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Introduction

The City of Hailey is experiencing relatively rapid growth in local land development, plus continued growth in regional traffic along State Highway (SH) 75 through the center of town. The current street network was originally designed more for vehicular travel, as many of Hailey’s older neighborhood streets were originally constructed without sidewalks. Within the past 10-15 years residents have increased their walking and cycling activities. More residents are taking to the streets by foot and by bike for the range of recreation, school, work and shopping travel needs. The combination of these factors has lead to ever increasing pressure on the city’s local street system to serve the full range of auto, truck, bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

A community’s transportation system is part of the framework within which its economy functions. A transportation plan identifies policies and projects that serve as the foundation to support and sustain the future residential and commercial growth within and around the City of Hailey, consistent with the city’s Comprehensive Plan.

Background

In 2005 the City completed its Comprehensive Plan which included a Transportation Chapter. Following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the City identified the need to build on and expand the Transportation Chapter to include a more thorough assessment and consideration for pedestrian and bicycle system needs and amenities in and throughout Hailey.

Furthermore, with the recent and expected growth, the City wanted to understand the potential strain on its transportation system infrastructure by completing a long-term Transportation Master Plan. The Transportation Master Plan would address infrastructure expansion projects and also provide for a long-term preventative maintenance program.

Purpose

The Transportation Master Plan provides a link between the City’s land use assumptions and the transportation facilities and services needed to support the growth over the next 20 years. The Transportation Master Plan focuses on safety, capacity, and operational improvements on SH-75 and the city’s arterial and collector streets. The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) incorporates pedestrian and bicycle programs to meet the overall transportation needs of the community.

The TMP is a key component to Hailey’s Comprehensive Plan. It provides the City with a guide for transportation system improvements to meet existing and future travel needs. It also integrates the City’s transportation improvements with those of Blaine County Highway District and the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD).

Role of Local Transportation Plans

The role of the Hailey TMP gives the city a tool to address growth and the ability to provide efficient and safe movement of people, goods and services. The TMP provides an effective
way of communicating the infrastructure goals of a City to its community and neighboring jurisdictions. The TMP consists of transportation policies that are tied to the Comprehensive Plan and are intended to guide the needed transportation infrastructure improvements to support the future growth while also maintaining Hailey’s quality of life.

The Hailey TMP provides specific information about transportation needs and how they might be met. It identifies needed street, bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects and a prioritization strategy to implement the projects.

**Plan Organization**

The Hailey TMP was developed in a series of tasks to meet the City’s initiatives. It is organized as follows:

- Introduction
- Goals and Policies
- Traffic Forecasts & Alternatives Evaluation
- Transportation Systems Plan
- Implementation Plan

**Impact Area**

The impact area for the Hailey TMP includes the City limits and adjacent unincorporated Area of Impact. The Area of Impact has been defined by the City as part of its current Comprehensive Plan. Figure 1 shows the study area for the 2007 Transportation Master Plan.

Figure 1. Hailey Area of Impact
Goal and Policies

The transportation goal and policies were originally developed as part of the 2000 Comprehensive Plan process. In order to effectively implement the Hailey Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the goals and policies have been revised to focus on several key components. The transportation goal and policies will be used to implement plan projects and programs, review new land use development applications, and coordinate with other City planning processes.

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

The Transportation Plan is supportive and consistent with other elements of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan, including the land use, community design, and economic development elements. The Transportation Plan must be capable of supporting the Land Use Plan and demonstrate the identified transportation capital improvements can be implemented as future growth occurs.

Transportation & Circulation

The Transportation & Circulation section of Hailey’s Comprehensive Plan discusses a variety of transportation issues which help focus the planning activities for the Hailey TMP. Significant issues highlighted include:

- Create safe, livable streets in residential neighborhoods and a pedestrian friendly community.
  - Interconnectivity
  - Designated Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes
  - Pedestrian Crossings
  - Traffic Calming Measures
  - Street Proportions and Design
- Creating a pedestrian friendly Main Street
- The need for transportation options
- Proportional street designs make pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods
- Balancing parking for business and community needs

Goal, Policies & Implementation

Hailey’s transportation goal, policies and implementation measures provide a starting point for the Master Plan. Hailey’s specific goal and major policies are summarized here, including specific implementation measures.

Goal

Create and maintain a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly community with a convenient and efficient multi-modal system for all Hailey residents – “move people and not just cars.”
Policies

1.1 Provide adequate routes and accesses to accommodate different uses and circulation.

_Implementation: Minimize potential conflicts between uses by planning for and designating separate areas, routes and accesses for pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles and trucks._

- Designate truck routes
- Designate bicycle and pedestrian routes that connect places
- Ensure Main Street traffic flows smoothly and safely
- Designate properly distributed pedestrian crossings on Main Street
- Discourage future curb cuts on Main Street (Access policy)

1.2 Protect residential districts by building streets that encourage pedestrians and bicycles, while allowing automobiles at slower, safe speeds.

_Implementation 1: Consider city standards that allow traffic to flow smoothly and safely while encouraging lower traffic speeds._

- Consider standards for alternatives to stop signs and traffic lights, such as vertical displacements, traffic circles or roundabouts, innovative intersection designs and other traffic calming devices (Traffic Calming & Management Plan)
- Consider street standards for less pavement and narrow travel lanes to encourage lower vehicle speeds (Functional Classification Policy & Street Design Standards)
- Encourage limiting the length of streets; shorter blocks keep vehicles at a slower speed. (Block Length)

_Implementation 2: Street standards should encourage pedestrian and bicycle use._

- Sidewalk or pathways should be provided for pedestrians and bicycles along designated routes and in business districts. Encourage sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicycles in neighborhoods and other districts.
- Encourage appropriate street trees in all neighborhoods that create a canopy that does not interfere with pedestrian use or create visual obstructions for vehicles. Require street trees in all commercial districts.
- Explore medians and tree planting strips that would create boulevards and parkways.
- Adopt street rights-of-way that are proportional to the heights and setbacks of adjacent structures.
- Adopt residential setbacks that place an emphasis on the entrance to the house and not the garage.
- Adopt residential street standards that include pedestrian access and on-site mail distribution.
Implementation 3: Establish procedures determining the need for traffic control and traffic calming measures.

a. Use information from a traffic counting program to determine areas of the city that require further study and possible installation of traffic control measures.
b. Establish a procedure to allow neighborhoods to petition the city for traffic calming measures to be installed. Set guidelines to determine the appropriateness of the requests and to determine the correct measure to be installed. (Traffic Calming & Management Plan)
c. A community-wide plan for stop signs should be implemented. Recognize that stop signs do not work well to control vehicle speeds.

1.3 Ensure an interconnected community that provides multi-modal access to all neighborhoods.

Implementation:

a. Provide safe corridors for pedestrians and bicycles throughout our community.
b. All new streets should connect, wherever possible, to exiting streets as well as future potential developments.
c. Include transit shelters in neighborhoods and business developments along designated routes.

1.4 Promote long-term planning and development of an interconnected and integrated multi-modal transportation system. Contain or reduce the number of single-occupant cars.

Implementation:

a. Create and implement a Transportation Master Plan
b. Participate in, and support, transportation planning for traffic and transportation management.
c. Support efforts to create a public transportation system that includes a local circulator shuttle within walking distance of most Hailey residents, as well as commuter service within the Wood River Valley corridor.

1.5 Promote land development that discourages urban sprawl, connects the community, and encourages multi-modal use.

Implementation

a. Create clear entrances at our north and south to define Main Street (where to slow down).
b. Balance parking needs with multi-modal transportation needs. Minimize the effect of large parking lots with landscape buffers and islands. (Parking Management Plan).
c. Encourage neighborhood service centers that serve adjacent neighborhoods.
d. Encourage or require transit shelters along designated routes.
e. Encourage multi-use development closer to or along transportation corridors.

1.6 Maximize transportation opportunities and minimize tax dollars.

Implementation

a. Explore, create and foster cooperative opportunities with other county and regional resources.
b. Explore and support efforts for a public transportation system that provides regional commuter service and connects to a local circulator shuttle. (Public Transportation Plan).
c. Support and enable a cooperative relationship with the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority.

