

Ada County Highway District Bicycle Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes – March 7, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted for Review: Adrienne Weatherly, BAC Secretary

Attendees (BAC): Lisa Brady (Chair), Gary Segers (Vice Chair), Adrienne Weatherly, Jeffrey Larsen, Morgan Cornwall, Marcus Batson, John Yarnell, Mary Beth Nutting, Greg Laragan, Wava Kaufman, Andrew Query, Brian McClure (ex-officio)

Absent: Nina Schaeffer, Debbie Lombard-Bloom

Attendees (Commissioners): President Goldthrope, Commissioner May, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Pickering, Commissioner May

Attendees (Staff): Director Wong, Meg McCarthy (Staff Advisor), Tom Laws, Kristy Inselman, Justin Lucas, Austin Miller

Other attendees: Karen Gallagher, Zach Piepmeyer (CCDC), Cynthia Gibson, Ellen Bush, Becky Walker, Clancy, Ellen Bush, Nathan Plowman, Nick Foster (Kittelson & Assoc.), Ryan Head, Tessa Greeger, Braden Cervetti, Lisa Hecht

I. Call to Order: 5:00 p.m.

II. Welcome & Introductions: A quorum of members was present for this virtual meeting conducted via the Zoom application and chaired by Lisa Brady (BAC Chair).

a. Approve November Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 10, 2022 and February 22, 2022 was made and passed by unanimous vote with no discussion.

III. Agency Updates

a. Rose Hill Traffic Calming (Kristy I.): Kristy presented the Rose Hill St. Corridor Traffic Calming Concept Study Project Kick-Off, Roosevelt to Vista (approximately 1 mile residential arterial). Rose Hill and Owyhee intersection project will be in conjunction in this project, and duration is about 9 months from start to finish with and end timeframe of August/September. This corridor is a walk route for several schools, several nearby parks, and gateway to other attracters in downtown Boise. Kristy noted significant amount of housing on this corridor, allowed parking on roadway, 11 local roadway connections, and a wide street which encourages speeding. Project considerations and next steps were covered (details in presentation). Online survey is live 3/10/2022 - 3/24/2022. Gary Segers asked about travel lane width. Kristy advised they vary around 12-13 feet but would be looking at narrowing the lane widths with this project. Gary suggested narrowing with and wondered if judging speed changes would be a possibility to assess road

diet need. Kristy stated road diets usually consists of removal of travel lane, but considering removing center lane and other options/recommendations are currently welcome. Gary asked if Kristy will come back after public input, and Kristy agreed to come back after draft alternatives are available. Mary Beth and Lisa thanked Kristy for her work on this project as it is a concern, and Kristy noted she has walked this corridor and agrees it is not currently a comfortable corridor.

b. Impact Fees (Austin M.): Last summer commission directed staff to revise impact fee ordinance by July 1, 2022. An impact fee is money paid imposed as a condition of development to ensure development pays its proportionate share of the cost of system improvement needed to serve development. State statute requires Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) based methodology for how to determine what/how fees are charged. Impact fees are based on CIP, then roadway improvements are determined based on growth and where growth is occurring. Fees cannot be used for maintenance or other incidentals. Austin provided a map of current CIP projects and a list of staff recommended changes and updates, including updating project costs for active projects, removed completed projects, updated service area balance, increased eligibility for miscellaneous items such as removal of obstructions, and updating the ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Edition. Austin shared the Unfunded List (in progress) of projects but noted right of way acquisition for said projects are still working on being funded, with a summary of key impact fee rates schedule provided to share financial impacts of projects. State statute does allow certain portions of development if they fall under Idaho Code for Affordable Housing, in which case general fund monies would be used to fund system improvements in lieu of an impact fee. Austin outlined next steps for updates including meeting with advisory groups, presenting to the ACHD Commission on April 6, a public hearing on May 25, with an effective date of July 1. Marcus inquired if roadway improvements were only about adding more lanes or overall improvements. Austin clarified that yes, that is a feature, but other design elements such as bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities are factored in improvements, but ultimate design details are worked out outside of setting aside CIP funding. Marcus asked question about roadway maintenance, and Austin clarified initial assessment is to determine initial cost of roadway improvement and other considerations such as maintenance costs are determined elsewhere in the process. Lisa asked about the accuracy of the map as we move through time. Austin noted the CIP map is a 20-year projection which is updated every 4 years. Greg asked about conditions of approval regarding roadway improvements and noted frustrations from public when projects are approved but without roadway improvement conditions. Austin stated sometimes conditions of improvement are required in certain situations, such as subdivisions. However, some improvements are problematic if construction projects are not continuous (i.e. bicycle lanes for 150 feet but then next roadway improvement not scheduled to occur until future, so bike lane disappears). Right of way acquisition is also a consideration. Commissioner Pickering asked Austin to bring roadway cost breakdown to the Commission to make decisions regarding budgeting. Questions and comments for Austin can be reached at amiller@achdidaho.org.

