

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

**31 May 2022  
2:01 – 4:05 p.m.**

## **In Attendance:**

Don Durden, Bob Manning, Bryce Boddie, John Kight, Northern Hendricks, Gary Louie, Rankin D'Spain, Jeff Carroll, Bobby Balli, Ben Eldredge, Jonah Evans, Rich Sena, Del Eulberg, Tim Bannwolf, and Bitsy Pratt via Zoom.

## **Not in Attendance:**

Henry Acosta, Josh Limmer, Kim Blohm, Marcus Garcia, Stephen Zoeller, and Steve Sharma.

## **Item 1: OPENING REMARKS**

Don Durden calls the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. and allows for comments from the Committee members.

Bob Manning notes preemptively that he looks forward to the progress they will make today.

Tim Bannwolf did a great deal of work on drafting the policy recommendations portion of the report. That will be looked at and hopefully adopted at this meeting.

## **Item 2: CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 17, 2022**

Durden opens the floor for the consideration of the minutes of May 17, 2022.

Bobby Balli motions to approve and adopt the minutes. Gary Louie seconds the motion.

With no objections, the minutes are approved and adopted.

## **Item 3: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Alex Rudd approaches the lectern. She begins her comments by displaying pictures of Kreuzberg Road, looking at many of the entrances of subdivisions in that area. She wonders if converting this road to an FM road is the answer. She spoke with TxDOT, and FM roads have speed limits of 50-60 mph, which she says is unsafe. She asks what the agenda is behind this. She explains that she, along with many others, are in a terrible state of uncertainty because of this. She also explains that there is pending legislation to reduce speed in residential areas. Rudd reaches her 3-minute time limit and says she will return at the end of the meeting.

**Item 4: CONTINUE DISCUSSING CROWDSOURCE PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION AND PROCESS FOR FINAL DISPOSITION INTO LONG- AND SHORT-RANGE PROGRAMS WITH COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Project 1: Old San Antonio Road improvements. Northern Hendricks suggests sticking with the interim report and using this CrowdSource project as support. The interim report suggestion was for a center turn lane installation. Ben Eldredge also suggests adding sidewalks. The project is included in the final report.

Project 2: A roundabout at School Street and Johns Road. Bitsy Pratt chimes in and says there has been some discussion and concern about pedestrian school crossing at that location. Bryce Boddie agrees, it is a very busy school crossing intersection. Jonah Evans suggests putting something in the report that suggests doing a study to investigate pedestrian safety. Pratt chimes in again, saying that the Projects Subcommittee talked about this concept at length, and they liked the idea because it would provide cross-town movement more quickly and efficiently. She mentions that this would provide better access to IH-10 as well. The project is moved forward for the final report.

Project 3: Improvements on the crossings on School Street to make it a better north-south corridor. John Kight and Durden both share major reservations about this project because of ROW and creek interference. Manning chimes in and says that he was on Council when the sidewalk between Hosack and Highland was being proposed. He wants there to be

serious consideration for making this area pedestrian friendly. Durden asks if they should make the recommendation for a continued study. Pratt notes that there are only parts of School Street that have concern for ROW issues; not all. Durden suggests keeping it for a comprehensive study and looking at pedestrian-friendly solutions in all sections. There are no objections, and the project moves to the final report.

Project 4: Sisterdale Cutoff made into a one-way street to reduce congestion at the 5 points intersection. Evans says that he thinks everyone can agree that this intersection would be best served by a roundabout in the long-term, but no one agrees it should be the first roundabout the City does. Balli says his support goes to the City's interim and long-term plan. This project does not move forward as it is suggested.

Projects 5 and 6: These projects focus on bridges built on School Street. Reference ID 92 (Project 5) talks about a section on W San Antonio Avenue. Jeff Carroll says the City widened that area and put sidewalk on the north side. The Committee members agree this area is acceptable how it is. Project 5 is nixed in favor of other projects. Project 6 regarding a bridge on School Street is kept in for consideration.

Project 7: Raising the Frederick Creek Bridge. Evans chimes in and notes that raising the bridge would have a lot of benefits for animals that live in that area. Collisions would be mitigated and there would be more room for animals that follow the creek.

Project 8: Connection on Telford Way between two subdivisions. Carroll notes that the reason his hasn't already been addressed is completely political. An ex-council member lives in one of the subdivisions and did not want the connection between the two neighborhoods. However, first responders want the connection to be made. Many of the Committee members agree there should be a connection here. It moves forward for the final report.

Project 9: Improvements on Upper Balcones Road. This item is rejected for redundancy since many of the issues on this road near Starbucks have been resolved.

Project 10: Improvements for the intersection at Upper Balcones and IH-10. Evans notes that this was an issue before TxDOT began their work over there. It's been resolved now. It is rejected with no objections from the Committee.

Project 11: Add a connection on Winding Woods that allows passage through the neighborhood and avoid Highway 46. Carroll mentions that this suggestion is already on the current thoroughfare plan. Evans suggests crafting some language that supports the City's thoroughfare plan and uses this item to leverage it. The Committee members agree, and the item moves forward for the final report.

The Committee has now completed the review of CrowdSourcing projects. Durden announces that they will consolidate the items and organize them for the report.

