what he would like to see happen is a full scope of recommendations brought to the table first for discussion. He says he understands that the individuals from the GIS committee have offered other recommendations. He says he thinks it best not to put anything out until the committee can discuss everything and vote.

Northern Hendricks adds that any form of presentation she can get ahold of she is sure to add to the website to make it available for the public.

Pratt notes that they do not have access to the information from AAMPO still. The subcommittee did a comb-through of the crowd-sourcing recommendations that can be found on the website. There were a lot of recommendations regarding getting kids to school, but those are not necessarily included on the website. She says the subcommittee felt that the more contentious items should be discussed with the larger committee. Their focus was on the low-hanging fruit and short-term projects.

Bannwolf clarifies with Pratt that they are looking for the larger committee to come up with recommendations to which Pratt replies yes, they felt a subcommittee of only 5 people was not sufficient for making such large-scale decisions. She says they have seen some larger-scale items from Jeff Carroll, and those things concur with what they are seeing on the map.

Rich Sena chimes in saying that the subcommittee's focus was more of a localized approach targeting pedestrian traffic and school bus routes. Pratt says that interconnectivity between neighborhoods will be crucial and needed whether the City provides new roads and works on big, long-term projects or not.

Durden clarifies the charges of the committee include a short-term plan, a long-range plan for future congestion, and recommended policies that will facilitate the development of the transportation in the county that is also consistent with the values of its residents. He mentions a man named Cecilio from AAMPO who he hopes will make it to the next subcommittee meeting to present the crowd sourcing information. He encourages anyone who is interested and able to attend to come.

Sena adds that the subcommittee looked at the quadrants that make up BISD and the number of units that are expected over a 5 to 10-year period. They looked at possible solutions for pedestrian traffic. Pratt notes that the heaviest and most immediate needs are in the southeast and southwest quadrants. Those areas warrant a closer inspection. Sena also notes that there will be an increased effort in trying to keep kids in schools that are on the same side of the highway that they already reside on. That should cut down on traffic as well.

Item 5: UPDATE ON AMMPO PROGRESS TO ORGANIZE CROWD SOURCE DATA

Bob Manning chimes in and says they are beginning to feel the crunch time pressures. He hopes Cecilio will have comprised some useful data to present at the subcommittee meeting because he reminds the committee that the thing that sets this committee apart from previous efforts is their

willingness and charge to be the voice of the community. The committee's report should reflect that charge.

Sena says that Henry Acosta and John Ramirez have been a great help in producing the recommendations regarding school traffic and interconnectivity between neighborhoods.

Manning notes also that the committee *will* catch some heat once their recommendations are made public and presented to the powers that be. He wants to ensure that everyone is prepared for that and that they have logical reasons to back up their recommendations when getting questioned about it. He says he feels the BISD information has been very valuable to their cause.

Jonah Evans notes that even small tweaks on roadways can have a big impact on traffic congestion; those smaller projects should not be undervalued. The big projects are important, but so are the smaller projects too. He also says that he did spend about 15 minutes looking at the GIS data. He thinks that it will be a slow gathering and organizing process regarding that data. He says this will be a few days of work.

Ben Eldredge chimes in saying he wants to put pressure on the school district. While he understands sensitivity, he considers schools to be amenities. He wonders if there is a role for the school district to have some sort of policy directed at making sure any development that is buying land for a school should be asked to provide the mobility network that feeds into that school.

Sena says some of the subcommittee's recommendations will reflect that suggestion.

Carroll chimes in to say that most likely that suggestion will lead traffic studies.

Eldredge says there are other ways to help mobility if they prioritize it.

Carroll notes there is no clause in the City's ordinances that will force a development to take responsibility for mobility networks.

Louie also agrees on establishing policies and standards in this regard.

Durden says he hopes to get all this information in a tangible report.

Pratt notes that the next step will be to work on a Power Point for presentation. She says they are needing a deeper pool of resources.

Durden says he will be attending a meeting soon with the Mayor and County Judge to discuss more the need for resources. As soon as they have identified a resource, he will reach out to her. Steve Sharma chimes in and offers assistance to Pratt and her team.

