

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

**18 May 2021
2:07 – 4:10 p.m.**

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

In Attendance:

Co-Chairs Don Durden and Bob Manning, Henry Acosta, Tim Bannwolff, Bryce Boddie, Jeff Carroll, Ben Eldredge, Mayor Tim Handren, Northern Hendricks, Gary Louie, John Kight, Rich Sena, Steve Sharma, Richard Tobolka, John Ramirez, Veronika Vasquez, Erika Yount.

Not in Attendance:

Kim Blohm, Rankin D’Spain, Jonah Evans, Marcus Garcia, Josh Limmer, Mark Stahl, Stephen Zoeller.

Visitors:

There were three visitors in attendance.

Item 1: Opening Remarks

The meeting began at exactly 2:07 p.m. because of a rain delay.

Item 2: Consider Approval of Minutes

Don Durden decides to defer this until the next meeting because the previous meeting’s minutes had not gotten out in time for review.

Item 3: Public Comment

No public comment during this time. There are three visitors in attendance.

Item 4: Update on Committee Membership

Durden explains that there is one addition: Adele Ulbert. Ulbert is not in attendance today. There is still one vacancy for representation of Fair Oaks Ranch.

Item 5: Consideration of Combining GIS and Projects/Past Studies Subcommittees

For lack of a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, this item number is held off as members of the committee trickle in from the rain delay.

Modification for consensus takes place later in the meeting. Durden asks if there is anyone who objects to the combination of the two subcommittees. There are no objections.

Item 6: Major Thoroughfare Plan Discussion

Jeff Carroll begins discussing the Major Thoroughfare Plan on the City of Boerne's website. He says the City is looking at updating it. The first plan was created in 1974. It has been updated in 2004, 2010, 2017 and 2019. He explains that when new developments come to town, the City can require enough ROW to create new roadways. If the amount of ROW required does not affect enough of the roadways, the City cannot require that developers to build an entire road to accommodate the developments and surrounding roads. He explains that the Major Thoroughfare Plan requires ROW and based on the amount of ROW needed, City of Boerne codes require that a developer must build a road to accommodate the traffic the new development will generate. He says the point of having the Thoroughfare Plan is so that when developers come to town, the City can require them to accommodate the traffic it will generate. The City is also looking at updating cross sections and creating shared paths for bikes and pedestrians alike. He also mentions that once the city's population grows to 25,000 people, the ETJ will bump up to 2 miles instead of the current 1 mile, which means the City can enforce its codes and mandates further out. He says once a consultant is hired, these are the things they will look at.

Richard Tobolka, representing Kendall County, begins by saying that the County coordinates often with the City of Boerne. He says the County has not adopted a Major Thoroughfare Plan. Tobolka explains that the County is eligible for creating a Thoroughfare Plan because of its proximity to Bexar County. He explains that the County works off a constraints-driven

analysis, meaning that they aim to avoid cutting through historical, cultural, biological, and other sensitive and controversial properties throughout the county. He says the County can declare or identify existing roadways as thoroughfares and adopt sections that would allow the County to ask for dedications as development occurs adjacent to those roadways. The largest sections are collector roads which require minimum values 76 feet of ROW and 32 feet of pavement. He says that if a new development Traffic Impact Analysis will generate more growth, these minimum values are there to ensure that the County will not have to go back in later and expand.

Gary Louie chimes in and asks Tobolka to clarify who takes priority in the ETJ. Tobolka responds and says in the ETJ, the County refers to the City's transportation plan for guidance. He reiterates that the County works closely with the City when there are questions pertaining to

Tobolka also explains that the County is taking their rules back to the Commissioners Court for review. He mentions collector roads again and says there are several roads that behave differently than cul-de-sac roadways.

Carroll says in response to Louie that the City is currently having conversations with TxDOT. He says the City's access requirements of driveways on arterials is more stringent than TxDOT's requirements. He explains that TxDOT will listen to the City before acting on something because of the City's codes.

Durden says that in each city that has an ETJ is required to have an agreement with the county in which that city exists. It is typically renewed every 2 years or so. Carroll and Tobolka respond yes. Durden says that since he has been a County Commissioner, he has seen improved cooperation between the City and County entities, but he still thinks there needs to be more. Durden the proceeds to ask about roadway classifications.

Carroll says there are somewhere between 11-12 roadway classifications, but that there are only about 6-7 major classifications are used all the time. He explains that there are primary and secondary collector roads, and that some roads will never cross the threshold to become primary roads. He

says the way the City's code is written makes things tough, therefore they are looking at revising it.

Durden inquires if the City's Major Thoroughfare Plan addresses city and county roads, but a big component of that system is the TxDOT ROW requirements, and he asks for clarification if that is something that shows up on the Plan. Carroll responds that the City has all TxDOT roadways classified as arterials. Durden clarifies that the County can require setbacks of 50 feet.

Tobolka chimes in and says the County needs to adopt a thoroughfare plan. Once the Commissioners Court adopts Hwy 46, the county can enforce setback requirements.

Durden makes a comment that one recommendation the City should consider is policy changes the City and County can adopt that would allow them to incorporate those types of requirements.

