

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

**07 September 2021
2:04 – 3:41 p.m.**

In Attendance:

Bob Manning, Don Durden, Bryce Boddie, Northern Hendricks, John Kight, Steve Sharma, Ben Eldredge, Bobby Balli, Jeff Carroll, Del Eulberg, Bitsy Pratt, Jonah Evans, Gary Louie.

Not In Attendance:

Kim Blohm, Marcus Garcia, Josh Limmer, Henry Acosta, Rankin D’Spain, Rich Sena, Stephen Zoeller, Tim Bannwolf.

Item 1: OPENING REMARKS

Don Durden opens the meeting. He welcomes Commissioner Richard Elkins who is in attendance and welcomes him to join in on the discussion at any time. Durden also notes that both Boerne newspapers are represented at this meeting, and he welcomes them.

**Item 2: CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 2021
AND AUGUST 31, 2021 (IF AVAILABLE)**

Durden opens the floor for consideration of the minutes taken on August 17, 2021, which are available at this time. Minutes from August 31, 2021 are unavailable for consideration for this meeting. Durden asks if anyone has questions, corrections, changes, or additions to the minutes from August 17, 2021. There are no objections. Gary Louie makes a motion to approve those minutes. Del Eulberg seconds the motion, and the minutes are adopted by consensus.

Item 3: PUBLIC COMMENT

Durden then opens the floor for any attendees from the public to comment at this time.

Lance Kyle chimes in to say that while he does not want to “muddy the water”, he thinks that it is important to say that the media was harsh on

John Kight regarding comments he made in the previous meeting's exchange. He notes that he likes and appreciates the reporter a lot. Kyle reiterates his support for both persons. He just felt it was a comment that needed to be made.

Tana Fowler comments that she also thinks John Kight is a wonderful person. She also notes for the record that she is against the new thoroughfare.

Commissioner Elkins mentions that he keeps up with the minutes from the meetings that this committee has had, and he is very pleased. He says he has great expectations for a final report.

Item 4: CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS – NORTHERN HENDRICKS

Durden says that Northern Hendricks is doing an incredible amount on work and reducing the proposals from the crowd sourcing information from AAMPO and changing into a format that is useful.

Hendricks says she hopes that everyone has had a chance to look at the spreadsheets, the tables, and the one-page summaries. So far, she has pulled information in from the sensitive features table and the subcommittee interim report table. She asks what the committee wants to do with the information.

Bitsy Pratt asks if there is a way to correlate the crowd sourcing information with what has been on the City of Boerne's master plan.

Hendricks responds and says that she would need help cross-referencing with the master plan. She notes that to organize the information, *something* must be the main reference point. Here, the main subject is the crowd sourcing material.

Jonah Evans asks if Hendricks is trying to combine duplicative records in some way if she came across them.

Hendricks replies and says that Cecelio Martinez worked on combining a few of them. She says she isn't really doing anything with the data, she is just sending it out as it is.

Evans notes that it is probably premature to vote on projects just yet. He suggests condensing the information gathered into individual projects as

the next step, and then the committee can review them. He suggests adding a check box.

Hendricks says she can go through and flag the ones that align with the subcommittee projects.

Bobby Balli notes that it sounds as though there still needs to be a screening process for what gets included on the final list. He asks about the meaning of “short-term”. He asks if it is really the committee’s job to prioritize the short-term projects.

Durden clarifies that they are not prioritizing projects, rather they are grouping them into short-term and long-term projects. He thinks they should have all the proposed projects listed in the report. Some projects would gain the endorsement of the committee. Similarly, some projects will not have the endorsement of the committee. That does not mean that 20 years from now, that project won’t be relevant. He would hate to lose all the ideas, but it should be clear what the committee endorses.

Balli asks about endorsing projects that maybe don’t completely make sense or would have potential safety issues.

Hendricks says that right now she is just trying to get the information into a readable format and hopes the committee can come back and discuss once the projects they want to talk about have been flagged.

Bryce Boddie notes that the most important part in all of this is the crowd sourcing information. He wonders if they should maybe do another crowd sourcing outreach just to make sure they have everything they need.

Durden notes that he does not think time will allow them to do another crowd source outreach.

Bob Manning chimes in and says that the community is a dangerous place to walk around in right now. Crosswalks are important, and if there is one that is proposed in a dangerous area, they can address it then. This committee exists as a representative of a broad group.

