

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 5:45 p.m., Monday, September 20, 2021, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault, Brad Hoaglund and Liz Strader.

Members Absent: Joe Borton.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**MERIDIAN CITY COUNCIL ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE**

☒ Liz Strader	☐ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT COMMISSIONER ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Jim Hansen	☒ Alexis Pickering
☒ Mary May	☒ Kent Goldthorpe
☒ Dave McKinney	

Simison: We will go ahead and call the meeting to order. For the record it is September 20th, 2021, at 5:45 p.m. I want to make sure our guests online can hear us okay. Okay. All right. We will begin today's meeting with roll call attendance. We will ask the Clerk to do roll call attendance. Working better? Okay. I would just ask everyone to speak in their mic, please. To turn it on.

Goldthorpe: Okay. I will call this -- our part of the meeting tonight to order and we do have a full quorum. All five of us are present. Thank you.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Simison: Next item for Meridian is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Motion and second to adopt the agenda as published. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. The agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Multi-Use Pathway for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Simison: First item up will be the multi-use pathways for pedestrians and bicycles. I know that this was a conversation -- or an issue that came up in a workshop, as well in a letter that was sent, as well as information that was provided back to the city through staff, but we would -- we would like to have a continued conversation -- and I don't know if there is any information that ACHD would like to continue to provide at this point in time or if it's just a discussion.

Goldthorpe: We do have some information. We received a little more formal presentation that answered some of our questions -- at least the remaining questions that we had from Gary Inselman. We have asked him to present that tonight. Gary.

Inselman: Got it. It's blank. Okay. You will advance? Okay. Thank you. There we are. All right. And you are going to control? Okay. Go ahead. Thank you. So, I will give you -- try and go through this as quickly as we can. Some background information. When we were designing our Fairview and Locust Grove intersection project and the segment of Fairview out to Eagle, our commission had required us to revise the on-street bike lanes to raised bike lanes and, then, further directed as to modify designs on our other arterial road projects to remove on-street bike lanes. So, after that we engaged a consultant Kittelson & Associates to work with us and come up with some standard drawings to help guide the design of these pathways. The traditional guidance in the United States through AASHTO, there is conflicts with multi-use pathways and one being that motorists often do not notice how to direction bikes from the norm. You got the difference in speeds from bikes, now we have added scooters and e-bikes to the mix of this -- equals blocking the side street crossing waiting on a main road, attempts to require bicyclists to stop or yield are typically not effective. Advance. Continuing of -- from the list, the bicyclists on side paths are not in the normal scanning area of drivers. Traffic control devices have been shown to be ineffective in changing driver or path user behavior and for these and other reasons AASHTO cites these reasons to look at other types of bike facilities, typically on-street bike lanes. We didn't have that choice. We were given the direction to look at facilities that are off the street, so the raised bike lanes or multi-use pathways. So, we worked to mitigate these potential conflicts through our designs. From AASHTO this exhibit shows some typical driver viewing area issues with multi-use pathways. Driver A is looking for traffic to the left. So, the contra-flow cyclist is not in the field of view. Driver B is looking for traffic ahead, so the contra-flow cyclist is not in the field of view. Driver C is looking for turning traffic on the main road and traffic in the minor road, so a cyclist riding with traffic is not in their field of view. From ODOT this figure shows ten potential conflict points with crossings at an intersection with a multi-use pathway. Go ahead. Did

find a study from the National Center for Biotechnology Information and National Library for Medicine, which is a U.S. government agency. They actually looked at 20 years of crash and injury data for Montreal. As I said before, typical engineering guides in the United States has discouraged bicycle facilities that resemble cycle tracks, including parallel side paths and sidewalk bikeways, suggesting that these facilities and cycle tracks are more dangerous than bicycling in the street. Data from this study suggests the injury risk on bicycling and cycle tracks and side paths is less than biking in the street and the accident probability also decreased at intersections where the cycle track approaches are deflected away from the main roadway between two and five meters. So, this is a figure from the Massachusetts DOT. The highlighted statement states that similar to roundabouts a recessed crossing can reduce conflicts at the intersection crossings with the pathway. This places the crossing in the driver's field of view straight ahead. From the Michigan DOT they actually did safety analysis of six years of bicycle and related crashes in two counties and, then, a survey of the residents to develop a Side Path Intersection and Crossing Treatment Guide. With the offset geometry motorists turning from the parallel roadway more directly faces a bicyclist in the crossing, rather than the conventional designs that position a bicyclist closer to the travel lanes in the motorists' blind spot. This is a Complete Streets Design Manual from Hampshire County, Massachusetts. Again showing the recessed crossing and, then, you can see in the figure in the middle that the crossing is put a little further back on the higher speed roadways. So, Kittelson & Associates developed these design standards for us. They include recommended buffer widths for the desired level of traffic stress. That's how far away the pathway will be set from the travel lanes. The travel way. At a signalized intersection the crossing is controlled by the signal, so the pathway doesn't move, but it looks like a typical intersection, just you got the ten foot pathway and the ten foot pedestrian and ramps. Crossing at the roundabouts are the same as they are treated today. At all of our roundabout designs we have brought the bikes up onto the sidewalk and it's widened to a multi-use pathway width to get them out of the circular roundabout and, then, they cross the roadways as this drawing depicts. So, at the side street intersections the distance will be site specific, depending on the characteristics of the main road and the side the street and the pathway. The initial guidance is based on the speedway of the arterial at 40 to 45 miles an hour. We are looking to recess it back as shown in this diagram. Our pedestrian advisory group actually commented that they liked the recessed crossing as shown in this detail and thought that they should be built at this distance at all locations. For speeds at 35 miles per hour or less that setback decreases, but, again, it will be site specific depending on the characteristics of the main roadway, side street, and the pathway. So, to summarize, advantages of the setback crossing, it removes the right turning vehicle conflicts at the crossings. Removes conflict from left turning vehicles at the crossings. Bicyclists and other users slow down approaching a side street. It causes vehicles on the side street to yield at the pedestrian bike crossing separate from looking for gaps in vehicle traffic on the main roadway and it provides a safer street crossing for all users. So, in conclusion, we are looking to design facilities for all users as directed by our commission. We will design facilities that fit the environment and characteristics of the area. We did review these details with our pedestrian advisory group and bicycle advisory committee just last week and following that we are going to finalize these drawings and use them to advance our current designs. So, with that I can stand for any