Tobolka says the linchpin on definitions for roads is directly related to data inputs on the rough proportionality spreadsheets. When calculating the demand impact on proposed development, the County is using identifications to estimate costs to bring facilities up. The ROW dedication is part of the rough proportionality. He explains that depending on how the property is valued, much of the funding pertained is absorbed by dedication to the ROW.

Louie asks where a road classification sheet can be found. Durden responds that the development codes will reflect that. Carroll explains that each City/County will have different terms.

Durden says that as the population doubles and the City takes on more area, at some point he believes the ETJ could line up the classifications.

Carroll says the City's sections include bike trails and things that are not necessarily in the County.

Bob Manning notes the intriguing nature of the County declaring existing roads as thoroughfares which he says would seem to pay for the thoroughfare plan. Carroll notes that Comal County adopted a thoroughfare

plan and that there is a lot of residential development happening, but the funding is coming from the developers because the way the ROW is.

Manning also asks if the Boerne trails system requires a ROW. Carroll responds and says yes. The collector roads within the City all require sidewalks, and they are thinking about making sidewalks larger.

Manning notes that some residential areas have sidewalks and others do not. He thinks that is odd. He hopes that one of the things the committee can help with is rectifying that issue. Carroll agrees, and even notes that many of the mailboxes in Boerne are illegal and do not meet requirements for safety.

Manning asks Carroll what he foresees regarding the consultant the City will hire and the role they will play along with the committee. Carroll says he expects the consultant to attend a few of the committee meetings to gain information and feedback. He says the City will even most likely set up some Open House events. He explains that the main goal is the connectivity between the roads within the City.

Rich Sena chimes in with a question: at point are subdivisions required to have a second entrance/outlet? Carroll responds and says that the moment a subdivision surpasses 30 houses, a secondary entrance is required. Sena makes a note that this will be critical for safety thinking of students and school routes. Carroll says that was a widely heard public comment: interconnectivity.

Tobolka notes that the County is working under the same rules regarding secondary entrances.

Ben Eldredge inquires whether the County ever has a role in the new designs that are submitted. Tobolka responds that under TCEQ rules, a developer must demonstrate to the County that they have the capacity and ability to provide the service that they are claiming they can provide. He says this is based on a rough proportionality agreement with the City, which he notes speaks to how well the City and County work together.

In terms of rough proportionality, Durden inquires whether the City and County are using the same methods. Tobolka notes the real changes are

with the sections, and Carroll notes they selected the same consultant to prepare the plans because they liked the continuity factor.

The attention of the committee is turned back to Eldredge's question. He asks if there is any mechanism the committee can use for connectivity between developments? Carroll notes that sometimes the plans for developments do not go far enough out that the City can decide to plat a development that way.

Tobolka notes that he thinks the County would support a percent for the dedication of ROW, but currently it is not there. Durden thanks them both for their contributions to the discussion.

Item 7: Updated BISD Demographic Studies

Henry Acosta introduces John Ramirez, the Transportation Director for BISD. Sena then goes up to give a presentation on projected growth within the area and how that will affect the placement of new schools. He also discusses some ways in which the zoning of schools could potentially help the traffic problems as it relates to the school district.

Sena begins discussing the growth over the last decade, and notes that even with the COVID crisis, there was still a growth in the number of students attending school. He notes that one of the issues relating to the traffic in Boerne is that there is a massive school district in a small zone. He moves through some slides that show the new developments and units within those developments that are expected to be filled. Some areas expected to grow over the next 10 years include: Blanco Road, west of I-10, and Highway 46. He notes that if schools are zoned in these areas, it will keep traffic that has to cross the highways now from having to do that in the future; keeping the students in the same zones that they live in for school should help solve some of the traffic issues. He also comments that some of the areas that look very rural now could end up being developed in the future as developers come in offering money for privately owned properties, therefore creating more growth. He concludes by saying the school district expects there to be more than 16,000 kids by 2029. He notes that while there is much growth, the small-town element that Boerne carries is very attractive to families and it is something the school board aims to hold on to.

Acosta chimes in and says that as they plan for new facilities, they are also looking for subsites to host the transportation department. Other things they fight for include getting kids to walk and making it easy for buses to turn into subdivisions.

Ramirez adds that every bus takes 36 vehicles off the road, but he says the challenge lies in that the subdivisions are right on top of each other, making it difficult for buses to get direct access in picking kids up. He says the denser the areas become the more kids will be put on buses. Once walkways interconnect, there may be less of a demand for them though. He says cul-de-sacs are also an issue because buses need a lot of space to back up and out. He also talks about another issue: gate timers. Most gates open at 7:00am, but if they could open even an hour earlier, there would be less trouble getting kids to school on time.

Acosta also notes they are looking for enough parking to accommodate all who want to drive to school.

Tim Bannwolff asks how many bus and car trips happen back and forth across I-10 every day. Ramirez says there is a large number, but not having to cross the freeway would be of immense value. He notes that the more cars they can replace with buses, the better the traffic will be. Acosta also notes that low water crossings can be a problem as well. When those are closed off, this pushes buses back out toward I-10.

