

## Advisory Group Meeting Notes

This appendix summarizes the notes from each of the Technical Advisory Group meetings. Membership of the TAG is as follows:

| <b>NAME</b>        | <b>GROUP</b>        | <b>EMAIL</b>   |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Devin Rigby        | ITD                 | <a href="mailto:Devin.Rigby@itd.idaho.gov">Devin.Rigby@itd.idaho.gov</a>                         |
| Bruce Christensen  | ITD                 | <a href="mailto:Bruce.Christensen@itd.idaho.gov">Bruce.Christensen@itd.idaho.gov</a>             |
| Chuck Carnohan     | ITD                 | <a href="mailto:Chuck.Carnohan@itd.idaho.gov">Chuck.Carnohan@itd.idaho.gov</a>                   |
| Beth Callister     | Citizen             | <a href="mailto:bcallister@ketchumidaho.org">bcallister@ketchumidaho.org</a>                     |
| Janis Gillette     | Citizen             | <a href="mailto:janissunvalley@msn.com">janissunvalley@msn.com</a>                               |
| Jim Finch          | Peak Bus            | <a href="mailto:peakbus@wrrs.org">peakbus@wrrs.org</a>   |
| Aaron Domini       | Smart Growth        | <a href="mailto:adomini@citizensforsmartgrowth.org">adomini@citizensforsmartgrowth.org</a>       |
| Becki Keefer       | Citizen             | <a href="mailto:bskefer@sunvalley.net">bskefer@sunvalley.net</a>                                 |
| Jan Edelstein      | Citizen             | <a href="mailto:jme@sunvalley.net">jme@sunvalley.net</a>   |
| Brian Yeager       | Galena Engineers    | <a href="mailto:byeager@galena-engineering.com">byeager@galena-engineering.com</a>               |
| Rob Thomas         | Citizen             | <a href="mailto:liftmech@cox.net">liftmech@cox.net</a>   |
| Mike Chapman       | Hailey Fire Chief   | <a href="mailto:haileyfiredepartment@cox-internet.com">haileyfiredepartment@cox-internet.com</a> |
| Kristin Anderson   | P&Z Member          | <a href="mailto:kristin@andersonARC.com">kristin@andersonARC.com</a>                             |
| Stefanie Marvel    | P&Z Member          | <a href="mailto:sdmarvel@cox.net">sdmarvel@cox.net</a>   |
| Kathy Grotto       | Hailey Planning Dir | <a href="mailto:kathy.grotto@haileycityhall.org">kathy.grotto@haileycityhall.org</a>             |
| Hailey Police Dept | Police              | <a href="mailto:Hailey.Police@haileycityhall.org">Hailey.Police@haileycityhall.org</a>           |



# City of Hailey

## Transportation Master Plan

### Transportation Advisory Group

### Meeting #1 Results

Thursday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005 – 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.  
Hailey City Hall: City Council Chambers

#### Attendance

- Mayor Susan McBryant
- Tom Hellen, City of Hailey
- Don Keirn, Hailey City Council
- Jim Finch, Peak Bus
- Ray Hyde, City of Hailey
- Dave Stellers, City of Hailey Police Dept.
- Kristin Anderson, P and Z Chair
- Devin Rigby, ITD District 4 Engineer
- Bruce Christiansen, ITD District 4
- Kathy Grotto, City of Hailey Planning Dept.
- Aaron Domini, Citizens for Smart Growth
- Becky Keefer, Hailey Parks and Lands Boards
- Stephanie Marvel, Hailey City P and Z
- Brian Yeager, Galena Engineering
- Beth Callister, City of Ketchum Planner
- Andy Mortensen, The Transpo Group
- Mike Pepper, KMP Planning

#### 1. Planning process overview

- a. Andy presented an overview of the planning process, general outline of the scope of work and schedule.