1.7 Standards for development should encourage multi-modal transportation.

Implementation.

a. Residential development of 20 units or more, and commercial developments of 20,000 square feet or more should provide a Transportation Management Study and should construct the infrastructure necessary to meet the transportation needs of that development, such as transit shelters, sidewalks and pathways, park and ride parking spaces, etc.
b. Review the number and types of signs needed to direct or inform traffic.
c. Carefully consider the long-term consequences on existing and future development of a waiver of standards that address transportation issues.
d. Consider prohibiting off-road vehicles.

The predominant theme in Hailey’s Comprehensive Plan is “moving people not just cars.” As summarized and noted here, the Transportation Master Plan is intended as the City’s implementation and includes of the following elements as action items:

- Plan and map for all modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, trucks and public transportation
- Street Design Standards and Functional Classification Policy & Map
- Traffic Management Plan with Traffic Calming application and program guidelines
- Parking Plan
- Public Transportation Plan
- Transportation Finance
Traffic Forecasts & Alternatives Evaluation

The foundation of the Transportation Plan is based on the evaluation of the existing transportation system. An inventory and analysis of existing facilities was conducted in 2006. This analysis identifies locations that may have deficiencies in traffic operations or safety, and areas with inadequate non-motorized facilities. The full inventory and analysis of the existing transportation system is provided in Appendix A.

Base-year traffic volumes were collected in 2006 at many of the city’s major intersections. Figure 2 illustrates the p.m. peak hour traffic conditions on Hailey’s major street system. Based on the historic trend in regional traffic, as illustrated in Figure 3, year 2026 traffic conditions are likely to be significantly higher than today.

Figure 2. 2006 PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
To provide a framework for future transportation system needs, the Transportation Plan also considers the transportation needs of future growth. The City of Hailey has selected 2026 as the analysis horizon year, which provides a long-range look at transportation facilities needed to support anticipated growth within and surrounding the City. The traffic forecasts represent future average weekday conditions during the PM peak hour. The weekday PM peak hour generally has the highest overall traffic volumes in the community and thus provides the basis for identifying improvement needs.

Alternative improvement projects were evaluated in order to understand the effect they would have on travel patterns within the area of impact and their ability to resolve existing or future capacity or operational deficiencies.

The following provides an overview of the assumptions and the alternatives analysis used in preparing the forecasts. The resulting travel forecasts are also presented. The travel forecasts provide a technical basis for identifying the transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Master Plan.

**Growth and Travel Forecasts for 2026**

This chapter presents the methodology and assumptions used to develop future Hailey travel demand forecasts for the 20-year period beginning in 2006. The chapter also includes an analysis of the impact of growth on traffic operations at selected intersections within the Hailey urban area.

**Background and General Assumptions**

Figure 3 illustrates the trend in traffic growth along SH-75. To forecast the growth in traffic at study intersections, intersection volumes were grown by 1.0 percent annually for twenty years. This rate accounts for general growth at all highway and non-highway study intersections. In addition, future traffic estimates from seven definite or likely developments were added to the study intersections. These developments include all the areas within or near the city that have development potential. Based on these forecasts, Highway 75 traffic is forecasted to grown by 1.6 percent annually.

Future traffic forecasts were also developed for Highway 75 in the SH-75 Timmerman to Ketchum Draft Environmental Impact Statement (ITD, September 2005). These traffic forecasts were based on population and land-use forecasts for the Wood River Valley, as well as an associated travel demand model. Forecasts for average daily traffic is summarized in Table 1.
Table 1. Average Daily Traffic Forecast for 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 75 Geographic Segment</th>
<th>Baseline 2000 ADT</th>
<th>Forecasted 2025 ADT</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gannett Road to Fox Acres Road (South of Hailey)</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKercher Boulevard to Elkhorn Road (North of Hailey)</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As shown in Table 1, forecasted annual growth rates presented in the EIS are expected to be between 1.5 and 1.8 percent. The alternate methodology used to forecast 2026 PM peak hour intersection volumes predicts a 1.6 percent rate, which is consistent with the Highway 75 EIS.

Figure 3. Historic Traffic Trend – Highway 75

By examination of year 2006 traffic conditions it is clear that many of the unsignalized intersections along SH-75 are experiencing significant delay, particularly on the local side-street. By 2026, SH-75 traffic is expected to grow by 57%. Similar growth rates are expected on many of Hailey’s collector street. The resulting 2026 PM peak hour traffic forecasts are shown in Figure 4. The 2026 forecasts have been compared to the existing 2006 traffic volumes to better highlight the amount of growth in the number of vehicles anticipated under the existing land use plan. By 2026, the following traffic conditions are expected:

- Main/Bullion traffic signal over capacity
- Main/Airport traffic signal over capacity
- Main/McKercher traffic signal nearing capacity,
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- More difficult/dangerous for minor street left-turns onto Main Street without traffic signals.

The results of the future alternatives analysis were used to develop the framework for the recommended transportation network and ultimately the transportation systems plan. A recommended transportation network model scenario was created to estimate forecast 2026 traffic volumes within the study area.

Figure 4. 2026 PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Planned Improvements

In addition to volume forecasts, the future capacity of roadway sections were forecasted based on planned improvements outlined in the Highway 75 EIS, Alternative 2. Highways 75 study intersections were assumed to have two lanes each direction with a center turn-lane. The intersections of Highway 75/Woodside Boulevard and Highway 75/Countryside Boulevard were assumed to have traffic signals.

While Alternative 2 of the Highway 75 EIS suggests improvements to Hailey’s Main Street corridor, none of these improvements were assumed in baseline 2026 conditions. As part of this plan, several alternative Main Street design concepts were evaluated. These alternative concepts present similar solutions as outlined in the Highway 75 EIS. To present clear comparisons between the baseline and alternative design concepts, no EIS improvements were assumed along Main Street for baseline conditions.

It was also assumed that the River Street connection between Myrtle Street and McKercher Boulevard would be completed. This new connection is anticipated to shift a portion of local traffic from the Highway 75 to River Street.

Future (2026) Traffic Operations and Performance

Future operations where estimated with the same HCM methodology used to calculate existing traffic operations. Table 2 summarizes existing and future traffic operations at Hailey study intersections.
### Table 2. Future Intersection Level of Service – Hailey TSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Location</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>2006 Existing PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>2026 Future PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS¹</td>
<td>Delay²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 75 Intersections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75 / W Meadow Dr</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75 / McKercher Blvd</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75)/ Myrtle St</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75)/ Buillion St</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75)/ Elm St</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75)/ Cedar St</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75) / Airport Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (SH 75) / 3rd Ave</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75 / Fox Acres Rd</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75 / Countryside Blvd</td>
<td>Stop/Signal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75 / Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Stop/Signal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-highway Intersections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttercup Rd / W Meadow Dr</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttercup Rd / McKercher Blvd</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle St / River St</td>
<td>Stop (All-Way)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullion St / River St</td>
<td>Stop (All-Way)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croy St / 8th Ave</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar St / River St</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar St / Broadford Rd</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside Blvd / Fox Acres Rd</td>
<td>Stop (All-Way)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. LOS = Level of Service  
2. Delay = in Average Seconds per Vehicle  
3. V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio  
4. WM = Worst Movement Reported for Unsignalized Intersections (excluding All-Way Stop Control)

Intersection operations for non-highway intersections degrade somewhat due to increased traffic volumes. However, all of these intersections remain at LOS D or better. Due to improvements suggested in the Highway 75 EIS, all the highway intersections outside of Main Street operate adequately at LOS D or better.

Along Main Street in 2026, all intersections would operate at LOS E or F during the PM peak hour. Increased traffic volumes would exacerbate delays at unsignalized and signalized Main Street intersections. While difficult to quantify, this Main Street congestion would likely lead to increased traffic along parallel non-arterial streets.

### Main & River Street Options Analysis

Three major options were evaluated in developing the Hailey TMP. See Appendix D for maps summarizing each option. These options involve roadway concepts along Main Street and River Street to improve livability in downtown Hailey. The options include a five-lane Main Street, a four-lane Main Street, and a three-lane couplet involving Main Street and River Street.
Five-lane Main Street
Under this option, Main Street would remain at five-lanes as it currently exists. However, pedestrian crossing improvements at Myrtle Street and Elm Street would be installed, as well as other streetscape enhancements. River Street would be improved to facilitate local traffic circulation, on-street parking, and a continuous bike and pedestrian route.

