

State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan Meeting #3 Summary November 4, 2010

MEETING OBJECTIVES

The State Street Transit and Traffic Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met for the third time on Nov. 4, 2010. The purpose of the meeting was to present and gather input on:

- The draft near, medium and long term recommended improvements for the State Street corridor
- The draft plan for implementing the recommended improvements
- Discuss December open house

This document summarizes the presentations, discussion and comments from the meeting.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE

- Dave Angell, Idaho Power
- Anne Barker, Boise Planning & Zoning
- Jeanne Barker, Garden City
- Vasile Bejenarim, AmeriCorps
- L. Kent Brown, Garden City Planning & Zoning
- Ester Ceja, Collister Neighborhood Association
- Eric Davis, Retail West Properties
- Leslie Felton-Jue, Collister Neighborhood Association
- Daren Fluke, JUB Engineers
- John Franden, ACHD
- Brooke Green, CTAI
- David Greene, Riverglen Junior High School
- Maureen Gresham, ITD
- Sally Goodell, ACHD
- Mike Hall, CCDC
- Chris Hansen, House of Brokers Inc
- Chris Hendrickson, Berkeley - Bike Commuter
- Rob Howarth, Central District Health
- Lindsay Klein, Salvation Army
- Julie Klocke, Collister Neighborhood Association
- Jeff Lowe, ACHD
- Susan Mason, Boise State University
- Don Matson, COMPASS
- Jerry Nielson, Garden City
- Jim Neill, Garden City Planning and Zoning
- Norm Semanko, Eagle City Council
- Vicki Smith, Hewlett-Packard
- Ryan Head, ACHD
- George C. Knight, Bike Advisory Committee, ACHD
- Andrea Tuning, City of Boise
- Mark Wasdahl, ITD – District 3
- Deanna Watson, BCAC Housing Authority

PROJECT TEAM ATTENDANCE

- Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
- Fred Kitchener, McFarland Management
- Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise
- Andy Daleiden, Kittelson & Associates
- John Ringert, Kittelson & Associates
- Katie Pincus, Kittelson & Associates
- Ed Myers, Kittelson & Associates
- Rosemary Curtin, RBCI

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PowerPoint presentation
- Near-term comment sheet (Yellow)
- Medium-term comment sheet (Blue)
- Long-term comment sheet (Green)

MEETING AGENDA AND SUMMARY

Welcome

- Rosemary Curtin, RBCI opened the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation. She discussed the following items:
 - Reviewed meeting agenda and materials
 - Reminded committee members this is the last meeting and thanked everyone for their participation
 - Announced the public meeting on Dec. 2
 - Asked all participants to fill out the comments sheets

Near, medium and long term recommended improvements– Overview

- Andy Daleiden, Kittelson & Associates provided the committee with an overview of:
 - Where the project team is in the study and provided information about:
 - Background conditions
 - Reviewed outcomes from CAC meeting #2
 - Reviewed outcomes from online survey
 - Draft recommended alternative
 - Explained what alternatives were evaluated
 - Explained the evaluation process that was used to identify the draft recommended alternative
 - Discussed the draft recommended alternative by segment
 - Draft implementation plan
 - Discussed the near-term improvements
 - Discussed the medium-term improvements
 - Discussed the long-term improvements

Questions/Answers from Committee Members

Additional Technical Review

Could the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes have a problem with usage? It seems like a lot of roadway to just serve 3,000 vehicles a day. Would the lanes be implemented by time of day?

HOV lanes work well with approximately 200-400 vehicles per hour per lane. If the HOV volumes in the lane are outside this range, the volume can be managed by modifying the types of vehicles allowed to use the lane. For example, if the HOV lane had too much usage, the requirements could be modified to increase the number of occupants needed for a vehicle to use the HOV lane from two to three occupants.

In addition to the above data, a detailed regional HOV study will be conducted in the future to identify HOV lane usage requirements and their effects on the use of the HOV lane.