#### 2. Roles and responsibilities

- a. Mike presented an overview of the roles and responsibilities for the City/Council, TAG, ITD, LHTAC and the General Public - no comments or changes

#### 3. Public Involvement

- a. Mike presented an overview of the public involvement plan highlights - no comments or changes

#### 4. Existing conditions

- a. Andy provided an overview of the existing conditions and highlighted the key issues from the comp plan – see Andy's memo – Nov 2, 2005

#### 5. Plans and policy documents review

- a. Andy noted that local plans, such as the Hailey City Comp Plan were being reviewed. Review of the Comp Plan was completed, with other plans scheduled for review by the next TAG meeting

#### 6. Issues and concerns

- a. Main St. Function: – removal of angle parking and changes in configuration to four lane plus center turn lane – some prefer consideration of returning to 3 lane section – one lane each direction, plus center turn lane

- b. One Way Couplet: Consider a one-way couplet on Main / River St. to improve traffic flow and enhance pedestrian safety and mobility
- c. Street Closure: consider closing streets to improve pedestrian access
- d. Traffic Calming Measures: streetscape measures / boulevards w/trees, improved aesthetics, etc. – would require landscaping in the center turn lane area – while retaining the left turn lane and pockets. – developers may be willing to pay
- e. SH 75 EIS: draft due out soon – review and comment as per the results of the Hailey TMP
- f. Comments based on Comp Plan memo: critical / key issues
  - 1. Outlying area impacts from new development: be aware of new traffic impacts to existing neighborhoods from development in Croy and Quigley Canyon
    - 1. Quigley development could be 200-300 homes at buildout – Quigley canyon is not now in the City – need coordination with larger planning efforts to determine potential infrastructure impacts to the community
    - 2. Consider impacts of additional outside growth on other roadways, such as Broadford Rd., Peregrine Ranch
  - 2. Annexation / impact fees: consider and evaluate impact fees, (i.e. traffic impact fees) from new development to support infrastructure needs caused by new development
    - 1. could also be in the form of developer requirements to support projected facility needs – may not be as dependable or effective as direct impact fees
    - 2. State of Idaho requires a CIP to implement impact fees
    - 3. See “Tishler” (contracted with City) for info on financial analysis for impact fees
  - 3. Long-Term Improvement Identification
    - 1. Traffic Growth Data source: traffic counter on north side of town – approx. 3.5% annual growth in traffic volumes – utilize a range from 2.5% to 3.5% growth over the 20 year planning period
    - 2. Potential Development: Reference high and low potential development: use to identify potential needed improvements to meet long-term needs
    - 3. **Local Use** Alternate route to SH 75 / Main St: such as through Old Hailey, causes impacts to neighborhoods; lack of “looking” and awareness of other cars at intersections – need to identify potential route that is supported to an overall “Traffic Management” plan for the community
      - a. Consider Myrtle St. widening to additional lanes for alternate route
      - b. Remember to think “multi-modal” in the final solutions
      - c. Old Hailey has substantial pedestrian use
      - d. Alternate route must include traffic calming measures
      - e. Consider mini roundabouts at residential street intersections
      - f. Lack of connectivity between Woodside and Buttercup – with slowed down traffic
    - 4. Healthy Street: is multi modal – allows cars, bikes, and peds to safely use – need a network of healthy streets
    - 5. 2 town sections – residential (off SH 75) and through the corridor (on SH75)
    - 6. Sense of Place: need to regain Hailey’s sense of place, with a real Main St.