c. 8th St. Update Post PIM (Tom L. and Zach P.): Tom provided a brief reminder of this project, which was in front of the BAC in a recent past meeting. Tom noted Brooke Green initially led the project but Tom is taking over for ACHD as Brooke is currently at the legislature. Franklin bikeway will tie in well with 8th Street improvements. Tom revisited existing conditions and challenges of the project. He reminded the group of the three alternatives for consideration and provided a concept comparison chart. Zach provided information from public outreach conducted in January into February. In total, 182 people provided comments on concepts. Concept A received the most support for implementation by the public, Concept B was second, and Concept C was least supported. CCDC and ACHD staff convened to discuss options and collectively agreed with the public that Concept A is the best choice. Formal recommendation was requested from the BAC for presentation and request for approval from ACHD Commissioners in April. CCDC is looking to 2023 for construction and ACHD is still working to identify construction timeline. Morgan inquired if same-way traffic was considered for 8th and 9th, respectively, and Tom provided historical background and noted focus at this time was only on 8th. Tom noted maintenance project is slated for 9th as well and other options are a possibility for the future. Morgan noted the logic in having cyclists move in the same direction as traffic, which makes looking at 8th and 9th as a tandem project the logical consideration. Jeff wondered if there was some attribute about Concept C that drew property owners to that concept. Tom noted it was important to property owners to keep as much parking as possible, and Zach concurred. Gary asked questions regarding consistency in design and bicycle travel logistics and Zach addressed Gary's logistics questions. Tom answered Lisa's inquiry about protected bike lanes, and Tom confirmed moving forward with every arterial project moving forward, the bike lane needs to be protected, and that is ACHD's plan. Lisa recommended a motion to move forward with writing a letter of recommendation to ACHD, Gary seconded motion. Marcus recommended moving forward with recommendation for Concept A, Jeff Larsen supported Marcus's recommendation. Other members agreed by voice and signing. All ayes, recommendation passed to proceed with letter of support for Concept A.

d. Bike Facility Inventory and Bike Map Update (Meg M.): Bike map is being updated. The Bike Map Subcommittee needs to reconvene next week around an hour meeting and an hour to review to provide feedback to Edinson. Meg asked current members (Andy, Morgan, Wava, Mary Beth). All current members agreed to meet. Meg proceeded to share bicycle facility data and explained technicalities and features of the map. The plan is to work with Meg, intern, and chip seal team and review CIP, other projects to find fixes to roadways with the "low-hanging" fruit first and work toward more challenging project. Meg will be sharing link via email for BAC review. Gary asked about chip sealing, and Meg stated if the roadway has bicycle lane along with roadway, chip sealing and repainting can be utilized more efficiently on multiuse lanes to make a better bicycle facility. Jeff stated one challenge of bike lanes are obstructions in bike lanes and asked about what will be done about such anomalies. Meg stated there are notes in the map pictures about such anomalies and, if not, then please advise so it can be noted. Greg asked if any

efforts have been made to try and reconcile bike inventory against master bike plan to show major disconnects between the two. Meg stated this has not been done yet but offered BAC to look at this. Greg stated this as a next logical step to see where failings are with existing plan. Gary stated he is working in subcommittee regarding policy and updating roadways to bikeways plan and commended Greg for suggesting integration for a good look at facilities in the county.