Durden notes that some projects will be slam dunks and others will be controversial. He would like to see if they can modify to get a consensus among the members for acceptance.

Hendricks says they can discuss the projects more fully as early as the next meeting.

Durden says there could be recommendations gathered from the crowd sourcing material, but the committee reserves the right to modify or combine the suggested projects.

Louie chimes in with a comment. He says he is beginning to understand where the committee wants to head, but the first question he has is whether they are accepting that the community input pre-Covid is valid and ready to bring back to the table to discuss? He asks if the committee can get a heads up on the agenda to focus on particular projects at the meetings. Durden says that is a fair request. Louie also suggests that the committee should not get dragged down by the technological aspects otherwise they would be sitting here forever trying to make decisions. He suggests keeping the process evergreen for future councils to not have to come back and reinvent everything.

Del Eulberg says that he appreciates Louie's comments. He asks what the key elements are of input from any source. He notes that he and Ben Eldredge have discussed non-vehicular mobility. He looked at the committee website and looked to see how the CIP and vehicular traffic correlate. He also says he noticed that the CIP information that Jeff Carroll provided aligned with the subcommittee project recommendations.

Hendricks says right now the projects she is focusing on are the vehicular projects, not the ped projects. She notes that the CIP projects have been pulled into the crowd sourcing data.

Pratt chimes in to clarify that what is not on the crowd sourcing data is the input that they received for the pedestrian and closed gates from BISD. Hendricks says that is right/

Carroll says the Champion Heights gate was in the crowd sourcing data.

Eulberg notes that it is important to list the "universe" the committee worked from and that they were transparent with the public. That way any future committee will know the primary sources of input they are using today.

Evans said that could work for some projects, but they would have to look at danger and safety as well. He suggests looking at traffic congestion to

alleviate projects and then tying them into project growth or something like that.

Kight chimes in and says they need to come up with priority system for the committee to go through and pick out the projects that will accomplish something now. He suggests picking projects that would reap benefits. He says they should look at how those decisions would impact the next set of projects. He thinks it is important to prioritize projects so that the following project will tie in effectively.

Durden says they may be able to come up with a range of priority for organizing projects. Kight says money will play into that quickly.

Pratt notes that clicking through the crowd sourcing data goes quickly—about 30 seconds for one. She notes that a lot of the ped projects are duplicates and many of those have already been done anyway. Some of them are on the CIP so the committee will not need to vote on those or review them. As big as the numbers are, she acknowledges that reviewing the information goes quickly.

Durden says he would like to give opportunities to comment on projects and incorporate those in the project sheets.

Louie asks if they should respond directly to Hendricks with their thoughts as they review. Hendricks asks that the members send a good description of the project and the reference number.

Item 5: CONSIDERATION OF CHAPTER 1 OF THE FINAL REPORT

Durden directs the room to the back of the agenda packet handout. He notes that the changes they discussed at the last meeting have been made. He asks specifically about Tim Bannwolf's suggestion for including participant's and their names in the list, and he opens the floor for discussion.

Manning thinks there should be a sentence somewhere that says not everyone who participated necessarily agreed with what the committee discussed. He thinks this is important since they were so welcoming to the public and thinks that should be made clear.

Boddie says he thinks it is important to include that they were transparent in public support, but that naming every person seems over the top.

Louie says that anyone who is interested can refer to the minutes on the website.

Eldredge says he wants to bring equity back up before moving on. He reiterates his concern for the welfare of all citizens and wants to focus on mobility for all ages and socioeconomic backgrounds. He wants to make sure that all peoples have a way to get to work, the grocery store, pharmacy, etc. He feels that if this is not highlighted as a policy recommendation that it would be too easy to overlook. He thinks it wise to include it as part of what the committee is aiming to achieve.

Pratt's thoughts are that it is fair to include equity as one of the goals of transportation, but it is also fair to recognize that the responsibility does not rest solely on the committee either.

Eldredge notes that the policy recommendations section in the draft has very vague wording, but to embed the issue in the policy would give it more weight.

Eldredge suggests changing the wording to read, "Facilitate mobility for citizens of all ages and socioeconomic capacities."