questions you may have.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Gary, thank you for that presentation. I just -- I need just one clarifying question that I have. Can the folks remote -- can they hear me? Good. So, my question that I have, Gary, is I -- I -- I don't -- I don't mind having a recessed multi-use pathway that -- depending on what the speed limit is it draws further back into the intersection. I think that's great. I don't have a problem with that at all. My concern and I believe other people's concerns is when there is a car -- you know, when this pathway goes behind cars that are also at that intersection. Do you have any information in regard to that? Did your data -- or did Kittelson or any of the folks that did your data, did they mention anything about that? Yeah. Parked at the -- at the intersection. Stacked. You know, originally when this first was brought to us a while ago the design had -- for example, if it was a side street -- I guess that's what was mentioned in the presentation. You had a car that was not parked, but stopped at a stoplight or a -- or a signalized intersection and the multi -- and the multi-use pathway came down to the intersection and came behind the first stopped car and, then, went back on the other side of the -- of the intersection. Our transportation commission and our Council had concerns about visibility, like you guys have concerns about -- or the -- what the data suggests that they are -- that -- the visibility issues and what that looks like and so I was wondering in these new designs that you just showed is -- are these multi-use pathways going behind that first stacked stopped car or -- or is the stacking or is the cars moved back? And even though the pathways are recessed, is -- are -- are the cars parked -- or not parked -- are they stopped where -- where the pathway is in front of the cars, not behind at least one car? Does that make sense?

Inselman: Yeah. I think so. The -- with the path of crossing recessed on the side street there would be room for a vehicle in front of the crossing to, then, advance into the main roadway in most cases. On the slower speed roads, the pathing -- the path crossing would be a little closer. A large vehicle would probably hang over into that crossing some, but a standard size car would probably fit. But the idea is to have that crossing back so that the vehicles entering the roadway -- the people in that crossing are in their direct line of sight and view. Pathway users slow down. The ones approaching from inside a subdivision say heading towards the arterial, if there is people crossing they are to stop before the crossing, wait for it to be clear, advance forward if it's clear, to, then, stop at the stop sign and, then, turn into -- into the roadway.

Bernt: Did your -- did your data -- or did the study suggest -- so, I guess what you are saying is that when -- in the studies and the data that you presented, the folks that did it didn't see any problem or didn't see any visibility issues for cars -- if there is a -- if there is a stopped car at that -- at an intersection and there is a car that's, you know, turning -- that may be turning into that intersection, that may not be able to see, you know, pedestrians on -- on bikes or walking -- going behind that first stopped car, do they -- do

they -- did the data or the study suggest any concerns of visibility issues there?

Inselman: Did not.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Gary -- oh, sorry. I'm not super bright when it comes to this, so appreciate maybe the -- asking a dumb question. Walk me through the difference between traditional bike lane, a multi-use pathway, and the side paths that you kind of referenced in your discussion. What are -- what are the major differences between the three and why is one a better option than another based on either speed or location?

Inselman: Councilman, the -- the traditional bike lane is just the five or six feet along the side of the road at the same level as the roadway, separated with an eight inch white stripe. In recent years we added a two foot painted buffer in some areas. You will see that in some areas. Get a little more separation from the bicycle lane user and the -- and the automobiles, but they are on the same -- they are on the street level, so traveling with traffic ideally -- that's where they are supposed to be, so they are visible to the people traveling in their direction. There are issues with the right hooks, the bicyclists we will call it, where someone is turning right right in front of a bicyclist or you will have issues with the left turning vehicles quite often. So, that's why one of the reasons our commission asked us to look at off-street options. As I use the terms in this, because that one study used several different terms. Side path. Multi-use path. It's the same thing. It's a facility off the road behind the curb at a different elevation. They are typically a minimum of ten feet wide. If it's for both directions, peds and bikes or other users, ideally 12 feet or wider would be more ideal and so those, then, are set back away from the roadway some distance. In our standards we give different buffer widths for the different level of traffic stress we are trying to achieve for -- in our case all users is what we are trying to do, about eight to 80 as the -- that group.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Gary, is the district, then, kind of evolving to the side path, the multi-use pathway kind of format? Does it have its -- I guess is there criteria where the highway district is looking to do that and other criteria where you are trying to keep a traditional bike lane? And what's -- what's the matrix on that?