Three thousand riders on the buses would be using the lane. The lane would serve buses, right-turning vehicles, and HOV. HOV lanes are implemented at certain times of day in some locations, which is an option for this corridor.

If federal dollars are used for the HOV lane, can it later be converted to a mixed traffic lane? Would the local agencies be required to pay back the federal money used to construct the HOV lanes?

It all depends on the language used in the federal application. If a HOV project was to move forward with a federal application, the language should be carefully written to provide as much flexibility in the future for the region.

The planned transit service for State Street between Eagle and Downtown Boise is 18 buses per hour per direction. How does that number translate into bus headways?

The planned service would operate at 10 to 15 minute frequencies for some routes. The combined frequency of all the routes serving a stop would be 3 to 5 minutes at some locations.

The frequency of service for a rider traveling along State Street to the Downtown Boise Multimodal Center would be 3 to 5 minutes since the traveler could use any of the multiple routes serving that destination.

***Operations of Draft Recommended Alternative
(Curbside Running Way with HOV Simulation)***

Is the HOV lane volume in the model based on requiring at least two occupants per vehicle_[RBCI]?

In this VISSIM simulation model, we assumed a 2+ occupancy requirement but did not take vehicles out of the mixed traffic lanes. The HOV were added on top of the traffic volumes in the mixed traffic lanes. The model assumes a fixed number of vehicles in the HOV lanes and does not adjust driving patterns based on the HOV lane requirements.

What are the traffic volumes in the model?

The year 2010 traffic volumes and future transit service were used to represent the traffic volumes in the model. Additionally, the HOV lane includes an additional 200 vehicles per hour per lane in this model.

Does the bus travel from Collister Drive to 33rd Street without making any stops?

The express bus does not stop between Collister Drive and 33rd Street, but the primary route stops more frequently and serves stops between those locations.

The bicycles in the model do not turn off of State Street. What safety treatments would be in place for bicyclists in the curbside running way with HOV?

The model shows how bicyclists traveling along State Street would interact with buses, HOV, and right-turning vehicles. The recommended bicycle safety treatments would be explored in the concept or design phase of the widening project.

There are not very many right-turning vehicles in the model.

We did not model all of the driveways along State Street, but there are right-turning vehicles at the signalized intersections along the corridor. Right-turning vehicles at driveways would maneuver into the HOV lane in the same way.

It seems like the HOV lanes would be hard to enforce with the number of driveways along State Street that would cause right-turning vehicles to use the lane.

As we discuss the recommended improvements for the corridor in the breakout sessions, we will identify specific projects like the Access Management Plan and HOV Lane Use Study that address this concern.

Discussion of near, medium and long term improvements (breakout sessions)

- Committee members were divided into three groups. Each group had the opportunity to review the recommended improvements for the near, medium and long term.
- A member of the project management team led a discussion at each group.
- Team members were asked to record their comments.

Below is a summary that includes input from 34 comment sheets and three working groups. A verbatim transcription is included in the appendix to this document.

General Comments

In general, attendees supported the plan.

- Attendees saw a need for coordination between the elements of the plan.
 - TOD nodes should be located with park-n-rides.
 - Land use and future developments should be considered.
 - Public and private sectors should work together.
- Improvements should make it easier for pedestrians, bicyclists and elderly or disabled patrons to use transit (i.e., bike lockers, bike lanes, bike racks on buses, sidewalks, pavement, proximity of bus stops to shopping, transfer times, etc.)
- Transit should include more feeder routes and north-south routes.
- School buses should not stop on State Street.
- Some wanted more information about specific timelines, funding and the extent and location of pedestrian improvements.
- Some felt the plan was not ambitious or long-term enough, and transit improvements should be constructed sooner.

Near-term Improvements

The majority of attendees supported the near-term improvements.