Four-lane Main Street
Under this option, the center two-way, center-turn lane along Main Street would be reduced to a narrow median except at major intersections. This would make left-turn at mid-block locations more difficult and encourage drivers to use major intersections. Sidewalks could also be widened to enhance the pedestrian environment. Pedestrian crossing improvements at Myrtle Street and Elm Street would be installed, as well as other streetscape enhancements. River Street would be improved to facilitate local traffic circulation, on-street parking, and a continuous bike and pedestrian route.

Three-lane Couplet
Under this option, Main Street is converted to a one-way, three-lane roadway for northbound Highway 75 traffic, and River Street becomes the parallel one-way, three-lane roadway for southbound traffic. This would reduce the street width on Main Street which could enhance the pedestrian environment along that corridor. Several concerns were raised when evaluating this option, such as:

- The costs of acquiring right-of-way at the transition areas north and south of downtown were high, as well as construction costs.
- River Street would experience regional truck traffic that would have otherwise remained on Main Street.
- North-south local circulation west of Main Street would be impacted and be required to use the couplet system along with regional traffic.

Preferred Option
The five-lane concept is considered the preferred option as it provides the necessary capacity and mobility function for SH-75, and coupled with median and pedestrian access and safety design and amenities, provides the least disruption to Hailey’s city street system (see Appendix C for Advisory Group discussion and guidance on these options). The outcome from the options analysis is also a contributing factor to the various options studied for River Street, as described in the Transportation Systems Plan.
Transportation Systems Plan

The analyses of options, funding, and City goals and policies were used to develop a comprehensive transportation improvement program for the City. The program is based upon issues identified by the residents of Hailey, City staff, and an analysis of the existing transportation analysis summarized in Appendix A. The program also addresses forecast needs through 2026 based on the projected growth in and around the City of Hailey. The Transportation Systems Plan focuses on five major components of the transportation system:

- Streets and Highways
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
- Freight
- Transit
- Air Transportation

The core of the transportation systems plan covers Hailey’s streets and SH-75. These streets serve the primary movement of people and goods. In addition to the streets, Hailey’s system of shared-use paths and trails provide an essential transportation system framework for non-motorized travel.

Streets

The city streets and SH-75 that serve Hailey provide the foundation of the transportation system. The street and highway section identifies the functional roadway system, conceptual arterial design standards, maintenance program, and improvement projects and programs needed to maintain and expand the street and highway system to best accommodate all modes of travel, with particular focus on pedestrian and bicycle access, circulation and safety.

Street Functional Classification

Street functional classification outlines a hierarchy of roadways to meet the City’s differing transportation needs and act as a guide for future development of the overall street network. The purpose of the functional classification plan is to provide a hierarchy of arterial and local streets, including arterials, collectors, and local streets. Arterial streets serve higher traffic volumes and may have few access points. Collector streets link arterials and local streets and may provide access to individual parcels. Local streets provide neighborhood circulation and access to individual parcels. A well-connected hierarchy of roadways enhances overall mobility and access within the City, while also facilitating greater opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle travel. Figure 3 highlights the general concept of accessibility versus mobility.

The functional classifications for the City of Hailey include seven types of streets: major arterials, minor arterials, collector streets, neighborhood collectors, and local/access streets. Table 3 provides the general descriptions for the Hailey street classifications. Figure 6 shows the specific street classifications and designations for the City of Hailey.
Table 3. Functional Classification Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major Arterial</th>
<th>Minor Arterial</th>
<th>Collector Street</th>
<th>Neighborhood Collector Street</th>
<th>Local Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functions</strong></td>
<td>1. Provides regional connections. 2. Serves major business areas. 3. Serves truck routes.</td>
<td>1. Connects to major arterials and commercial centers. 2. Serves truck routes.</td>
<td>1. Collect neighborhood traffic and feed it into arterials. 2. Access to schools, parks, etc.</td>
<td>1. Collect neighborhood traffic and feed it into collectors. 2. Access to schools, parks, etc.</td>
<td>1. Access to individual properties. 2. May provide on-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Control</strong></td>
<td>Partially controlled</td>
<td>Limited to abutting lots not fronting on collectors or local streets</td>
<td>Limited to abutting lots not fronting on local streets</td>
<td>Relatively unlimited</td>
<td>Relatively unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Volume</strong></td>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>2,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>500 to 2,000</td>
<td>500 to 2,000</td>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes</strong></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managed Speed</strong></td>
<td>35-45 mph</td>
<td>30-35 mph</td>
<td>25 mph</td>
<td>20-25 mph</td>
<td>20-25 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Right of Way</strong></td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>60 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Paved Width</strong></td>
<td>70 feet</td>
<td>46 feet</td>
<td>36-44 feet</td>
<td>36 feet</td>
<td>28-32 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truck Usage</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaped Buffer</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** These are to be used only as guidelines to classifying existing or future roadways. The City Engineer reserves the right to deviate from the guidelines as conditions warrant.
Figure 6. Street Functional Classification
The Transportation Master Plan has identified minor modifications to the city’s historical functional classification system to best incorporate more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly design treatments. These revisions are an update from the City’s 2000 Comprehensive Plan. The collector classification has been reclassified into two distinct classifications, collectors and neighborhood collectors. The neighborhood collector is designated by the surrounding land use.

**Intersection Traffic Control**

**Traffic Signals**

Traffic signals assign right-of-way to various traffic movements and thereby profoundly influence traffic flow. It is an effective traffic control device when used at the proper place under appropriate conditions, consistent with MUTCD requirements. Since vehicular delay is sometimes greater under traffic signal control than other control types, consideration should be given to providing alternatives to traffic signals even if one or more the signal warrants has been satisfied. Part 4 of the MUTCD provides a detailed description of the appropriate guidelines that should be followed when installing or placing a traffic signal.

**Roundabouts**

Roundabouts are essentially a small circulating roadway within the intersection to which all traffic entering the intersection must yield. Under low-volume conditions, major street and minor street traffic rarely stops while using the intersection. Roundabouts are an effective intersection design when used at the proper place under appropriate conditions, consistent with FHWA Roundabout Guidelines and MUTCD requirements.

**Stop Sign Traffic Control**

There are several possible types of intersections where stop- or yield-control signing measures can be applied in Hailey:

- Arterial and a collector or neighborhood street, where the lower order street is stopped;
- Two collector streets, where both are stopped (all-way stop);
- Collector and a neighborhood streets, where the local (neighborhood) street is stopped;
- Two local streets, where no control unless special circumstances exist; and,
- Yield signs may be used, in place of stop signs, in light traffic areas.

Arterial Streets are those defined as main roads primarily used by through traffic. State Highway 75 (Hailey’s Main Street) is the only designated arterial within Hailey.

Collector Streets are those streets roads which distribute local traffic, are primarily used to access residential districts, and are all streets within light industrial and commercial districts which are not arterial. Collector Streets are designated in the TMP. Local, or neighborhood streets are those which service individual residences and residential districts and are not generally used as through streets.
In all cases, the City Engineer shall base the warrant and placement of stop signs consistent with the procedures as provided by the most recent version of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD, US DOT), as further summarized in Appendix E.

The City may, in special circumstances, provide for exceptions to the above options and place stop or yield signs where necessary for public safety. The Hailey City Engineer shall determine which intersections shall be signed, and those intersections shall meet at least one of the following criteria:

- A visual obstruction is within 100’ of the intersection and prevents a clear view of the intersection (obstructions may be removed to resolve this problem);
- The streets intersect at angles less than 80 degrees and/or have slopes within 100 feet of the intersection of more than 5%;
- The intersection experiences traffic flows in excess of 1,000 cars per day;
- A public school is within 660 feet of the intersection;
- A public park or other public recreation area is within 660 feet of the intersection; and,
- A history of accidents at the intersection.

**Street Maintenance Program**

The main goal of the maintenance program is to maximize use and efficiency of available revenue and provide for a comprehensive and systematic way to sustain the transportation infrastructure at a level acceptable to the City. The maintenance program is one of the most important programs the City can implement. The quality of the program and the process by which existing streets and other transportation infrastructure are maintained, directly determines the pavement surface life, future maintenance cost, ride quality, and long-term user costs. A long-term maintenance plan was developed as part of the Transportation Master Plan and is summarized in Appendix F.

