Minutes of the Kendall County Transportation Planning Committee

October 08, 2019

The Kendall County Transportation Planning Committee meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. on the 8th day of October 2019 at the Kronskosky Place in Boerne, Texas, with Bob manning and Don Durden, Co-Chairs, presiding. All Committee members were present.

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

1. Opening comments from committee members.

Don Durden mentioned that Tuesdays are not a good day for the Kronkosky place. Suggested possibly having them at BISD or memorial library. If meetings stay at the Kronkosky Place meeting would take place on Mondays. The consensus of the committee was to stay with the same day and time, and see if a new location could be located. Later in the meeting, Rich Sena advised the committee that BISD had agreed to host future meetings.

All members of the committee have been assigned an email address. (committee@kcbfotc.com) is a public email address and anything sent to that address will be forward to every member's email.

Mr. David Anderson, who replaced Buddy Kuhn as the Precinct 3 appointee, introduced himself.

Don Durden thanked Lessly Barajas for preparing the minutes of the first meeting and for agreeing to continue on until we found a permanent scribe. He reported that John Kight had given him a name that he would follow up on and encouraged committee members to spread the word.

2. Comments from the public

Mike Luckey: Gave an opinion on the Kendall Gateway and mentioned how he would like to see other commissioners involved in this committee's work.

3. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of September 23, 2019

Mark Stahl moved the minutes of September 23, 2019 be approved. The motion was seconded by Tim Bannwolf and passed unanimously. Several members asked to receive minutes in advance for future meetings.

4. Consideration of decision making protocols for the committee

Co-chair Durden noted that it would be important, in light of past transportation planning efforts, to carefully and fully consider many questions leading up to our recommendations, and that it

would be important to make our decisions effectively. He advised that he had met with Jonah Evans, who has had some prior experience with group decision making regarding complex topics. He thought Mr. Evans's experience might be helpful in some of the more specific proposals that might come forward, and he asked Mr. Evans to describe his experience with that decision-making process. Mr. Evans described a system wherein members of a group formulate a range of conceptual solutions to a specific problem or multiple ways to achieve a certain goal. Then members make a list of values, i.e., things that are important to group members, such as monetary cost, environmental costs, convenience, etc., and they assign a weighting factor to those things, with the sum of all weight adding to 100%. Finally, members of the group assign a numerical score for each factor which represents how well a solution achieves or represents that value. This method allows a more objective analysis of multiple solutions that affect different values.

Durden reiterated his support for using that sort of matrix analysis for specific questions and noted that some decisions did not lend themselves to that sort of matrix analysis. He suggested the committee consider using consensus to make major decisions. He read a definition of consensus from Scott Peck's book, <u>A World Waiting to Be Born</u>. He then suggested a modification to pure consensus-based decision making is prudent to avoid becoming bogged down by a very small number of committee members who refuse to accept the decisions of an overwhelming majority and/or do not participate in good faith.

Bob Manning spoke in favor of both the modified consensus process and the analysis using weighted factors. He believes the use of modified consensus should leave open the option to add a strong dissent. John Kight noted that the Regional Water Planning Group he had participated in used consensus-based decision making.

John Kight made a motion to use the modified concession method, and the motion was seconded by Bob Hartwig. Discussion ensued regarding what the modification would be and when it would be invoked. Some suggested if 10% declined to agree that should invoke a move to modified consensus; others suggested 25%.

Don Durden suggested we establish a two-step process if pure consensus could not be achieved on a question. In the first step, if a committee member believes a small minority of the committee is: 1) opposed to the majority opinion on a question, and 2) unwilling to work toward achieving consensus on the question, then that member can move the committee vote to move from pure consensus to modified consensus for that question. If the vote to move to modified consensus is passed by a simple majority, then the committee votes on the question with a super majority necessary to pass.

Ben Eldredge suggested doing the consensus with the public input so that the voting is in part with the public.

Mr. Bannwolf proposed that 12 of the 18 voting members (2/3rd's) should be required to move from pure consensus to modified consensus. Some members questioned what happens if not all members are in attendance. Is the rule proposed to be 2/3rd's of those present, or 2/3rd of the entire committee? Also, is proxy voting allowed? Considerable discussion ensued and eventually

Durden said he thought he discerned a consensus had emerged and that he would restate the motion, which is:

That the committee make major decisions by consensus when possible, and when not possible, the committee would consider making that decision by modified consensus by voting upon a motion from a member who believes a vote is required; the vote required to move to modified consensus and the vote on the question both require the affirmative votes of fourteen of the eighteen voting members to pass. Mr. Durden inquired if Mr. Kight accepted the restate motion, and he affirmed he did. Mr. Durden inquired if Mr. Hartwig accepted the restated motion, and he affirmed he did. Mr. Durden asked if all committee members would approve the motion as restated, and they agreed by consensus.

Mr. Durden turned to the question of proxy voting. Most members were not in favor of allowing votes by proxy. Mr. Evans asked if a member might be allowed to vote electronically or remotely. The committee discussed this and generally were still not in favore of allowing proxy votes. Mr. Durden asked:

Are all committee members comfortable disallowing proxy votes? No committee member objected to disallowing proxy votes, so by consensus, proxy votes are disallowed.