Goldthorpe: If I might. We have decided pretty much that that is going to be our -- our standard, unless there is a reason not to, and we expect Gary and the staff to tell us when there is a reason not to. One of the biggest reasons that we have decided to go with this is because we have been told that that's the configuration that parents will allow their kids to ride to school on, to the store on, to the library on, thus reducing congestion and if I

might just add, one of the things we hear a lot of is, well, no one's using these bike lanes and it's like, well, you wouldn't use these on-street bike lanes on arterials, on Fairview and whatnot. It's a waste of space, because it's -- it's -- and -- and Gary used the term level of stress. Well, we have now developed a matrix -- a measurement system that will determine, okay, we want to reach a level of stress. So, it's not necessarily a specific type of design, as much as a measurement whether it will be used, because it's just a waste of taxpayer money to build a bike lane that's -- that's just not safe and it's not going to be used. In fact, what it does it -- it just makes the profile of the road that much wider and invites people to speed. So, we are moving towards this, not just because we think it's a great idea, but because we are also moving towards measuring what will work and what won't and, in fact, we are very proud of the fact that our staff member Ryan Head, who helped develop this all this year, has been nominated for an American Planning Association Award for his incredible work in helping us incorporate those measurements in -- in facilities. You know, we are responsible for the right of way for movement of all kinds of people in the right of way and we want them to be safe whatever the mode is that they are using. Is that Alexis?

Simison: We have got something here from Alexis. The request is to punch it back to Gary to ask him the specific matrix that are being used to make these determinations. Did I get enough of that right for --

Inselman: Well, at this time I don't believe we are designing any new projects with on-street bike lanes. I know we have had a request from Eagle to make sure that they are on-street on Floating Feather, but they are after a different type of user on that corridor. But the rest of our projects we are designing multi-use pathways or the raised bike lanes as you may have seen in the concepts for the Fairview project from Locust Grove to Eagle and through that intersection.

Cavener: Kind of a follow up question and I appreciate the fact that we are getting away from bike lanes on-street, because to your exact point, our type of community it makes sense and maybe I'm not correct in this, but I think consistency is important in travel lanes. So, I live over by the project on Eagle where you put in these in some parts of that project. In other places in the project you didn't. So, I guess, again, kind of going back to -- I assume that that was the decision of the right of way or something else, but why would you make these improvements to a majority, but not all in that same road section? Consistency is the thing that I think is important personally if we are going to go down and one -- one way or not, but --

Inselman: Mr. Mayor, thank you. On -- on that particular project we were making changes to that design very late in the process after we had acquired right of way trying to accommodate the practice in the field as best we knew it at that time while we were still developing these standards and for that very reason is why we developed these design standards for that consistency moving forward. But this project -- this project was already designed with multi-use pathways and, then, we are trying to look at the intersection treatment a little later in the game. So, because of some right of way constraints some are a little different than what we would do today. We are going to re-design and build

one of the crossings at Rome. We are looking at a different -- different treatment there. We had some utility constraints and other issues that we are working through to improve that backcrossing in particular.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Gary, for the presentation. It helps understand what you guys looked at to get to the point that you are. It's helpful to have that understanding as well. Two questions. One is this does not apply to collectors, I assume. Those may still be on-street bike lanes that -- because of the lower speeds and whatnot I would assume. But also that slide up there, show that grade and, then, raised and I was trying to think raised -- okay. Give me a definition of raise, what that looks like. I just couldn't picture that.

Inselman: Councilman, yes, the raised crossing is an alternative where that would be more appropriate depending on the characteristics of the users in the area. Typically it would raise it to the same level as the pathway approaching the side street, so that -- it's like -- it's not the right terminology -- like a speed table or something where it's raised up so the car has to physically go up and over. Obviously, that requires coordination with your fire department and other emergency service providers to make sure that they are on board with that. But that's an option that is in the standards for the appropriate locations.

Hansen: May I --

Simison: Oh, go ahead.

Hansen: I was just going to say on the raised crosswalks, just take a look at 11th Street when they get built and you might want to consider something in downtown Meridian. It's -- it's a lower speed one, but the design the CCDC is using is going to have a raised bike lane and then -- and, then, the sidewalk. So, you will see it's actually something that will be separated and raised.

McKinney: You know -- and if I may add, the -- several of the -- kind of motivating factors that have led ACHD to, you know, move in the direction of these multi-use pathways is in part the -- the on-street bike paths that we build and we see that they in many places don't get a lot of use and so we think on the one hand, you know, of course, there is the -- there is the cost of that in the first place. A lot of people don't use them simply because they don't feel safe, even though, you know -- and, you know, people's perceptions are a huge part of it. So, the -- the hope and the intent is that with the multi-use pathways that they will get used more, so that in that respect we will feel like the -- you know, the expenditure is more worthwhile than building something that doesn't get used. At the same time, you know, in thinking this through, I have concluded there is no perfect solution. There really isn't. I think this is a better solution than what we have had before. We are never going

to have a perfect solution, unless we have complete separation between bicycles and vehicles in all cases and, of course, the cost of that would be astronomical and that's -- that's not a practical possibility. So, there are pros and cons of both approaches and we feel like the multi-use pathways is the better of the two options and that's why we have gone in that direction.

Simison: Council Woman Strader? So, the question is regardless of speed, is an increased setback always the preferred save this decision? Council Woman Strader, thumb up if I got enough of that correctly.

Inselman: I guess the short answer would be yes, but the distance of that setback would be dependent on speed and the other variables associated with the project in the area for these types of facilities.

Simison: Council Woman Strader. I think he answered yes, but, again, repeating -- regardless of his speed is it better to have an increased setback for pedestrians. Arterials is what I'm hearing from inside here.

Inselman: Yes.