The development of the maintenance program included the evaluation of arterials and local roadways for pavement condition. Based on the existing inventory and periodic updates, the City’s Pavement Management System (PMS) provides alternative systematic approaches for identifying overlay and chip seal projects each year. The PMS also provides input regarding the need to rebuild existing streets, instead of performing an overlay. As traffic control devices, including traffic signals, are constructed along City maintained roadways, they should be monitored and serviced regularly as well.
Highlights from the Hailey PMS study and findings are notable:

- Hailey has jurisdiction of about 43 miles of streets,
- All of the City’s streets are asphalt, many of which have no concrete edge and/or drainage systems,
- The replacement value estimated at $21.7 million (2006 $’s),
- Many streets are over 5 years-old and showing significant signs of severe cracking and rutting,
- The Remaining service life of Hailey’s street (pavement) system is limited (see chart).

The pavement analysis shows that Hailey’s street maintenance budget should be increased significantly (to at least $250,000) in order to maintain and improve the street system over the next 15-20 years. Currently, Hailey budgets about $80-90,000 annually for street maintenance. Such an increase would require a significant policy change for Hailey.

Table 4 compares street mileage and annual maintenance budgets for Hailey, city of Twin Falls and the Twin Falls and Ada County highway districts. The table includes funds budgeted specifically for street improvements over 3 years, the percentage increase/decrease over the previous year, and the budgeted cost per mile of road based on the 2006-2007 projected budgets for the agencies listed. These agencies were chosen to provide a reasonable comparison to the City of Hailey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Miles of Road</th>
<th>2004-2005 Budget</th>
<th>2005-2006 Budget</th>
<th>2006-2007 Budget</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Budgeted cost/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>43.34</td>
<td>$87,466.06</td>
<td>$97,453.78</td>
<td>$81,500</td>
<td>-16.37%</td>
<td>-11.42%</td>
<td>$1,880.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>±200</td>
<td>$1,054,373</td>
<td>$1,834,546</td>
<td>$2,223,421</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>73.99%</td>
<td>$13,034.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFHD</td>
<td>781.77</td>
<td>$2,219,616</td>
<td>$2,719,616</td>
<td>$2,223,421</td>
<td>-18.17%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>$13,034.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHD</td>
<td>658.79</td>
<td>$22,727,124</td>
<td>$17,555,245</td>
<td>$23,579,000</td>
<td>-34.31%</td>
<td>-22.76%</td>
<td>$35,791.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based off information collected from agencies and other public information sites.
2. Based off the 2004 Annual Road and Street Financial Report on file with the Idaho Transportation Department.
4. Based off information collected from agencies and other public information sites.
5. No road improvements were constructed in the summer and fall of 2006 based on information provided by the City Engineer.

Data and Analysis Source: Toothman-Orton

1 Recommendations from Toothman-Orton.
The table shows that the City of Hailey spends significantly less than the other agencies listed on a budgeted cost/mile basis. The proposed budget increase to $250,000 would give the City of Hailey a cost per mile of about $5,700. While this would exceed the cost per mile of the Twin Falls Highway District (TFHD) it would be significantly less than that of either the City of Twin Falls or the Ada County Highway District (ACHD).

This analysis is based on a snapshot of the existing conditions and the probable results of using specific maintenance procedures. The TAMS program is meant to be an ongoing analysis tool and should be used on a regular basis to reevaluate the current road conditions and to refine the use of public funds.

To assure that the existing and future transportation infrastructure is preserved in a cost-effective manner, the City should allocate annual budget resources to maintaining existing infrastructure. Appendix F includes a more detailed summary of the maintenance inventory, projects, costs, and priorities.
Transportation Improvement Projects

Based on the evaluation of existing and forecast traffic volumes, traffic operations, safety, and connectivity, a recommended list of transportation improvement projects and programs was defined. The projects and programs were organized into the following six categories:

- Highway 75 Improvements
- Urban Street Improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Low-Intensity Street Improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Pedestrian-only Connectors
- Intersection Improvements
- Maintenance Programming

Table 5 identifies each of the projects and programs. Figure 7 shows the location of the local improvements identified in the Hailey Transportation Master Plan. The table lists and defines the project extents, description, schedule (five-year increments), revenue source and planning-level cost estimates. The cost estimates are in 2007 dollars and were prepared based on typical per unit costs obtained from ITD. The cost estimates incorporate the features included in the conceptual street standards and have been refined by type of street and overall scope of the improvement.

The relative priority of each project is also included in Table 5 was assigned to reflect the need of the project based on input from city staff and the Transportation Advisory Group.

ITD Improvements

Consistent with ITD’s plans for SH-75, portions of the highway are to be widened for additional travel lanes, north of McKercher Boulevard and south of Fax Acres Road. These additional lanes are to accommodate the growth in regional and local traffic using SH-75. In addition to added travel lanes, the Hailey TMP identifies the need for median and pedestrian streetscape enhancements between McKercher Boulevard and Cedar Street. These improvements are intended to help buffer the impact of heavier vehicular traffic on SH-75, and improve pedestrian crossing safety. Final design treatments will identified by ITD in coordination with Hailey staff, and constructed as state and federal funds become available through ITD.
### Table 5. Long-Range Transportation Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Extents</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Revenue Source (DRAFT Assumptions)</th>
<th>Planning Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Main Street McKercher Blvd to Cedar St</td>
<td>Median and pedestrian streetscape enhancements</td>
<td>ITD-GARVEE</td>
<td>$8,537</td>
<td>Assumes back-in, 60 degree parking (19 ft parking width from curb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Highway 75 (North) McKercher Blvd to (north) Widen per Hwy 75 EIS (widen 4-5 lanes)</td>
<td>ITD-GARVEE</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Highway 75 (South) Fox Acres Rd to (south) Widen per Hwy 75 EIS (widen 4-5 lanes)</td>
<td>ITD-GARVEE</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>River Street Myrtle St to Cedar St, with connections to Main St Reconstruct per River St Plan</td>
<td>Federal Grant/LID/ City Contribution Bond</td>
<td>$6,537</td>
<td>Sidewalk should extend to Second Ave, which is route to Middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Myrtle Street (West) Main St to First Ave Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Bullion Street (West) Little Indio Ln to River St Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Croy Street (West) River St to First Ave Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td>Only a small section needs new sidewalk - maintenance and drainage needs for remainder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Elm Street (West) River St to First Ave Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Airport Way Hwy 75 to Aviation Dr Reconstruct to 3-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd (North) Fox Acres Rd to Shenandoah Dr Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Development/Bond</td>
<td>$1,276</td>
<td>Some sidewalk development exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd (South) Winterhaven Dr to Highway 75 Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Development/Bond</td>
<td>$1,386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Street Improvements</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Second Avenue McKercher Blvd to Elm St Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
<td>Myrtle St to McKercher has asphalt sidewalk on east side. Non-motorized improvements only north of Myrtle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue Myrtle St to Croy St Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Myrtle Street (East) First Ave to Buttercup Rd Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Bullion Street (East) First Ave to Wood River Trail Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Croy Street (Central) First Ave to Fifth Ave Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Elm Street (East) First Ave to Bike Path Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>School District is improving south side of Elm St from 1st to 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Intensity Street Improvements</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Fourth Avenue Croy St to Elm St Reconstruct to 2-lanes</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped. Conn.</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Croy Street (East) Fifth Ave to Quigley Rd Add sidewalks</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>First Ave Multi-use Path Elm St to Airport Way Add shared-use path to improve north-south non-motorized connectivity.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Extents</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Revenue Source (DRAFT Assumptions)</td>
<td>Planning Cost ($1,000)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>River St/McKercher Blvd</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom of steep slope. Recommended for traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>River Street/Cedar St</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-to-School route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Main Street/Myrtle Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Install traffic signal</td>
<td>TIF/ITD</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grades might be a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Main Street/Elm Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Install traffic signal</td>
<td>TIF/ITD</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with School District plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Second Ave/McKercher Blvd</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom of steep slope. Recommended for traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Second Avenue/Myrtle Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-to-School route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td>Second Avenue/Bullion Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grades might be a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Second Avenue/Elm Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with School District plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>509</td>
<td>Forth Avenue/Elm Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue/Elm Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grades will be a problem. Probably not possible. Also, need to coordinate operations at nearby Buttercup Rd/Myrtle St intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue/Bullion Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be constructed in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512</td>
<td>Highway 75/Countyside Blvd</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Install traffic signal</td>
<td>TIF/ITD</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of Hwy EIS 75 plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Highway 75/Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Install traffic signal</td>
<td>TIF/ITD</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>Cedar St/Silver Star</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Construct Roundabout</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offsets intersection - needed for traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Sidewalk Replacement Program</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Replace sub-standard existing sidewalks</td>
<td>Grants/Local/Bonds/LOT Funds</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$20 per linear foot (5 ft width). Does not include individual panel replacement costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>902</td>
<td>Curb-ramp Replacement/Construction Program</td>
<td>(see map)</td>
<td>Replace sub-standard existing curb-ramps or provide where missing</td>
<td>Grants/ITD on Main St</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$1,500 per curb ramp replacement (64 total: 38 Main St related, 13 roadway project related, 13 non-project related)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>903</td>
<td>Pavement Management</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Maintain city streets</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>Annual budget, estimates range from 225,000 To $250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>904</td>
<td>Bike route designation on non-reconstruct roadways</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Add signs and pavement markings to designate bike routes</td>
<td>Grants/Local/Bonds/LOT Funds</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$4 per linear foot of roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>905</td>
<td>Interim bike route designation</td>
<td>Woodside, Second, Elm, Croy, Bullion, Myrtle, River</td>
<td>Add striping, signs, and pavement markings to designate bike routes</td>
<td>Local Option Tax (Maintenance)</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Transportation Improvement Projects
Urban Street Improvements