**Item 5:      DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF THE POLICY SECTION OF THE REPORT**

Durden explains his desire to ensure that with the policy section of the report, all recommendations have been carefully considered, fully vetted, and thorough in all things that need to be said. It's time to make decisions. He explains that if any Committee members have concerns to make a list, and the Committee will go back one by one and address the concerns.

Balli chimes in with concern that perhaps not all comments have been heard. He mentions that he made some notes in reviewing the policy section with yellow-boxed highlights. There is some discussion and clarification on what those were on the digital file and the Committee proceeds in addressing them right there.

After some conversation ensues, Evans notes that no one is really tied right now to any deep organization or structure at this point. Manning says that he thinks Bannwolf should go ahead and read the updated policy sections, and the Committee can address with comments after that to ensure there are no contradictions.

Bannwolf takes the floor, noting that they revised the section regarding eminent domain. He notes that they wanted to call special attention to preserving the character of the area.

Louie makes some comments and wants to encourage the County to move toward the adoption of a thoroughfare plan.

Bannwolf mentions that Kight had sent more comments the previous day that he had not had a chance to look at, so he asks Kight to expound now.

Kight discusses the issue of open space, parks, and trails along the waterways.

Section 2.4 which was revised by Kight is adopted.

Section 2.1, Kight has questions regarding the maintenance of the rural Hill Country environment—should solving congestion issues within the area really be based on that? He expresses his concern that while others don't see a 15-20 delay at an intersection as a big deal, but he does not feel that is acceptable.

Durden suggests not replacing the language but simply adding Kight's. The Committee concurs.

Prat points out that they are looking at improving the intersections to increase their capacity. That doesn't have to be mutually exclusive from maintaining the rural character of the community.

Evans wants to ensure that before they abide by some traffic capacity manual that they are looking at what the needs and desires of the community are first.

Kight expresses concern about the language that excludes "governmental entities". He says they don't want to "bite the hand that feeds you" when it comes to funding for projects. Durden suggests changing the verbiage to say something along the lines of "...as it aligns with the values and concerns of Kendall County." Bannwolf reads the section with Kight's

changes added. The Committee concurs, and there are no objections to its adoption.

Pratt chimes in with commentary on how she thinks it is important that the County and other appropriate authorities' processes be included to keep the public informed. She uses the Major Thoroughfare Planning process as an example. She recommends using language that references the appropriate planning processes for development, especially for those properties in the ETJ, being taken to Commissioner's Court for approval. Evans agrees.

Carroll responds and says that the current MTP map shows lines in the ETJ. There are existing roadways and a couple greenfield roads. He says it is something they can investigate.

Balli chimes in with some comments about getting approval in Commissioner's Court and combining discussion about thoroughfare planning and development between the Cities and the County.

Pratt comments on the FM standards issue. She thinks they need to be very specific in noting that indicating there are only parts of roadways that would need to be addressed and upgraded, not the whole road. They also don't want to say that "all roads" need to be upgraded to FM standards, only roads that function as major arterials.

Durden discusses the adoption of the policy by consensus. He says if there are objections, they will take note of any concerns and address each one by one.

Evans notes a modification. He echoes Pratt on the ROW concern. He says it seems a bit ambiguous right now. Conversation ensues on those changes. Durden suggests language that clarifies that they are no in support of making all roads FM standard roads.

Rudd approaches the lectern once more to speak, saying she still sees points where clarity is missing regarding the FM standards conversation. Who will maintain these roads? Kight chimes in and clarifies that the idea is to just match design standards for problem areas; not fix or change the

entire road. The idea is to correct hazardous areas. This reassurance brings some comfort to Rudd.

Durden asks if there is anyone who objects to adopting the report? Kight makes a motion to adopt the policy section of the report. Evans seconds the motion. Durden says the intent is for the public to view this at some point, but there may still be subsequent changes after the public looks at it and makes comments. They will get the final draft, put it away safely, and publish everything at one time. With a consensus from the Committee, the policy section is adopted.

**Item 6: DISCUSSION AND DISPOSITION OF PROJECTS  
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Pratt says they have covered many of the elements in the Projects Subcommittee report. They plan to have a subsequent meeting for consideration after the Committee has time to refresh their memories.

**Item 8: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Vialissa Gerhardt makes her way to the front. She is thankful the public will have a chance to comment on the policy recommendations. She expresses concern about some of the language that a developer or entity would have an agenda to use it and push boundaries. She says no matter what the Committee does, there will still be two high schools that let out at lunch time, which adds to mid-day traffic. She says the intersections are where the fixing needs to happen. She also cautions against eminent domain. She's afraid it will be used to someone's benefit. She briefly mentions the sharp 90-degree turn on Ammann Road, and finally expresses concern that the document will be used for some other purpose than what the Committee intends.

Evans responds, saying that she brings up a good point. He mentions the County Commissioners again, saying that those who live in the ETJ really have no representation. He wonders if that does leave some of them unsure where to go to express their concerns. He also notes that passing the policy section document is a huge achievement.

The Committee members give their thanks and sentiments to one another for all the hard work that has gone into creating the document.

Rudd has some final questions. There was a low water crossing connection to 3351; she wonders if it was approved. Hendricks responds and says that project will come up again later. She remembers seeing it in the subcommittee recommendations. Rudd voices her opposition to a bridge for connection to 3351. Her concern is that Kreuzberg Road will turn into a thoroughfare.

**Item 9:     ADJOURNMENT**

The Committee adjourned at 4:05 p.m.