- Frequent “likes” included bus bays, 15-minute bus service, park-n-ride locations, queue jumps and transit signal priority.
- Participants disagreed about the urgency of transit improvements in Eagle.
- Sidewalks should be added from Collister Drive to 36th Street and out to Bogart Lane.
- Focus on reducing transportation demand (i.e., parking policies, adding bike lanes, etc.)
- Construct improvements (bus bays, sidewalks, etc.) in their ultimate locations.
- Intersection improvements should include Bogart Lane, 30th Street, Ballantyne Lane, Veterans Memorial Parkway, Eagle Road and Collister Drive.
- Bike lanes needs to be expanded to north/south and parallel streets

- Add Horseshoe Bend TOD in the near term.

Medium-term Improvements

Attendees showed moderate support for the medium-term improvements.

- Future park-n-ride lots are planned in the right locations.
- HOV lanes between 23rd Street and Glenwood were generally supported, but some felt they should be built sooner.
- Intersections that need improvement should include Linder Street, SH 16 and SH 55.

Long-term Improvements

Comments about long-term improvements varied widely.

- HOV lanes from Glenwood Street to Eagle Road are important. Attendees suggested moving the project to the medium-term and extending HOV lanes to SH 16.
- Transit-oriented development locations can be expanded.
- Transit should include more feeder routes and north-south routes.

Next steps

November 2010

- Address comments received from the TAC and CAC
- Update draft implementation plan

December 2010

- Open house (December 2)
- Address comments received from the open house
- Prepare implementation plan for adoption

January 2010 – Spring 2011

- Present to agency boards, councils and commissions
- Adoption of implementation plan

NEAR TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the near term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. In the near term, are we recommending the right pedestrian improvements? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. In the near term, are we recommending the right locations for intersection improvements? If no, what suggestions do you have?
1.	Route 9 – yes, 15-minute frequency is a good near-term goal for this route. Route 44- - I am not familiar with current schedule of this route. If route 9 runs at 15-minute intervals, perhaps Route 44 could offer express to DBMM during peak, and local to State/Glenwood off-peak.	What about Collister? Seems like there could be some sidewalk improvements there, to. Regarding the improvements listed, these are good if you put sidewalks on both sides of the street. Sidewalks on State should extend to Bogart, if you plan to add signal at this intersection.	Near-term priorities should be 30 th , Bogart, Ballantyne. Save Linder and SH 16 for mid-term. Intersection improvements should include measures for bicycles – priority signals, bike boxes, pavements markings to assist biker changing lane, etc.
2.	Seems appropriate for #9. Not sure on #44 – don't know enough about demand for that route.	Yes, most have sidewalk/pathways that connect with transit stops and businesses. Does “ped improvements” include bike lanes? If it does, then no, not enough improvements if bike lanes aren't added in entirety.	Don't know.
3.	Yes, appears to be adequate and well thought out. What if any provisions or improvements for bicycle traffic?	Yes, it appears that is about all that is possible without acquiring significant additional right-of-way.	Yes, appears logical at present.
4.	Should extend Rt. 9 to Wal-Mart/Bogart in near-term. Need more north/south service in near/mid-term for connections across the river.		VMP will need improvements sooner. Eagle Road (+Hwy 55 north) may need improvements sooner.
5.	Would like to consider doing something more aggressive (median running) from multi-modal center to 23 rd Street then do HOV from there out.	Please make sure bike and ped improvements happen at the same time.	
6.	Yes – generally speaking.	It seems the south side of State Street is in need of sidewalks – especially in the Collister to 36 th Street area.	