Evans notes that the nice thing about remembering all ages is that it includes those kids who walk to school and other instances like that, but when you specify ages, you may be talking about people who cannot afford a car or have others means of convenience. He likes the idea of a more general verbiage so that it is more inclusive and then using the paragraphs for more details.

Kight notes that he likes the idea of leaving the verbiage to include all ages and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Louie notes that he likes the very broad principles as well because if you throw out specific groups that can be exclusive of other groups.

Pratt chimes in to remember the visitors that come to the area as well.

Louie notes that if the words are changed to read "all citizens" then it eliminates the issue of exclusivity.

Eldredge makes a motion to approve the language of "individuals of all ages and socioeconomic capacities." The motion is seconded by Louie.

There are no objections, and the motion is approved, and the language is adopted.

Evans turns a question to Durden about individuals coming forward to present project proposals. Durden responds yes. If anyone has ideas for different projects, he opens the floor for everyone to feel free to come and present their ideas.

Item 6: PRESENTATION OF A PROJECT PROPOSAL BY COMMITTEE MEMBER JOHN KIGHT

Kight begins his presentation by saying that he spent much time looking at low water crossings and safety. He realized there is not much mobility within the county for emergency vehicles to get around, especially when it is flooding. He started to ask himself: what projects would enhance safety?

His project suggestions include:

- Adding road connections between Adler and Main, School Street and Main, Esser Road and Highway 46 (A roundabout has been suggested for this area but is not favorable with TxDOT).
- Adding a connection where Herff turns into Frey Street and connects to Highway 46 (and crossing over Cibolo Creek through Highway 46 to Plant Avenue).
- A North-South High-Water Corridor proposing a water line to cross Balcones Creek Road and Scenic Loop, and a road that would tie into Old Fredericksburg Road.
- Connection between Highway 46 and Esperanza that would tie into Spring Creek Road (this would not impact the subdivision on the south side). This would intersect with Highway 474 and cross to Sisterdale.
- Connection between Adler Road and Becker Street to alleviate school traffic.

Kight closes his presentation by noting that Boerne has grown significantly since 1914, and it continues to grow. There needs to be planning for this. While the population continue to double in size from generation to generation, the number of vehicles also doubles (he considers that most

families have two cars or more). He is proposing looking at any areas where drainage could be improved which will improve safety.

Durden thanks Kight for his presentation and notes that he has been an advocate for transportation for many years. His insight has been instrumental. He turns to Hendricks and asks her to input this information the same way she is inputting the other information regarding the crowd sourcing tables.

Eldredge asks what problem Kight is trying to solve with the Frey Street connection crossing Cibolo Creek. Kight says the aim is to create a way to get across the Cibolo. Eldredge says from a cost-benefit standpoint, would it be better to have a higher crossing at Herff Road (as an example). Kight and Durden note the difficulty of building under traffic.

Eldredge then asks why TxDOT did not like the 5-point roundabout solution. Carroll replies and says that it is because they may not be able to get the gas station on board with that plan.

Kight notes that TxDOT does not like to get involved with underground tanks.

Evans circles back to the emergency bypass idea at Herff Road and Esser. He asks if it would be feasible to do something that goes behind the gas station, that way it would not matter whether the gas station was on board. Kight explains the reason he did not do that was because it would still require crossing the creek.

Louie asks what the problem would be with diverting all traffic down south.

Kight says that coming down Sisterdale Cutoff there would be a cul-de-sac. Carroll notes that there are very few businesses over there. He says the cul-de-sac could be on either end. He says the City's consultant has five different schematics for this area.

Manning refers to Louie's proposal, saying that it is slightly antagonistic. He notes that people do not want to be isolated.

Evans says it could allow people to go in through the north to access businesses. He also notes that it seems that there is a lot of space to build around the gas station.

Kight says it would be difficult because of the sharp angles associated that that intersection. Roundabouts normally have rounder angles.

Carroll says a semi-truck cannot make a right turn onto the street without cutting through the gas station. He is working on trying to design something. He offers to bring in the five options from the City's consultant.

Durden says the County has met with the City about two drainage projects and there is a possibility for collaboration between the City and County for funding.

Item 7: PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Durden says that in the meantime, if there is a project that anyone can think of to be discussed among the committee members, please feel free to create a presentation and bring it to the table.

Item 8: ADJOURNMENT

The committee adjourned at 3:41 p.m.