Item 6: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT FINAL REPORT TABLE OF CONTENTS

Durden moves into this next discussion topic by saying there are 9 meetings left to get their goals and charges completed. He then begins discussing a rough draft of what he hopes to have ready to present. It read:

- I. *Introduction*
 - a. *Purpose*
 - b. *Participants*

- II. *Background*
 - 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*

- III. *Technical Foundation*
 - a. *Demographics*
 - i. *Population*
 - ii. *Socio-economic*
 - b. *Traffic Counts and Travel Demand Trends*

- c. Influence of Primary and Secondary School Traffic*
- d. Economic Development Factors*

IV. Short Range Program

- a. Goals of Short-Range Program*
 - i. Addressing Congestion*
 - ii. Improving Pedestrian Safety*
- b. List of Projects*
 - i. TxDOT*
 - ii. County*
 - iii. City of Boerne*
 - iv. City of Fair Oaks*

V. Long Range Program

- a. Goal of Long-Range Program*
 - i. Addressing Congestion*
 - ii. Preserving Rural Character of Rural Kendall County*
 - iii. Avoiding Latent Traffic Demand*
- b. List of Projects*
 - i. TxDOT*
 - ii. County*
 - iii. City of Boerne*
 - iv. City of Fair Oaks*

VI. Policy Recommendations

- a. Preserving the Hill Country Environment*
- b. Preserving the Hill Country Character*
- c. Residential Density*
- d. Access Management*
- e. Interconnectivity*

VII. Other Recommendations

- a. Coordinated Roadway Geometric Standards for Rights of Way and Roadways*
- b. Coordinated Major Thoroughfare Plan*
- c. Pedestrian Infrastructure*
 - i. Countywide Bicycle Mobility Plan*
 - ii. Sidewalks*

VIII. Acknowledgments

- a. Boerne ISD*
- b. City of Boerne*
- c. AAMPO*
- d. Presenters*
 - i. City of Carmel, Indiana*

ii. Dr. George Veni

Evans commends Durden on his draft and thinks it is a great foundation. He wonders if under “Technical Foundations” there something about general concepts should be added as well as what the committee has learned during the course of the meetings that helped them in making their recommendations. He also suggests maybe finding room under “Policy Recommendations” about land acquisition. He also mentions some general principles and concepts on things that the committee wanted to maximize and minimize (ex. maximize aesthetics and minimize environmental damage).

Durden discusses bond issues. He says conventional wisdom is such that you cannot have two bond issues at the same time, or they will both fail. He says conventional wisdom can be validated with subdivisions. He says there no compelling deadline other than the fact that the political context in which they exist is in a constant state of flux. It could be helpful to determine what is meant by “short-term” and “long-term” in the committee’s charge

Sena says that it is important that an entire group be knowledgeable to determine what the next step is. Small improvements can go a long way.

Hendricks suggests including something pertaining to the cost of roads. A lot of times people are on board with building a new road but as soon as a higher property tax is mentioned, people bow out. She says to mention that a road will cost however much and include its maintenance period.

Durden thinks this is doable but reiterates that the mayor does not want the committee to focus too much on funding and costs. Their job is to focus on the recommendations. John Kight agrees that at least knowing what a road will cost and how it will affect taxes will help in making decision on recommendations.

Pratt asks given what they already know, how will traffic be impacted? She suggests getting a proof-of-concept summary from AAMPO. What would

happen if they carried out their recommendations? How would it impact traffic?

Durden says AAMPO's Traffic Demand Model has certain travel analysis zones. Certain attributes and demographics for those zones (income, age, distribution, etc.) are used with historical information to project travel demand on certain roads. From there, a traffic count is done to calibrate the model, and a Travel Demand Model is created.

Sharma notes that it is tough to get completely accurate, but relatively speaking it works. Durden notes that it would take a lot of effort to get there, and he is unsure how the committee can get there.

Pratt mentions a spaghetti model. Looking at traffic slows in a visual way and not by numbers could be helpful in imagining how the traffic will be impacted. Sharma says that is possible. Pratt also notes that if they could understand trip analysis, they could maybe get what percentage of traffic is local through downtown from I-10. Sharma says it could show volume of traffic and other things in the report. This kind of information is public and can be viewed on the TxDOT website.

Evans chimes in and says that when they are discussing smaller projects like intersections, he notes that can be a non-trivial amount of money. It can involve land acquisitions especially if there is a lot of work being done. However, what the committee learned about wide-nodes, narrow roads is that small roads can carry a lot of traffic. It is not trivial to do intersection redesigns and can get very expensive.

Manning tags on and says that getting the crowd sourcing data in a form of recommendations might be helpful in gaining insight on what the impact of taxes would be. He reiterates the importance of the crowd sourcing data. He does not want to fall in the same trap that others have fallen in with previous efforts to solve the traffic problems.

Hendricks asks if the standard of the cost of land acquisition is always by the county standards? Durden says for Farm to Market Highways, the

County is responsible, but if the road is a state highway, the state will cover those costs.