7. Street Standards: need street standards (cross sections) to support Hailey’s goals for multi-modal system function
    - a. May need to split street designations and create other designations for street design – between local and connector and arterial classification – to be adopted in Master Plan
  8. Parks and Lands and Trails Master Plan: will be referenced and incorporated in development of the Transportation Master Plan
    - a. Continue to support snow removal from pathways to key community facilities such as the Community Campus
    - b. Parks dedication ordinance is enacted: emphasizes park space and
      - i. Park space for every 9 units or funds in lieu of
        1. .0277 per residential unit
    - c. What about additional taxes for parks, etc.? – probably not now due to growing property tax objections
    - d. Suggest enhanced coordination with Blaine Co. Rec. Dist for additional parks and rec facilities – current philosophy is for the BCRD to provide programs
    - e. Consider ITD funding – “safe routes to schools program”
4. Blaine Co. Public Transportation Feasibility Study:
    1. Designed in part to coordinate with the SH 75 EIS
    2. Started the PEAK Bus system
    3. Next step is to integrate with KART to create a regional transportation service
    4. See Phase Descriptions
      - a. Will likely be implemented incrementally
      - b. Phase I
        - i. PEAK now includes Hailey, Bellevue and Carey
        - ii. Current stops are on SH 75
        - iii. Just beginning to implement additional stops, some off SH 75 – but these come at the loss of other stops – don’t have funds to expand the # of stops
        - iv. Integrate other transportation elements such as new sidewalks, connections and routes that will connect with planned bus stop locations – now and future
      - c. Phase II
        - i. A “circulator” service
        - ii. Need to link highway stops to off highway connections
      - d. “Safety in Lieu” fund may increase available funds for transit – the Transportation Master Plan will outline improvements that support transit use for funding

## 7. SH 75 EIS

- a. Includes reference to need for transit to reduce / mitigate future transportation impacts
- b. Community streetscape / livability issues for review, comment and consideration in SH 75 EIS
  1. focus on ped safety issues – responsive to recent pedestrian death
  2. ITD improvements
    1. protected left turns

2. Mark McNeese (ITD Bike / Ped Planner) is an asset for planning of these improvements
3. Possible improvements
  1. Myrtle St. improvements – provide detail to the EIS
    - a. Suggest replacing the single curb ramp with double ramps oriented directly across the street – lines up sidewalks
    - b. Ped ramps should be moved out further or eliminate parking near corners to provide better visibility of peds by motorists
    - c. Side street angle parking encroaches on sidewalks as aligned from corners
    - d. Consider real improvements to SH 75 that creates a different “sense of place”
    - e. Consider streetscape / landscape treatments through town
    - f. May not need continuous left turn lanes, some could be replaced with landscaped medians – to assist in slowing of traffic
    - g. Consider a roundabout or arterial chicane at South end of town, with internal statue – create intimate feel entering and through town
      - i. Cedar / Broadford and SH 75 intersection
      - ii. PB has assessed the possibility of a roundabout
    - h. Consider in-pavement flashers at primary school crossings

**8. Be Dramatic with new Alternatives!**

- a. New ideas – with a plan, funding, implementation strategy
- b. Consider reducing to a 4 or a 3 lane section – see Iowa study – will be part of the study
- c. Bruce Christiansen will provide PB’s traffic model for roundabout / chicane
- d. Be willing to look at options that require additional right of way

**9. Absentee TAG input via E-mail**

...interested in participating as [plans for] Main Street [are developed] and hope that [the Team] will be looking to the work of *Walkable Communities.org* and the *Oregon DOT book “Main Street, When A Highway Runs Through It”* for ways to give drivers on Main Street a greater sense of enclosure which naturally results in slower speeds.

One other point – regarding pedestrian crossing on Main at Bullion - try driving west on Bullion across Main when the sun is setting. It is blinding. I wonder how one deals with that fact of nature?



# City of Hailey

## Transportation Master Plan

### Transportation Advisory Group

### Meeting #2 Agenda

Tuesday, May 2, 2006 – 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.  
Hailey City Hall: City Council Chambers