A number of Hailey’s arterial and collector streets lack the full dimension and features of urban streets, particularly those elements that are critical to cyclists (bike lanes) and pedestrians (sidewalks). Eight specific street projects are identified in the TMP for urban street upgrades. Each of these projects has unique issues and solutions.

River Street

River Street is identified as Hailey’s “local” main street, in parallel to SH-75 (Main Street), and connecting north and central Hailey (commercial mix) and south Hailey (residential). The desired context for River Street is a lower speed (lower than SH-75), two-lane (one in each direction) arterial with bike lanes and on-street parking. The underlying design objectives for River Street balances are (1) optimum pedestrian access, (2) bicycle circulation and (3) retain and enhance (if possible) vehicular capacity and mobility.

Various conceptual designs for River Street were examined as part of the TMP process. Various on-street parking dimensions (and their cost implications were considered, including their impact on overall project costs (see exhibit).

Balancing the pedestrian street crossing width, pedestrian streetscape space, and type/width of on-street parking was discussed by staff, Advisory Group and City Council and also by participants the public Open House meetings. Within the commercial area it was noted that the most likely successful package included the following:

- Wider pedestrian streetscape (10-12 feet) with street trees in buffer zone
- Back-in, diagonal parking on the east side (maximize # spaces and minimize right-of-way) and parallel parking on west side, and
- One travel lane in each direction and on-street bike lanes.

These issues will be further addressed at the time of preliminary and final design.

Both the southern and northern termini of River Street are possible design candidates for urban, single-lane roundabouts (see intersection projects #501 and #502). It is anticipated that an all-way stop traffic control measure is the best solution at the intersection of River and Bullion.
**Myrtle, Bullion, Croy and Elm Streets**  
The major east-west city routes crossing or connecting to Main Street (SH-75) each require reconstruction (full or partial) to urban street standards, with the intent of providing full pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between west and east Hailey. The need for better pedestrian and bicycle facilities (on-street bike lanes and contiguous and continuous sidewalks) increases as future traffic grows on each of these routes. Each of these street improvements will also include replacement or new on-street parking. The Bullion street improvement will also provide better pedestrian and bicycle connection from downtown and Main Street to the city park and Wood River trails.

**Airport Way**  
The portion of Airport Way south of SH-75 includes sidewalks, curb and gutter. The full urban street cross-section is needed along Airport Way to the southern terminus at Aviation Drive. These improvements are driven by the size of recent and expected future industrial and commercial development in the airport area. The Airport Way project improvements would include full street reconstruction, with a center left-turn lane, and new sidewalks.

**Woodside Boulevard**  
The city recently completed lane re-striping along Woodside Boulevard as an interim safety measure to better accommodate pedestrian and bicycle travel (see Appendix E for further guidance in travel lane striping). In the future, Woodside Boulevard will continue to serve popular local travel patterns with linkages middle- and high schools. Woodside Boulevard is the primary north-south route for local residential and non-residential access linking south Hailey to Hailey schools and downtown. Many sections of Woodside lack sidewalks.
**Low Intensity Street Improvements**

Many of Hailey’s local arterial and collector streets in the older, core area east of SH-75 either lack sidewalks or sidewalks are sporadic with poor connectivity. Through the master planning process a number of these routes were identified as important, walk-to-school routes, Wood River Trail connectors, and also important vehicular circulation routes, likely to see an increase in future traffic due to further development throughout the Hailey area. North-south routes include Second and portions of Fourth and Fifth Avenues; and east-west routes include Myrtle, Bullion, Croy and Elm Streets.

Further, the pavement condition on many of these streets is very poor, as severe winter weather and snow plowing has impacted the structural base, particularly the street edges. Each of these streets was identified in the Street Maintenance Program as needing re-construction. In most cases these streets are located within excessively wide public rights-of-way. Another technical factor that was considered in the long-range planning for these routes is whether street designs should consider drainage and stormwater systems. Currently, the city does not have stormwater systems to convey stormwater in this section of Hailey.

Through the TMP, the community has expressed a desire to balance the needs for vehicular and non-motorized traffic along these routes, provide critical pedestrian system features, but do so in such a manner that does not require a new stormwater system. Optional, low-intensity street designs (see Appendix E) were considered and evaluated by staff and TMP participants, resulting in the following:

- Concrete edge treatment, to help abate impacts of winter conditions and snow-plow operations (long-term pavement management strategy),
- On-street bicycle lanes striped with maximum travel lane widths,
- Variable space for private parking and snow storage,
- Continued use of natural filtration for street drainage, and
- Variable space and optional alignment for new sidewalks.

Figure 8 illustrates the design concept for low-intensity streets. The combination of these design treatments will have the affect to moderate excessive vehicular speeds, better maintain a balance between motorized and non-motorized traffic, better construct and protect the public’s investment in street pavement, and minimize new street improvement costs through continued application of natural filtration for street water run-off.
Figure 8. Low-Intensity Street Design Concept
**Pedestrian-Only Connections**

Two special projects are identified in the TMP that provide critical pedestrian connections. New sidewalks are needed along Croy Street, east of the Wood River Trail. These sidewalks provide an important pedestrian connection between the newer subdivisions east of the Trail, to the Trail and downtown Hailey. Local pedestrian access to the U.S. Post Office, located south of SH-75 near Airport Way, is extremely limited. A new shared-use path is identified in the TMP providing critical linkage between Elm Street and Airport Way.

**Intersection Improvements**

As both motorized and non-motorized traffic grows in Hailey, the need to better balance transportation design for all users becomes critical, especially at intersections where crossing traffic of all types become possible conflicts. The Hailey TMP evaluated future traffic conditions and identified the need for new traffic signals on SH-75 at Myrtle Street and Elm Street. These signals will assist local vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian traffic circulation and access. New signal coordination equipment will likely need to be coordinated with ITD for all traffic signals along SH-75, to best maintain state highway traffic progression while coordinating local access. It is also expected that new traffic signals will be warranted on SH-75 in the future at Countryside and Woodside Boulevards.