Durden circles back to questions about deadlines and discusses an upcoming vote on a bipartisan bill that many anticipate will pass sometime in October. If the committee has recommendations that are well defined and supported, funding for those projects could come more quickly.

Eldredge says there is a contention regarding building more highways and folks that say other solutions are needed. He notes, as in previous meetings, no one has ever really been able to permanently solve traffic issues before and asks if anyone has looked outside the box at communities who may have broken the code.

Sharma responds and says that people are moving here faster than the travel demand models can be made. The volume is astronomical. Everyone is looking for ROW, but no one is willing to sacrifice for it either.

Bryce Boddie mentions quantitative data, but Sharma says people will move to Kendall County no matter what.

Durden says there is literature out there on how to address latent travel demand. He mentions access management.

Louie chimes in and says one thing they have not really discussed is public transportation. Kight and Pratt note that in the past the community has touched on it briefly.

Evans asks about linking up with San Antonio's VIA Metropolitan Transit, and Durden responds saying that Kendall County would have to agree to impose VIA's sales tax in order to be eligible for their service.

Kight says that 15-20 years ago there was a transportation system discussed and it was tested because many people in San Antonio who need jobs and come to Boerne, but there were only 2-3 people that would board the bus for a commute. He says there was not really a demand for it

but recognizes that there could be more of a demand now with the time that has passed.

Durden says the report should address mass transit and why it would or would not be a good idea for Kendall County at this time.

Eldredge says providing mass transportation to more rural areas can become very expensive. He thinks something in town like a trolley could be useful, but it would be seriously subsidized.

Durden says that at the next meeting he would like to have crowd sourcing information presented, and he asks the committee to continue thinking about the draft outline. He hopes to look at putting together a schedule for a time frame and how they will rank the recommendations.

Manning Circles back around to the deadline comment and says they need to set their own. He says he and Durden will discuss it.

Pratt chimes in and says the next conversation her subcommittee will have will be about the PowerPoint that will help facilitate conversation about the projects, but she also notes that the current data is easy to read through.

Manning says he wants to have some tangible form of committee progress.

Evans chimes in to say that some of these things can happen in parallel, not necessarily sequentially.

Pratt asks who will write the report.

Durden says that he might recommend that some projects be made with joint function. He thinks leaving the timelines to the policymakers is best.

Louie chimes in and says that the committee has not discussed toll-roads. Evans says he is not sure the City/County would have much say in those anyway.

Durden notes that they may want to create a regional mobility authority. He says it would not be inconceivable that something like that would be a good recommendation.

Eldredge agrees that policy recommendations are worth considering. He also agrees that the area is beginning to get swallowed up by San Antonio. He says he is in favor of different community characteristics.

Evans says there are several policies like that including limited access roads that requires connections between neighborhoods and a variety of other interesting mechanisms.

Louie thinks they should be creative so as not to fall into the “same ol’ same ol’.”

Hendricks notes that there was a section in the Kendall Gateway Study that was dedicated to community participation and input. She recommends putting something like that into the outline as well.

Eldredge suggests hosting open houses. He notes that many people who would have been affected by the Kendall Gateway were not even aware that it was coming. Therefore, it would be good to make the community aware of their recommendations so that nothing is a surprise.

Boddie encourages more engagement with the public. Evans agrees and encourages a detail of some kind to recognize public input.

Item 7: PUBLIC COMMENT

Vialissa Gearhardt is in attendance, and she recommends a detail about the environmental needs and the risks involved. She also thinks discussing the cost of potential roads is important. She has heard in previous meetings that the directive from the City is not to worry about cost, but she does think it is important.

Another public attendee, Seth Mitchell, thinks Hendricks’ suggestion about cost is good. He explains the delivery of a project and how it is impacted is

largely based on who owns it. He also circles back to Evan's comment about public participation, and he commends the committee on its willingness to include the public in its meetings. He says he has never been a part of anything like that. Regarding long-range projects, he hopes the committee will be ready when defending recommendations to interconnectivity. He also mentions policy recommendations saying that many people who work in the service industry do not live here in town. He thinks that is a housing affordability issue. He notes that non-transportation issues that affect the traffic and transportation should also be addressed.

Bannwolf chimes in and says it would be good to send out mail pieces—something tangible for people to open and read to get information out there.

Eldredge says allowing space for a motion is a process.

Durden notes that they would like to get some projects populated and in motion. If they force projects too soon it would be doing the community a disservice, but he agrees there are things they can be doing as they discuss more.

Item 8: **ADJOURNMENT**

The committee adjourned at 3:48 p.m.