Simison: Any additional questions or --

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Going back to Councilman Bernt's question regarding placement of the first vehicle at a recessed intersection, just kind of thinking through how traffic would flow in that situation and -- and not only is there a concern about pedestrians that might be behind the vehicle -- so, vehicles that are coming off the arterial making a right may not see the pedestrians coming behind a vehicle that's heading in the opposite direction. But are there -- is there any -- was there any data done on whether there is actually more motorists accidents in that situation? Because if you have a vehicle turning right, for example, and they have got to stop -- and they have to stop in order for a pedestrian to cross and somebody who is behind them doesn't see they are stopping, they don't see the pedestrian, it just seems to me like that would cause more motorist accidents, even if it's making it safer for pedestrians and bikes -- bicyclists because of those vehicles potentially stopping in between the -- the crosswalk and the arterial.

Inselman: Council Woman --

Perreault: So, that was -- that's a question for Gary.

Inselman: No, we don't have any data on if there is increased vehicular accidents in those situations, but that's one of the reasons on the higher speed facilities you set the crossing a little bit further back, so the car can get completely onto that side street and yield or stop

for the users of the multi-use pathway crossing and be out of the travel way on the arterial.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It would seem to me that there would be a lot of rear ending when that would happen, because the second vehicle that's following the first vehicle off of the arterial onto the side street, if that first vehicle isn't paying attention if there is a pedestrian in that walkway because it's so recessed, they are going to slam on their brakes and the vehicle behind them at a signalized intersection is going to hit them. I just -- it seems to me -- am I -- I would like to hear my other Council Members thoughts, if I'm explaining it correctly, but it seems to me there would be a lot of fender benders with that design, because the crosswalk is recessed enough that perhaps the second vehicle isn't seeing it that's behind the first turning in or stopping, because there -- you know, the -- I don't know what the -- I don't know what the distance is from the corner to the recessed crosswalk, but I assume it's going to be -- if it's enough for one vehicle, then, I assume that's far enough back that vehicles following that first off of the arterial won't notice the pedestrians either.

Inselman: Councilman, like I said, there isn't any data on an increase in vehicular accidents or that type of -- in that type of situation. You would have the same thing at the crossing where we are up closer. If someone stops in the arterial waiting for someone in the crosswalk, you hope they stop, then, the car behind them, which is traveling at a much greater rate of speed because they are on the arterial at speed has to stop. So, you can have that same situation or worse in -- with the vehicles trying to stop in the arterial waiting for users of the -- in the crosswalk to get out of their way. This at least provides an opportunity for that first vehicle to turn. Part of the design is a little tighter radiuses so that they are turning slower. Without the bicycle lanes on the street, the curbs are closer in, so just with that you have to take that turn much slower, because you don't have that extra space from the bicycle lane to track across at a different angle. So, with all of those factors in mind, the car that's turning into the side street is traveling at a lower rate of speed. Now, the users of the pathway are in their direct line of vision. They can stop if they need to or continue on if the crossing is clear.

Goldthorpe: Mr. Mayor, I'm remembering back to some work sessions that we had -- had when we were discussing some treatments on Fairview for the whole length of the road and we asked for a whole lot of accident data and discovered that the vast majority of collisions on Fairview were more damaging to the guy who hit the rear end are to their ego than their car. They were pretty cheap, pretty inexpensive, and there were -- there were a ton of them, but it was mostly when somebody was slowed down to go into an access point, like a used car lot or Axiom or wherever and, then, somebody else who wasn't paying any attention ran up their -- their exhaust pipe and that's going to continue no matter what. Fortunately at a much slower rate of speed.

Simison: Council, any additional questions, comments? Yeah. I think, hopefully, the commission hears. I think there is still some concern from the City of Meridian about this

approach. I don't think that as a body were bought in that this is the best appropriate treatment for our community. Understanding what Commissioner McKinney said that there is a lot of choices in a lot of this, you know, and choices have pros and cons and just like you could have multi-use pathways with crossing the same place crosswalks do and there is choices from that standpoint. Whether or not in the future whether it occurs -- yeah, to say -- well, we just hope the commission keeps an open eye and ear to the city's preferences when it comes to these type of issues and part of me wants to say if it's good enough in one area, go back and fix the area where you didn't have enough right of way. The other part says I don't really think it's needed, so don't. But consistency is an important part of the transportation network and that's what I would encourage you personally to make sure that what we are doing is being consistent in what we do and where we do it and not making shortcuts or decisions on the fly then -- because I know that was a challenge that was given back to us, that it was too late to make decisions and determinations on other things, especially on Eagle Road at those points in time. So, look forward to working with you on these and keeping an eye on what -- how these go.

Goldthorpe: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, may I ask one more question?

Simison: Sorry. Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: What's the timeline for the district to approve the design and can you share a little more about the process to get there?

Inselman: Council Woman, we will work with our consultant to finalize these design standards in the coming weeks. We are utilizing them currently and when they are finalized they will be just part of our design process with our projects. We weren't planning a public hearing or anything. It's a design detail.

Goldthorpe: And it could be a three to five year process on the projects and arterials. So, there will be plenty of time.

2. 2002 Legislative Coordination Efforts.