NEAR TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the near term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. In the near term, are we recommending the right pedestrian improvements? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. In the near term, are we recommending the right locations for intersection improvements? If no, what suggestions do you have?
7.	I believe that Route 9 can provide ridership for 15-minute bus service now for the commute hours 6-9 a.m. and 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. The route could support 15-minute bus service at the end of the near-term. I do not know whether Eagle ridership can support 30-minute day bus services (I think that Eagle is a ___ location)	Sidewalks along State Street from Glenwood in makes sense to me. I believe the problem sidewalk areas are listed above.	I rarely drive past (west of) Highway 55, however, when I do drive out there it is during the evening rush hour and the traffic is very congested.
8.	Need better timing coordination between State St. routes and other N/S routes. Stops need to be closer to destinations (not mid-block). Investigate use of existing parking lots as park and ride closer in (Glenwood to 23 rd St.)	If possible, move up to near-term bus pull-outs.	Collister and State Pierce Park and State
9.	Yes		When you improve those intersections you should build bus bays at the same time.
10.	Not sure about rider demand in the Eagle area in the short-term. Costs too much and the bus stops too much/takes too long – need HOV lane!		
11.	Where new signals are indicated bus bays should be installed at the same time. Provision for bus or commuteride should be integrated at that time.	It's ok.	I think its ok but I would like to have land use plans and ACHD (ITD) plans in place to support up front the intersection improvements (e.g. bus bays at all signals).
12.	Yes – would like to know how...	Yes	Not sure – would think it would make more sense to do closer in intersections.

NEAR TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	4. What do you like and dislike about the recommended near-term improvements?	5. Did we miss anything for the near-term improvements? Other comments.
1.	Added bus bays good. Also I like new park-n-ride locations at Glenwood, Horseshoe Bend Road and expansion of park-n-ride at Edgewood. There should be more park-n-rides added in short-term. Add SH 16, Linder, Park. Park-n-rides should include bicycle parking/bike lockers.	Park-n-rides should include bicycle parking/bike lockers. Also, put bike racks at busy bays. DBMM center should include bike-share system, with terminals at bus stops inside 36 th Street. Also, your graphic displays do not make clear what will be done to improve pedestrian/bicycle connections, besides sidewalk projects mentioned in question #2 above.
2.	Like – bus bays and park & rides, timed signals Dislike – transit improvements don't seem well coordinated with transit service functionality. (Not everyone is trying to go to/from downtown)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No left turns should be allowed during peak hours in 4 lane road segments (8th to 27th Street) ▪ More greenbelt access signage – specifically at Plantation River Dr. ▪ Several bike storage facilities (locker, rack, etc.) at bus stops and park & rides.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bus bays are a good idea ▪ 15-minute increments should significantly increase ridership. 	Nothing I can identify.
4.		
5.		
6.	They seem achievable under the current circumstances. Relative to the lack of a dedicated funding source.	Not that I can think of.
7.		We should create plan to encourage commuter bike ridership on the greenbelt and Hill Road. This would allow a limited bicycle use on State Street. The low use could be accommodated with a widened sidewalk placing pedestrians with bicycles. The end result is saving about 10 feet or ROW.
8.		
9.		Biggest problem is that if this is ever going to happen then need to associate a date as a goal by when these improvements will have been accomplished. If you don't then the decision makers will continue to put these off until some future time. For example I would set a goal that said we should get the near-term improvements in place within 5 years.
10.		

**NEAR TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010**

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	4. What do you like and dislike about the recommended near-term improvements?	5. Did we miss anything for the near-term improvements? Other comments.
11.	A lack of dedicated funding is a real threat to any project. Multi-agency agreement must be in place shortly after the recommendations are finalized.	
12.	Would like it to be a bit more ambitious. Bus bay locations are good.	