As noted above (River Street project), new roundabout design treatments at the north (McKercher) and south (Elm) ends of River Street are especially suited for moderating traffic speeds and maintaining continuous traffic flow. Single-lane roundabouts are also found to be well suited for safe pedestrian and bicycle traffic operations, and have the added benefit of continuous flow during winter conditions (unlike traffic signals or all-way stop-signs which force stop-and-start operations). For the same reasons, compact roundabout intersection designs are also identified on Second Street (McKercher, Myrtle, Bullion and Elm), Fourth Street (Elm) and Fifth Street (Myrtle and Bullion). However, local street grades may play an important factor in final project designs.
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
Pedestrian and bicycle travel has grown at similar if not higher rates than vehicular traffic within Hailey. More Hailey residents are walking and biking for recreational travel, which is not necessarily limited to warm-weather months. Due to the relatively flat terrain and viability of non-motorized travel, bicycle and pedestrian facilities play a vital role in the City’s transportation environment. The non-motorized transportation system is comprised of facilities that promote mobility without the aid of motorized vehicles. A well established system encourages healthy recreational activities, reduces vehicle demand on City streets, and enhances safety within a livable community.

As reflected in the TMP list and map of recommended transportation improvements (Table 5 and Figure 7), most of Hailey’s planned improvements directly benefit or are originally defined to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, circulation and access. Together, these improvements help define an integrated network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities within Hailey.

Figures 9 illustrates Hailey’s Pedestrian System Plan, including major street routes with existing and planned sidewalks, and existing and proposed shared-use paths.

Figures 10 illustrates Hailey’s Bicycle System Plan, including major street routes with bike lanes, shared lane routes, and existing and proposed shared-use paths.

See Appendix E for further description and recommended design guidelines for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Freight
The City of Hailey is expected to continue to have regional trucking activity due to its location along the SH-75 corridor. In the future, it is projected that truck traffic will increase proportional to anticipated commercial and industrial growth. Most of the increase in truck traffic will be from non-local industry. Overall, trucks are expected to comprise a lower percentage of the future PM peak hour traffic volumes due to more significant residential development and recreational travel over the next 20 years.

Trucks have a significant impact on traffic operations, safety, and roadway maintenance. They also impact air quality and noise levels in the City. Therefore, the City has designated a commercial truck route as SH-75. If trucks have an origin/destination within the City, they should limit travel off of SH-75 to the shortest distance between the origin/destination and SH-75.
Figure 9. Major Pedestrian System Plan
Figure 10. Bicycle System Plan
Public Transit

In order to provide viable transportation alternatives, the City of Hailey recognizes the importance of transit. Transit is a tool to help reduce vehicular emission and congestion, but can also provide needed transportation to jobs and services for the community.

Partnered with ITD, Blaine County, and other public and private organizations, the Wood River Rideshare (WRRS) organization manages public transportation within the Wood River Valley. They provide bus service, carpool and rideshare programs, and other transportation demand management services. In 2002, WRRS helped develop the Peak Bus, which is a regularly scheduled commuter bus service. This bus operates on one fixed route through the Wood River Valley connecting Bellevue to Sun Valley. Through the City of Hailey, the route follows Woodside Boulevard then shifts to Highway 75. The bus also stops at the Park-and-Ride located on northwest corner of Bullion Street and River Street.

The provision of a public transit system is an important component of a long-term economic strategy to encourage business to locate in Hailey. Extra right-of-way should also be reserved at key locations to accommodate future bus stops as land use density increases to further support transit.

Air Transportation

Air service for Hailey and the rest of the Wood River Valley is provided by the Friedman Memorial Airport located south of downtown and west of Highway 75. The runway is at approximately 5,300 feet elevation and consists of asphalt and is approximately 6,600 feet long and 100 feet wide. Friedman Memorial airport is serviced by two commuter airlines, three automobile rental agencies, and air charter operators.

The Airport currently does not comply with critical FAA safety standards and is severely space constrained. It has been determined that improvements necessary to bring the airport within standards are not feasible at its current location. Airport officials are in the process of selecting the location of a new airport in southwestern Blaine County to replace the Friedman Memorial Airport.
Financial and Implementation Plan

The list of transportation improvement projects must be funded and implemented to meet existing and future travel demands in and around the City of Hailey. Estimated project costs and future revenue sources are presented and options to fund projects are described. Implementation strategies are discussed and include items such as coordination with ITD to prioritize and fund regional partnership projects that benefit the greater community and economy.

This section summarizes the costs of the recommended capital improvements and identifies revenue sources that are available to fund the improvements.

Funding Analysis

The funding analysis highlights the costs associated with implementing the Hailey Transportation Plan and the available revenue sources to finance the projects.

Based on the travel forecasts and initial LOS standards, the comprehensive list of transportation improvement projects was defined. Planning level cost estimates were prepared for each project. A description of funding sources is also provided to identify the types of revenue that could be used to implement the projects.

Project Cost Summary

Planning level cost estimates were prepared for all street, intersection and pedestrian projects and maintenance costs. Table 6 summarizes the project cost estimates, by improvement type. The City of Hailey will rely primarily on ITD for improvements to Highway 75. A more detailed listing of the projects is attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Project Cost Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Capital Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian Capital Improvements

Pedestrian Connections | $179,000

Intersection Capital Improvements

Highway 75 Intersections | $900,000
Non-Highway Intersections | $3,500,000

Subtotal | $4,400,000

Maintenance Program

City Roadways (20 Year Cost) | $4,676,000

Subtotal | $4,676,000

TOTAL | $24,677,000

1. Planning level costs in 2007 dollars.
2. Non-highway intersections assumed to be 100 percent TIF eligible. Highway 75 intersections assumed to be 50 percent TIF eligible.
More than half of the 20-year project costs involve upgrading local streets to urban standards. “Low-intensity” street improvements involve striping and constructing more permanent “edges” to streets (which will greatly extend the City’s investment in pavement) and cost an estimate of $2.9 million. Completing pedestrian connections is estimated to cost almost $0.2 million. Almost $4.5 million is needed in intersection capacity improvements, most of which are identified as eligible for funding through the city’s traffic impact fee program. Another $4.7 million in maintenance programming is needed over the 20-year period. The total funding need is about $24.7 million over 20 years.

Funding Sources

This summary of federal, state, and local transportation funding options briefly re-caps current programs already familiar to the City of Hailey, highlights those federal and state programs that the City of Hailey may not have pursued, and explores local funding options available to the City of Hailey that it currently does not employ.

Cities and counties throughout Idaho and other states have routinely employed policies that solicit federal and state funding for local projects. In Idaho, federal and state transportation revenues (primarily from federal and state gas taxes and state vehicle registration fees) are distributed back to local communities through the Highway Distribution Account. The Idaho Local Highway Technical Assistance Council2 (LHTAC) provides a good summary for the Idaho Highway User Revenue (various federal and state revenues) available to local jurisdictions, but does not fully identify other local funding options for the full range of transportation projects.

This summary references but does not replicate LHTAC’s report, as it is not likely the intent of the Hailey Transportation Plan to significantly affect change in federal and state taxing of fuels and vehicle registration. Rather, the summary focuses more on those federal and state programs that provide grants to local jurisdictions, to which City of Hailey might be successful in its application to help fund local transportation projects.

These federal and state grants are highly competitive, and typically no longer fund large projects at the local level. It is rare for small cities to repetitively succeed in grant award. It is becoming much more difficult for local jurisdictions to rely on federal and state grant programs to fund substantive portions of their transportation plans. More often, local jurisdictions are examining local funding options to fund local street and sidewalk priorities, which is the greater focus of discussion in this summary. Table 7 highlights the existing funding sources that are available to the City of Hailey.