Simison: Okay. Item 2, 2022 legislative coordination efforts. This was a follow up from conversation this last -- I think May -- following up on last year's legislative session and the district indicated that they would come forward and share with us what your thoughts and priorities and plans for the upcoming legislative session was and so we were hoping we could get some idea if there was something that the district is pursuing and moving forward with. So, hopefully, if we can be partners --

Goldthorpe: Probably the -- the single largest issue that we would like to take to the legislature this year by way of changes in statute has to do with impact fees. We want a greater -- I mean a development -- any kind of a development application is going to impact a whole lot more than just the traffic in front of that development and we want the

ability to utilize impact fees for other costs that are indirectly related to that development and specifically there is some ones that are glaring and that's the treatments for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other means of transportation maybe downstream from where the development is and I would like to make it real succinct and quick and that's curb, gutter, sidewalks, bicycle facilities and right now, unless it's directly attributable to the development, we can't spend impact fees on that kind of expense and we would like to be able to. This year we wound up at the end of the season with about eight million dollars of impact fees we couldn't even spend and that's a crying shame, because there are a lot more than eight million dollars of sidewalk gaps and things like that out there in the county. You have seen a ton of them that we have filled along Five Mile, Cloverdale, and some of those other areas where you are approving development right now and there will be a bunch more in the next couple of years because of the budget motion that we had this year and we could do a whole lot more a whole lot quicker if we have that kind of legislative statutory change. It's only a matter of a few words being changed in the current statute.

Hansen: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, just to add on. There is so many examples and I'm sure you hear of it a lot where, you know, an area functions pretty well and, then, a new development comes in a little further on down the road and so the need for a crosswalk, the need to put in sidewalks now, the need for something to make it a little safer -- you know, we have been getting a lot of requests to upgrade the crossings at Pleasant Valley Elementary School and -- in Boise on Amity and it's largely because there is now new traffic going in front of those schools -- more traffic, but the developers that are, obviously, helping to create that -- that added traffic, their impact fees can't be spent to improve those crossings. They can only be spent under current law to add more lanes to a particular road or to widen an intersection. So, it is crazy. Exactly. So -- so, what we would like to do is to give us the flexibility -- trust us on the local level. We are not going to abuse this authority. Let us use the impact fees to address the impact of growth and if you don't know what the impacts of growth are, I'm sure when you go knocking on doors in any neighborhood they will say this is how this particular new development is impacting this neighborhood. We would like to be able to use that money, instead of saying, well, get in the back of the line, the only thing we can -- only money we can use to -- to address those is property taxes and the list is extraordinarily long. So, anything you can do to deliver the legislators from your -- from Meridian would be fantastic, if you can -- can help us convince them to add that -- that language into the statute. I think when the statute was first written 30 years ago they didn't sort of think through that aspect of it, but today we are dealing with it and, you know, sooner or later we are going to build out all the arterials and we won't have anything else to spend it on, but we will still have new growth. So, we would like to -- anything you can do to help us would be great.

Goldthorpe: Council or staff, was there anything else that we ought to bring up on this particular topic? At least that you want to talk about today? Oh, the co-option. Yeah. Well, okay. Yeah. If that gets addressed or introduced, yeah, we could use all the support we can get.

Hansen: Yeah. In fact, there is money being lined up. Congressman Simpson has --

hopefully this earmark will get through. We have got other federal monies. We have got the VRT and the City of Boise. So, the priority, high capacity corridors -- State Street. That's sort of the model that we will be able to look at and -- but, of course, the key is can we -- can we afford to operate it, you know, if we get all the capital expenditures to put into place can we afford to operate it without a local option and I think that until we get that one moving, then, we can address the ones on the rail corridor and other -- other areas. We -- I think we -- we are 20 years behind the curve. We really need to -- and all this FTA money that is being put into the federal budget shouldn't just be going to other states. Some of it should be coming here.

Goldthorpe: There is another thing, Mr. Mayor, and that is in a few years the Safe Routes To School money is going to -- that particular bill that enabled us to have the vehicle registration fee increase, which is a local option, will sunset and it will all be gone and we won't have money for congestion management or Safe Routes To School any longer and the reason that -- when we -- we tried to float a bill -- well, this was a voter initiative -- to allow us to extend that without the sunset and it became obvious very quickly -- one we thought for sure we were -- that was going to prevail with the voters and, then, it became -- something that became obvious that we hadn't considered and that was the fact that heavy truckers don't -- heavy trucks don't pay any fees and so that offended -- and rightly so -- the voters. It -- we were defeated by a small margin, but it was still a defeat for something we thought -- particularly me thought was going to probably win by a landslide. If we cannot convince the legislature to include fairness -- and it's a two step process. They need to change the statute that will allow voters to decide who pays that fee. They won't even do that and that's a really sad thing. So, it's like some of our friends that we all know like to say that there is no such thing as local government in Idaho. It ends at the state level and I say that a lot and a lot of my friends in the legislature cringe when I do and if this is reported they will cringe again, but it's true.

May: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Commissioner May.

May: Another topic that we have had discussion about is a dedicated funding source for public transportation. So, that's -- that's one of the priorities that's under consideration and, then, the other day when we had our meeting at COMPASS a lot of things came up. I know you had a lot of ideas. And so I think 389 -- I know you have had the suggestion to just -- just repeal it and, then, we had the discussion about citing specific things that we would like to see in that bill, some -- some mitigation and -- rather than just ask them to come on out and repeal it, come back with some type of solutions. What -- what's not working, why, you know, what would you suggest going forward and, like I say, be part of the solution. Talked about the registration fee. A fuel tax. You know, several things. So, I know we are just starting our discussion. So, it would be helpful to hear from you and your Council what things that are on your radar that you would like to see going forward.

Simison: Commissioner Pickering, you are also trying to speak? And if you are speaking I'm not hearing anything. It looks like we are frozen. Yes. So, she's echoing what

Commissioner May just said in terms of collaboration on issues from our standpoint. Council?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It's my understanding that a lot of the opposition, especially when it comes to dedicated funding sources for public transportation and traffic issues that are really unique to the Treasure Valley, receive a lot of opposition from legislators from rural areas. So, can you talk to us about how you approach that and what you expect?