MEDIUM TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (____) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the medium term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. In the medium term, are the park-n-ride lots and Transit Oriented Developments in the correct locations? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. What do you like and dislike about a HOV lane on State Street between 23 rd Street and Glenwood Street.
1.	Yes if downtown Eagle becomes a transit oriented city. I expect that park and ride would be required to accommodate all the folks living north of downtown on 3-5 acre developments. Frequency and the ability to handle large usage during the commute is key.	See above – it depends on how large or expandable the lots will be.	I believe this is the most realistic option for moving rapid transit forward in the Treasure Valley. The design for right lane HOV is the right medium-term step.
2.	Probably but on the condition that Eagle pays for the service.	The TOD sites should be based on where the private sector investment is showing some momentum – or at least those with momentum should not be excluded at this stage.	Once you allow the public to use it as an HOV lane it will be difficult to change it to a dedicated lane.
3.	Please add median running downtown to 23 rd at this point if it has not already happened.	Okay	Worry about business so if we get median running – people can see in future the HOV won't be in the way of business entrances.
4.	Yes	As good as we can predict now.	
5.	Yes. The four lane expansion from Ballantyne to HWY 16 is long due.	Why would the entire corridor (for several ____N&S of the Hwy.) not be considered as a TOD zone in the interest of encouraging appropriate higher density development and/or ____.	Good ideas. Will improve traffic flow and efficiency, as well as encourage car pooling and use of HOV's.
6.	Suppose. Would think ridership demand and demographics will determine the appropriate level of service. Need more feeder routes.	Park and Ride at Multimodal Center is key! Still isn't clear to me exactly what TOD characteristics are. Bike storage facility at Park & Ride locations.	Like the idea of it but unsure how enforcement and public education about it will work. What prevents 1 occupant cars from falsely driving in HOV lane when there are right turn access points all along the route?

MEDIUM TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the medium term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. In the medium term, are the park-n-ride lots and Transit Oriented Developments in the correct locations? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. What do you like and dislike about a HOV lane on State Street between 23rd Street and Glenwood Street.
7.	Route 9 service should migrate westward to coincide with developments of park-n-rides. When park-n-ride is added near-term at Horseshoe Bend road, extend route 9 to there., etc. When new park-n-ride is done at Plaza, extend Route 9 there; and so forth.	Yes, if you add park-n-ride near term at Park and Linder.	What I dislike is that it still leaves 2 lanes each direction for mixed traffic. We should be aiming to reduce automobile trips in our region, and thereby trying to reduce the need for more pavement supply.
8.	I believe all TODs should be shown on near, medium term plans. Development will dictate which ones are happening earliest. Public should be aware of final plan.	Yes they are probably in correct locations. I believe all TODs should be shown on near, medium term plans. Development will dictate which ones are happening earliest.	I like it (the sooner the better) so that the public and business community can acclimate sooner rather than having to adapt in a high use/frequency environment.
9.	Comment for all phases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How much will this cost? ▪ I know there are multiple contingencies and complications BUT we should have some estimate of costs with public vs. private investments. 		
10.	Need to consider better access to State St., pedestrian and/or feeder routes.		
11.		Should note the TOD that is at Horseshoe Bend Rd. It is already in Garden City's comp plan.	
12.			

**MEDIUM TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010**

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	4. In the medium term, are we recommending the right locations for intersection improvements? If not, what suggestions do you have?	5. Did we miss anything for the near-term improvements? Other comments.
1.		
2.		Potentially some of the TOD sites were missed. You should identify all TODs on this map. You should identify the area around the MMC as a TOD even though the land use policy for the MMC already supports transit and some form of TOD is already happening.
3.		Be sure to make bike and ped improvements along the way.
4.	VMP needs work sooner near term Hwy 55?	
5.	Yes. Appear to be logical ___.	None I can identify.
6.	Don't have experience to really know. Would look to ACHD as expert.	More bike transit conducive policies needed. In general, VRT #'s aren't going to be where need to be w/o local option tax and forcing (incenting) ridership.
7.	I would save Linder and SH 16 intersections for medium term. Again, intersection improvements need to include bicycle specific safety measures. Priority signals, colored lane, bike boxes, etc.	It seems that for a 7-15 year horizon we should be supposing more feeder routes that just the two shown on graphic. Make sure to provide bicycle parking/bike lockers at ever park-n-ride. Bike racks at bus stops, especially where you build bus bays.
8.	Yes	1. Hope not. 2. I think mid-term sidewalk and bike path improvements should be made future west from Eagle to improve access for students at Eagle High School.
9.		
10.		General direction of plan is good, but concerned about funding.
11.		Same comment as near term. Need to set a date for when these items would have been accomplished as a goal i.e. within 10-15 years.