---

2 Idaho Local Highway Technical Assistance Council website: www.lhtac.org/funding/index.shtml
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development, (HUD) Discretionary Grant Program – Sidewalks, Neighborhood Enhancements</td>
<td>Funding level is not high and competition is high. Hailey should continue monitoring HUD grant application requirements and submit applications for local projects, particularly for new sidewalk funding in established neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA – Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>See State below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA – Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>See State below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP – Local Urban</td>
<td>Hailey should aggressively pursue grant funding, annually, through special STP programs for local projects with connections to state highways. These grant applications will require significant and consistent coordination and approval of ITD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP – Enhancement</td>
<td>Funds pass from FHWA through ITD to local jurisdictions. Funding level is not high (capped at $100,000 per year; competition is high. Hailey has recently and should continue to identify critical safe routes to schools, particularly for missing sidewalks, and apply annually through ITD for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP – Safety</td>
<td>Hailey should aggressively pursue grant funding, annually, through special STP programs for local projects with connections to state highways. These grant applications will require significant and consistent coordination and approval of ITD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Hailey has recently and should continue to identify critical safe routes to schools, particularly for missing sidewalks, and apply annually through ITD for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE Bonding participation with ITD and legislature</td>
<td>Current projects already identified in CARVEE program; Source for Highway 75 improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ)</td>
<td>Hailey is currently eligible for CMAQ grants. These grant funds would need to be used to reduce transportation related emissions. (ongoing investigation, need to confirm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation – Trails Funding</td>
<td>Have not applied in the past but could be a source for assistance to help fund non-motorized pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvement District (LID)</td>
<td>Only upon public initiative (majority of neighborhood or city-wide property owners) Hailey should support development and implementation of local improvement districts to fund needed street and sidewalk improvements. Such LID programs require two-thirds approval of affected property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal Funding</td>
<td>Hailey should consider plans to identify priority streets/sidewalks in disrepair and whether urban renewal financing is an appropriate measure that is supported by local property owners and voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
<td>Hailey should investigate and determine if it is appropriately charging franchise fees for utility use of public right of way; consistent with state code limitations. Franchise fee revenue can be used to help maintain and fully develop Hailey streets to urban standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impact Fee</td>
<td>Hailey is about to adopt a comprehensive traffic impact fee (TIF) program. As currently structured, this program will pay for a portion of the intersection capacity improvements identified in the Hailey Transportation plan, and some street department rolling stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>Only upon public initiative (majority of neighborhood or city-wide voters) Hailey should support establishment of taxing district, levying tax and issuance of bonds to help fund needed street improvements. Such bonds/tax levies require two-thirds voter approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Option Tax</td>
<td>Hailey has adopted a local option tax consisting of (a) a Rental Vehicle Tax (3%), (b) a Hotel-Motel Occupancy Tax (3%), (c) a Liquor By-The-Drink Tax (2%) and (d) a Restaurant Food Tax (1%). Use of the local option tax revenue is restricted to the following transportation-related programs: (1) road repair, transportation enhancements and snow removal, (2) town improvements (library modernization, sidewalks, town square, etc.), and (3) public transit and related improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>Could be used for specific projects and programs to reduce congestion and increase safety. This effort would need to be lead by the County and it is unlikely voters would support a countywide vehicle registration fee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Funding

Federal funding for transportation improvements is currently administered by the US Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as authorized by Congress through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users Act, referred to as SAFETEA-LU.

Community Development Block Grants

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regularly funds pedestrian-related improvements as part of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. The program provides annual grants on a formula basis to entitled cities and counties to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. HUD awards grants to entitlement community grantees to carry out a wide range of community development activities directed toward revitalizing neighborhoods, economic development, and providing improved community facilities and services.

A brief research indicates that many U.S. cities and counties seek Block Grants to fund sidewalk (especially curb ramp) improvements (sometimes with local matching revenues) as a means to simultaneously: (1) fund curb ramp improvements to meet the ADA requirements; and (2) remove obstacles to disadvantaged residents as a housing improvement. Entitled cities or counties have populations of 50,000 or more.

Highway Safety Grants

The Idaho Department of Transportation (ITD) administers Highway Safety grants, as part of the current SAFTEA-LU, through its Office of Highway Safety. Pedestrian and Bicycle safety problems are targeted with the Highway Safety grant program. The City of Hailey may be eligible for future funding of pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements.

Only state and local governmental units are eligible to receive highway safety grants. The highway safety grant process operates on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY), which runs from October 1 to September 31. Request for proposals for the upcoming FFY go out on the first Monday in January. The request for proposal gives an overview of the grant application requirement, jurisdictions eligible to receive funds, and a description of the focus areas. The letter of intent is the grant application. It must be received or post-marked by the last Friday in February. Letters of intent may be faxed or mailed to the Office of Highway Safety.

State Funding

Some state funding programs are familiar to the City of Hailey. Others may not be in that they have been recently formalized.

---

3 See ITD Highway Safety website at www2.state.id.us/itd/highways/ohs/index.htm.
**STP Local Urban**
Funds are allocated for projects in urban areas of 5,000 population or greater. They may be used for new construction, reconstruction or rehabilitation of roadways functionally classified with FHWA as urban collectors or higher. These funds may also be used for enhancement, bridge, or safety activities. For cities greater than 5,000 population, but excluding the three Idaho Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's), eligible projects are identified, prioritized, and requested by local agencies through a formal project application process (January-March). Project proposals are reviewed and ranked by LHTAC and a prioritized list of projects (based on available funding) is then presented to the Idaho Transportation Board, for inclusion in the draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in June.

**STP Enhancement**
Funds are available to local agencies for the following transportation enhancement activities:

- Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Acquisition of scenic easement and scenic or historic sites.
- Scenic or historic highway programs, including the provision of tourist or welcome centers.
- Landscaping and other scenic beautification.
- Historic preservation.
- Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities.
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors
- Control and removal of outdoor advertising
- Archaeological planning
- Mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff
- Mitigation of wildlife mortality caused by vehicles
- Establishment of Transportation Museums

Projects are solicited through an annual statewide application process (Nov-Feb). The Enhancement Advisory Committee (EAC), an advisory committee established by the Idaho Transportation Board, then prioritizes project applications within available funding levels. The Idaho Transportation Board has set a $500,000 maximum cap on Federal-aid funds. The local or state match requirement is from 2 to 10 percent. Final project selection is by the Idaho Transportation Board.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ)**
Funds are aimed at reducing transportation related sources and emissions throughout all areas of the state. The primary purpose of Idaho's CMAQ Program is to fund projects, planning, and programs in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas, as well as areas of concern for ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM) which reduce transportation-related emissions. Geographic areas of concern will be identified in cooperation with the Idaho Division of
Environmental Quality (IDCQ) as having measured air quality problems or the potential for air quality problems. CMAQ funds are available for construction and non-construction type projects. The local or state match requirement is 7.34 percent.

Projects are solicited through an annual statewide application process targeted to communities with an air-quality problem (Nov-Feb). A CMAQ Technical Review Committee reviews the CMAQ Program applications and recommends high-ranking projects to the Idaho Transportation Board. Projects are evaluated and ranked on a statewide basis for air quality benefits and cost effectiveness.

The City of Hailey is currently eligible for CMAQ grants as are other Idaho cities and other jurisdictions.

**STP Safety**

Funds are for projects to reduce accidents at identified hazardous locations and for bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements, including on-road facilities, public trails, and traffic calming activities, or for projects that improve motorist protection at railroad crossings. These funds are available for any state or local public road. The local or state match requirement is 7.34 percent. Accident reduction projects at hazardous locations are identified from a systematic review of high accident locations produced from the statewide accident records system. All proposed local or state projects are prioritized statewide within available funding levels on a safety benefit to project cost ratio, which is heavily dependent on accident history and project cost data. Final project selection is by the Idaho Transportation Board.

Accident reduction projects at railroad/highway crossings are identified from a systematic review of hazardous crossings. All proposed local or state projects are prioritized statewide within available funding levels on a ranking formula, which considers vehicle traffic, train traffic, accident history and other relevant crossing data. The Idaho Transportation Board makes the final project selection.

**Idaho Safe-Routes-To-School**

The Idaho Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program is administered by the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) which annually posts application requirements in January of each year (current notification and submittal requirement by Letter of Intent to Apply was January 31, 2007). Schools, school districts, non-profits, highway districts, cities and counties can apply.

The purpose of the SR2S program is to increase the safety and number of children walking and bicycling to school. Everyone benefits from SR2S. The benefits of walking to school extend beyond increasing physical activity, and include decreasing congestion surrounding schools, increasing an emphasis on pedestrian safety in the community, decreasing emissions surrounding schools, and even improving student behavior and performance within the classroom.

The Safe Routes to Schools Program (SR2S) is a federal program of the FHWA SAFETEA-LU program. The funds are dedicated to create FHWA SR2S programs.
that will enhance children's health and well-being; ease traffic congestion near schools; improve air quality, improve community members overall quality of life.