Goldthorpe: Oh, we talked a little bit about making assignments to each one of us as commissioners to take a list of legislators and start to discuss this with them. I have taken the liberty myself to start this and when I sit down, for instance, with one of the -- the Senator from Mountain Home, the way I started the conversation was why do you hate Ada county and they don't want to address it. What do you mean why do I hate Ada county and, you know, with a smile on my face, we can, you know, direct the conversation to where I want it to go and -- we don't hate Ada county. I would never vote against that. Well, certain people in the legislature won't even let you see this. And, then, I name some names and ask them to contact them and it's not in the Senate, it's in the House, but this is something that we are going to go this route with some one on one this year and I have -- I have started it with e-mails and phone calls already.

Hansen: And I would -- I would just add that we need a unified Treasure Valley. That's about, what, a quarter of the legislature right there, but we have opposition in the Treasure Valley. People from -- legislators from Ada county. And so we need to work together to get them all on board, because it makes it extraordinarily difficult to make these kind of investments and so anything you can do to help. So, I think if the rest of the state recognizes Treasure Valley is united in this, I think -- I think we would get a lot -- a lot further.

Simison: Well, I can't speak for the Council, but I think when it comes to funding for transportation that's something I can always get behind and support. Number one issue in Meridian for our residents and so we need to continue to find ways to provide for expansion of roads in this part of the county. So, personally, that's where I can say that I can be supportive and work together, but I think it is -- the most important part is that we know what you guys are -- what your priorities are and where that is. I don't know -- how much it is working with the county highway -- or the -- forgive me -- the -- the road -- the road group, like we have AIC, you have the highway district -- association. That's where a lot of the issues are -- for us are formed and developed for that part.

Goldthorpe: We are joining that group again and I will be -- Alexis and I will be attending their convention in November, unless something drastic happens with the lockdown or something and that will be one of the focus points that we address the whole time we are there. Right, Alexis?

Simison: Yes. That was Alexis.

May: Mr. Mayor, I would -- if any of the -- sorry.

Simison: I will let you and Commissioner Goldthorpe talk about that. Okay. Yeah.

May: Well, I just -- I just wanted to reiterate that I would really be interested in hearing what's the priorities of your Council -- maybe that discussion still needs to happen, but as soon as you come up -- we are still flushing out our ideas and priorities. So, I think that conversation can be had another day as well, so -- just communicate.

Simison: I think the priority is probably around property tax and the impacts of 389 right now from the city's perspective. That's probably one of the biggest things. And, again, what does that look like working through that process. But it's the open lines of communication, so we are not talking about this at the Capitol in February. We want to be lockstep, hopefully, before then. So, let's keep the communication open.

Hansen: Great. And one of the -- oh, go ahead.

May: That seems to be the general consensus out there and so look forward to having those conversations going forward.

Hansen: And one of the biggest ways to take the pressure off the property taxes is reforming the impact fee statute, just to circle back, because all that stuff falls back on the property tax and the more we can address with the -- with development let growth pay for -- pay for these things the better.

Simison: Council Woman Strader. Council Woman Strader wants to say she appreciates the efforts on Linder Road overpass, pedestrian safety, and impact fees. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

3. Idaho Transportation Department Highway 16 Update

Simison: All right. So, next up Item 3, the Idaho Transportation Highway 16 update.

Goldthorpe: Tom is going to speak to us. He is nervous. He always takes lots of bullets on this one.

Laws: Thank you for that. All right. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Mr. President, Members of the Commission. For the record my name is Tom Laws. I'm the planning supervisor with ACHD and just like President Goldthorpe said, I will just be providing a little information about ITD's effort with Highway 16. I will divide this into three different sections. First talk a little bit about the project phasing that ITD is looking at with Highway 16. I will talk about their proposed timing and, then, how does this -- how does this impact the integrated five year work plan process with ACHD. So, first overview -- so, to give you an overview, when ITD talks about Highway 16, it's broken up into three

phases. The first phase was actually complete back in 2014 and that included the section between State Street or Highway 44 and Chinden, Highway 20-26. Following that there has been -- there is two additional phases. The next one being the continuation of the following five miles out to the interstate and with this -- with this phase it includes three signalized intersections, expanding the one at Chinden, Highway 20-26. Adding one at Ustick Road and, then, another one at Franklin Road. In addition to this there is a third phase that would, then, go back to those three intersections and actually a fourth with Highway 44 and State Street and make those full interchanges. Removing the signalized intersections. Here is just a little more in depth example of what phase two was proposing south to north at Interstate 84. There would be the official interchange with the on and off ramps. Franklin Road would be a signalized intersection. Cherry Lane would have an overpass. Ustick Road would be a signalized intersection with a slight reroute of McDermott Road. McMillan we would have another overpass, followed by completing out that signalized intersection at Chinden and no change to State Street. And, then, below here is just a cross-section of what that would look like with four 12 foot travel lanes, two in both directions. So, why are we talking about this today? It really comes down to funding and timing and earlier this -- this year in the spring the ITD board elected to allocate 170 million dollars for phase two construction and that construction is happening quick to start in spring of next year, with really the goal that that whole phase two would be complete within two to three years. In addition, this -- this process has been ongoing since the completion of phase one in 2014, where roughly 90 million dollars has already been spent on the acquisition of right of way along the corridor. In addition, the ITD board directed staff to -- to start working on phase three as well and through 14 million dollars in GARVEE savings the design process of phase three has already begun. Next I will talk a little bit about how this impacts ACHD and the City of Meridian. So, here is a map of -- of our capital improvement projects around this corridor and the red -- the red line you see here is Highway 16. The gray dashed line is the county border with Canyon county. Canyon county slightly in the orange. Ada county is in that lighter section. We have the school there right in the center. The new high school. And everything you see with the black dots, the maroon and the blue, are different projects that have been identified in our capital improvements plan. Specifically we have -- we currently have three projects highlighted in orange that are currently underway within our integrated five year work plan and -- and with the announcement of the accelerated funds for this project and the construction, we really took some time to look at what are those next projects that we need to move up as quickly as possible and get incorporated into this -- this edition of the integrated five year work plan and, really, what we are focusing with this effort is those intersections and corridors that are highlighted in blue and so it's really primarily Franklin, Ustick and, then, two intersections at Chinden where those intersections are going to be proposed with -- with McMillan and Cherry, as I mentioned, those will be overchanging. So, there -- there should be less impact on the local network at those two locations. And so just to summarize, with ITD's accelerated pace, there is going to be a big impact with ACHD, the City of Meridian, and really the whole Ada county in determining what projects move forward and what times and we are continuing to monitor this process and planning coordinately with our integrated five year work plan. And with that I will stand for any questions.