5. Consideration of defining the problem in a way that facilitates the organization of the committee's work

Mr. Durden stated his intentions in presenting an outline is not to control the process but to help the committee think about how it wants to organize itself as well as different ways to approach the problem, He then reviewed the background for this item.

Mr. Manning said he is pleased that we went through what the committee's purpose is, because the court order allows important flexibility in the issues that the committee can address. For instance, we can address issues beyond just new roads including the need to make it safer for the public to walk or ride bikes around the city, the use of roundabouts, the use of shuttle buses or trolleys, etc. At some point, we need to break into subcommittees to examine some of the important issues concurrently, and come back to the full committee with presentations, discussions, and voting.

Mr. Evans said as we move forward on thinking about the process that were going to use to take our initial steps, our first efforts should be looking at the county maps to see where the massive problems are, define the massive issues that we need to focus on, and to develop a list of priorities to start learning how we're going to address those issues.

Mr. Sena said regarding collecting data that we need to drill down to the community level, we need to know where the houses are, and where the subdivisions are, in detail. BISD has this data in sufficient detail to make a presentation to the committee.

David Anderson advised the committee to follow the water pipes to see where growth is going to take place.

Tim Bannwolf asked if "quality of life" is an issue the committee should discuss? If so, we need to consider connectivity. Mr. Kight said we should fix the low-water bridge on School Street. If this committee is going to succeed in anything we need to be out on the city and county roads. Find things to fix right now, find money for it, and take it to officials to get it done.

6. Consideration of future presentations from subject matter experts on information relevant to the Committee's work.

Ben Eldredge: we should plan something bigger than just creating a road plan, what is the context? We should be incorporating the public's input. We need to look at our mission holistically. We also need to make sure we check in with the public as we go, to let them know our direction and thinking. When it comes to outside experts the entire committee should hear all presentations.

Rich Sena: Suggested having 2-3 meetings where the full committee hears data from school, the city and then assign specific tasks to subcommittees.

Kimberly Blohm: Can we get the 2007 study emailed to the group? Also, how do we define "appropriate" economic growth? The weighted-voting will could come into play when deciding what is crucial, and how people feel about it

Don Durden: we need to have an understating of what the topics are. Do assumptions match what we're saying. Once we have a common understating we can break into subcommittees.

Bob Manning: The intention for subcommittees is not to keep secrets or information from members, but to do the preliminary work of defining the issue and locating the data and/or outside experts to lead us through a detailed learning experience at the full committee level. The purpose to split into groups is to move efforts forward in parallel.

Tim Bannwolf suggested that Rich Sena (BISD) should provide the first data, He agreed.

Dan Banks: there's a lot of information that we can use from the 2007 Report on 46, and suggested that we consider using information from the Kendall Gateway Study report.

Rich Sena: noted "dead man's curve," and used it as an example of something TxDOT will not consider but that county residents view as important to solve.

Ben Eldredge: if we have a data collection presentation, it need to be critically reviewed, so we understand how the data was collected, what the weaknesses are, etc. We should have a sophisticated look at data, and how it could be better.

Northern Hendricks: where could we easily solve the congestion areas? Find rapid fixes for them. What are going to do in the next decade, and what is going to happen in the near future?

Jonah Evans: What important information was not provided in the Gateway study? For example, what matters is where the roads are not moving. What is actually causing the congestion? Is it just people at 8 am trying to get to school? Also, someone should give a 15 minute presentation of what came from the 2007 report.

Don Durden: would like to bring the traffic modeling experts from AAMPO. He also noted that some projects that we may not know about are already programmed; we need to understand what those projects are so we don't waste our time there. Are we going to do a public survey asking for their input on this? If so, how are we going to arrange creating a survey?

Bob Manning: Regarding the need for accurate data, reminded the committee that during the Gateway presentations all four quadrants of the study were shown to have zero issues of any environmental concern, which is nonsense. In the same study, TxDOT claims that 3 times as much traffic coming into Boerne from New Braunfels goes toward Kerrville as it does to San Antonio; this data may be correct but simply does not seem correct to folks who live here. We need to get those numbers right.

Marcus Garcia: Discussed the overall idea of gathering data. It's a good idea to go with subcommittees to move this forward. Suggested that we create a Google document or a capability to save the documents, records, reports, minutes. He agreed to help Northern with the website and Google Documents.

Rankin D'Spain: Are developers paying enough in fees? Everyone wants to come into this county, but the developers probably need to pay much higher fees to address their impact on our community's infrastructure.

Bryce Boddie: Make sure that we are aware of what is going on already, a lot of what happens is the reaction. We need to focus on the idea of what it's going to look like and the outcome reaction. We should look at the funding options, for sidewalks etc...

Marcus Garcia: Suggested that the committee provide information and project recommendations with time for officials to act for annual funding requests. If deadlines are due in September we should introduce the information in July or August for possibly higher funding.

Tim Bannwolf: Would like to post meeting notifications in the paper once a permanent home for the meetings is established. Kimberly Blohm will also make sure she sends it to the Chamber's list and paper.

It was discussed that the website should be up in 2 weeks.

Next meeting is set for October 22 at 2pm, location details will be provided soon.

 Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.