Idaho will receive approximately $1 million per year for the SR2S program in fiscal years 2006 - 2009. However, in 2007 ITD was unable to establish programmatic budgets for SR2S but are intending to do so for 2008. ITD will administer this new funding source to advance SR2S activities throughout the state. The SR2S program is a reimbursement program. The sponsor pays the cost of the project and submits reimbursement request to the SR2S program.

Hailey has submitted a grant application for 2007.

Local Funding

A reference to the various Idaho Code sections pertaining to transportation funding is found in the LHTAC funding report. A brief summary of the Idaho Code relating to transportation funding is provided here.

Vehicle Registration Fee

*Title 40, Chapter 8, Section 27 (40-827)* enables authorization for voters to approve a local vehicle registration fee not to exceed two times the amount established in section 49-402 of the Idaho Code. The decision to hold election on such a vote requires adoption of a county-wide ordinance by majority vote of the county commissioners. Funds collected are restricted to highway construction, repair, maintenance, and traffic supervision (interest and principal of obligations incurred for these purposes).

The state law is specific as to how the county-wide registration fee revenues are to be distributed, either by written agreement approved by each of the local highway jurisdictions (if more than one) in the county or as follows:

- Thirty percent (30%) shall be apportioned among the cities, incorporated and specially chartered, in the county, in the same proportion as the population of the city bears to the total population of all the cities in the county, as shown by the last regular or special federal census.
- Seventy percent (70%) shall be apportioned as follows:
  - Twenty percent (20%) shall be divided equally between the county highway department, where applicable, and each highway district in the county, where applicable;
  - Eighty percent (80%) shall be divided between the county highway department where applicable, and each highway district in the county, where applicable, in the proportion that the number of miles of improved highways in each highway system of the county bears to the total number of improved miles of highways in the county.

Bonds

*Title 50, Chapter 10 (sections 27-41)* authorizes municipalities to issue revenue bonds to fund street projects. Idaho Code also governs the general election requirements for public approval of bonds (50-1026) as follows: two-thirds (2/3) of the qualified
electors voting at such election, assent to the issuing of such bonds and the incurring of the indebtedness thereby created for the purpose; and the municipal debt ceiling (63-802) by limiting a city’s property tax portion of their budget to a 3% annual increase, which can affect the level of bonding for local transportation projects.

**Local Improvement Districts**

*Title 50, Chapter 17* empowers municipalities to create a local improvement district for the construction, reconstruction or maintenance of street and accompanying curbs, gutters, culverts, sidewalks and other transportation amenities. The organization of the LID is to be defined in accordance with Idaho Code 50-17. Among other things, the LID can be formed for the following street-related amenities:

- To establish grades and lay out, establish, open, extend and widen any local, collector, arterial or other street, sidewalk, alley or off-street parking facility;
- To purchase, acquire, construct, improve, repair, light, grade, pave, repave, surface, resurface, curb, gutter, sewer, drain, landscape and beautify any street, sidewalk or alley;
- To purchase, construct, reconstruct, extend, maintain or repair bridges, sidewalks, crosswalks, driveways, culverts, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, ditches, drains, conduits, flood barriers and channels for sanitary and drainage purposes (et al).

**Local Option Tax**

Hailey recently adopted, by local ordinance (#950), their Local Option Tax. The local option tax revenues are limited to the following:

- Emergency services (rapid response, life saving, traffic enforcement, training, staffing, equipment, vehicles, etc.).
- Maintenance, improvement and acquisition of parks.
- Road repair, transportation enhancements and snow removal.
- City promotion, visitor information, special events and economic development.
- Town improvements (library modernization, sidewalks, town square, etc.).
- Public transit and related improvements.
- Direct cost to administer and enforce this ordinance.

**Franchise Fees**

*Title 50, Chapter 3, Section 29 (50-329A)* Cities may grant franchises to electric, natural gas and water public utilities, and to cooperative electrical associations ("public service providers") and may include franchise fees in franchises granted to public service providers. Franchise fees shall not exceed one percent (1%) of the public service provider’s "gross revenues" received within the city without the consent of the public service provider or the approval of a majority of voters. Also, franchise fees cannot exceed three percent (3%), unless a greater franchise fee is being paid under an existing franchise agreement, in which case the franchise agreement may be renewed at up to the greater percentage, with the consent of the public service provider or the approval of a majority of voters.
Has adopted franchise fees for garbage, gas, electric and cable; garbage and cable were negotiated at higher than the 3% cap. Gas and electric were set at 3% and 1%, respectively.

**Urban Renewal**

*Title 50, Chapter 20 and 29* enable cities to establish urban renewal agencies for the purpose of rehabilitating, conserving and redeveloping areas within municipal jurisdiction. The statutes define how urban renewal agencies are formed and what powers they can exercise, including the definition of urban renewal plans, the formation of taxing districts, the levying of taxes, and the borrowing of money and acceptance of loans, grants, contributions and other financial assistance to carry out the urban renewal plan. The urban renewal agency has the power to issue bonds to finance the undertaking of urban renewal projects. The bonds are not a debt to the municipality and are to be payable (both to principal and interest) solely from the income, proceeds, revenues and funds of the urban renewal agency.

**Traffic Impact Fee (TIF)**

*Title 67, Chapter 82 (67-82)* empowers the city to establish an impact fee for growth-related capital improvements. The Idaho Impact Fee Act requires that impact fees be based on a capital improvement plan that must contain specific elements, each of which are noted and summarized below as originally defined in *Section 67-8208* of the Idaho Code.

- General description of all *existing* public facilities, their deficiencies, and an estimate of costs and a plan to develop the funding sources related to curing the existing deficiencies to meet existing needs;
- Stated commitment by the governmental entity to use other available sources of revenue to cure existing systems deficiencies (where practical);
- Analysis of capacity, level of current usage, and commitments for usage of capacity of existing capital improvements;
- Description of land use assumptions by the government entity;
- Definitive table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption or discharge of a “service unit” (e.g., roadway volume-to-capacity) for each category of system improvements, and an equivalency or conversion table establishing a ratio of a service unit to various land use types;
- Description of all system improvements and their costs necessitated by and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions, to provide a level of service not to exceed the level of service adopted in the development impact fee ordinance;
- Total number of service units necessitated and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculate in accordance with generally accepted engineering or planning criteria;
- Projected demand for system improvements required by the new service units projected over a reasonable period of time not to exceed 20 years;
- Identification of all funding sources available to the government entity for the financing of system improvements;
- Specifies inter-governmental agreements for multi-jurisdiction system improvements, further restricting the use of impact fees; and
- A schedule setting forth estimated dates for commencing and completing construction of all improvements identified in the capital improvement plan.

There is significant detail in the Idaho Impact Fee Act beyond this summary. The City of Hailey adopted its local TIF to help pay for some intersection improvements and street department rolling stock; both were considered as capital expansion needed to serve new development growth. TIF revenue for intersection improvements is estimated at $629,000 for 5 years, or $2,516,000 for 20 years. The total TIF-eligible costs for intersection improvements over the 20-year period is $3,950,000. Hailey would need to fund the remaining portion of these costs with other funds.

Implementation Program

Implementation of the Transportation Master Plan involves several strategies. The first strategy includes partnering with other agencies to fund and construct regional transportation improvement projects. The other strategy is to have new growth mitigate the impacts of increased traffic by improving rural arterials to urban standards in order to accommodate new development.

Partnering with Other Agencies

The City will need to continue to coordinate and ITD on transportation needs within the City and its area of impact, particularly regarding street and intersection enhancements along SH-75. The City should work with ITD and other agencies to seek grants, legislative “earmarks” and other outside funding. The City could also contribute to these improvements through the application of their traffic impact fees (TIF) or other local revenue, if implemented.

Timing and Project Prioritization

As growth occurs, the City of Hailey should re-evaluate priorities and timing of projects to focus improvements on areas of need. This will be accomplished by reviewing traffic growth and the location and intensity of land use growth in the City and area of impact every 2 to 3 years. The City will then be able to identify areas that are most impacted by growth.

Development Review

Some of the projects in the Transportation Master Plan are assumed to be completed by new development. To support development of a comprehensive transportation system with urban amenities such as sidewalks and curb/gutter, the City has adopted development regulations and local street standards. The regulations and standards ensure urban amenities are provided as part of frontage improvements and new local roadways.
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