LONG TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the long term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. Are the additional TODs in the right locations? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. What are your thoughts on the expansion of the HOV lanes from Glenwood Street to Eagle Road?
1.	Still not convinced BRT is realistic for this area/size of community.		HOV is a great idea for cars and buses.
2.			When you widen from Eagle Road to SH 16 you need to buy ROW for future HOV lanes at that time.
3.	I think it is well thought out. I would be surprised to see it work out as recommended but it will never happen without a plan. I applaud the effort!	Yes	It could be done in the mid-term in my opinion.
4.	Yes.	I believe there should be a TOD at the 36 th intersection. It is a natural intersection for TOD on the north and west with the park on the southeast.	HOV should begin at Highway 16 and run to 23 rd Street.
5.	Yes – generally speaking.	Yes – but don't preclude transit supportive land use in areas not shown as TODs.	The HOV lanes might be more effective. Glenwood to Eagle than they are east of Glenwood because there are higher speeds and fewer right turns and curb cuts west of Glenwood.
6.	Yes	Yes	By now might think about median running from 23 rd to Glenwood.
7.	Yes, but the long-term still doesn't offer enough north/south connections/service. Some of the traffic on State will come from/go to south of the River. These travelers will stay in their cars without better transit interconnections.		

LONG TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	1. Is the level of additional transit service appropriate for the long term? If no, what suggestions do you have?	2. Are the additional TODs in the right locations? If no, what suggestions do you have?	3. What are your thoughts on the expansion of the HOV lanes from Glenwood Street to Eagle Road?
8.	Yes, appears to be adequate.	Why would the entire corridor from downtown to Gary Lane not be considered as a TOD to encourage appropriate higher density and/or fitting ___ in the several block distance N or S of the roadway.	
9.	Not going to get that level of ridership without local option tax. Maybe will if gas goes to \$5/gal, but some will need more subsidy.	Since they're pretty much @ every major intersection, think they're adequate.	Like the idea of them. Hopefully economic and population growth over next 25 years will create demand and funding for the expansion.
10.	BRT and Route 9 suggestions good. Seems like more feeder routes would be warranted.		Seems like Linder would be more realistic.

LONG TERM Draft Transcriptions
State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
CAC Meeting #3 - November 4, 2010

Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (___) indicates that the comment was not legible.

#	4. In the long term, are we recommending the right locations for intersection improvements? If not, what suggestions do you have?	5. Did we miss anything for the near-term improvements? Other comments.
1.		
2.		Same comment. Set a timeframe as a goal i.e. 2035.
3.	Yes	I think the study results should be extended to the western city limits of Star.
4.	These three intersections will be handling a large volume of traffic and do require improvements to efficiently move the vehicles.	
5.		
6.		Be sure to do bike and ped improvements along the way.
7.		Hwy 55 - we need to anticipate 3 cities river crossing will be built in the long -term, and it will make Hwy 55 a much busier/more complete intersection
8.	Yes, these appear logical choices.	None that I can identify.
9.	Still not clear to me in all scenarios how peds and bicyclists make their way across 7 lanes of traffic efficiently and safely.	Hovercraft lanes ☺ 25 years seems so far out hard to imagine if the plan is sufficient. Cost of fuel will drive viability of a lot of this.
10.	Hopefully there is no need to do more than these 3. Again, these intersection improvements should include bicycle specific safety measure there should be plenty of advances made during the 35-year planning period.	Are you adding bus bays on the whole route of widening? Are you adding safety measures for bicycles at each intersection in the area being widened.