- 3:00 p.m. I. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- Tom Hellen, Hailey City Engineer
  - Bob Humphrey, ITD / Lance Holmstrom, LHTAC
  - Andy Mortensen, The Transpo Group – Consultant Project Manager
  - Mike Pepper, KMP Planning– Public Involvement
  - Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) members
  - Introductions of other attending City, Planning Team, Guests
- Purpose of the meeting:**
- Review and confirm Traffic Growth Forecasts*
  - Present and discuss draft Highway 75/Main Street Options, Local Street and Pedestrian & Bicycle System Improvement Options*
- II. Project status / schedule**
- Work completed to date / Work underway
  - Primary goal of the process: *To identify the multi-modal capital facility improvements, pavement management plan and supporting policies to meet the City of Hailey's transportation facility needs for the next 20 years*
- 3:20 p.m. III. Traffic Forecasts**
- Growth forecasts and projections
- 3:40 p.m. IV. Possible System Improvements**
- Highway 75 / Main Street Options
  - Local Street System Improvements
  - Pedestrian and Bicycle Corridors
- 4:45 p.m. V. Next Steps / adjourn by 5:00 p.m.**
- TAG Meeting #3 – mid summer (tentative)
  - Complete pavement conditions assessment
  - Develop feasible multi-modal improvement alternatives
  - Develop draft plan policy recommendations
  - Define draft multi-modal transportation system improvement projects, including planning-level cost estimates



# City of Hailey

## Transportation Master Plan

### Transportation Advisory Group

### Meeting #3 Results

Wednesday, January 17, 2007 – 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.  
Hailey City Hall: City Council Chambers

*(Refer to PPT handouts issued at the meeting to provide details of plan materials presented for agenda items below)*

#### **I. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

- Tom Hellen, Hailey City Engineer
- Chuck Carnohan, ITD
- Andy Mortensen, The Transpo Group – Consultant Project Manager
- Brent Turley, The Transpo Group
- Mike Pepper, KMP Planning– Public Involvement
- Attendance: Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) members and other City Staff
  - o Becki Keefer
  - o Kathy Grotto, City of Hailey
  - o Jim Spinelli, City of Hailey
  - o Brian McNary
  - o Carl Helm, City of Hailey
  - o Stefanie Marvel
  - o Bruce Christensen – ITD
  - o Ray Hyde, City of Hailey
  - o Allan Stowell, City of Hailey
  - o Heather Dawson, City of Hailey

#### **Purpose of the meeting:**

- Review and evaluation future traffic conditions & performance measures
- Review and discuss draft improvement alternatives & financial plan

#### **II. Project status / schedule**

- Work completed to date / Work underway / Schedule revisions
  - o Andy provided an overview of the status of the project, schedule, etc.
  - o Proposed next TAG Mtg (#4) to discuss financial plans – tentative – approx. 6 weeks from today – late Feb – date to be announced

#### **III. Traffic Forecasts & Performance Measures** (see table handout)

- Andy provided an overview of the existing traffic volumes and Level of Service for 2006 – most of the downtown intersections are at LOS F during the pm peak hour
- Forecasts for 2026 illustrate all downtown intersections functioning at LOS F
- Comments from TAG - none

#### **IV. Multi-modal System Improvements**

- Andy presented the improvement options, including comparisons, common issues, differences, and the consultant recommendations:
  - o Street System Improvement Options Overview (see map handout)
    - o Hwy 75; 5 lane, 4-5 lane, 3 lanes and One Way couplet with River St.

- New right of way would be needed with the One Way couplet
- Consultant recommendation is for a 5 lane section on Main, with River St. upgrade as shown (local urban collector status) - includes pedestrian enhancements – this alternative assumes new signal at Elm and Myrtle Sts.
- River Street – roundabout on north end, with additional bike lanes and sidewalks – intention of this option is to make River St. the “livable” Main St. for community use
  - Comments from TAG – none at this time – see TAG comments below in Financial Plan section
- Collector Street Upgrades
  - Comments from TAG – none at this time
- Bike and Pedestrian System Improvement Options (see map handouts)
  - See TAG comments below in Financial Plan section
- Street Maintenance Needs (see map handout)
- Revised Street Functional Classification (see map handout)
- Discussion / TAG comments
  - Q: Regarding the 3 lane section – seems like the LOS would be worse than shown
    - A: Traffic “Ques” would be very long between signals