IV. Action Items

a. Access to Opportunities RAISE Grant Letter of Support (Ryan H.): Ryan asked for approval to send in letter of support for a grant application. Most recent infrastructure bill included a grant program (Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity). Minimum project size is \$5 million. ACHD is proposing planning grant to do planning and design of several projects. Program targets historically disadvantaged communities or areas where there has been historic lack of investment. In Ada County there aren't a lot of them, which is good, but some have been identified by federal government and ACHD took a look at them. April 14 is the deadline for grant and ACHD is working on proposal already, so BAC letter of support requested tonight. Ryan shared map of projects (Grant application name is Access to Opportunity) Projects identified would be Glenwood, portions of Garden City, Fairview Avenue at Cole Rd., Phillippi/Orchard area and portions of central and west Bench. Some details included improvement to Glenwood hill to widen sidewalk to make it a multiuse pathway. Mountain View from Glenwood to Cole to extend and connect to future Mountain View bikeway into residential section to Goddard Street, 10th Street to 43rd Street & Ustick, crossing to connect to Chinden and 43rd, 40th Street for sidewalks, 38th St bike and pedestrian crossing where fatality has been, Fairview Avenue from Cole and down the hill, Allumbaugh Street, Irving St., Phillipi bikeway to add pedestrian facilities, and Franklin near the mall along railroad. Lisa expressed support for projects and noted several BAC members thumbs up and hand claps. Gary expressed desire for more to be done on Adams Street near the fairgrounds. Morgan expressed support and glad to see 43rd Street corridor area on the list. Lisa proposed motion to provide Ryan with letter of support for proposed projects in support of grant request. Ryan clarified for Gary that a discussion on Adams is in neighborhood plan, just not included in this grant request based on grant criteria. Commissioner Goldthorpe noted Ryan's group and City of Boise worked together to work through identification of projects and Idaho had almost all but excluded themselves from the opportunity for this type of funding. Wava seconded motion. All ayes except Gary Segers opposed, motion passed.

V. Discussion Items

a. Traffic Calming (Lisa B.): Discussion of Draft Policy 5104.2.2 by Commissioner Hansen. He stated most complaints have to do with speeding and the concept of people driving what the conditions will allow. Commissioner Hansen explained two different types of system thinking (automatic versus mindful thinking) and how

ACHD is full of wide roads which encourages automatic thinking, leading to speeding. Thus far, neighbors have been charged with the responsibility of gathering signatures and organizing groups to mitigate speeding, which is where speed bumps have come from (Kootenai, for example). Nez Perce and Bergeson are other great candidates per Commissioner Hansen. Under old policy, arterials are not considered for traffic calming (think Rose Hill). Commissioner Hansen recommended starting process of examining worst-offending streets regardless of roadway type status as candidates for traffic calming. Perhaps future grant funds could be used for traffic calming measures. Commissioner Hansen requested a read through the policy Lisa sent out on 3/1/2022. Commissioner Pickering noted her district has a lot of renters not necessarily able to collect signatures. Agreed that most dangerous roads should be prioritized as highest need. Commissioner Pickering thanked Commissioner Hansen and hopes feedback can help tweak the policy so roadways are prioritized in an equitable way. Marcus stated he liked the idea of bringing up concerns without having to collect a lot of signatures to get noticed and people can address issues upon road design. Lisa sees this opportunity as a tool to improve roadway safety and slow drivers down as traffic crashes and deaths are increasing throughout the country. Greg suggested perhaps a more robust speed management process to aid in best assessment. Gary suggested a couple BAC members convene to scrub through policy and come back to provide input on draft policy. Commissioner Hansen was amenable to request and encouraged input. Lisa thanked Commissioner Hansen for advocating for public safety.

V. Open Public Comment

- * **Cynthia Gibson:** 8th and 9th street neighbors came together to sign a petition for traffic calming to Fort/Union to encourage more bicycle commuters. From Union south, both streets are a couplet into downtown and beyond. Cyclists would go both ways on 8th Street with 8th St. concept plan, but Cynthia concurred with Morgan that 9th St. should also be looked at since there is no safe way to get from 9th Street to 8th Street and requested improvements at Washington and 9th for increased safety for Boise High School students.

- * **Clancy:** Regarding bicycle lane data, inquiring when info will be available to the public. Meg stated she isn't sure when it will be available yet. Meg noted PAG has been working on a map as well and noted in a perfect world a comprehensive interactive map on ACHD website would be available. However, such technology is forthcoming and pending sometime in the future. Clancy inquired about possibility for Orchard/Chinden facility upgrades for pedestrians. Ryan Head stated Chinden is not within ACHD jurisdiction, and Orchard has complexities which makes upgrades more challenging. Though this is an intersection that could be considered for the future, other more viable projects at this time were better candidates for the grant request.

* **Becky Walker:** Thank you for any work to make dangerous roadways safer for bicyclists and pedestrians, especially for children.

Lisa noted there are links to active projects in our packet and encouraged BAC to check projects out and make comments. Lisa noted date for community bicycle ride on April 11, 2022.

VI. Adjourn - 6:57 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 4, 2022 @ 5:00 p.m.