



MEMO TO CITY COUNCIL

Request to Include Topic on the City Council Agenda

From: Brian McClure, Community Development **Meeting Date:** June 18, 2024
Presenter: Brooke Green, ACHD **Estimated Time:**
Topic: Linder Road Concept Study (Pine to Ustick)

Recommended Council Action:

Listen to ACHD staff update on Linder Road Concept Study. Consider a formal written recommendation to the ACHD Commission after.

Background:

The Ada County Highway District (ACHD) has completed public engagement for the Linder Road, Pine to Ustick concept study. ACHD staff will be presenting a project status to Council, and would like for City Council to consider providing a follow-up written recommendation to the ACHD Commission. After receiving a similar update from ACHD, the Meridian Transportation Commission recommended a 5-lane option to City Council (with no preference for concept 2 or 3).

Currently, the Ada County Master Street Map (MSM) plans for this roadway to be 5-lanes. A construction year is not identified in the current Integrated Five Year Work Plan; instead it is identified as "Future". The forecast used for the transportation analysis was Communities in Motion 2050 model. While the traffic analysis indicated that a 3-lane option could reasonably work, there are a number of additional considerations:

- The regional travel demand model (RTDM) is constrained; the City expects to continue growing beyond the allocated population and horizon year.
- Forecasts with the RTDM use planning level work, and more nuanced sub-area and specific turning movement analysis may be wrong, in some cases, by years and decades.
- The Linder I-84 Overpass and SH-16 expansion are wildcards and may drastically influence regional trip distribution beyond expectations. Other attractors and changes to planned land uses by other agencies may heavily influence programming.

The above is not intended as a staff recommendation. What staff would like to reinforce is that 3-lanes may not operate as expected in the foreseeable future, and that tradeoffs accepted and weighted between increased capacity or improved reliability, and the benefits or impacts to community based on each concept, are unlikely to be revisited in the future.

The following paragraphs include additional context from City staff. The engagement summaries are additional data points collected that was not presented in the infographic formats previously shared.

Landscaping and Remnant Spaces:

There are roadway projects throughout the County that have left remnant land. In some cases, access must be provided where it would otherwise not be supported. In others ACHD has retained control where no improvements have been made (bare earth conditions). Property auctioned off by ACHD carries original zoning entitlements and may have no development agreement restrictions. Given the number of property impacts being considered with this project, staff have discussed ensuring that any selected concept contemplates these issues for after widening. Bare-earth on 30-plus remnant parcels would negatively impacts the community. Similarly, properties auctioned later could redevelop in a manner that negatively impact a costly project.

ACHD has shared some of these same concerns, and so the challenge is ensuring that when the project goes into construction design, that the status quo is avoided.

Engagement Summaries:

Materials shared with the public did not break out feedback from participants based on their location; do they live in the study area or outside of it. ACHD shared the following data to help understand participant response perspective. In general, local participants disliked concepts with frontage roads more than those who did not live on the corridor, but prevailing opinion was the same regardless. **The public generally liked the standard 5-lane concept the most, and conversely liked the 3-lane concept the least.** Respondent perception of roundabouts is a potential influence factor in negative feedback of shared use roads; it's unclear what other factors may have led to a preference for a concept that removed more homes than another 5-lane option.

Note: these summaries do not necessarily reflect the opinion of those stakeholders who backout onto Linder, and who would be impacted the most. ACHD staff have been making extra efforts to understand the perspective of those stakeholders with multiple rounds of targeted, 1 on 1 and small group meetings.

What do you think of Concept 1 (three-lane design with shared use roads)?

Response	Live Adjacent	Don't Live Adjacent	Live Adjacent Preference	Not Adjacent Preference
Love it.	21	23	9.7%	10.0%
Like it.	28	44	13.0%	19.2%
Neither like nor dislike.	32	27	14.8%	11.8%
Dislike it.	69	76	31.9%	33.2%
Strongly dislike it.	66	59	30.6%	25.8%

Summary Totals

Like	49	67	22.7%	29.3%
Indifferent or Unsure	32	27	14.8%	11.8%
Dislike	135	135	62.5%	59.0%

What do you think of Concept 2 (five-lane design)?

Response	Live Adjacent	Don't Live Adjacent	Live Adjacent Preference	Not Adjacent Preference
Love it.	70	59	32.3%	25.8%
Like it.	68	73	31.3%	31.9%
Neither like nor dislike.	30	34	13.8%	14.8%
Dislike it.	22	31	10.1%	13.5%
Strongly dislike it.	27	32	12.4%	14.0%

Summary Totals

Okay	138	132	63.6%	57.6%
Indifferent	30	34	13.8%	14.8%
Dislike	49	63	22.6%	27.5%

What do you think of Concept 3 (five-lane design with shared use road)?

Response	Live Adjacent	Don't Live Adjacent	Live Adjacent Preference	Not Adjacent Preference
Love it.	40	43	18.5%	18.8%
Like it.	41	54	19.0%	23.6%
Neither like nor dislike.	39	35	18.1%	15.3%
Dislike it.	52	48	24.1%	21.0%
Strongly dislike it.	44	49	20.4%	21.4%

Summary Totals

Okay	81	97	37.5%	42.4%
Indifferent	39	35	18.1%	15.3%
Dislike	96	97	44.4%	42.4%

Which Concept do you prefer overall?

Response	Live Adjacent	Don't Live Adjacent	Live Adjacent Preference	Not Adjacent Preference
Concept 1 (3-lane, w/shared use)	41	48	19.1%	20.9%
Concept 2 (5-lane, standard)	105	98	48.8%	42.6%
Concept 3 (5-lane, w/shared use)	55	71	25.6%	30.9%
None of the above	14	13	6.5%	5.7%