## V. Draft Transportation Financial Plan

- 20-Year Project List (see table handout)
  - *Consultant Task: Need to add to table – “what is the benefit from the improvement” – will add by next meeting. – include “retain/improve the quality of life”*
  - Street Improvements – bike lanes, parking, sidewalks, curb/gutter/sidewalk
    - TAG comments / Q/A
      - Q: Why roundabout at Bullion rather than Croy?
        - *Consultant Task: Consider another roundabout at 5<sup>th</sup> and Croy or 3<sup>rd</sup> and Elm or 3<sup>rd</sup> and Croy – to slow traffic and deter truck cut through traffic from SH 75*
      - Q: What will happen to the additional space saved from using parallel parking on River St.?
        - A: Additional width would be added to sidewalks
      - Desire 10 ft. min sidewalk width
        - Is possible within existing ROW
      - Q: Can “back in” parking be used in other areas where “straight-in” parking is done
        - A: Yes
      - Q: What about enforcement for the new “head-in”?
        - A: Will likely take some time to adjust
        - *Consultant Task: Provide visual / graphic examples at next meeting*
        - Suggest a “test” area at Bullion and Main
      - Back in parking is safer for peds getting out of vehicles
      - Be mindful of use of medians due to conflict with snow removal
        - Medians would be short sections – primarily not at intersections – primarily at selected mid-block locations that do not negatively affect business access
    - “Swale” areas, if used, should not eliminate parking along residences – designed to provide drainage areas
      - City to construct, Maintained by residents
      - How to standardize resident improvements to the swale?
    - Swale would likely also be used for snow storage, which may decrease the elaborate swale landscaping
    - May also require “edge” treatments for vehicle damages to new curb to access driveways or parking area
    - Be mindful of impacts of traffic calming devices on emergency services; fire trucks, etc. – they need to be compatible



- Consider the first roundabout location NOT AT the busiest intersection to give residents a chance to get used to the new configuration before applying to busier intersections
- Pedestrian Connectors
  - TAG comments / Q/A
    - Q: What about existing sidewalks?
      - A: Some existing sidewalks on designated ped routes may be replaced as part of the drainage improvements
- Bicycle System
  - Shared Bike / vehicle lanes may require parking to be changed to “back-in” diagonal parking from “head-in” to improve safety
    - Does the city want to change all diagonal parking to “back-in”? – in commercial areas
    - Current ordinance prohibits bike use on sidewalks, although not enforced
  - TAG comments / Q/A
    - Q: What about residential areas? Many are doing “head-in” parking in the ROW now?
      - A: No parking changes are planned for these streets
- Intersection Improvements
  - TAG comments
    - Need to remove one parking on the “upstream” side to improve visibility
- Maintenance / Pavement conditions findings (see handouts for more complete findings and costs / options)
  - Presented effects of existing city maintenance budget on RSL
  - Presented effects of potential increased to \$250k annual city maintenance budget on RSL
  - Removing the capital needs for major street reconstruction such as Myrtle, Elm, etc. will reduce the annual maintenance cost from \$250k to \$225k for the remaining streets
  - TAG Comments
    - Q: How much longer will concrete edges extend the life of street surfaces?
      - *Consultant Task: Will research and provide comparison at next meeting*
- Draft Implementation Schedule
  - Consider implementing portions of these recommendations as well to retain public support, obtain good initial results from projects and increase support for next project funding request
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave should be a high priority due to school route use
  - Woodside Blvd. should also be a high priority due to it’s poor existing condition
  - Should approach the funding issues as a “city-wide” project, to avoid separation of support; i.e., “that project is not in my area”, etc.
- Cost Estimates & Revenue Sources
  - *Consultant Task: Will work with impact fee consultants to determine which improvements may be fundable from impact fees*
  - *Consultant Task: Will provide models of funding alternatives*
  - Maintenance cost estimates do not include snow removal costs (in presented estimates)

## VI. Next Steps / Adjourn by 5:00 p.m.

- Refine Financial Plan
- Develop draft plan policy recommendations
- Develop draft plan
- TAG Meeting #4 – early spring 2007 – late Feb or early March
- City Council Work Session – early spring 2007 – late Feb or early March