Durden asks if areas can be broken down into census tracts and suggests finding a way to get that information sent to AAMPO because he thinks that information could be more helpful than what AAMPO has. Carroll notes the AAMPO presentation has been updated by many people.

Manning thanks all presenters and notes his two take-aways:

- 1) The growth and the drive that that growth will have toward the committee's recommendations.
- 2) The importance of addressing automobile and non-automobile solutions.

Manning then introduces Mayor Tim Handren and gives him the floor.

Handren begins by expressing his thanks and excitement that the members of the committee have decided to play a part in finding transportation

solutions. He notes that he feels Boerne is behind the transportation requirements by 10 years, and that he feels a sense of urgency regarding the mobility issues in Boerne. He says the data shows the population will double in size again. He notes that what the committee is trying to do will be tough, but it is not the job of the committee to find funding for any recommended projects; the job of the committee is to find solutions. He says there are options available to work that out with AAMPO. He says that as I-10 gets wrapped up, the next year will likely be a disaster (referring to bridges on 87 and 46). He says that the most common complaints he hears daily have to do with the traffic issues around town. But before hiring an outside consultant, he wanted to give the people who live and work here a chance to find the best solutions for the area. He reiterates his sense of urgency and says the committee has about 6 months to come up with solutions. He then introduces Greg Maxton.

Maxton notes that he is new to the process, but he completely understands what Mayor Handren is saying. He stresses preparing for the future, otherwise the future will happen, and they will not be ready for it.

Durden thanks them both for joining them and speaking.

The Mayor also notes that Council specifically sets aside funds for research and other resources to help support the committee. He reiterates his urgency by saying it is time to do something. He is thankful for each member of the committee who brings their perspective to the table.

Item 8: Update on AAMPO

Durden mentions Amber Perez who is a public information officer. In working on transportation improvement, he hopes they will be able to help her with outreach in the community.

He says there are 72 projects nominated that are competing for funding. They will be working on public outreach from June 1st and June 27th. He asks for a volunteer to help with outreach. Louie and Norther Hendricks volunteer.

Item 9: General Discussion About Characteristics of Kendall County Surface Transportation System

The first step is getting it resurrected, then reaching out to the community and bringing it to a conclusion. He has some thoughts on how to get the recommendations organized over the next few months.

Louie asks for clarification on whether this is the list that was discussed 2 meetings ago or if it is a broader list and Durden says it is broader.

Bannwolff says it would be nice to have the GIS maps. Eldredge replies that it is available on the website.

Hendricks asks if anything was received from AAMPO. Durden says not yet. She then asks what format their data is in. Durden says he is not able to make sense of it. Bryce Boddie chimes in and says he has already started a spreadsheet. Louie asks if they will come back with a summary of it all. Durden responds and says they will try to get an agenda together, but he begs the question to the committee “How does the transportation plan we want to recommend . . . influence how we develop in Kendall County?”

Pratt notes that if buses are stopping and going, it is not conducive to thru traffic.

Louie brings up a point that urbanized solutions and the density of mobility it creates could affect what is happening with the more rural areas of the county.

Durden agrees that maintaining rural areas and dealing with traffic will be a challenge. He says he would like to see conversations move on to how to do things concurrently to address long term solutions.

Sena chimes in to sum up the best questions to reflect on how to move forward. What is the least invasive way to create roads that will also help with mobility? How do we minimize traffic and how it relates to schools? He says the data is collected; it is time to act.

Eldredge speaks up to say that the real challenge is getting leverage for connectivity. Are there ways that the schools can say they will not put a school in a certain place unless the builders are willing to contribute to the development of roads as well?

Acosta suggests categorizing the projects into problems that can be solved now, and long-term projects to be working toward. He also suggests formulating a schedule where the committee brings solutions to the table.

To that, Durden says he and Manning have discussed that method.

Item 10: Public Comment

Durden opens the floor for public comment. No Public Comment are made.

The conversation transitions. Bannwolff notes there are 5 Tuesdays in June, but the consensus is made that whether they will meet on that last Tuesday will be decided later.

Eldredge brings up the issue of being aware of policies as the committee discusses more controversial topics. Durden agrees that he would also like to get clarity on policy implications, as that could directly affect some of the long-term recommendations. Eldredge suggests moving that issue to a subcommittee for brainstorming. Manning says it is something to talk about, but he reiterates that it is not the job of the committee to take City direction.

Pratt tags on to this saying she would like to see more information on what dictates safe walkways. She sees this as a very real and solvable issue.

Durden discusses the reimbursement programs for schools. Hendricks asks for a list of trails and neighborhoods.

Hendricks says she looked on public maps, and those are not mentioned on those maps. She wonders if there is a way to get their ideas and thoughts on paper.

Manning suggests having subcommittees get ideas onto paper. He thinks categorizing projects could help their momentum.

Eldredge suggests a “soft sell” saying that presenting the vision of how the committee thinks it best to move forward would be most beneficial.

Manning says they will adopt as they see fit.

Item 11: Adjournment

The meeting concludes at 4:10 p.m.