Goldthorpe: I will add a little bit. As you have probably already heard, the discussions publicly or privately and what Tom added to, the additional cost that it's going to take to make all this happen. My hope is that the state of Idaho, in particular the legislature, realizes very quickly the burden -- cost burden that all this has, regardless of how soon or far out it is, that it has on the Ada County Highway District and the taxpayers in Kuna and East Boise and Garden City and places that will never in a million years benefit from Highway 16 and I don't mean that so much literally, but it's going to basically take, you know, motorists from Canyon county and Gem county that want to get over to the -- to 84 and a few other places and so my preference would be to get these guys to realize what they have done and find some more money out of this giant surplus that the state has right now and put it towards mitigating some of these interchanges and stretches of road that we will, otherwise, be forced to tell the city of Boise and Kuna and others, by the way, all this stuff you wanted to get your kids to school and to get to work on time and all that stuff, you don't see in five years and that's kind of me putting it bluntly, but that's kind of the only way I know how to communicate, so away we go.

Simison: So, Tom, a question. If you know. As they start building -- and let's say it takes three years from when they start. Do they plan to open sections as they complete them or does ACHD have three years to work to get the sections they want done or do you have to do some stuff as early as a year and a half from now, based upon what they are doing?

Laws: Mr. Mayor, there have been quite a few different scenarios with those phasings where they can open things at different timing. I think right now the full intent is to get it all complete as soon as possible. At the staff level we have also heard that if the design of phase three happens fast enough, then, ITD might look into just go ahead and building those intersections all at once, rather than doing the signalization and, then, coming back in a few years to complete phase three. To President Goldthorpe's point, you know, our -- our projects -- these -- these major arterial projects tend to take at least four years. A perfect example would be with -- with Ustick where we are, you know, actively working west towards the Canyon county line. We have Ustick, Ten Mile and Linder right now, which is under a concept study and so you have a full year for concept, followed by that full year design, full year of right-of-way acquisition and, then, construction. So, a lot of these projects -- those blue ones I highlighted are -- are, frankly, going to be at least probably three to five years out, just because of the time it takes to design them correctly to acquire that right of way and, then, construct.

Goldthorpe: And we hope to get a little help financially between now and then to make more of it happen sooner.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor. So, can you talk to us a little bit about Franklin and 16 intersection. So, essentially, they are going to turn that into on ramps and off ramps, an interchange, but not connect it to the interstate, so you are going to have vehicles going east and west to get on and off of the Ten mile and Garrity interchanges and is -- okay. That's -- from

your slideshow it didn't look like that was what the plan was. So, I wanted to understand that. So, there is going to be an interchange at Franklin and 16 and, then, another one at the Interstate and 16?

Laws: That's correct.

Goldthorpe: That's going to be nothing, but a ribbon of roads.

Perreault: Yeah. Just wanted to make sure I was understanding that.

Hansen: So, Mr. Mayor, Mr. President, I think we are going to be talking about this for the next ten years or more. This is a huge extraordinarily big project that will transform Meridian probably more than anything else. First of all, don't believe them when they say this is about congestion relief. This will not relieve congestion. Congestion is created by development and there will be more and more development. What it will do it will channel and we will have much more specific intense areas on, obviously, State Street, Chinden, Ustick, Franklin and the interstate and we will have to grapple with that. ACHD and Meridian don't -- don't have the ability to use a GARVEE type of debt financing to upfront the capital expenditures that would be needed for the -- for those arterials and the associated road systems, infrastructure on either side, so we do need to work very closely together to figure out, you know, what tools we do have and to go to the legislature and ask for more. We -- we do have an extraordinary impact fee system, which might be a way of addressing some of that, but -- and as Kent says, we do need to go to the legislature and make it clear, you know, they won't just go back and forth on 16 or the state system. You are not -- we don't tell them you have to pay a fee to exit a state highway in order to come onto a local road. They get to just come onto it and so going to the state and helping to figure out in the financing of those, whether some of that state money or -- anyway, it's a huge -- it's a huge, huge thing that we are going to be talking about for a long time. You young people are going to be talking about it for a long time, because the impacts there are very significant and -- and we are going to need these tools. Whether it's using the extraordinary impact fee statute or whether it's some other mechanism, but this needs to be the start of a very long, very in-depth conversation about the kind of tools that Meridian and ACHD and Canyon county, frankly, needs to have.

May: Mr. Mayor? Towards that end, Tom, I had made the request -- we could see the breakdown of the funding that we got from the legislature. So, if we are having the discussion about perhaps going back and seeing if we can acquire some more funding, I would like to know where that 20.4 million has been allocated and so if we could get that done, so we kind of have a crystal clear picture of exactly where we are, that would be very helpful. So, if we could get that sooner rather than later, I would appreciate it. Thank you. And also if you could share this presentation with the Meridian Council. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader. Council Woman Strader's concern is -- and I'm going to put it in the form of a question -- is how do we work to make the northwest section of

Meridian that's going to be cut off by Highway 16 still part of our community through pedestrian and/or other connection points. Any thoughts? Suggestions? Or, if not, considerations as we look at that area?

Goldthorpe: That's a really good question and with the desire and expertise and I know the -- there can't be too much of a change of the priorities of the citizens of Meridian. I remember when they said pathways was such a high priority just a few years ago and, of course, congestion has probably edged that out a little bit, but, you know, that's -- fortunately we have got a lot of time to fix those connectivity issues before they happen and I would suggest that making absolutely sure that every school that's approved there and every development that's approved there we make sure that we have the funds -- whether it's amending the -- the impact fee statute or otherwise to make it so those kids can ride their bikes to school, instead of have to be, you know, put in mama's car just to go 300 yards. But, you know, those sorts of issues we have got a lot of time to develop and I think it's going to be fun to get it right.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much. So, on that note, Commissioner Hansen was correct, development is going to come as soon as the announcement that that -- the construction is going to come, the development is going to -- it already has. We have already approved several communities out there along 16. So, my request to you is -- I don't know which of the staff members prepares the letters for us on our applications, but if -- if they could give us an update more specifically if -- if it has to do with dollars on your part, we get that information in addition to, is it possible to add some updates about 16 specifically, especially if the application borders 16, as to where we are at in the process in the communication that we receive on our individual applications? That's really where we are -- that's really the information that we are using on -- on those site specific decisions. So, any -- any information you want to provide to us on specific applications along that corridor we would appreciate that.

Goldthorpe: That would be -- I hope -- well, the staff just heard that and I think that should be absolutely automatic, because all we have to do to pull out the -- a reasonably bad example of maybe not getting it done right quickly is the Owyhee High School.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I think we have got one good example, though, Miranda and ACHD staff worked -- and it was in the -- it's our Five Mile pathway where we are starting to set up -- we are widening and going under and making sure that we are in alignment with all the activity -- requirements for ACHD how to do that and allow that continual pathway to continue without interruption and having to cross a major road like that, which is always

a good thing. But I did have a question for you, Chairman, Mr. President, or Tom, you know, the infrastructure bill that's in Congress right now has bipartisan support. Of course all the politics behind that. I have no idea of the outcome. But is there funding sources coming locally from that infrastructure bill that you are aware of?

Goldthorpe: No, not yet.

Hansen: And Mr. Mayor and Mr. President, I just want to point out -- you guys work so hard to try and get the Linder overpass built, you know, which should have been built when the interstate was first built and so now is the time. I think you are -- I think Council Member Strader is totally right, Meridian is going have not only that -- basically you already know what it's like to have Meridian north of I-84 and south of I-84 and so now is the time to say you want something more than just at every mile a connection. If there is some areas you want connections in the mid mile, go for it, push for it, try and get it done now, because it's going to be extraordinarily difficult to try and get it afterwards, so -- and -- and, of course, we tried to make mid mile collectors for roadways and sometimes all we can get is pathways. But, you know, I -- I would say go through that right now and say we anticipate this kind of connection needs to be made. ITD, this is what we need done, whether it's an overpass or -- or underneath, to make sure that the kind of wall I think that Council Member Strader described, will separate one part of the community from the other. It can be mitigated a little bit.

Goldthorpe: You know, one of the other corridors that's really getting a lot of attention -- at least in the press right now is South Linder. From Victory to Colombia there has been literally thousands of homes that are talked about being platted and they are so close to each other, these developments, that there is absolutely no reason in the world that I can see that everything from multi-use pathways to other pathways and other solutions can't be conditioned and done with those developments to make it so it's -- with the new -- with the Linder overpass and stuff that kids can't ride their bikes clear into town from Columbia. I mean that's going to be a lot of years before it's all done, but it's just like -- it is probably about the same stage as Ten Mile right now, maybe slightly behind. But that I think will be fun for whatever councils and commissions exists between now and then to ensure that there aren't, you know, hundreds of yards of gaps with nothing but a fog line on the road, so that it effectively puts up a blockade to everybody who wants to walk, bike, or use other kinds of transportation.

May: Mr. Mayor? So, Tom, isn't the end expectation here with Highway 16 is that it's an expressway and it's going to be -- people are going to get on and they are going to be able to go -- and it's not -- when everything is said and done it's not going to have traffic that's going east-west crossing the expressway, it's going to be a separate entity all the way to the interstate.

Laws: That's correct, yes.

May: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Good job, Tom.

Simison: Any further questions?

Goldthorpe: Thanks, Tom.

Simison: All right. Then with that we have reached the end of our agenda. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Goldthorpe: Before you do I would like to thank us all for being here and having such a good discussion.

Bernt: Yes, I would echo that, Chairman Goldthorpe. I appreciate your efforts, the director's efforts and staff's efforts. It was a productive meeting and I want to thank you guys for coming in to speak with us and also there is still a bunch of food back there, so feel free to have a little dinner before you leave. Seconds for you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn the meeting. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:02 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK