AGENDA

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

April 16, 2020
A G E N D A

Regular Meeting of the Idaho Transportation Board

April 16, 2020

The meeting will be conducted remotely.
It will be an audio meeting only; no visuals.
The meeting is open to the public except for the executive session.

To listen:
1. Dial 1-844-740-1264
   a. Meeting number (access code): 286 839 774 #
   b. When asked for an attendee number, hit “#” to join the conference call

KEY:
ADM = Administration
CD = Chief Deputy
OP = Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CALL MEETING TO ORDER</td>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SAFETY/SECURITY SHARE: Executive Assistant Higgins</td>
<td>8:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>BOARD MINUTES – March 18</td>
<td>8:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2020 BOARD MEETING DATES</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 20-21 – District 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 16-17 – District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 15-16 – District 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CONSENT CALENDAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Add two Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization transit projects</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Delay STC-2822, West Glendale Road and Canal Bridge, Blaine County from FY20 to FY21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Increase professional services agreement amount to over $500,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Consultant agreements</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Contract for award</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule. The meeting is open to the public, except for the executive session.
### Information Items

6. **INFORMATIONAL CALENDAR**
   - OP ___ Contract award information and current advertisements ................................28
   - OP ___ Professional services agreements and term agreement work tasks report......34
   - ADM ___ FY20 General Funds Apportionment for Local Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation in the approved FY20-26 Program.................................41
   - ADM ___ State FY20 financial statements ......................................................................42
   - ADM ___ Monthly report of federal formula program funding through March.............60

7. **DIRECTOR’S MONTHLY REPORT ON ACTIVITIES**
   - Time*: 8:40

8. **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**: Governmental Affairs Manager McCarty
   - Time*: 8:55

9. **AGENDA ITEMS**

   **Action Items**
   - ADM ___ Revisions to Board and Administrative Policies 4052 and 5052 Official Tolman Travel by Department Personnel (Resolution on page 69).......................62
   - CD ___ Idaho 16, I-84 to SH-44 cost estimates ...........................................................70
   - CD ___ Public Transportation Advisory Council District 4 appointment....................76
     (Resolution on page 88)

10. **BREAK**
    - Time*: 9:50

11. **AGENDA ITEMS, continued**

   **Action Items**
   - OP ___ Board and administrative policies for small cell facilities in Rindlisbacher ITD right of way .................................................................89
   - OP ___ District 1 SH-3 levee widening .................................................................93
     (Resolution on page 101)
   - OP ___ Designation of District 6 routes as 129,000 pound truck routes .............102
     (Resolution on page 182)

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule. The meeting is open to the public, except for the executive session.
12. **AGENDA ITEMS, continued**

**Action Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minzghor</td>
<td>Relinquishment of East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access....................</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Resolution on page 198)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minzghor</td>
<td>Relinquishment of SH-33 Sugar City Half Interchange................................</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Resolution on page 213)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crider</td>
<td>Board and administrative policies 4030 and 5030 Surface Transportation</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>11:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Grant Rural Exchange Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Resolution on page 225)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Item**

13. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**  

PERSONNEL ISSUES [SECTION 74-206(a), (b)]  
LEGAL ISSUES [SECTION 74-206(c), (d), (f)]

14. **ADJOURNMENT** (estimated time) 12:15

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule. The meeting is open to the public, except for the executive session.*
REGULAR MEETING OF THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

March 18, 2020

The Idaho Transportation Board convened at 8:30 AM on Wednesday, March 18, 2020 at the Idaho Transportation Department in Boise, Idaho. The following principals were present:
Bill Moad, Chairman
Julie DeLorenzo, Member – District 3
Brian W. Ness, Director
Scott Stokes, Chief Deputy
Larry Allen, Lead Deputy Attorney General
Sue S. Higgins, Executive Assistant and Secretary to the Board

The following participated remotely:
Jim Kempton, Vice Chairman – District 4
James R. Thompson, Member – District 1
Janice B. Vassar, Member – District 2
Dwight Horsch, Member – District 5
Bob Hoff, Member – District 6

Safety/Security Share. Project Manager Mark Campbell emphasized the importance of work zone safety. He reminded motorists to be aware of their surroundings, don’t drive distracted, plan ahead, leave early, and leave sufficient room between your vehicle and the vehicle in front of you. He said a lot of construction is occurring on I-84 in the Nampa area and the Department has an extensive communication plan to keep motorists informed of the activity.

Chairman Moad thanked Project Manager Campbell for the important message.

Board Minutes. Member DeLorenzo made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on February 19, 2020 as submitted. Member Hoff seconded the motion. Via a roll call vote, the motion passed 4-0 due to technical difficulties with Districts 2 and 5.

Board Meeting Dates. Chairman Moad said the workshop planned in conjunction with the Board meeting in District 2 next month is being postponed. The business meeting will be on the 16th; however, the location will be determined at a later date. The following meeting dates and locations were scheduled:
April 16, 2020 – location to be determined
May 20-21, 2020 – District 5
June 16-17, 2020 – District 3

Consent Items. Due to audio difficulties, Member DeLorenzo relayed Member Vassar’s concern with the policies on the consent calendar. The Board Subcommittee on Policies did not review those revisions. Executive Assistant Higgins explained that the Subcommittee was established to review every policy and either re-format the policy or delete it. After a policy has been re-formatted, if revisions are proposed, the policy is presented to the full Board. Those
policies have not been reviewed by the Subcommittee. Vice Chairman Kempton confirmed that process, and added that the Board may hold policies for a 30-day review period.

Chairman Moad recommended removing Administrative Policy 5508 Smoking Policy and Board and Administrative Policies 4052 and 5052 Official Travel by Department Personnel from the consent calendar and re-submitting them next month.

Member DeLorenzo made a motion, seconded by Member Hoff, and passed 4-0 by individual roll call vote, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB20-07
WHEREAS, consent calendar items are to be routine, non-controversial, self-explanatory items that can be approved in one motion; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Transportation Board members have the prerogative to remove items from the consent calendar for questions or discussion.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves the distribution of FY20 Highway Infrastructure Program funds; adjustments to the Transportation Alternatives Program in the FY20-26 Idaho Transportation Investment Program; a consultant agreement; and a contract for award.

1) Distribution of FY20 Highway Infrastructure Program Funds. Last month the Federal Highway Administration notified Idaho that it would receive $14.1 million in Highway Infrastructure Program funds, with $8.5 million for Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation and $5.7 million for the State Transportation Block Grant. The latter funds are not subject to obligation limitation, require a non-federal match, must be obligated by September 30, 2023, have some limitations as to project eligibilities, and are to be sub-allocated by population. Because these funds are unique, staff recommends deviating from Board Policy 4028 Allocation of Federal Formula Highway Apportionments to Local Public Agencies. It requests approval to distribute the funds as follows: $696,074 (12.3%) to Urban – Transportation Management Area; $357,427 (6.3%) to Urban – Urban Balancing Committee; $357,427 (6.3%) to Rural – Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC); and $4,262,521 (75.4%) – any area – ITD.

2) Adjust Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in the FY20-26 Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP). Staff requests the removal of the $148,000 SH-55, Bosma to Labor Camp Sidewalk, Marsing project, key #22072 from the FY20 TAP. It also requests advancing the Local, Stoddard Path Extension Phase 2, Nampa, project, key #22070 to FY20 for $473,000.

3) Request to Approve Consultant Agreement. In accordance with Board Policy 4001 Authority to Sign Contracts, Agreements, and Grants and Requirement to Report Certain Contracts, staff requests approval to exceed the $1 million agreement limit for key #20662 – US-95, McArthur Lake, Boundary County for completion of design services and engineer of record services in the estimated amount of $1,500,000.

4) Contract for Award. The low bid on key #13419 – STC-5804, Westside Road, Trout Creek Bridges was more than ten percent over the engineer’s estimate, requiring justification and
Board approval. The major differences between the engineer’s estimate and low bid were in the Superpave Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement Including Asphalt, Concrete Class 40-A Schedule No. 1, Prestress Stringer, Provide and Drive 16” Diameter Steel Shell Pile, Special Bridge – Spray–Applied Waterproof Membrane, and Mobilization items. The engineer’s estimate was prepared a year before the project was advertised, and it was not reviewed prior to advertisement. Rebidding the project is not anticipated to result in savings. LHTAC and the project sponsor, Boundary County, believe the bids are reasonable considering the current bidding climate and location of the project, and recommend awarding the contract. Boundary County will provide the additional funds. Low bidder: C.E. Kramer Crane and Contracting Inc. - $943,663.


The list of projects currently being advertised was provided.

2) Professional Services Agreements and Term Agreement Work Tasks Report. From February 1 through February 26, 33 new professional services agreements and work tasks were processed, totaling $4,099,263. Six supplemental agreements to existing professional services agreements were processed during this period in the amount of $323,604.

3) State FY20 Financial Statements through January. Revenues to the State Highway Account from all state sources were ahead of projections by 5.6%. Receipts from the Highway Distribution Account were 4.6% or $6 million more than forecast. State revenues to the State Aeronautics Fund were ahead of projections by 4.4%, or $92,000. This is primarily due to the receipts for aircraft registrations; however, total receipts from aviation fuel taxes were below the forecast by 2.4%. Expenditures were within planned budgets. Personnel costs had savings of $7.6 million or 9.8% due to reserves for horizontal career path increases, vacancies, and timing between a position becoming vacant and being filled. Contract construction cash expenditures of $327.6 million exceeded any from the past three years.

The balance of the long-term investments was $109.5 million and the cash balance was $77.8 million at the end of January. Expenditures in the Strategic Initiatives Program Fund were $19.2 million. No additional funds, other than interest earned on the cash balance, are coming into this fund due to the expiration of the law effective May 31, 2019 that required the transfer. Deposits into the Transportation Expansion and Congestion Mitigation Fund were $10.8 million year-to-date. Expenditures in the GARVEE Capital Projects Fund through January were $13.1 million.

4) Monthly Reporting of Federal Formula Program Funding through February. Idaho received obligation authority of $286.6 million through September 30 via an appropriations act signed in December 2019. This includes $936,200 of Highway Infrastructure General Funds carried over from last year in the Transportation Management Area. Last month Idaho received $14.1 million of General Funds, of which $8.5 million of bridge funds were distributed evenly with local officials as part of a Board agenda item last month. The disposition of the remaining $5.7 million Highway Infrastructure General Funds was submitted under the Consent Calendar this month. Obligation authority is $295 million, which corresponds to $295.4 million with
match after a reduction for prorated indirect costs. Idaho received apportionments via notices through February 13, 2020 of $331.7 million, including Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds and Highway Infrastructure General Funds. Obligation authority is currently 90.7% of apportionments. Of the $295.4 million allotted, $170.7 million remains.

5) Non-Construction Professional Service Contracts Issued by Business and Support Management (BSM). The BSM Section did not execute any professional service agreements during the previous month.

Director’s Monthly Report on Activities. Director Ness announced the resignation of Chief Operations Officer Travis McGrath. Chief Deputy Stokes and he will assume the Chief Operations Officer’s duties until that position is filled. He testified at a Senate Banking Committee meeting on public transportation last month. Because of concerns with the novel coronavirus pandemic, next month’s workshop with legislators and local officials in District 2 is being postponed. Other Department activities included Districts 4, 5, and 6 identified various collaboration opportunities; continuation of the Star Card campaign; and the initiation of a new hiring process that will reduce the amount of time it takes to fill positions. He also recognized Financial Manager – Financial Planning and Analysis Joel Drake’s service and congratulated him on his upcoming retirement.

Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO) Brenda Williams summarized the efforts to address the novel coronavirus concerns and the response to the Governor’s declaration of a state of emergency. The top priorities are the safety and well-being of employees and customers and the continuity of operations. A number of conferences and meetings have been cancelled. Other measures include allowing employees to work from home, determining if training can be provided online, and eliminating all non-essential travel. CHRO Williams added that leadership will continue monitoring the situation and communicating with the Governor’s Office.

The entire Director’s Board Report can be viewed at http://itd.idaho.gov/Board.

Chairman Moad thanked Director Ness and CHRO Williams for the reports.

Legislative Report. Governmental Affairs Manager (GAM) Mollie McCarty reported that three of ITD’s legislative proposals have been signed into law, those relating to the local bridge inspection program, aligning fees for driver’s licenses and identification cards with the administrative process, and minimum sales requirements for dealers and salesman licensing renewals. The elimination of validation decals for commercial motor vehicles has passed both chambers. It does not appear the last proposal regarding reinstatement of a lifetime disqualification for a commercial driver’s license will be approved this year. Staff is continuing to monitor other legislative proposals, including on distracted driving, transportation funding, dyed fuel, specialty license plates, and drones. She also mentioned that Senate confirmation hearings were held last week for Member Hoff and Todd Hitchcock, who was appointed to the Aeronautics Advisory Board.

Chairman Moad thanked GAM McCarty for the legislative report.
Status: FY21 Appropriation – Joint Finance and Appropriation Committee (JFAC) Actions. Justin Collins, Financial Manager – Financial Planning and Analysis (FM-FP&A) reported that the FY21 appropriation bill is awaiting the Governor’s signature. He summarized changes JFAC made to the Governor’s recommended budget. Three Full Time Equivalent positions and personnel funding of $276,600 were transferred from Highways to the Division of Motor Vehicles to implement the Insurance Verification Program. The $3.5 million inflationary adjustment in Highways was funded through a transfer from Personnel to Operating, and the $25,000 Visitor Center line item was not approved. Those costs are to be absorbed within the Highways Operations budget. The total FY21 appropriation is $782,602,500, which is $2,818,800 less than the Governor’s recommended budget, and 1,648 full time positions.

Chairman Moad thanked FM-FP&A Collins for the update.

Plan to Address District 4 Office Building Deficiencies. Facility Program Manager (FPM) Tony Pirc said the District 4 office building in Shoshone is being assessed to determine the best approach to keep the building in sufficient working condition without making significant long-term expenditures. Modifications are planned to address Americans with Disabilities Act requirements; the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system; and deficiencies in the Materials Lab. Some windows will also be replaced. FPM Pirc said these modifications, estimated at $186,750, will be made with funds from the existing Facility Management Program.

Chairman Moad thanked FPM Pirc for the report.

Recognition of Employees’ Service. Chief Administrative Officer Charlene McArthur said that due to concerns with coronavirus, the employees who have reached a milestone in their service will be presented their certificates in October. She read the names of the employees who are being recognized for their state service in five-year increments.

Chairman Moad congratulated the employees on their milestones.

Temporary Waiver of Limitations for Emergency Movements – Process Improvement Recommendation. Compliance Program Manager (CPM) Reymundo Rodriguez summarized the Board’s authority to issue exemptions to the permit process in emergencies. Because the hardship requiring an exemption is usually time sensitive, CPM Rodriguez requested the Board delegate this authority to the Chief Engineer and Motor Vehicle Administrator. He explained how that process would work, including an engineering and safety analysis and necessary traffic control requirements.

In response to Chairman Moad’s question on the appeal process, DAG Allen replied that the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act will be followed. After staff’s review and analysis, a recommendation to approve or deny the request will be presented to the Chief Engineer. The Chief Engineer’s decision may be appealed to a hearing officer. The hearing officer will make findings and issue a decision for the Director to act on. If the applicant is not satisfied with the Department’s final decision, that decision may be appealed to district court.
Member DeLorenzo made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB20-08

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board may waive existing permit policy limitations in the event of an emergency, which is defined in IDAPA 30.03.03.630; and

WHEREAS, these requests can be time sensitive in nature due to the emergency; and

WHEREAS, the Board may grant authority to delegate as per Idaho Code 40-505 to appropriate staff.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board grants authority to the Division of Motor Vehicles Division Administrator and Chief Engineer to review, approve or deny requests for the waiver of existing permit policy limitations. The Board approves the process that has been brought before it as it provides that each request is analyzed utilizing engineering and safety criteria pertaining to appropriate Idaho laws, rules, and regulations in the movement of vehicles that exceed legal size and weight. The Board shall have findings reported via an informational Board agenda item.

Public Transportation 2020-2022 Application Funding Recommendations. Shauna Miller, Grants/Contracts Officer (G/CO), said a two-year competitive application process for the 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities, 5311 Formula Grant for Rural Areas, 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities, and Vehicle Investment Programs was recently completed. After reviewing the applications, staff presented the prioritized list of projects to the Public Transportation Advisory Council. The Council approved the funding recommendations for the 2020-2022 rural awards in the amount of $20,008,309. G/CO Miller added that not all of the requests could be funded, and that some funding remains in other Programs because the funding requests did not equal the amount of money available.

Member DeLorenzo made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB20-09

WHEREAS, the Public Transportation Office is charged with soliciting, reviewing, and programming public transportation projects in the rural areas of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board serves as the final approver of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funded projects in Idaho before being submitted to FTA; and

WHEREAS, the funding sources include three FTA grants, the 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, 5311 Rural Formula Program, and 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program, and one state grant Vehicle Investment Program; and
WHEREAS, the Public Transportation Office has solicited, reviewed, provided for public comment, presented and received unanimous concurrence from the Public Transportation Advisory Council on the proposed projects.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board acknowledges the projects proposed, as shown as Exhibit #519, which is made a part hereof with like effect, and approves the rural funding amount of $20,008,309, for submittal to the FTA for final approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these projects are submitted for inclusion in the FY20-26 Statewide Transportation Investment Program and programmed in FY20.

Corridor Plan: SH-44 (North Glenwood Street). Planning Services Manager (PSM) Ken Kanownik requested approval to complete a 20-year corridor plan for a portion of SH-44 in Garden City in-house. The area is impacted by extensive growth and a number of things are occurring in the corridor, including the creation of an Ada County advisory committee to explore the best use of the property housing Expo Idaho, Les Boise Park, and the fairgrounds, which are adjacent to the highway. The Plan would determine the best use of the existing geometry and right-of-way and determine Garden City’s ultimate vision for the corridor.

Senior Planner Cecilia Awusie said the project will develop partnerships, collaborate with stakeholders to identify potential transportation/environmental issues, allow stakeholders to suggest corridor solutions and planning issues, notify property owners of potential land use for transportation purposes, and increase overall transportation efficiency. She added that District 3 is involved with this proposal.

Member DeLorenzo made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. WHEREAS, Idaho Code § 40-310 directs the Idaho Transportation Board with ITB20-10 powers and duties over the state highway system; and

WHEREAS, the Scope of Work for State Highway 44 (Glenwood Street) corridor plan has been approved by the Idaho Transportation Department District 3 and the City of Garden City; and

WHEREAS, the Garden City Council received a corridor plan informational briefing on February 24, 2020; and

WHEREAS, ITD staff has coordinated closely with Garden City and will lead this planning effort for SH-44 and ITD staff is proposing to complete a corridor plan without any Idaho Transportation Investment Program funding associated.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, on March 18, 2020, the Board approves of ITD staff commencing with the corridor planning process for SH-44 (Glenwood Street).
2020 Board Outreach Workshops – Overview. PSM Kanownik said that due to concerns with the coronavirus pandemic, the Department will be flexible in planning and scheduling the workshops with local officials and legislators. The intent of the workshops is to improve efficiency, understand major factors impacting transportation, and document unmet transportation needs. The agenda consists of an overview on current coordination efforts and identifying other potential coordination opportunities; a discussion on statewide trends, focusing on the aging bridges, growth, and the changing needs of transportation users; and identifying the unmet regional transportation needs.

Chairman Moad thanked PSM Kanownik for the overview on the workshop plans.

Executive Session on Personnel and Legal Issues. Member DeLorenzo made a motion to meet in executive session at 11:05 AM to discuss personnel issues as authorized in Idaho Code Section 74-206 (b) and legal issues as authorized in Idaho Code Section 74-206 (c). Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote.

The discussions on legal matters related to the acquisition of real property. The discussion on personnel matters related to the performance of an employee.

The Board came out of executive session at 11:50 AM.

WHEREUPON, the Idaho Transportation Board’s regular monthly meeting officially adjourned at 11:50 AM.

_____________________________
BILL MOAD, Chairman
Idaho Transportation Board

Read and Approved
__________, 2020
__________, Idaho
# BOARD MEETING DATES

**2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 20-21</th>
<th>District 5</th>
<th>September 15-16</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 16-17</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>October 14-15</td>
<td>Boise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15-16</td>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>November _____</td>
<td>Boise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19-20</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>December _____</td>
<td>Boise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ![Calendar](calendar.png) |

"X" = holiday  
"-----" = conflicts such as AASHTO/WASHTO conferences (or Board/Director conflicts)

**Other dates of interest:**

- April 19-24: AASHTO National Transportation Advanced Leadership Institute, Washington, DC
- May 26-29: AASHTO spring meeting
- June 7-11: National Transportation Leaders Institute
- June 19-23: TRB/AASHTO Research Advisory Committee
- June 28 – July 1: Western Assoc. State Highway/Trans. Officials annual mtg, Salt Lake City, UT
- July 19-21: AASHTO Research Advisory Committee
- September 20-23: ARTBA annual meeting
- November 4-8: AASHTO annual meeting, Baltimore, MD

**Action:** Approve the Board meeting schedule.

*SSH: mtsched.docx*
RESOLUTION FOR CONSENT ITEMS

WHEREAS, consent calendar items are to be routine, non-controversial, self-explanatory items that can be approved in one motion; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Transportation Board members have the prerogative to remove items from the consent calendar for questions or discussion.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves the addition of two Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization transit projects; the delay of STC-2822, West Glendale Road and Canal Bridge, Blaine County from FY20 to FY21; increasing a professional services agreement amount to over $500,000; consultant agreements; and a contract for award.
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020

Consent Item  X  Information Item  □  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  

Presenter's Name  Ron Duran  Presenter's Title  Public Transportation Program Manager
Preparer's Name  Shauna Miller  Preparer's Title  Grants/Contract Officer

Subject
Add two Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO) Transit Projects to the approved FY 2020 – 2026 ITIP

Key Number  new  District  1  Route Number  Transit

Background Information
The purpose of this consent item is to request approval to add two transit projects to FY 2020, per policy 5011 Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP) and at the request of the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO) and the sponsor Kootenai County.

The Coeur D’Alene UZA Riverstone Transit Center, Phase 2 project is to complete construction of the transit center (original project under Key 12279). The funding would be used to provide for the design, engineering and construction of the remaining site that will be used as a park and ride lot in conjunction with the use of Citylink public transportation services. The cost of $850,000 is from FTA Section 5339 Grant and was approved from current and prior year available funds.

The Coeur D’Alene UZA Paratransit Services project is for a continuation of Kootenai County’s Purchase of Service, Ring a Ride service years 2021 and 2022. This will provide ongoing reliable services to both senior and disabled individuals that would not have access to traditional public transportation services. The cost of $191,000 is from FTA Section 5310 and was approved from prior year available funds.

The KMPO has updated their Transportation Improvement Program on March 24 and March 30, 2020 to add these two projects.

The staff requests approval to add these two projects as detailed above to the approved FY 2020 – 2026 ITIP.

Recommendations
Approve the addition of two Transit projects: the Coeur D’Alene UZA Riverstone Transit Center, Phase 2 project at a cost of $850,000 and the Coeur D’Alene UZA Paratransit Services project at a cost of $191,000.

Board Action
□ Approved  □ Deferred  □ Other  

Page 1 of 1
Meeting Date: April 16, 2020

Consent Item [ ] Information Item [ ] Amount of Presentation Time Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake Rindlisbacher</td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>LSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparer's Name</td>
<td>Preparer's Title</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Miles</td>
<td>LHTAC Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Delay STC-2822, W GLENDALE RD & CNL BR, BLAINE CO from FY 2020 to FY 2021 in the approved FY 2020 – 2026 ITIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STC-2822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

The purpose of this consent item is to request approval to delay STC-2822, W GLENDALE RD & CNL BR, BLAINE CO (KN13998) from FY 2020 to FY 2021, per policy 5011 Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP) and at the request of LHTAC and the project sponsor, Blaine County.

The project cost is $2,210,000 currently scheduled in FY 2020 in the Local Rural program. These funds can be used instead to help cover the current year funding shortfall due to high bids.

Staff requests the delay of this project be made to the program as detailed above.

Recommendations

Approve the delay of STC-2822, W GLENDALE RD & CNL BR, BLAINE CO (KN13998) from FY 2020 to FY 2021. The current year budget is $2,210,000.

Board Action

[ ] Approved  [ ] Deferred

[ ] Other
February 26, 2020

Wayne Herbel, P.E.
LHTAC
3330 Grace St.
Boise, ID 83703

Re: W GLENDALE RD & CNL BR, BLAINE CO; PROJECT NO: A013(998)

Dear Wayne,

Blaine County understands the above-mentioned project may be delayed due to a lack of available funding at this time. However, Blaine County is prepared to move forward with this project if the funds should become available on short notice.

Please keep us apprised on any developments so that we may plan accordingly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Jacob Greenberg
Chairman
Meeting Date: April 16, 2020

Subject: Request to increase professional services agreement amount to over $500,000- T-O Engineers

Key Number: 18770
District: 2
Route Number: STC-4792/BEECH/CHESTNUT ST RECONSTRUCTION

Background Information

The purpose of this Board Agenda Item is to request approval to exceed the consultant individual task agreement limit of $500,000 for consultants selected from the term agreement list set by Board Policy 4001 for T-O Engineers for the Beech/Chestnut Street Reconstruction Project, Key No. 18770.

Project Description

The proposed project will improve ten blocks of Chestnut Street from N. Garfield Street to S. Cedar Street, and three blocks of Beech Street in Genesee.

The agreement for the first phase of the project took the project through Charter Report Approval.

The agreement for the second phase continued the project from Preliminary Design through PS&E. In September of 2019, T-O Engineers and Hodge & Associates (City Engineer) conducted individual meetings with property/business owners to present the preliminary design alternative, after which a Public Open House was held to present the preferred alternatives to the public. Subsequently it was decided the roadway should be designed to accommodate farm equipment (combines with 16-foot wide headers) to travel along Chestnut Street, and increase the turning radiuses at the intersections for the large grain trucks. A supplemental agreement is needed to re-design Chestnut Street.

The consultant will also be needed for a post award consultant agreement for Engineer of Record tasks. The estimated cost of that agreement is $20,000.

Funding

This project currently has $486,000.00 obligated for PC. Current agreements total $482,002. Additional funds will be obtained from program balancing to cover the additional cost to complete the design.

Recommendations

Approve request for T-O Engineers to exceed the consultant individual task agreement limit of $500,000 for consultants selected through the RFI process, up to $600,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Date: April 15-16, 2020

Consent Item [ ] Information Item [ ] Amount of Presentation Time Needed [ ]

Presenter's Name: Monica Crider, P.E.
Presenter's Title: Contracting Services Engineer
Initials: MC
Reviewed By: MC

Preparer's Name: Holly McClure
Preparer's Title: Grants/Contracts Officer
Initials: HM
Reviewed By: LSS

Subject
REQUEST TO APPROVE CONSULTANT AGREEMENT

Key Number
Various
District
1 & 3
Route Number
Various

Background Information

Board Policy 4001 delegates authority to the Director or another designee to approve routine engineering agreements of up to $1M. Any agreements larger than this amount must be approved by the Board. The purpose of this Board item is to request approval for agreements larger than $1M on the same project.

The size of the agreements listed were anticipated because of the complexity and magnitude of the associated construction projects. In many instances, the original intent is to solicit the consultant services in phases allowing for greater flexibility of the Department, limited liability, and better design after additional information is obtained. In other cases, such as for Construction Engineering and Inspection services, one single agreement over $1M may be issued allowing for continuity of the inspection. In all cases, any agreement over $500,000 is awarded through the Request for Proposal (RFP) process which is open to all interested firms.

Recommendations

Approve: (see attached sheets for additional detail)

- Key No. 12310, Ramsey Road; Wyoming to Lancaster Road – for completion of design services and engineer of record services for a total estimated amount of $1,601,000
- Key No. 20575, SH 53, Hauser Lake Road to N Bruss Road – for completion of design services for a total estimated amount of $1,500,000
- Key No. 01004, SH 55, Smith’s Ferry to Round Valley, Valley County – for construction engineering and inspection services for a total estimated amount of $1,600,000

Board Action

[ ] Approved  [ ] Deferred  ________________________________
[ ] Other  ________________________________
DATE: March 23, 2020

TO: Monica Crider, PE
Contracting Services Engineer

FROM: Jeff Miles, PE
LHTAC Administrator

RE: Request to Increase Professional Services Agreement Amount to over $1,000,000 for design by David Evans & Associates

David Evans & Associates was selected through individual project solicitation to provide design services for the Ramsey Road, Wyoming to Lancaster project, Key No. 12310. This is a phased project that will eliminate the gap in the connectivity of the roadway at the Coeur d’Alene Airport. Currently Ramsey Road terminates near the north and south boundary of the airport, resulting in a gap to motorists. The south half of the corridor (Phase 1) will be constructed as a three-lane roadway with a continuous center turn lane to provide improved access for an area of Hayden that is currently well-developed. The north half of the corridor (Phase 2) traverses undeveloped land where access will be limited to well-planned intersections.

Project Phasing

The project is split into two phases for design. Phase 1 covers Ramsey Road south of Wyoming Avenue to Lancaster Road in Hayden, Idaho. This phase will be constructed in two phases. Phase 2 will complete the project north of Lancaster Road, and will be designed and constructed at a later date.

Current Funding and Agreement Amounts

This project currently has $1,601,000.00 obligated for design. Current agreements total $778,548. This includes more than ten years of alignment negotiations with stakeholders including extensive alignment negotiations with the airport, several different alignment concepts and preliminary design work for since-abandoned alignments. The anticipated amount of future agreements is $630,736. This will complete design for Phase 1. It is anticipated that these phases will be constructed separately due to a current lack of funding (referred to as Phases 1a and 1b for construction). It is also anticipated that a supplemental in the future will be needed to refresh Phase 1b prior to bidding.

The consultant will also be needed for a post award consultant agreement for Engineer of Record tasks. The estimated cost of the agreement is $20,000.

The purpose of this board item is to request approval to extend the existing consultant services agreement amount on this project to $1,601,000 to complete design services and provide engineer of record tasks.
DATE: March 31, 2020

TO: Monica Crider, PE
    Contracting Services Engineer

FROM: Damon Allen
      District Engineer

RE: Request to exceed professional services agreement amount of $1,000,000 to complete design of this project.

The purpose of SH-53 Hauser Lake Rd to Bruss Rd is to increase safety by providing deceleration right turn lanes and illumination at major intersections, removing hazards from the clear zone, providing recoverable side slopes, median left turn lane, AASHTO standard shoulder widths and passing lanes where practical.

The purpose of this Board Agenda Item is to request approval to exceed the previous consultant engineering agreement limit of $1,300,000 for Key Number 20575 SH-53 Hauser Lake Rd to Bruss Rd.

This project is located adjacent to and partially overlaps KN 10005 Pleasant View Rd and SH-53 Grade Separation, which is another important project on SH-53. KN 10005 plans to reconfigure the intersection of SH-53 and Hauser Lake Road but has experienced delays in schedule due to lack of funds for construction and thus has been pushed into later years of the Program until construction funding becomes available. As a result, KN 20575 is now scheduled to be constructed before KN 10005. Due to uncertainty as to when KN 10005 will be constructed, turn bays at the intersection of Hauser Lake Road and SH-53 are being added back into KN 20575 to meet the objective of increasing safety by providing turn bays at major intersections. Key 10005 is a grade separation project and as such, will continue to include reconfiguration of this intersection in its scope.

The District is seeking authorization to increase the agreement limit with the design consultant from $1.3 million to $1.5 million so this additional design work may be added to their scope by supplemental agreement. The funding needed to complete this design work under KN 20575 is already obligated and available.
DATE: March 12, 2020

TO: Monica Crider, PE
    Contracting Services Engineer

FROM: Caleb Lakey, PE
      District 3 Engineer

RE: Request to increase professional services agreement amount to over $1,000,000 for CE&I Services

The SH-55, Smith’s Ferry to Round Valley project will widen SH-55 from milepost 98.3 to 99.3. The project will straighten the roadway, move rock slopes away from the roadway, provide rock slope stabilization, and add guardrail on the river side of the road. The objective is to improve safety and mobility along this section of roadway.

The construction contract for this project was awarded February 6th, 2020 and construction is scheduled to begin in September 2020. The contract is valued at $25,693,420.95.

The purpose of this board item is to request approval to exceed the $1 million professional services agreement amount on this project. The current estimate for the construction and inspection services of the project is approximately $1.6 million, which is 6% of the awarded contract value. Solicitation for this consultant agreement will open in April 2020 and consultant selection is anticipated by June 2020.

Sufficient funds to cover this agreement have already been scheduled and obligated on the project.
Meeting Date    April 16, 2020
Consent Item  X  Information Item   
Amount of Presentation Time Needed   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter’s Name</th>
<th>Presenter’s Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Kuisti, P.E.</td>
<td>Highways Construction &amp; Operations</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>LSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparer’s Name</td>
<td>Preparer’s Title</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Dietz, P.E.</td>
<td>Contracts Engineer</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject
Board Approval of Contracts for Award

Background Information

INFORMATION
The following table summarizes the projects bid since the start of the fiscal year by jurisdiction, along with those requiring Board approval to award and Board approval to reject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Bid Summary (10/1/19 to 3/30/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION
In accordance with board policy 4001, the construction contract on the attached report exceeded the engineer’s estimate by more than ten percent (10%) but are recommended for award with board approval.

The following table summarizes the contract requiring Board approval to award since the last Board Agenda Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts requiring Board Approval to Award -Justification received 3/3/20 to 3/30/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
In accordance with board policy 4001, the construction contract on the attached report is recommended for award with board approval.

Board Action

☐ Approved   ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
## Monthly Status Report to the Board

### CONTRACT(S) FOR BOARD APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>No. of Bids</th>
<th>Eng. Est.</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SH-41, E Prairie Avenue to Boekel Road
Contractor: Scarsella Bros. Inc

Federal

111%
DATE OF BID OPENING - MARCH 3, 2020 - IDAHO FEDERAL AID FINANCED PROJECT

IDAHO FEDERAL AID Project No. A020(098)
SH-41, E Prairie Ave to Boekel Rd
Kootenai County, Key No. 20098

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of reconstructing SH-41 from MP 2.45 to MP 6.46 to include 4-lane divided rdwy, upgrade/install new signals, remove at grade RR crossings including a grade separation, intersection turn bays & illumination, & adding a shared-use path on one side of hwy

BIDDERS:

SCARSELLA BROS., INC. SEATTLE, WA
$31,563,456.42

INTERSTATE CONCRETE & ASPHALT CO. RATHDRUM, ID
$32,479,603.60

M.A. DEATLEY CONSTRUCTION, INC. CLARKSTON, WA
$32,891,826.66

3 BIDS ACCEPTED (3 irregular – DBE)

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $28,372,330.51

LOW BID - 111% Percent of the Engineer's Estimate

AWARD) (REJECT) (REQUIRES BOARD APPROVAL)

Approval to award or reject this project is based on Bid Review and Evaluation.

Attached is the justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the recommendation. ***

Dana Dietz
DANA DIETZ P.E.
Contracts Engineer

Date
DATE: March 26, 2020  
Program Number(s) P171200

TO: Monica Crider, P.E.  
Contracting Services Engineer

FROM: Damon Allen P.E  
District 1 Engineer

RE: Justification for award of Bid

On March 10, 2020, 3 bids were opened for the above referenced project. The low bid of $31,563,456.42 was 11.25% higher than the Engineer’s estimate of $28,372,330.51. All 3 bids were within 3.25% of each other.

The following items account for most of the difference between the low bid and the Engineer’s Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Price</th>
<th>Bid Unit Price</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205-005A</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>307,535.00 CY</td>
<td>$7.75</td>
<td>$9.90</td>
<td>$661,200.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S911-06C</td>
<td>SP FIBER OPTIC CONDUIT (INSTALL 3 - 2&quot; RPC CONDUIT)</td>
<td>60,769.00 FT</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$607,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z629-05A</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$1,418,538.75</td>
<td>$3,150,000.00</td>
<td>$1,731,461.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Difference from these Items $3,000,351.50

% of Difference in Engineer’s Estimate 94.02%

The Engineer’s Estimate was based on project Right of Way (ROW) limitations and on observation of contractors already mobilized in the area. Had we considered that the project is a three year project and has certain ROW contract restrictions, we would have adjusted the unit price for mobilization and increased the excavation and conduit costs to reflect work area restrictions. This would have brought the Engineer’s Estimate to within 110% of the low bid.

This project addresses a significant deficiency in the roadway and in order to increase the safety and mobility of the public, needs to be to be awarded in the 2020 construction season.

The district has obtained additional funds through statewide balancing. The district does not believe that re-advertisement will result in lower estimates. The district recommends award of this contract.
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020

Consent Item  Information Item  □  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter’s Name</th>
<th>Presenter’s Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Kuisti, P.E.</td>
<td>Highways Construction &amp; Operations</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>LSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparer’s Name</th>
<th>Preparer’s Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana Dietz, P.E.</td>
<td>Contracts Engineer</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Contract Awards and Advertisements

Background Information

INFORMATION
The following table summarizes the contracts bid since the start of the fiscal year by jurisdiction, along with those requiring Board approval to award and Board approval to reject.
The attached chart only shows the ITD State Infrastructure Projects listed by Summary of Cost and Summary of Contract Count.

NOTE:
The table below shows year to date summaries for both ITD and Local contracts bid. These ITD Contracts and the ITD project numbers do not match as there are times that multiple projects are companioned and bid and awarded as one contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Bid Summary 10/01/19 to 3/30/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECENT ACTIONS
In accordance with board policy 4001, Staff has initiated or completed action to award the contract listed on the attached report.
The following table summarizes the Contract awarded (requiring no Board action) since the last Board Agenda Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts Requiring no action from the Board 3/3/20 to 3/30/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE ACTIONS
The Current Advertisement Report is attached.

Recommendations
For Information Only.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ____________________________

☐ Other  ____________________________
**FFY20 State Infrastructure Project Bid Results: YTD Summary By Cost**

**35 Projects YTD through March 30, 2020**

YTD Total for all 35 projects:
Ratio of Bid Costs / Engineer's Estimates = $178.7 / $179.9M = 99.3%

**Notes:**
1) Local Project are not included.
2) Contracts may have multiple Projects

**FFY20 State Infrastructure Project Bid Results: YTD Summary By Project Count**

**35 Projects YTD through March 30, 2020**

- 80% of Bids below EE (28 of 35)
- 80% of Bids below 105% of EE (28 of 35)
- 11% of Bids above 110% of EE (4 of 35)

**Note:** Local Projects are not included
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>No. of Bids</th>
<th>Eng. Est.</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
<th>% of EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22513</td>
<td>SH-77</td>
<td>3/3/2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$884,869.94</td>
<td>$884,459.50</td>
<td>($410.44)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-77, Cassia County Seal Coats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: Kloepfer Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20035</td>
<td>US-95/SH-41</td>
<td>3/3/2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,984,939.41</td>
<td>$1,528,684.32</td>
<td>($456,255.09)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-95/SH-41, FY21 D1 Seal Coats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: Poe Asphalt Paving Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20559/20596</td>
<td>I-84</td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$16,705,425.10</td>
<td>$15,130,000.00</td>
<td>($1,575,425.10)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-84, Jerome IC to Twin Falls IC WBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: Western Construction Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19867</td>
<td>Off SYS</td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,817,670.34</td>
<td>$5,955,120.00</td>
<td>($862,550.34)</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY20 N Bannock County Pavement Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: VSS International Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC (1)</td>
<td>20038</td>
<td>Off SYS</td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,551,267.59</td>
<td>$5,760,522.09</td>
<td>($790,745.50)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramsey Road; Chilco to Scarcello, Lakes Highway District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: LaRiviere Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20051</td>
<td>US-30</td>
<td>3/17/2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,056,378.01</td>
<td>$5,395,568.00</td>
<td>$339,189.99</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-30, Caribou County Line to Georgetown Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: H-K Contractors Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20590</td>
<td>US-26</td>
<td>3/17/2020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,813,009.10</td>
<td>$7,190,385.00</td>
<td>($1,622,624.10)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-26, Puzzle to MP 283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor: Knife River Corporation-Mountain West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Contract Advertisement As of 3-30-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Bid Opening Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHD(3)</td>
<td>13492</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/7/2020</td>
<td>SMA-7169, Int Linder &amp; Deer Flats Roads</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000 to $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19312</td>
<td>SH-27</td>
<td>4/7/2020</td>
<td>SH-27, Poleline Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 to $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHD(3)</td>
<td>18728</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>FY20 Capital Maintenance, ACHD</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000 to $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20189</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>FY21 D6 Bridge Repair</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000 to $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21827</td>
<td>I-15B</td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Cedar to Flandro, Pocatello</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000 to $2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC(6)</td>
<td>19030</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>STC-6810, Packsaddle Road Teton River Bridge</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 to $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20142</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>FY21 D5 Bridge Repair</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000 to $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC(1)</td>
<td>12315</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>STC-5743, Kidd Island Road, Worley Highway District</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000 to $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC(3)</td>
<td>12049</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>STC-8202, W 9th Street; Pioneer to W Indianhead Road, Weiser</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000 to $2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Key No.</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Bid Opening Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC(1)</td>
<td>19749</td>
<td>OFF SYS</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STC-5829, Riverview Drive Guardrail Installation, Post Falls Hwy District</strong></td>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000 to $500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20457</td>
<td>SH-34</td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SH-34, Tincup Creek Bridge MP 106.818</strong></td>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000,000 to $2,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22271/22272</td>
<td>SH-5</td>
<td>4/28/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SH-8, FY21/22 D1 Deep Base Repair</strong></td>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000 to $1,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS AND TERM AGREEMENT WORK TASKS

Background Information

For all of ITD:

Consultant Services processed Thirty-Four (34) new professional services agreements and work tasks totaling $6,045,595.69 and four (4) supplemental agreements to existing professional services agreements totaling $246,594 from February 27, 2020 through March 25, 2020.

New Professional Services Agreements and Work Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  HQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Design</td>
<td>1  1  2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4  4  1  1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2  2  1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Load Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Sign Structure Inspection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Public Agency Projects</td>
<td>2  2  2  1  1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3  9  11 4  3  4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For ITD District Projects:

Twenty-Six (26) new professional services agreements and work tasks were processed during this period totaling $3,943,943.69. One (1) supplemental agreement totaling $198,660 was processed.

### District 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SH 1, Mission Creek Culvert Repair, Boundary County | Resources not available: Surveying | Additional Surveying | Direct from Term Agreement | Glahe & Associates | Prev: $7,129  
This: $4,930  
Total: $12,059 |

### District 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| US 12, Clearwater River Memorial Bridge, Nez Perce County | Resources not available: Bridge | Bridge Design, Ph II: Completion of Design through PS&E | Individual Project Solicitation | WSP USA, Inc. | Prev: $948,213  
This: $1,187,706  
Total: $2,135,919  
Board Approved $3M during February 2020 Meeting |
| US 95, Culdesac Canyon Passing Ln, Phase 2 | Resources not available: Construction | Construction Inspection Support | Direct from Term Agreement | Horrocks Engineers | $50,000 |
| US 95, Culdesac Canyon Passing Ln, Phase 2 and Lapwai Creek Bridge | Resources not available: Construction | Inspection of Rock Blasting Operastuins | RFI from Term Agreement | BDS, Inc. | $23,061 |
| SH 13, Sally Ann Creek Road Culvert, Idaho County | Resources not available: Environmental | Complete Environmental Clearance | Direct from Term Agreement | Bionomics Environmental | $14,764 |
| SH 11, Quartz Creek (Jaype) Bridge, Clearwater County | Resources not available: Environmental | Complete Environmental Document | Direct from Term Agreement | Anderson Environmental | $57,610 |
| South Winchester to Chainup Turnout, Lewis County | Resources not available: Environmental | Complete Environmental Document | Direct from Term Agreement | Anderson Environmental | $79,520 |
| SH 8, MP 5 Eastbound Passing Lane, Latah County | Resources not available: Environmental | Complete Environmental Document | Direct from Term Agreement | Anderson Environmental | $77,466 |

### District 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH 55, Flemming Creek Bridge, Boise County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Bridge</td>
<td>Completion of Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>Keller Associates</td>
<td>Prev: $194,225 This: $303,337 Total: $497,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 20/26, Linder to Locust Grove and Locust Grove to Eagle</td>
<td>Resources not available: Public Involvement</td>
<td>Construction Public Involvement and Agency Coordination</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>The Langdon Group</td>
<td>Prev: $353,500 This: $153,920 Total: $507,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Cold Springs IC to Glenns Ferry IC, Elmore County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Engineer of Record Services</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>HDR Engineering</td>
<td>Prev: $512,918 This: $108,474 Total: $621,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Cold Springs IC to Glenns Ferry IC, Elmore County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Inspection and Materials Testing</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>Materials Testing &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$708,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 20, Phyllis Canal Bridge to SH 16, Ada County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Report</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>GeoEngineers</td>
<td>$10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 52, Downtown Emmett Reconstruction</td>
<td>Resources not available: Public Involvement</td>
<td>Public Outreach Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>HDR Engineering</td>
<td>$32,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 52, UPRR Bridge MP 13.3, Payette County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Historic Context Statement</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Stevens Historical Research</td>
<td>$23,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95, Council Alternate Route</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint Survey</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>GeoEngineers</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 20, Phyllis Canal Bridge to SH 16, Ada County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Review</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Bionomics Environmental</td>
<td>$17,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH 75, Yankee Fork of Salmon River</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Mitzi Rossillon</td>
<td>$25,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 30, Dry Creek Bridge, Twin Falls County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Bridge</td>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Forsgren Associates</td>
<td>$95,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 27, G Canal Bridge, Cassia County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Bridge</td>
<td>Utility Locates, Asbestos/Lead Testing, Hydraulics Services</td>
<td>RFI From Term Agreement</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $391,050

### District 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None this month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 20, Thornton Environmental Monitoring, Madison County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental Monitoring and Reporting</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Headquarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20 State Highway System Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>Resources not available: Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>Bridge Inspection Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates</td>
<td>$99,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 Local/Off System Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>Resources not available: Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>Bridge Inspection Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Collins Engineers</td>
<td>$21,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 State Highway System Bridge Inspection</td>
<td>Resources not available: Load Rating</td>
<td>Bridge Load Rating and Software Testing</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering</td>
<td>$99,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 State Highway System Sign Inspection</td>
<td>Resources not available: Sign Inspection</td>
<td>Overhead Sign Structure Inspections</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Collins Engineers</td>
<td>$219,520.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Agreements to Existing ITD Professional Service Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Original Agreement Date/Description</th>
<th>Supplemental Agreement Description</th>
<th>Total Agreement Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US 95, McArthur Lake, Boundary County</td>
<td>H.W. Lochner, Inc.</td>
<td>8/2018, Roadway and Bridge Design Services</td>
<td>Additional Environmental and Geotechnical Services</td>
<td>Prev: $922,808 This: $198,660 Total: $1,121,468 Board Approved $1.5M during March 2020 Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Local Public Agency Projects:

Eight (8) new professional services agreements totaling **$2,101,652** were processed during this period. Three (3) supplemental agreements totaling **$47,934** were processed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossing Near Sandpoint</td>
<td>Bonner County</td>
<td>Roadway Design Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers</td>
<td>$85,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey Road; Chilco to Scarcello</td>
<td>Lakes Highway District</td>
<td>Engineer of Record Services during Construction</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>David Evans and Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Sidewalk &amp; ADA Ramps, Lapwai</td>
<td>City of Lapwai</td>
<td>Construction Engineering and Inspection</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Keller Associates</td>
<td>$35,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bear Creek Bridge</td>
<td>City of Troy</td>
<td>Engineer of Record Services during Construction</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>David Evans and Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Bundling Project for:</td>
<td>Local Highway Technical Assistance Council</td>
<td>Bridge Design, Phase I: Preliminary Design Services</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>Keller Associates</td>
<td>$1,789,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Idaho Canal Bridge, Bonneville Co;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Approved $1.950M during January 2020 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- St. Charles Creek Bridge, Bear Lake County;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Portneuf River Bridge, Pocatello;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deep Creek Bridge, Buhl Highway District;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little Wood River Bridge, Shoshone Highway District;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- North Fork Boulder Creek Bridge, Owyhee County;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indian Creek Bridge, Caldwell;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Higbee Bridge, Idaho Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fairview Avenue Greenbelt Ramp, Boise  
City of Boise  
Construction Engineering and Inspection  
Direct from Term Agreement  
Materials Testing & Inspection  
$34,718

10th Avenue East Sidewalk, Jerome  
City of Jerome  
Construction Inspection Services  
Direct from Term Agreement  
Civil Science  
Prev: $1,107,500  
This:  $20,722  
Total: $1,128,222  
Board Approved September 2017 Meeting

East 1300 North, Ora Bridge  
Fremont County  
Engineer of Record Services, Year 2  
Individual Project Solicitation  
HDR Engineering  
Prev: $6,776  
This:  $5,000  
Total: $11,776

### Supplemental Agreements to Existing Local Professional Services Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Original Agreement Date/Description</th>
<th>Supplemental Agreement Description</th>
<th>Total Agreement Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | City of Moscow Safety Improvement Projects | Precision Engineering | 12/2019, Safety and Pedestrian Improvement Design | Design replacement curb, gutter, sidewalk, and drop inlet relocation | Prev: $88,082  
This: $ 9,603  
Total: $97,685 |
| 3        | 10th Avenue Bridge, Caldwell | Stanley Consultants | 2/2019, Construction Engineering and Inspection Services | Additional Inspection Services | Prev: $407,007  
This: $33,331  
Total: $440,338 |
This: $5,000  
Total: $11,776 |

### Recommendations
For Information Only

### Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other

☐ Other
Meeting Date: April 16, 2020

Consent Item ☐  Information Item ☒  Amount of Presentation Time Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake Rindlisbacher</td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>LSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparer's Name: Jeff Miles
Preparer's Title: LHTAC Administrator

Subject
FY 2020 General Funds Apportionment for Local Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation in the approved FY 2020 – 2026 ITIP

Background Information
During the February 19, 2020 Board meeting the “Distribution of the FY 2020 Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, Formula Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program Funds” item was presented by Joel Drake, Financial Officer for FP&A. The resolution was approved by the Board to split the funds equally between ITD and LHTAC. FP&A is providing the detailed information below as a follow up to the Board to show where the funds were used.

Idaho received $8,450,501.20 in FY 2020 General Funds Apportionment specifically for Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation. This provided $4,225,250.60 each for the State Highway System (ITD) and the Local Highway System (LHTAC).

LHTAC has placed the funds on the following projects. Their portion of $4,225,250.60 with match of $334,700.40 equals $4,559,951.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>NBIS#</th>
<th>Bridge Program</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29035</td>
<td>Off-System</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>OROFINO CR RD BR, CLEARWATER CO</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13135</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31570</td>
<td>Off-System</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BEAVER CR BR, CLARK CO</td>
<td>Est. PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,298,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14060</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31250</td>
<td>Off-System</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>GREAT WESTERN CNL BR, BONNEVILLE CO (BMPO)</td>
<td>Est. PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19030</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33055</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>PACKSADDLE RD TETON RV BR, TETON CO</td>
<td>Est. PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$783,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30230</td>
<td>Off-System</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>RAPID LIGHTNING CR BR #5, BONNER CO</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$130,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20230</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28655</td>
<td>Off-System</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>EASTSIDE DR BR, VALLEY CO</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,559,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITD Bridge section is in the planning stages on their project list. Once that is finalized for the State Highway System the information will be provided to the Board under separate cover.
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Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
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<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Tolman</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DT</td>
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</tbody>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparer's Name</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Tolman</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DT</td>
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</table>

Subject

State Fiscal Year 2020 Financial Statements

Background Information

**July 01, 2019 thru February 29, 2020, Fiscal Year 2020 Financial Statements**

The financial operations of the Department as of February 29, 2020 shows this fiscal year with expenditures following projected budgets. ITD will experience revenue reduction due to COVID-19. It is anticipated that these impacts could be felt in April collections and will update the Board at their May meeting.

- Revenues to the State Highway Account from all state sources are ahead of forecast by 1%. Of that total, receipts from the Highway Distribution Account are ahead of forecast by 3.4% or $5.1M. The one category that is below forecast is in the equipment buy back and it is simply a difference in timing. State revenues to the State Aeronautics Fund are ahead of forecast by 6.7% or $156,000. This is primarily due to the receipts for aircraft registrations, however total receipts from aero fuel taxes are below forecast YTD by -.6%. Staff will continue to monitor revenue and provide future updates. The dramatic changes in travel for both surface and air travel will impact ITD’s revenue in the coming months. Staff will keep the Board informed as additional information is available.

- Expenditures are within planned budgets YTD. There are timing differences between planned and actual expenditures plus encumbrances estimated. Personnel costs have savings of $8.6M or 9.7% is due to reserves for horizontal career path increases, vacancies and timing between a position becoming vacant and filled.

- Contract construction cash expenditures through February of this year has exceeded any from the past three years: FY20 = $349.7M; FY19 = $325.3M; FY18 = $303.6M. After eight months in this fiscal year ITD continues on the effort of increased delivery over the prior year.

The balance of the long term investments as of the end of February is $109.7 Million. This is after a transfer of $30M to the cash balance to ensure the continued payouts of construction is not constrained. These funds are obligated against both construction projects and encumbrances. The long term investments plus the cash balance ($83.9M) totals $193.6M.

Expenditures in the Strategic Initiatives Program Fund (GF Surplus), through the month of February, were $20.4M. There are no additional funds (other than interest earned on the cash balance) coming into this fund with the expiration of the law effective May 31, 2019 that required the transfer.

Deposits into the Transportation Expansion and Congestion Mitigation Fund of $12.1M is 10% ahead of forecast. The receipts into this fund for FY20 are committed to construction projects identified in the ITIP.

Expenditures in the GARVEE Capital Projects Fund, funded with proceeds from the bond sale of May 2019, through the month of February were $13.8M.
Recommendations

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐Deferred  ________________________________

☐ Other  ________________________________
### Funds Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Forecast YTD</th>
<th>FY20 to FY19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 to Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Highway Account</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reimbursements</td>
<td>207,997</td>
<td>260,544</td>
<td>259,123</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Inc. H.D.A.)</td>
<td>233,249</td>
<td>240,972</td>
<td>239,328</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>20,206</td>
<td>13,683</td>
<td>157.1%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Highway Account:</strong></td>
<td>449,105</td>
<td>521,722</td>
<td>512,134</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Aeronautics Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reimbursements</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Aeronautics Fund:</strong></td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Received:</strong></td>
<td>451,763</td>
<td>524,443</td>
<td>514,694</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disbursements (includes Encumbrances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Budget YTD</th>
<th>FY20 to FY19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Payouts</strong></td>
<td>329,756</td>
<td>351,781</td>
<td>370,991</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>117,557</td>
<td>126,791</td>
<td>145,786</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>24,201</td>
<td>23,091</td>
<td>25,903</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17,613</td>
<td>18,659</td>
<td>21,171</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>688.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>-43.1%</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>166,493</td>
<td>173,861</td>
<td>195,726</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>10,903</td>
<td>12,809</td>
<td>12,787</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers:</strong></td>
<td>10,928</td>
<td>12,809</td>
<td>12,787</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements:</strong></td>
<td>507,177</td>
<td>538,451</td>
<td>579,505</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Actual YTD</th>
<th>FY20 Budget YTD</th>
<th>FY20 to FY19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td>76,081</td>
<td>79,988</td>
<td>88,608</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>63,160</td>
<td>64,405</td>
<td>68,489</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>16,621</td>
<td>18,746</td>
<td>24,758</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Grantee</td>
<td>10,631</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>13,871</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Operations Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>166,493</td>
<td>173,861</td>
<td>195,726</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Construction</td>
<td>329,756</td>
<td>351,781</td>
<td>370,991</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (excluding Transfers):</strong></td>
<td>496,250</td>
<td>525,643</td>
<td>566,717</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Includes Equipment Buy Back Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Actual Revenue</td>
<td>27.003</td>
<td>54.686</td>
<td>82.976</td>
<td>110.644</td>
<td>136.997</td>
<td>164.897</td>
<td>195.901</td>
<td>222.483</td>
<td>249.311</td>
<td>273.673</td>
<td>299.623</td>
<td>326.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 Actual Revenue</td>
<td>29.298</td>
<td>57.454</td>
<td>84.752</td>
<td>114.108</td>
<td>142.878</td>
<td>173.775</td>
<td>206.239</td>
<td>233.249</td>
<td>258.362</td>
<td>284.523</td>
<td>319.267</td>
<td>344.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 Current</td>
<td>32.334</td>
<td>60.074</td>
<td>89.748</td>
<td>123.908</td>
<td>150.217</td>
<td>180.320</td>
<td>214.342</td>
<td>240.972</td>
<td>284.523</td>
<td>319.267</td>
<td>344.728</td>
<td>380.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 Forecast</td>
<td>27.394</td>
<td>56.487</td>
<td>84.985</td>
<td>116.487</td>
<td>144.443</td>
<td>173.700</td>
<td>203.029</td>
<td>239.328</td>
<td>266.313</td>
<td>292.386</td>
<td>319.280</td>
<td>346.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Highway Fund 0260

**Fiscal Year 2020**

**Expenditures**

**February - For Period Ending 2/29/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>FY18 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY19 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY20 Current</th>
<th>FY20 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>66.330</td>
<td>95.849</td>
<td>100.532</td>
<td>131.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>139.287</td>
<td>163.446</td>
<td>174.652</td>
<td>202.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>221.745</td>
<td>238.100</td>
<td>255.180</td>
<td>289.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>308.357</td>
<td>316.163</td>
<td>324.290</td>
<td>374.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>360.460</td>
<td>372.747</td>
<td>390.416</td>
<td>432.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>405.710</td>
<td>422.734</td>
<td>448.247</td>
<td>480.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>437.190</td>
<td>459.444</td>
<td>484.733</td>
<td>517.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>468.029</td>
<td>493.898</td>
<td>523.466</td>
<td>564.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>504.461</td>
<td>533.081</td>
<td>600.860</td>
<td>643.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>550.126</td>
<td>574.555</td>
<td>649.164</td>
<td>696.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>607.868</td>
<td>626.054</td>
<td>1,074.472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>669.206</td>
<td>703.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
Includes Misc. Revenue and Transfers - In

Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2020
State and Interagency Revenue Sources Forecast vs Actual
February - For Period Ending 2/29/2020

FY18 Actual Revenue
FY19 Actual Revenue
FY20 Current
FY20 Forecast
### Aeronautics Fund 0221

**Fiscal Year 2020**

**Expenditures**

**February - For Period Ending 2/29/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY18 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY19 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY20 Current</th>
<th>FY20 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>1.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>1.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1.685</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>2.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>2.376</td>
<td>2.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>2.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>3.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>2.826</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>3.398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances*
## Idaho Transportation Department

**OPERATING FUND BALANCE SHEET**

**FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Aeronautics Fund</th>
<th>State Highway Fund</th>
<th>Transportation Expansion and Congestion Mitigation Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Feb-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash on Hand (Change Fund)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank (Daily Operations)</td>
<td>2,455,545</td>
<td>2,557,828</td>
<td>77,776,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Long Term: STO - Diversified Bond Fund)</td>
<td>853,915</td>
<td>855,539</td>
<td>109,477,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash &amp; Investments</strong></td>
<td>3,309,460</td>
<td>3,413,366</td>
<td>187,260,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Due From Locals (Project Overruns)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,424,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inter Agency</td>
<td>12,686</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>2,133,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receivables</strong></td>
<td>12,686</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>3,558,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory on Hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,155,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets:</strong></td>
<td>3,322,146</td>
<td>3,419,737</td>
<td>208,974,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue (Local Projects Match)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,903,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable Overpayment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Retained % (In Lieu Of Performance Bond)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,137,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Encumbrance</td>
<td>311,002</td>
<td>236,057</td>
<td>44,612,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,011,144</td>
<td>3,183,679</td>
<td>141,224,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td>3,322,146</td>
<td>3,419,737</td>
<td>185,836,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>3,322,146</td>
<td>3,419,737</td>
<td>208,974,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Idaho Transportation Department

## OPERATING FUND BALANCE SHEET

FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Initiatives Fund (State Share)</th>
<th>Strategic Initiatives Fund (Local Share)</th>
<th>Total Strategic Initiatives Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash on Hand (Change Fund)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank (Daily Operations)</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Long Term: STO - Diversified Bond Fund)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash &amp; Investments</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Due From Locals (Project Overruns)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inter Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receivables</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory on Hand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets:</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue (Local Projects Match)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable Overpayment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Retained % (In Lieu Of Performance Bond)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Encumbrance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance:</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance</td>
<td>25,898,494</td>
<td>24,830,993</td>
<td>48,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**User ID:** kbentley  
**Report ID:** AD-FN-GL-002  
**Run Date:** 06 Mar 2020
# Idaho Transportation Department

## STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

### BUDGET TO ACTUAL

### FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

### Fiscal Year: 2020

### Budget Fiscal Year: 2020

### REVENUES

#### Federal Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Highway</td>
<td>230,145,500</td>
<td>232,932,684</td>
<td>17,971,141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,787,184</td>
<td>1.21 %</td>
<td>506,876,702</td>
<td>273,944,018</td>
<td>54.05 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Indirect Cost</td>
<td>17,666,000</td>
<td>16,884,857</td>
<td>1,019,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(781,143)</td>
<td>-4.42 %</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>8,115,143</td>
<td>32.46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Authority</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>6,724,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(875,976)</td>
<td>-11.53 %</td>
<td>14,483,600</td>
<td>7,759,576</td>
<td>53.57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA - Highway Safety</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
<td>2,935,806</td>
<td>123,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14,194)</td>
<td>-0.48 %</td>
<td>4,642,800</td>
<td>1,706,994</td>
<td>36.77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Aid</td>
<td>761,664</td>
<td>1,066,911</td>
<td>39,031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305,247</td>
<td>40.08 %</td>
<td>3,940,000</td>
<td>2,873,089</td>
<td>72.92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Federal Sources:</strong></td>
<td>259,123,164</td>
<td>260,544,283</td>
<td>19,242,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,421,118</td>
<td>0.55 %</td>
<td>554,943,102</td>
<td>294,398,820</td>
<td>53.05 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Buy Back</td>
<td>8,328,900</td>
<td>1,721,422</td>
<td>107,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6,607,478)</td>
<td>-79.33 %</td>
<td>8,328,900</td>
<td>6,607,478</td>
<td>79.33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>21,171,648</td>
<td>22,192,046</td>
<td>2,540,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,020,398</td>
<td>4.82 %</td>
<td>31,998,033</td>
<td>9,805,987</td>
<td>30.65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Sources:</strong></td>
<td>29,500,548</td>
<td>23,913,468</td>
<td>2,647,772</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,587,080)</td>
<td>-18.94 %</td>
<td>40,326,933</td>
<td>16,413,465</td>
<td>40.70 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match For Local Projects</td>
<td>13,683,300</td>
<td>20,198,391</td>
<td>1,545,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,515,091</td>
<td>47.61 %</td>
<td>36,651,278</td>
<td>16,452,887</td>
<td>44.89 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7,500)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Sources:</strong></td>
<td>13,683,300</td>
<td>20,205,891</td>
<td>1,545,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,522,591</td>
<td>47.67 %</td>
<td>36,651,278</td>
<td>16,445,387</td>
<td>44.87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>302,307,012</td>
<td>304,663,642</td>
<td>23,435,978</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,356,629</td>
<td>0.78 %</td>
<td>631,921,313</td>
<td>327,257,672</td>
<td>51.79 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFERS-IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Distribution Account</td>
<td>149,387,900</td>
<td>154,462,908</td>
<td>17,138,454</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,075,008</td>
<td>3.40 %</td>
<td>218,971,500</td>
<td>64,508,592</td>
<td>29.46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/Registration Direct</td>
<td>47,411,480</td>
<td>48,155,081</td>
<td>5,442,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>743,601</td>
<td>1.57 %</td>
<td>68,416,500</td>
<td>20,261,419</td>
<td>29.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol Fuels Tax</td>
<td>13,028,000</td>
<td>13,265,124</td>
<td>1,402,301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>237,124</td>
<td>1.82 %</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>5,534,876</td>
<td>29.44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,175,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,175,642</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,175,642)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>209,827,380</td>
<td>217,058,755</td>
<td>23,982,777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,231,375</td>
<td>3.45 %</td>
<td>306,188,000</td>
<td>89,129,245</td>
<td>29.11 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:** 512,134,392 521,722,397 47,418,755 0 9,588,004 1.87 % 938,109,313 416,386,917 44.39 %
## EXPENDITURES

### Operations Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Staff Salaries</td>
<td>59,294,906</td>
<td>53,722,928</td>
<td>6,318,669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,571,978</td>
<td>9.40 %</td>
<td>90,686,045</td>
<td>36,963,117</td>
<td>40.76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, Hourly, OT, Shift Diff</td>
<td>1,154,641</td>
<td>1,013,763</td>
<td>198,941</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,878</td>
<td>12.20 %</td>
<td>1,591,678</td>
<td>577,915</td>
<td>36.31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>27,368,101</td>
<td>24,529,480</td>
<td>3,000,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,838,621</td>
<td>10.37 %</td>
<td>41,482,177</td>
<td>16,952,697</td>
<td>40.87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Travel Expense</td>
<td>1,097,744</td>
<td>1,048,332</td>
<td>102,345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,412</td>
<td>4.50 %</td>
<td>1,708,808</td>
<td>660,476</td>
<td>38.65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Travel Expense</td>
<td>221,391</td>
<td>165,702</td>
<td>19,157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,689</td>
<td>25.15 %</td>
<td>350,480</td>
<td>184,778</td>
<td>52.72 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Operating Expense</td>
<td>19,621,942</td>
<td>13,646,159</td>
<td>1,489,823</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>803,718</td>
<td>(6.30 %)</td>
<td>41,482,177</td>
<td>25,665,010</td>
<td>61.79 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>46,745,896</td>
<td>36,251,181</td>
<td>4,614,983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>522,475</td>
<td>9.94 %</td>
<td>67,408,590</td>
<td>25,310,219</td>
<td>37.55 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Equipment Expense</td>
<td>2,167,090</td>
<td>1,414,924</td>
<td>1,704,290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,222,340</td>
<td>30.24 %</td>
<td>3,356,290</td>
<td>1,134,050</td>
<td>34.38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment Expense</td>
<td>22,159,128</td>
<td>8,072,557</td>
<td>14,086,540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,011,531</td>
<td>34.76 %</td>
<td>32,286,360</td>
<td>7,828,763</td>
<td>24.09 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facilities Expense</td>
<td>389,597</td>
<td>2,123,016</td>
<td>233,968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>796,329</td>
<td>(649.32 %)</td>
<td>5,834,597</td>
<td>2,915,252</td>
<td>49.96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>13,129,584</td>
<td>9,362,685</td>
<td>1,048,698</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,027,491</td>
<td>23.91 %</td>
<td>19,390,900</td>
<td>9,288,807</td>
<td>47.90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>193,350,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,077,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,916,952</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,606,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,665,816</strong></td>
<td>11.21 %</td>
<td><strong>278,626,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>106,942,781</strong></td>
<td>38.38 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contract Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Operating Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,490,432</td>
<td>232,609</td>
<td>298,716</td>
<td>(1,789,148)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,789,148)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>5,840,000</td>
<td>1,529,598</td>
<td>76,852</td>
<td>228,428</td>
<td>4,081,973</td>
<td>69.90 %</td>
<td>17,994,003</td>
<td>16,235,977</td>
<td>90.23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>363,850,564</td>
<td>346,229,479</td>
<td>21,727,901</td>
<td>1,543,230</td>
<td>16,077,855</td>
<td>4.42 %</td>
<td>771,597,538</td>
<td>423,824,829</td>
<td>54.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>1,300,500</td>
<td>461,883</td>
<td>50,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>839,017</td>
<td>64.51 %</td>
<td>6,253,502</td>
<td>5,792,019</td>
<td>92.62 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Construction</strong></td>
<td><strong>370,991,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>349,710,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,087,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,070,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,209,697</strong></td>
<td>5.18 %</td>
<td><strong>795,845,043</strong></td>
<td><strong>444,063,677</strong></td>
<td>55.80 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES:**

564,341,085  500,788,720  40,004,861  22,676,851  40,875,513  7.24%  1,074,472,029  551,006,458  51.28%

**TRANSFERS OUT**

Operating  12,787,332  12,808,782  0  0  (21,450)  -0.17%  57,527,200  44,718,418  77.73%

**TOTAL TRANSFERS OUT:**  12,787,332  12,808,782  0  0  (21,450)  -0.17%  57,527,200  44,718,418  77.73%

**TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:**  577,128,417  513,597,502  40,004,861  22,676,851  40,854,063  7.08%  1,131,999,229  595,724,876  52.63%

Net for Fiscal Year 2020:  (64,994,025)  8,124,895  7,413,894  50,442,067  (193,889,916)  (179,337,959)
# Idaho Transportation Department

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Construction</td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>423,586</td>
<td>25,291</td>
<td>38,824</td>
<td>337,590</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
<td>5,942,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>2,594,526</td>
<td>282,177</td>
<td>488,320</td>
<td>1,917,155</td>
<td>38.34%</td>
<td>11,519,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,081</td>
<td>95.20%</td>
<td>532,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>90,502,561</td>
<td>110,868,708</td>
<td>6,158,777</td>
<td>164,377</td>
<td>(20,530,523)</td>
<td>-22.69%</td>
<td>188,029,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>232,340,663</td>
<td>205,721,732</td>
<td>13,958,241</td>
<td>1,066,769</td>
<td>25,552,162</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>506,996,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>FICR</td>
<td>33,825,391</td>
<td>14,670,888</td>
<td>1,337,758</td>
<td>312,083</td>
<td>18,842,420</td>
<td>55.70%</td>
<td>41,107,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7,181,949</td>
<td>14,968,152</td>
<td>273,126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7,786,203)</td>
<td>-108.41%</td>
<td>35,464,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>90,502,561</td>
<td>110,868,708</td>
<td>6,158,777</td>
<td>164,377</td>
<td>(20,530,523)</td>
<td>-22.69%</td>
<td>188,029,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>232,340,663</td>
<td>205,721,732</td>
<td>13,958,241</td>
<td>1,066,769</td>
<td>25,552,162</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>506,996,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>FICR</td>
<td>33,825,391</td>
<td>14,670,888</td>
<td>1,337,758</td>
<td>312,083</td>
<td>18,842,420</td>
<td>55.70%</td>
<td>41,107,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7,181,949</td>
<td>14,968,152</td>
<td>273,126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7,786,203)</td>
<td>-108.41%</td>
<td>35,464,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>20,155</td>
<td>19,086</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>299,845</td>
<td>93.70%</td>
<td>2,420,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>940,500</td>
<td>441,328</td>
<td>31,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>499,172</td>
<td>53.08%</td>
<td>3,489,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>344,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>Total Contract Construction:</td>
<td>1,300,500</td>
<td>461,483</td>
<td>50,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>839,017</td>
<td>64.51%</td>
<td>6,253,502</td>
<td>5,792,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract Construction:</td>
<td>Year to Date Allotment</td>
<td>370,991,064</td>
<td>349,710,992</td>
<td>22,087,909</td>
<td>2,070,374</td>
<td>19,209,698</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>795,845,043</td>
<td>444,063,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Idaho Transportation Department

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
BUDGET TO ACTUAL
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

Fund: 0269  Transportation Expansion and Congestion Mitigation Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year:</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Fiscal Year:</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment (A)</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual (B)</th>
<th>Current Month Activity (C)</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance (D)</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable (E = A - B - D)</th>
<th>Percent Variance (F = E / A)</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation (G)</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance (H = G - B - D)</th>
<th>Percent Remaining (I = H / G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>629,054</td>
<td>73,272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,054</td>
<td>42.97 %</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>30,946</td>
<td>4.69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>440,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>629,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>189,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.97 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>660,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,946</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.69 %</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFERS-IN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette Tax</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>4,330,169</td>
<td>4,330,169</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>10,950,000</td>
<td>12,115,773</td>
<td>1,287,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,165,773</td>
<td>10.65 %</td>
<td>17,699,656</td>
<td>5,583,883</td>
<td>31.55 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,950,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,115,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,287,532</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,165,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.65 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,029,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,914,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.00 %</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,390,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,744,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,360,805</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,354,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.89 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,689,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,944,998</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.83 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENDITURES**      |                             |                          |                             |                             |                                               |                             |                         |                                   |                             |
| Contract Construction - Capital Projects | 15,298,119                  | 9,486,645               | 2,559,315                   | 0                            | 5,811,474                                    | 37.99 %                     | 62,507,633             | 53,020,988                         | 84.82 %                     |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES:** | **15,298,119**             | **9,486,645**           | **2,559,315**               | **0**                        | **5,811,474**                                | **37.99 %**                 | **62,507,633**        | **53,020,988**                     | **84.82 %**                  |
| **TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:** | **15,298,119**             | **9,486,645**           | **2,559,315**               | **0**                        | **5,811,474**                                | **37.99 %**                 | **62,507,633**        | **53,020,988**                     | **84.82 %**                  |

Net for Fiscal Year 2020: (3,908,119) 3,258,182 (1,198,511) 7,166,301 (39,817,808) (43,075,990)
Idaho Transportation Department

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

BUDGET TO ACTUAL

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

Fund: 0270 Strategic Initiatives Program Fund (State 60%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
<th>Budget Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>666,600</td>
<td>541,628</td>
<td>44,588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(124,972)</td>
<td>-18.75%</td>
<td>862,300</td>
<td>320,672</td>
<td>37.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES:</td>
<td>666,600</td>
<td>541,628</td>
<td>44,588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(124,972)</td>
<td>-18.75%</td>
<td>862,300</td>
<td>320,672</td>
<td>37.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</td>
<td>666,600</td>
<td>541,628</td>
<td>44,588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(124,972)</td>
<td>-18.75%</td>
<td>862,300</td>
<td>320,672</td>
<td>37.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES

Contract Construction - Capital Projects | 16,000,000 | 20,363,265 | 1,112,090 | 0 | (4,363,265) | -27.27% | 44,768,703 | 24,405,438 | 54.51% |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES: | 16,000,000 | 20,363,265 | 1,112,090 | 0 | (4,363,265) | -27.27% | 44,768,703 | 24,405,438 | 54.51% |
| TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT: | 16,000,000 | 20,363,265 | 1,112,090 | 0 | (4,363,265) | -27.27% | 44,768,703 | 24,405,438 | 54.51% |

Net for Fiscal Year 2020: | (15,333,400) | (19,821,636) | (1,067,502) | (4,488,237) | (43,906,403) | (24,084,766) |
## Idaho Transportation Department

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020**

**Fund: 0270 Strategic Initiatives Program Fund (LHTAC-Local 40%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
<th>Budget Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year to Date Allotment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDITURES       |                          |
|                   | Contract Construction - Trustee & Benefit Payments |
|                   | 25,831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,831 | 100.00% | 25,831 | 25,831 | 100.00% |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES:** | 25,831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,831 | 100.00% | 25,831 | 25,831 | 100.00% |
| **TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:** | 25,831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,831 | 100.00% | 25,831 | 25,831 | 100.00% |

**Net for Fiscal Year 2020:**

| 25,831 | 638 | 80 | 26,469 | 25,831 | 26,469 |
Idaho Transportation Department

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
BUDGET TO ACTUAL
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

Fiscal Year: 2020
Budget Fiscal Year: 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,991,487)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,991,487)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,991,487</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,991,487)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,982</td>
<td>11,837</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,982)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,982)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,513,548</td>
<td>707,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,513,548)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,513,548)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,624,530</td>
<td>719,720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,624,530)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,624,530)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFERS OUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,175,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,175,642)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,175,642)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS OUT:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,175,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,175,642)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,175,642)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,800,172</td>
<td>719,720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,800,172)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,800,172)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net for Fiscal Year 2020:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191,315</td>
<td>(717,507)</td>
<td>191,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(191,315)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

## BUDGET TO ACTUAL

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020

**Fiscal Year:** 2020  
**Fund:** 0375 GARVEE Debt Service Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year:</th>
<th>Budget Fiscal Year:</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E = A - B - D)</td>
<td>(F = E / A)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H = G - B - D)</td>
<td>(I = H / G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES

- **State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues**
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0  
  - Year to Date Actual: 95,401  
  - Current Month Activity: 10,199  
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
  - Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 95,401  
  - Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
  - Annual Appropriation: 0  
  - Appropriation Balance: (95,401)  
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

**Total Revenues:**

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: 95,401  
- Current Month Activity: 10,199  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 95,401  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: (95,401)  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

### TRANSFERS-IN

- **Operating**
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0  
  - Year to Date Actual: 17,508,782  
  - Current Month Activity: 0  
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
  - Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 17,508,782  
  - Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
  - Annual Appropriation: 0  
  - Appropriation Balance: (17,508,782)  
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

**Total Transfers-In:**

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: 17,508,782  
- Current Month Activity: 0  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 17,508,782  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: (17,508,782)  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

### TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: 17,604,183  
- Current Month Activity: 10,199  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 17,604,183  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: (17,604,183)  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

### EXPENDITURES

- **Bond Principal / Interest**
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0  
  - Year to Date Actual: 59,026,437  
  - Current Month Activity: 402,288  
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
  - Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: (59,026,437)  
  - Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
  - Annual Appropriation: 0  
  - Appropriation Balance: (59,026,437)  
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

**Total Expenditures:**

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: 59,026,437  
- Current Month Activity: 402,288  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: (59,026,437)  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: (59,026,437)  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

### TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: (59,026,437)  
- Current Month Activity: 402,288  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: (59,026,437)  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: (59,026,437)  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %

**Net for Fiscal Year 2020:**

- Year to Date Allotment: 0  
- Year to Date Actual: (41,422,254)  
- Current Month Activity: (392,089)  
- Year to Date Encumbrance: (41,422,254)  
- Variance Favorable / Unfavorable: 0  
- Percent Variance: 0.00 %  
- Annual Appropriation: 0  
- Appropriation Balance: 41,422,254  
- Percent Remaining: 0.00 %
# Idaho Transportation Department

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/29/2020**

| Fund: 0221 State Aeronautics Fund |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2020</th>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current Month Activity</th>
<th>Year to Date Encumbrance</th>
<th>Variance Favorable / Unfavorable</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Sources - FAA</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>234,781</td>
<td>61,046</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,781</td>
<td>2.52 %</td>
<td>667,500</td>
<td>432,719</td>
<td>64.83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>297,467</td>
<td>434,487</td>
<td>86,351</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137,020</td>
<td>46.06 %</td>
<td>362,500</td>
<td>(71,987)</td>
<td>-19.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>164,400</td>
<td>193,889</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,489</td>
<td>17.94 %</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>56,111</td>
<td>22.44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>690,867</strong></td>
<td><strong>863,157</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>172,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.94 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,280,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>416,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.57 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TRANSFERS-IN       |                        |                     |                        |                          |                                  |                 |                      |                      |                  |
| Operating          | 1,868,491              | 1,857,710           | 179,285                | 0                       | (10,781)                         | -0.58 %          | 2,650,000            | 792,290              | 29.90 %           |
| **TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:** | **1,868,491**         | **1,857,710**       | **179,285**            | **0**                   | **(10,781)**                     | **-0.58 %**      | **2,650,000**        | **792,290**          | **29.90 %**        |

| EXPENDITURES       |                        |                     |                        |                          |                                  |                 |                      |                      |                  |
| Permanent Staff Salaries | 520,200               | 468,910             | 58,102                 | 0                       | 51,290                           | 9.86 %           | 796,788              | 327,878              | 41.15 %           |
| Board, Hourly, OT, Shift Diff | 39,200               | 42,602              | 300                    | 0                       | (3,402)                          | -8.68 %          | 57,900               | 15,298               | 26.42 %           |
| Fringe Benefits    | 230,582                | 210,313             | 25,543                 | 0                       | 20,269                           | 8.79 %           | 350,912              | 140,599              | 40.07 %           |
| In State Travel Expense | 39,007                | 39,939              | 461                    | 0                       | (932)                            | -2.39 %          | 59,246               | 19,307               | 32.59 %           |
| Out of State Travel Expense | 13,759                | 19,681              | 620                    | 0                       | (5,922)                          | -43.04 %         | 17,800               | (1,881)              | -10.57 %          |
| Technology Operating Expense | 30,903                | 33,926              | 3,936                  | 10,952                  | (13,974)                         | -45.22 %         | 46,257               | 1,380                | 2.98 %            |
| Operating Expense  | 718,197                | 538,318             | 62,617                 | 180,047                 | (168)                            | -0.02 %          | 1,156,697            | 438,332              | 37.90 %           |
| Technology Equipment Expense | 9,600                 | 4,080               | 4,080                  | 0                       | 5,520                            | 57.50 %          | 9,600                | 5,520                | 57.50 %           |
| Capital Equipment Expense | 33,000                | 0                   | 0                      | 33,000                  | 0                                | 100.00 %         | 33,000               | 33,000               | 100.00 %          |
| Capital Facilities Expense | 0                    | 7,676               | 6,482                  | 451                     | (8,127)                          | 0.00 %           | 50,000               | 41,873               | 83.75 %           |
| Trustee & Benefit Payments | 741,664               | 620,210             | 51,675                 | 0                       | 121,454                          | 16.38 %          | 2,029,911            | 1,409,701            | 69.45 %           |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES:** | **2,376,112**          | **1,985,655**       | **213,815**            | **191,449**             | **199,008**                      | **8.38 %**       | **4,608,111**        | **2,431,007**       | **52.75 %**        |

Net for Fiscal Year 2020: 183,246 735,211 122,114 360,517 ((678,111) (1,221,874))
## Subject

### Monthly Reporting of Federal Formula Program Funding Through March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background Information

Idaho received $286.6 million of obligation authority through September 30th via an appropriations act signed on December 20, 2019. This includes $936,200 of *Highway Infrastructure General Funds* carried over from last year in the Transportation Management Area. On February 13th we also received $14.1 million of *Highway Infrastructure General Funds*. Obligation authority through September 30th (365/365ths) is $300.7 million which corresponds to $301.5 million with match after a reduction for prorated indirect costs.

Idaho has received apportionments via notices through February 13th of $331.7 million. This includes *Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds* and *Highway Infrastructure General Funds*. Currently, obligation authority is 90.7% of apportionments.

The exhibits on the following page summarize these amounts and show allotments and remaining funds by program through September 30, 2020.

### Recommendations

For Information

### Board Action

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Deferred
- [ ] Other

---
Board Agenda Item

Exhibit One
Actual Formula Funding for FY2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per FAST Tables – Total Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Only</td>
<td>$317,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Match</td>
<td>$344,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Apportionments – Total Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Only</td>
<td>$331,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Match</td>
<td>$359,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation Limits through 9/30/2020</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Only</td>
<td>$300,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prorated $25M indirect costs w/Match</td>
<td>$301,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. All dollars in Thousands
2. ‘Approved Program’ amounts from the FY 2020 Board Approved Program (Sky Blue Book).
3. Apportionment and Obligation Authority amounts reflect available funds via federal notices received through February 13, 2020.

Exhibit Two
Allotments of Available Formula Funding w/Match and Amount Remaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Allotted Program Funding through 9/30/2020</th>
<th>Program Funding Remaining as of 3/31/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Other SHS Program</td>
<td>$167,936</td>
<td>$76,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE Formula Debt Service*</td>
<td>$62,318</td>
<td>$48,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning and Research*</td>
<td>$7,076</td>
<td>$534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning*</td>
<td>$1,941</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>$1,941</td>
<td>$1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives (Urban/Rural)</td>
<td>$3,571</td>
<td>$1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td>$1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG - Local Urban</td>
<td>$8,333</td>
<td>$361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG - Transportation Mgt. Area</td>
<td>$11,558</td>
<td>$2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives (TMA)</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG – Local Rural</td>
<td>$13,720</td>
<td>$5,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bridge</td>
<td>$9,462</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off System Bridge</td>
<td>$3,676</td>
<td>($723)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>$8,038</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (excluding indirect costs)</td>
<td><strong>$301,542</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,939</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. All dollars in Thousands.
2. Allotments based on the FY 2020 Board Approved Program (Sky Blue Book).
3. Funding amounts include match and reflect total formula funding available (excluding indirect costs).
4. Data reflects both obligation and de-obligation activity (excluding indirect costs) through March 31st.
5. Advanced construction conversions of $78.1 million are outstanding for FY 2020.
   * These programs are provided 100% Obligation Authority. Other programs are reduced accordingly.
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Subject

Board Policy 4052 and Administrative Policy 5052 – Official Travel by Department Personal

Background Information

The ITD travel policies as outlined in Board Policy 4052 and Administrative Policy 5052 required some changes to clarify who shall set the annual Department spending plan, who shall monitor and manage the spending plan, and includes the need to consider the most efficient and cost effective travel be chosen. These changes are consistent with, and meet the State Board of Examiners State Travel Policy.

Recommendations

Approve changed to the attached Board Policy 4052 per resolution, page 69.

Board Action

☐ Approved   ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Purpose
The Board authorizes the Director to monitor travel by Department personnel to ensure it is necessary and in the best interests of the Department.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code 67-2004 – Regulation of per diem travelling expense
Idaho Code 67-2005 – Voucher forms duty of State Controller
Idaho Code 67-2006 – Travel expense vouchers
Idaho Code 67-2007 – Standard travel pay and allowances
Idaho Code 67-2008 – Determination of per diem allowance by Board of Examiners

The Director or a delegate shall monitor travel by Department personnel to ensure that the trips are necessary and in the best interest of Department operations.

In-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations within Idaho.

Out-of-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations outside of Idaho regardless of the duration of the trip. Additionally, out-of-state trips which have costs being reimbursed by a third party shall also be classified as out-of-state travel.

Each year, the Director shall develop an amount for both proposed out-of-state and in-state travel in their budget the Department spending plans. The amount of these spending plans shall be subject to Board review and approval, monitored and managed by the respective division administrators and district engineers.

The Director or a delegate shall report to the Board any changes in expense allowances as determined by the State Board of Examiners.

Approved by the Board on:

Date January 17, 2019

Jerry Whitehead Bill Moad
Board Chairman
OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Purpose
The Board authorizes the Director to monitor travel by Department personnel to ensure it is necessary and in the best interests of the Department.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code 67-2004 – Regulation of per diem travelling expense
Idaho Code 67-2005 – Voucher forms duty of State Controller
Idaho Code 67-2006 – Travel expense vouchers
Idaho Code 67-2007 – Standard travel pay and allowances
Idaho Code 67-2008 – Determination of per diem allowance by Board of Examiners

The Director or a delegate shall monitor travel by Department personnel to ensure that the trips are necessary and in the best interest of Department operations.

In-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations within Idaho.

Out-of-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations outside of Idaho regardless of the duration of the trip. Additionally, out-of-state trips which have costs being reimbursed by a third party shall also be classified as out-of-state travel.

Each year, the Director shall develop an amount for both proposed out-of-state and in-state travel in the Department spending plans. These spending plans shall be monitored and managed by the respective division administrators and district engineers.

The Director or a delegate shall report to the Board any changes in expense allowances as determined by the State Board of Examiners.

Approved by the Board on:

Date

Bill Moad
Board Chairman
OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to implement Board policy 4052 concerning the Director monitoring travel by Department personnel to ensure the travel is necessary and in the best interests of the Department.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code 67-2004 – Regulation of per diem travelling expense
Idaho Code 67-2005 – Voucher forms duty of State Controller
Idaho Code 67-2006 – Travel expense vouchers
Idaho Code 67-2007 – Standard travel pay and allowances
Idaho Code 67-2008 – Determination of per diem allowance by Board of Examiners

Travel by Department employees may be authorized when the trip is in the best interest of the Department operations and, considering the purpose and destination, is accomplished by considering the most efficient and economical means available. The Chief Administration Officer shall monitor the preparation of, and the compliance with, Department procedures governing employee travel.

General Travel Considerations:
• District Engineers, Section Managers, or higher authorities shall review and approve or disapprove all travel vouchers (Form ITD 0103) and reimbursement requests for official travel.

• Attendance at all meetings, conferences, and seminars shall be held to the minimum number of employees that can accomplish Department objectives.

• When considering the most efficient and economical options for a trip, total cost of transportation, the employee’s time away from the office in travel status shall be included.

• The mode of transportation that best serves Department needs considering both efficiency and cost and is the most economical should be chosen. Whenever possible, comparisons of travel estimates should use the most economical prices, advance purchase discounts, etc.

• Employees may request to use personal transportation for Department business by comparing personal transportation costs to other modes of transportation on an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison.

• The Division of Aeronautics provides air service for state employees conducting official business both in-state and out-of-state. Several Division aircraft are available to provide service on demand and usually to the exact city where business is being conducted. Comparison of state aircraft travel costs with commercial rates and other options shall be made on an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison.
Super-saver airfares may result in a longer stay-over to meet the conditions of the airline. (Saturday night stay-over or minimum number of days before the return trip.) When considering the advantage of a “super saver” air fare, all other costs (including meals, lodging, compensated time, rental cars, etc.) for an extended stay-over should be compared on an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison.

The District Engineers, Section Managers, or higher authorities shall review the request and authorize reimbursement for the mode of travel that best meets Department needs and is economically prudent considers efficiency and cost. The employee may choose any appropriate mode of transportation (personal or other), but reimbursement shall be limited to the authorized mode of travel. (See the Financial Services manual for further explanations.) Reimbursement of personal transportation costs shall be made at the rate prescribed by the State Board of Examiners.

In-State Travel

In-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations within Idaho. All in-state per diem and other travel expenses shall be reimbursed using Board of Examiners’ in-state travel policies and defined rates.

Out-of-State Travel

Out-of-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations outside of Idaho regardless of the duration of the trip. Additionally, out-of-state trips which have costs being reimbursed by a third party shall also be classified as out-of-state travel. All out-of-state per diem and other travel expenses shall be reimbursed using Board of Examiners’ out-of-state travel policies and defined rates.

Each year, the Divisions shall submit a set budgeted amount spending plan for both proposed out-of-state and in-state travel in their budget plans. This spending plans amount shall be monitored and managed by the respective division administrators and district engineers subject to Board review and approval.

For each out-of-state trip, an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison shall be signed by the director, appropriate division administrator, or district engineer and submitted with the employee’s ITD 0103, Individual Expense Account – Travel Voucher. Travel arrangements shall not be made until an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison is approved.

Rental Car Insurance Requirements

The Department self-insures against rental car liability and accidents for usage essential to state business. Insurance premiums that may be added for personal use of a rental car are not reimbursable.

__________________________________________ Date 5/17/2019
Brian W. Ness
Director
OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to implement Board policy 4052 concerning the Director monitoring travel by Department personnel to ensure the travel is necessary and in the best interests of the Department.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code 67-2004 – Regulation of per diem travelling expense
Idaho Code 67-2005 – Voucher forms duty of State Controller
Idaho Code 67-2006 – Travel expense vouchers
Idaho Code 67-2007 – Standard travel pay and allowances
Idaho Code 67-2008 – Determination of per diem allowance by Board of Examiners

Travel by Department employees may be authorized when the trip is in the best interest of the Department and, considering the purpose and destination, is accomplished considering the most efficient and economical means available. The Chief Administration Officer shall monitor the preparation of, and the compliance with, Department procedures governing employee travel.

General Travel Considerations:
- District Engineers, Section Managers, or higher authorities shall review and approve or disapprove all travel vouchers (Form ITD 0103) and reimbursement requests for official travel.
- Attendance at all meetings, conferences, and seminars shall be held to the minimum number of employees that can accomplish Department objectives.
- When considering the most efficient and economical options for a trip, the employee’s time away from the office in travel status shall be included.
- The mode of transportation that best serves Department needs considering both efficiency and cost should be chosen. Whenever possible, comparisons of travel estimates should use the most economical prices, advance purchase discounts, etc.
- Employees may request to use personal transportation for Department business by comparing personal transportation costs to other modes of transportation on an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison.
- The Division of Aeronautics provides air service for state employees conducting official business both in-state and out-of-state. Several Division aircraft are available to provide service on demand and usually to the exact city where business is being conducted. Comparison of state aircraft travel costs with commercial rates and other options shall be made on an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison.
The District Engineers, Section Managers, or higher authorities shall review the request and authorize reimbursement for the mode of travel that best meets Department needs and considers efficiency and cost. The employee may choose any appropriate mode of transportation (personal or other), but reimbursement shall be limited to the authorized mode of travel. (See the Financial Services manual for further explanations.) Reimbursement of personal transportation costs shall be made at the rate prescribed by the State Board of Examiners.

**In-State Travel**

In-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations within Idaho. All in-state per diem and other travel expenses shall be reimbursed using Board of Examiners’ in-state travel policies and defined rates.

**Out-of-State Travel**

Out-of-state travel shall be defined as all business travel to final destinations outside of Idaho regardless of the duration of the trip. Additionally, out-of-state trips which have costs being reimbursed by a third party shall also be classified as out-of-state travel. All out-of-state per diem and other travel expenses shall be reimbursed using Board of Examiners’ out-of-state travel policies and defined rates.

Each year, the Divisions shall submit a set spending plan for both proposed out-of-state and in-state travel. These spending plans shall be monitored and managed by the respective division administrators and district engineers.

For each out-of-state trip, an ITD 0633, *Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison* shall be signed by the director, appropriate division administrator, or district engineer and submitted with the employee’s ITD 0103, *Individual Expense Account – Travel Voucher*. **Travel arrangements shall not be made until an ITD 0633, Out-Of-State Travel Request and/or Travel Cost Comparison is approved.**

**Rental Car Insurance Requirements**

The Department self-insures against rental car liability and accidents for usage essential to state business. Insurance premiums that may be added for personal use of a rental car are not reimbursable.

_____________________________    Date __________________

Brian W. Ness
Director
Resolution on Board Policy 4052

WHEREAS, The Idaho Transportation Board is charged with setting policies for the Idaho Transportation Department; and

WHEREAS, Employee travel and associated costs are a necessary component of the Idaho Transportation Department’s mission and function;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves revisions to Board and Administrative Policies 4052 and 5052 Official Travel by Department Personnel.
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date  April 16, 2020

Consent Item  Information Item  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  30 minutes
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<td>Amy Schroeder</td>
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**Subject**

**Idaho 16, I-84 to SH-44 Cost Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20788</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Information**

This presentation builds on the information presented at the February 2020 Board meeting. Additional information is being provided regarding corridor costs and project readiness. Advancing the right-of-way and design of this complex project will increase the overall readiness and may be advantageous for one-time revenue or grants, funding redistribution or various other funding sources.

The following sheets show the corridor phasing and cost estimates by phase code and by corridor section within “Phase 2”. The scope of Phase 2 is to purchase all the right-of-way for the corridor (including the future interchanges) and to construct five miles of new four-lane limited access highway between I-84 and US-20/26. This Phase 2 work includes an interchange at I-84; at-grade signalized intersections at the future interchange locations (Franklin Road, Ustick Road and US-20/26); grade separations at other local road crossings (Cherry and McMillan); bridges over the Union Pacific Railroad, Ten Mile Creek and Five Mile Creek; and select local road improvements to reconnect access interrupted by the new highway.

Since 2018, $8 million has been utilized to complete the environmental re-evaluation, refine the conceptual design and produce right-of-way plans to begin acquisition in this corridor. The right-of-way is currently funded at $90 million, however, costs at the 70th percentile in their assumed year of expenditure indicate that $125 million is needed. An additional $35 million is needed to fund the right-of-way acquisition at the 70th percentile cost estimate.

The total estimated cost to complete the design of Phase 2 is $14 million if approved within the next year, as shown on the following cost summary sheets. The design for each of the three sections will take between 18 and 24 months to complete, which includes coordination with COMPASS, STIP Amendments, procurement of professional service providers and the design tasks to complete a bid-ready package. Advancing the design of this corridor will improve project readiness and will be advantageous for proceeding to construction as soon as funding becomes available.

One possible option for funding the design and right-of-way in this corridor is to reallocate the savings that have been identified on I-84. Savings on I-84 resulted from competitive bids of work already under contract, a recent approval to use the remainder of the INFRA grant to reconstruct the Middleton and Ustick bridges over I-84, and design refinements currently underway for the five miles of widening between Caldwell and Nampa. These savings of approximately $34 million GARVEE bonds must be used in other legislatively approved GARVEE corridors.

Up to $14 million of these GARVEE savings could be used to complete all of the design on Idaho 16, and the remaining $20 million could be used to bolster the right-of-way budget and close the gap between the current funding and the estimated cost to acquire all of the property in this corridor.
Recommendations
Staff will present options for the Board’s consideration in May.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
Purpose & Need
Regional Growth, Future Travel Demands, Mobility, Delays to Motorists, Mobility and Safety

Idaho 16 Facilities
- Four general purpose travel lanes
- System to system interchange access at I-84
- Idaho 16 access by interchanges at Franklin Road, Ustick Road, US 20/26, and Idaho 44
- Idaho 16 grade-separated bridges over existing local east/west routes at Cherry Road and McMillan Road
- Auxiliary lanes as needed, such as between Franklin Road and Ustick Road near design year of 2045

Achievements to Date
- 2006-2011 Environmental Study: Cleared the corridor for future development ($7.6M)
- 2014 Phase 1: New highway extension connecting US 20/26 (Chinden) and ID-44 (State Street including a new Boise River bridge crossing in west Treasure Valley ($102M)
- 2018 – Present: Advancing development of project, reductions in impacts, preparing for right-of-way preservation ($8M)
- 2020 – future: Right-of-way acquisition and other project opportunities ($90.3M)

Phase 1
- Constructed 2 miles of new four-lane expressway connecting US 20/26 and Idaho 44. This phase of Idaho 16 provided a 1,730-foot-long bridge over the Boise River, as well as bridges over the Phyllis Canal and Joplin Road, in combination with multiple local access roads connecting properties divided by the new limited access corridor. At-grade signalized intersections at US 20/26 and Idaho 44 provide access until the remainder of the corridor is complete.

Phase 2
- Connects I-84 and US 20/26 with 5 miles of new four-lane limited access highway. This phase of Idaho 16 provides for an interim facility with an interchange at I-84 and at-grade signalized intersections at Franklin Road, Ustick Road, and US 20/26, connecting on to ID 44. The new interim Idaho 16 will cross over the east/west local roads Cherry Lane, McMillan Road, and the railroad.
- Opportunities to split Phase 2 into three separate projects, allowing Idaho 16 to extend and provide connections to east/west routes. Each of these could be programmed and built as separate projects.

Phase 3
- Completes the interchanges at I-84, Franklin Road, Ustick Road, US 20/26, and Idaho 44, including the addition of auxiliary lanes, based on need and available funding. Each interchange could be programmed and built as separate projects.
- $185M (2019 dollars) is estimated for the Construction and Project Development/Administration.
- Phase 3 completes the ultimate build and results in a fully functioning expressway.
Idaho 16, Phase 2, North to South
Cost Estimates by Segment and Phase Code

**Chinden to Ustick:**
2-mile extension connecting US-20/26 (Chinden) to Ustick Road with at-grade signalized intersections, and bridges over McMillan Road and Five Mile Creek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$28.3M</td>
<td>$33.5M</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 3.4M</td>
<td>$ 4.2M</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$44.6M</td>
<td>$52.3M</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ustick to Franklin:**
2-mile extension connecting Ustick Road to Franklin Road with at-grade signalized intersections, and bridges over Cherry Lane, Ten Mile Creek and UPRR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$36.1M</td>
<td>$43.2M</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 4.4M</td>
<td>$ 5.4M</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$54.8M</td>
<td>$62.7M</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franklin to I-84:**
First stage of interchange providing all movements to and from I-84, and with a direct connection to Franklin Road's at-grade signalized intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$40.6M</td>
<td>$46.9M</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 3.2M</td>
<td>$ 4.0M</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$45.0M</td>
<td>$52.5M</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Funding Allocation:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary/NEPA</td>
<td>$ 8.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$90.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Summary for Scenario in YOE presented:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$105.0M</td>
<td>$123.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 11.0M</td>
<td>$ 13.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$144.4M</td>
<td>$167.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Idaho 16, Phase 2, South to North
Cost Estimates by Segment and Phase Code

I-84 to Franklin:
First stage of interchange providing all movements to and from I-84, and with a direct connection to Franklin Road's at-grade signalized intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$62.0M</td>
<td>$71.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 3.2M</td>
<td>$ 4.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$43.6M</td>
<td>$50.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franklin to Ustick:
2-mile extension connecting Franklin Road to Ustick Road with at-grade signalized intersections, and bridges over Cherry Lane, Ten Mile Creek and UPRR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$31.3M</td>
<td>$37.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 4.9M</td>
<td>$ 6.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$62.6M</td>
<td>$71.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ustick to Chinden:
2-mile extension connecting Ustick Road to US-20/26 (Chinden) with at-grade signalized intersections, and bridges over McMillan Road and Five Mile Creek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
<th>YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$13.0M</td>
<td>$16.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 3.0M</td>
<td>$ 3.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$37.4M</td>
<td>$44.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Funding Allocation:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary/NEPA</td>
<td>$ 8.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$90.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Summary for Scenario in YOE presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30th%</th>
<th>70th%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$106.3M</td>
<td>$125.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 11.1M</td>
<td>$ 13.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$143.6M</td>
<td>$166.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amy Schroeder, Idaho Transportation Department, Transportation Program Manager
Date: April 3, 2020* costs for N-S and S-N scenarios are not equal due to differences in scope for each segment and different years of expenditure.
Meeting Date: April 16, 2020

Consent Item □ Information Item □ Amount of Presentation Time Needed: 10 Minutes

**Subject**

Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) District 4 Appointment

**Background Information**

Background: The Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) created per Idaho Code 40-514 to advise the Idaho Transportation Department on issues and policies regarding public transportation in Idaho. The council shall participate in planning activities, identify transportation needs, and promote coordinated transportation systems. Before setting programs and priorities, the council shall seek pertinent information, facts and data from local governments, agencies, and providers regarding rural public transportation issues.

The District 4 member resigned at the end of June 2019 due to concerns over conflict of interest with his new position. In order to fill the vacancy the Public Transportation (PT) Office solicited applications for the District 4 PTAC member position in late 2019. Two applicants submitted to the PT Office. those applications were reviewed by the PT Office and the remaining PTAC members.

During the March 30, 2020 meeting the PTAC moved by unanimous consensus that both applicants are fit to serve on the PTAC.

The District 4 member term began July 1, 2018 and is set to expire June 30, 2021. The applicant appointed will replace the recently resigned District 4 PTAC member and fulfill the remainder of the term.

**ACTION:** The Public Transportation Office hereby requests the Idaho Transportation Board reviews the applications and makes a selection to fill the District 4 position.

**Recommendations**

Board approval of the attached resolution. page 88.

**Board Action**

☑ Approved   ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) Application Form

Required for Submission

Please include the following information:

- Letters of recommendation and/or references
- Conflict of Interest Statement (attached)
- Current resume, including your work experience, educational background and any other relevant experience.

Contact Information

Full Name:  JEFFREY C. MCCURDY

Street Address:  742 CARRIAGE LANE  City/State/Zip:  Twin Falls, ID 83301

Phone:  (208) 731-5938  Email:  jmccurdy@csi.edu

Organization Affiliation (if any):

Name:  REGION IV DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Street Address:  202 FALLS AVE  City/State/Zip:  Twin Falls, ID 83301

District you are applying for:

District 1  District 2  District 3  District 4  District 5  District 6
Funding Review Functions

As a member of the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC), you will be leading and participating in meetings and processes related to public transportation.

This PTAC function requires that you fully disclose any real or potential conflict of interest that may influence or appear to influence your objectivity, judgment, or decisions. Based on the specific detail of any possible conflict of interest, you may be asked to recuse yourself from elements of the evaluation and recommendation process. If at any point you determine that a conflict of interest may exist, it is your responsibility to notify the presiding PTAC chair to determine the most appropriate action.

Examples of a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, exist when a council member:

- Is directly or indirectly associated with the project applicant.
- Is employed, working as an intern, or considered for employment by the project applicant.
- Is a student or volunteer with the project applicant?
- Is providing, or intends to provide, direct or in-kind financial assistance related to the applicant or project application.
- Is elected to, appointed to, or employed by an organization that is providing, or intends to provide, direct or in-kind financial assistance to an applicant or the project application.
- Is a member of a committee or board, voting or otherwise, of the project applicant?
- Participated in the preparation of a submitted project application.
- Maintains an ownership position of any type, including securities or other evidences of debt, with the project applicant.
- Has a personal relationship with someone who has an interest in the project application.

The above examples and are not intended as a complete list. If you have any questions concerning possible conflicts of interest, contact Public Transportation Program Manager prior to signing this form.

I have read and fully understand this Conflict of Interest Statement (Attachment A) and will immediately advise the presiding PTAC Chair or the Public Transportation Program Manager of any potential conflict during my term on the PTAC.

Print Name: JEFFREY C. Mccarthy

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 12/20/2019

Updated November 2019
Jeffrey C. McCurdy

202 Falls Ave, P.O. Box 5079, Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-5079
Work Phone: (208) 732-5727 ext. 3010 Cell: (208) 731-5938
jmccurdy@csi.edu

OBJECTIVE
Serve as a member of the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) to represent the communities in south-central Idaho (District 4) and advise the Idaho Transportation Department on issues and policies regarding public transportation.

WORK EXPERIENCE
Region IV Development Association, Inc.
(December 2019 – Present)
Title: President and Chief Executive Officer
Responsibilities Included: Assist public and private partners’ in developing, planning, financing, and implementing public infrastructure and economic development projects.

City of Rupert (March 2014 – December 2019)
Title: Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer, Human Resource Manager, Economic Development Specialist, Rupert Urban Renewal Agency Financial Officer
Responsibilities Include: Manage all financial transactions and records, reconcile monthly bank statements, prepare annual operating budgets (12 Departments and $15 million annually), assist in preparing the annual financial audit, oversee and process bi-weekly payroll, maintain and renew property leases and insurance coverages, coordinate and maintain working relationships with vendors, advise City employees on human resource issues, assist with business recruitment, grant writing, and project development/implementation.

Region IV Development Association, Inc.
(August 2004 – March 2014)
Title: Community Development Planner, Grant Administration Specialist, and Loan Closing Officer
Responsibilities Included: Assist public and private partners’ in developing, planning, financing, and implementing public infrastructure and economic development projects, prepare grant and loan applications to various funding agencies for local, State, Federal, and private funding programs, and coordinate with regulatory agencies to oversee compliance with funding program rules and regulations.

EDUCATION
Idaho State University – Bachelor of Business Administration – Marketing – May 2004
The National Development Council (NDC) – Economic Development Finance Professional Certification Program – May 2009
The Effective Facilitator Training Course – Leadership Strategies, Inc. – October 2010
Mini-Cassia Chamber of Commerce – Leadership (2016-2017)
ICDBG/RCBG Certified Grant Administrator – Idaho Department of Commerce – September 2018
ToP Facilitation Training – September 2019

SKILLS
Finance and Budgeting
Project Development/Grant Writing
Project Administration
Communication
Public Speaking
Human Resources
Facilitation
Microsoft Office Suite Programs

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
Idaho City Clerks, Treasurers, and Financial Officers Association (2014 – 2019)
Southern Idaho Economic Development Organization (SIEDO) – Board Member (2014 to Present) Executive Board Member (July 2017 to November 2019)
MC Fitness and Community Center – Advisor to the local Board of Directors (2016)
Twin Falls School District – Facilities Planning Committee Member (2013)
City of Twin Falls – Wastewater Citizen Advisory Committee Member (2012 – 2013)
Youth Sports Coach (Basketball and Soccer) (2011 to present)
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and American’s with Disability Act Citizen Review Committee Member for Jerome County, Lincoln County, Minidoka County, City of Bellevue, City of Hansen, City of Heyburn, City of Hollister, and City of Shoshone (2004 – 2013)
Senator Kelly Anthon, Idaho State Legislator and City Administrator
City of Rupert
624 F Street
P.O. Box 426
Rupert, Idaho 83350
Phone: (208) 436-9600
kelly.anthon@rupert.id.us

The Honorable Michael D. Brown, Mayor
City of Rupert
624 F Street
P.O. Box 426
Rupert, Idaho 83350
Phone: (208) 436-9600

Mark Mitton, City Administrator
City of Burley
1401 Overland Avenue
Burley, Idaho 83318
(208) 878-2224
mmiton@burleyidaho.org

Rebecca Wildman, Executive Director
Business Plus, Inc.
P.O. Box 929
Twin Falls, ID 83303
Phone: (208) 539-6470
Rebecca@BusinessPlusInc.org

Dennis Porter, Community Development Manager
Idaho Department of Commerce
700 State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093
(208) 287-0782
Dennis.Porter@commerce.idaho.gov

The Honorable Michel Tribe, District Court Judge
Cassia County Judicial Center
1559 Overland Ave.
Burley, ID 83318
Phone: (208) 878-7152

Travis Rothweiler, City Manager
City of Twin Falls
203 Main Avenue East
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301
(208) 735-7271
trothweiler@tfid.org

Connie Stopher, Executive Director
Southern Idaho Economic Development
P.O. box 1238
Twin Falls, ID 83303
Phone (208) 732-6459
connies@southernidaho.org
Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) Application Form

Required for Submission

Please include the following information:

- Letters of recommendation and/or references
- Conflict of Interest Statement (attached)
- Current resume, including your work experience, educational background and any other relevant experience.

Contact Information

Full Name: Sarah C. Michael

Street Address: 515 Mesquite

City/State/Zip: Ketchum, ID 83346

Phone: (208) 721-1593 Email: Ms. Sarah Michael @ Gmail.com

Organization Affiliation (if any):

Name: Former Mobility Manager District 4

Citizen with expertise

Street Address: ____________________________ City/State/Zip: ____________________________

District you are applying for:

District 1 ___ District 2 ___ District 3 ___ District 4 X District 5 ___ District 6 ___

Updated November 2019
Funding Review Functions

As a member of the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC), you will be leading and participating in meetings and processes related to public transportation.

This PTAC function requires that you fully disclose any real or potential conflict of interest that may influence or appear to influence your objectivity, judgment, or decisions. Based on the specific detail of any possible conflict of interest, you may be asked to recuse yourself from elements of the evaluation and recommendation process. If at any point you determine that a conflict of interest may exist, it is your responsibility to notify the presiding PTAC chair to determine the most appropriate action.

Examples of a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, exist when a council member:

- Is directly or indirectly associated with the project applicant.
- Is employed, working as an intern, or considered for employment by the project applicant.
- Is a student or volunteer with the project applicant?
- Is providing, or intends to provide, direct or in-kind financial assistance related to the applicant or project application.
- Is elected to, appointed to, or employed by an organization that is providing, or intends to provide, direct or in-kind financial assistance to an applicant or the project application.
- Is a member of a committee or board, voting or otherwise, of the project applicant?
- Participated in the preparation of a submitted project application.
- Maintains an ownership position of any type, including securities or other evidences of debt, with the project applicant.
- Has a personal relationship with someone who has an interest in the project application.

The above examples and are not intended as a complete list. If you have any questions concerning possible conflicts of interest, contact Public Transportation Program Manager prior to signing this form.

I have read and fully understand this Conflict of Interest Statement (Attachment A) and will immediately advise the presiding PTAC Chair or the Public Transportation Program Manager of any potential conflict during my term on the PTAC.

Print Name

Date

Updated November 2019
Summary of Experience
Public Transportation Advisory Council

Public policy expert Sarah Michael has spent decades in leadership roles in Idaho and California in state and local governments and in the private and non-profit sectors. Her career has been focused, in large part, on public transportation issues.

A full time Idaho resident since 1993, Ms. Michael was elected to three terms as a Blaine County, Idaho, County Commissioner (2001-2008). Under her leadership, Blaine County worked with ITD in 2002-2007 to fund a commuter bus service from Bellevue to Ketchum-Sun Valley through Federal Transit Administration and local grants. After five years of personal outreach to the cities of Sun Valley and Ketchum, Commissioner Michael secured the merger of the County’s bus system in 2007 with Ketchum Area Rapid Transit (KART) to create a regional bus service, Mountain Rides, which now carries over 500,000 passengers a year.

Before moving to Idaho in 1993, Ms. Michael’s public policy experience was based in Sacramento, California, working in the legislative, administrative, and private sector arenas of the state capitol. This provided her with a balance perspective on how state government operates. She served as Senior Consultant to the California Assembly Transportation Committee and then led transportation conservation and renewable energy programs at the California Energy Commission. Subsequently, as a lobbyist, she represented the California Public Transit Association which consisted of California’s public transit operators. Other clients included multi-national corporations such as IBM, American Express, Bechtel, Toyota, and solar energy companies.

After serving as a Blaine County Commissioner, Sarah returned to the California Energy Commission (2009-2012) where she was appointed as Special Advisor to Jim Boyd, Vice Chairman of the Commission, and oversaw the 2012 California Bio-Energy Action Plan.

In 2013, Ms. Michael was hired as District 4’s Mobility Manager for the Community Transportation Association of Idaho. In this role, she worked to promote public transportation and assisted the District 4 District Coordinating Council in evaluating applications for FTA 5311, 5310, 5339 and community choices grants. She focused her technical assistance in areas where public transportation expertise and funding were limited, particularly in Twin Falls, Minidoka-Cassia, and Jerome counties.

She worked with the City of Twin Falls on its 2014 application to obtain a FTA planning grant to undertake a transit development plan. This was Twin Fall’s first step in being prepared to become a small urban area and to provide public transportation within the 2022-2023
The plan was finalized in 2016 and is serving as a blueprint for future land use and public transportation services.

Also, in her role as Mobility Manager, Ms. Michael met with city and county officials in the Mini-Cassia area during 2013-2014 to help LINC secure local matching funds from the cities of Rupert, Burley, and Heyburn and from Minidoka and Cassia counties. This was the first time these jurisdictions committed local tax dollars to match Federal Transit Administration 5310 funds to provide transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities in the Mini-Cassia area. After talking with Melva Heinrich, LINC, in November 2019, unfortunately, LINC has not requested funds from these jurisdictions since then.

She also worked with small cities within the district to encourage applications to the ITD's Community Choices grants. This included the cities of Heyburn, Filer, Kimberley, Hazelton, Jerome, among others. Sarah was recognized for her work as Mobility Manager and other leadership accomplishments as one of Idaho’s 2015 Women of the Year.

She currently serves on the boards of the Wood River Land Trust (serving Blaine County) and the Southern Idaho Land Trust (serving Twin Falls, Jerome, Lincoln Counties) and was recently appointed as a Ketchum Rural Fire Protection District Commissioner.

References for her work in public transportation in Idaho include:

**Blaine County:** Angenie McCleary, Blaine County Commissioner, (208) 788-5500
- amccleary@co.blaine.id.us
- Former member of the District 4 Coordinating Council

**South Central Community Action Partnership**
- Ken Robinette (208) 733-9351
- ken@sccap-id.org
- Former member of the District 4 Coordinating Council

**LINC**
- Melva Heinrich, Community Resource Director, 208-733-1712 ext. 107
- mheinrich@lincidaho.org
- District 4 5310 Provider
I want to support Sarah for the District Seat 4 position on the Idaho PTAC. I am currently the at large board member for Mountain Rides in Blaine County, and I know Sarah has been instrumental in getting Mountain Rides where it is today. She has been a public servant for as long as I can remember, and she would be an asset to your organization.

Thank you for your consideration.

Melody Mattson
Ketchum, Idaho
Hi Shauna,

I have known Sarah Michael since 1977 when we moved to Ketchum. At that time Sarah was the ED of the Chamber and I was her volunteer. Sarah was instrumental in organizing Mountain Rides. Our commuter bus connections and vans are helping to do the job for the economy and our business community in Ketchum-Sun Valley. I think Sarah would be a very good member of PTAC. As you know she did work for regional transit at some point and spent a great deal of time getting to understand the Magic Valley transportation providers. I think she would be a fair decision maker.

Thank you.

Wendy

Wendy Jaquet
wendyjaquet@gmail.com
208.720.0968
P.O. Box 783
Ketchum, ID 83340
Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC)
Special Teleconference Meeting Agenda
March 30, 2020, 10:00 am – 10:30 am
Idaho Transportation Department – DMV Conference Room
3311 W. State St, Boise, Idaho 83703

1. Call to Order (Chair) .................................................................................................................... 10:00 am
2. Roll Call (Chair) ........................................................................................................................... 10:01 am
3. Approval of Minutes (Chair) – Vote ............................................................................................ 10:03 am
4. Public Comment ........................................................................................................................... 10:05 am
5. Safety Share (Shauna Miller) ....................................................................................................... 10:10 am
6. PTAC Appointment for D4 (Ron Duran) ....................................................................................10:15 am
7. New Business and Future Business ............................................................................................. 10:25 am
8. Adjourn ....................................................................................................................................... 10:30 am

*Call in information below:
208 334-8142, Conference Number 78533 followed by #
WHEREAS, Idaho Statute 40-514 establishes the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC); and

WHEREAS, the PTAC shall be comprised of six (6) members representing the six (6) Idaho Transportation Department Districts to be appointed by the Idaho Transportation Board; and

WHEREAS, the term of each member shall be three (3) years and the initial appointments to the council shall be such that two (2) members shall be appointed each year thereafter; and

WHEREAS, applications were solicited from interested parties to fill the position in District 4 with two submitted applications; and

WHEREAS, the Public Transportation Office solicited public comment on the submitted application from February 24, 2020 to March 25, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the submitted applications and associated public comments were reviewed by the PTAC at their March 30 2020 meeting where the council determined all applicants were qualified to fill the vacant District 4 position.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation Board has determined to appoint ___________________________ for the District 4 PTAC position for the completion of the term of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2021. 

Approved:
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020
Consent Item  Information Item  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  15 minutes

Presenter's Name  Blake Rindlisbacher, P.E.  Presenter's Title  Chief Engineer  Reviewed By
Preparer's Name  Amy Revis, P.E.  Preparer's Title  Division Administrator

Subject
Board and Administrative Policies for small cell facilities in ITD Right of Way

Background Information

Broadband and small cell facilities, while increasingly important to society and for modern communication, are not owned and operated by utility companies that are governed by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and subject to the ITD 2003 Guide for Utility Accommodation or IDAPA 39.03.39, Rules Governing Utilities on State Highway Right of Way. Regulation of broadband facilities is derived from 23 CFR 710 and guidance from the FHWA. Regulation of small cell facilities is derived from Executive Orders and guidance from the FCC. As regulation of these facilities originate from different sources, ITD staff desires to manage public utilities, broadband and small cell/5G independently and uniquely.

One telecommunication service provide has requested that ITD allow small cell facilities in the ITD Right of Way. Nationwide the best practice for managing small cell facilities in public right of way is through a company specific Master License Agreement (MLA). ITD staff is currently negotiating a MLA with the telecommunication service provide; however, Board and Administrative policies are required before a MLA can be approved and guidance issued to staff to permit placement of these facilities in the ITD right of way.

Board and Administrative policies that would authorize ITD to finalize a MLA and authorize staff to permit small cell facilities in ITD right of way are attached for ITD Board consideration. Staff continues to work on development of processes, fee schedules, guidance and operating procedures for broadband facilities independently.

Recommendations
This is a discussion item for the Board to consider Board and Administrative Policies for small cell equipment in the ITD Right of Way. No Board action is anticipated at this point.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
AUTHORITY TO SIGN AGREEMENTS ON THE ACCOMMODATION OF SMALL CELL WIRELESS EQUIPMENT ON THE HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY

Purpose
This policy delegates Idaho Transportation Board authority for signing and executing agreements with communication transmitting entities to the Director, thereby allowing for the day to day operation of the Idaho Transportation Department. This policy also designates limits and controls for staff authority regarding such agreements. Additionally, this policy establishes reporting requirements of these agreements to the Board.

The accommodation of facilities of communication transmitting entities on federal aid and non-federal aid state highway rights-of-way may be acceptable to the extent that such facilities may be accommodated without compromising the safety or integrity of the highway and without interference to the normal operation and maintenance activities as required.

Legal Authority
The Department shall be responsible for managing contracts, agreements, and grants in accordance with:

- **Idaho Code 40-309** – Board authority to contract fully in the name of the state.
- **Idaho Code 40-312(2)** – Assigning the Board to make regulations for the accommodations of communication transmitting entities on the highway right-of-way.
- **Idaho Code 40-505** – The Director has such authority as is delegated by the Board.

Delegated Authority
The Director or delegate may enter agreements and is authorized to sign agreements with regard to the accommodation of cellular antenna equipment of communication transmitting entities. Signing authority may be delegated to Executive Officers, Division Administrators, or District Engineers when acting within their jurisdictional duties. Any authority so delegated shall conform to all applicable laws, rules, and regulations. Such authority shall not be exercised by the delegate in the event of a conflict of interest or if apparent personal gain is evidenced.

Legal Review
All Department documents of a contractual nature must be in accordance with federal and state laws, and must be approved by the Department’s Legal section. The Legal section shall approve all negotiated contracts or agreements, except for right of way agreements and standard formatted agreements that have been previously approved by the Legal section. Standard Department contract templates shall be approved “as to form” before being printed and need not be re-submitted, unless the standard contract template is revised.
Log or Register of Contracts, Agreement and Grants
The Director shall instruct originating offices to maintain a log or register of their respective contracts, agreements, or grants.

Requirement To Report
The Board shall be advised of newly entered agreements with communication transmitting entities allowing the accommodation of small cell wireless equipment on the highway right-of-way.

Approved by the Board on:

_________________________________________________________   Date _______________________

Bill Moad
Board Chairman
AUTHORITY TO SIGN AGREEMENTS ON THE ACCOMODATION OF SMALL CELL WIRELESS EQUIPMENT ON THE HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY

Purpose
This policy implements Board Policy 4XXX concerning the accommodation of Small Cell Wireless equipment on the Highway Right of Way.

Legal Authority
The Department shall be responsible for managing contracts, agreements, and grants in accordance with:

Idaho Code 40-309 – Board authority to contract fully in the name of the state.

Idaho Code 40-312(2) – Assigning the Board to make regulations for the accommodations of communication transmitting entities on the highway right-of-way.

Idaho Code 40-505 – The Director has such authority as is delegated by the Board.

General Conditions
All Small Cell Wireless facilities within the Right of Way will require a Statewide Master License Agreement to be executed with each entity requesting accommodation. Each individual installation within the right of way will require a fully executed encroachment permit for small cell facilities (ITD 2112). The Master License Agreements and individual permits will be processed in accordance with the ITD Small Cell Wireless Accommodation Procedures Manual.

Delegated Authority: The Director has been delegated authority from the Board to enter into agreements on behalf of the Department for accommodating Small Cell Wireless facilities within the right of way. The Director sub-delegates authority to the Chief Engineer to enter into Master License Agreements and to the District Engineers to grant encroachment permits for individual sites subject to the procedures outlined in the Small Cell Wireless Accommodations Procedures Manual

Log or Register of Agreement
The originating office shall maintain a log or register of all agreements entered into subject to this policy.

Requirement To Report
The Chief Engineer or delegate shall report to the Board all newly entered Master License agreements with communication transmitting entities allowing the accommodation of small cell wireless equipment on the highway right-of-way.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Brian Ness  
Director  

Date
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020
Consent Item ☐   Information Item ☐   Amount of Presentation Time Needed  15 min

Presenter's Name  Damon Allen, PE
Presenter's Title  District 1 Engineer
Initials

Preparer's Name  W.J. Roberson
Preparer's Title  Program Manager
Initials

Subject
District One, State Highway 3 Levee Widening

Key Number  District  Route Number
N/A  1  State Highway 3

Background Information

Background
In August 2019, the Idaho Transportation Board delegation toured Benewah County in District One. The tour route took the delegation south on State Highway 3 and over the St. Joe levee north of St Maries. This roadway segment has been on the list of priorities for the community for several years, however, due to permit challenges, poor soil conditions and very high construction cost, this project has never been funded.

The delegation had the opportunity to meet with county commissioners, city leaders, law enforcement, emergency management as well as members of the freight community in the area at the Potlatch Deltic Mill. The community members voiced their opinions and angst to the delegation, after which a productive dialog prompted the district to examine alternative means to resolve width restrictions on the levee with minimal impacts and costs.

Project Information
State Highway 3 is a north west route traversing District One from the Interstate 90 to the Latah County Line and continuing through District Two. In 2006 District One had to delay the active project on State Highway 3, Meadowhurst Road. to Goosehaven Road. in Benewah County. The federal aid project identified significant impacts to tribal cultural lands, jurisdictional wetlands and ultimately was ceased in the early development stages due to the impacts as well as budgetary constraints. The district recognizes the immediate need for improvements to the segment of the highway due to the narrow pavement width and increase commercial vehicles crashes. The 2.5 mile roadway segment is atop a non-jurisdictional levee which at its narrowest point is twenty-one feet from edge-of-pavement to edge-of-pavement.

The district has identified a solution to widen the roadway, mitigate crashes with no cultural or wetland impacts, however this alternative would require ST funds due to the roadway widths not meeting federal aid requirements. If approved, development could begin upon obligation of funding with PS&E delivery in spring 2021, and construction could begin summer of 2021 with a completion date of fall of 2021. Below are the budgetary requirements, by phase for the development and construction of the levee segment.

Funding
At this time, the district requests $1.5M for design engineering to develop the project including Plans, Specification and Estimate, bid ready in 2021. The construction costs for this project are estimated at approximately $15M; however, no construction funding is requested at this time as additional investigation and engineering are required to finalize the final engineer's estimate.
**Recommendations**

The District recommends adding this project to the ITIP in the FY2021 Significant Projects Program with approval for the engineering to prepare a bid ready project (PS&E) with $1.5M of ST funds for engineering will come from the FY2020 Board Unallocated Fund.

**Board Action**

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Deferred
- [ ] Other
## STATUS OF THE TRANSPORTATION BOARD'S STATE-FUNDED UNALLOCATED ACCOUNT

as of April 16, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/19/20</td>
<td>22562</td>
<td>I-84, Snake River Rest Area Repair</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested New SH-3 Levee Repair - engineering only</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Projects Year-to-date $2,750,000 (2,750,000.00)

Current Balance $2,250,000
Meadowhurst Rd to Goosehaven Rd
Milepost 87.35 to Milepost 95.6
Levee Rebuild Segment
MP 89.90 to MP 92.5
SH 3 Levee Crash Data

CRASH REPORT

SH 3 Levee Crash Data

Created on March 16, 2020
Created by William Roberson
Requested by Damon Allen
For crashes from June 8, 2014 to November 1, 2018

Applied Filters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Segment Code</th>
<th>001800</th>
<th>MP: 87.9 - 92.4</th>
<th>Accident Date (Year)</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident Date (Year)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Accident Date (Year)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Accident Date (Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Date (Year)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related Crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV Crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Object Crashes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist Crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Animal Crashes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Drug Report</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Injury Accident</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Accident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Injury Accident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A High Alert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SH 3 Levee
The proposed solution for the SH 3 Levee is to design and construct the existing levee using light weight GeoFoam blocks to widen the existing roadway. This solution is contained within the existing prism with no impacts to the wetlands area or tribal lands.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board is authorized to expend funds appropriated for construction, maintenance and improvement of state highways; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board is charged with considering the safety and convenience of the highway users; and

WHEREAS, it is in the public’s interest for the Department to publish and accomplish a current, realistic, and fiscally constrained five year Idaho Transportation Investment Program; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Idaho Transportation Board to effectively utilize all available federal, state, and local funding.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that project SH-3, Levee Widening Goosehaven Rd to Round Lake Rd, Shoshone Co. will be added to FY21 of the FY20-26 ITIP in the Significant Projects Program at a cost of $1.5M for design engineering to prepare a bid ready project including Plans, Specification and Estimate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding for the design engineering be added to FY20 of the FY20-26 ITIP and that funds will come from the FY2020 Board Unallocated Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board that the FY20 – 26 STIP be amended accordingly.
Meeting Date 16 April 2020

Amount of Presentation Time Needed 30 Minutes

Subject
129K Route Approval: SH 75 & US 93

Background Information

Staff will present two District 6 129K route requests from Arlo G. Lott Trucking Inc., to move the mineral Molybdenum (Moly) from Clayton, ID to the Montana border. Routes and case #s are:

SH75: Case #201709SH19. Start MP 219.5 to end MP 244.33. Clayton, ID to intersection of SH75 and US93.

US93: Case #201708US93. Start MP 244.3 to end MP350.82. Intersection of SH75 and US93 thru/to the Idaho/Montana border.

Attached information.

129,000 LBS District 6 Application Packet, Attachment 1.

129,000 LBS District 6 Application Presentation Attachment 2.

Recommendations

Staff will seek Board approval of both the requested routes to complete the final administrative steps to allow 129k permitting on the routes as described above. Resolution on page 182.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Action</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Approved</td>
<td>□ Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other</td>
<td>________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Idaho Transportation Board
Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes

February 18, 2020
Idaho Transportation Department
Room 209
3311 West State Street
Boise, Idaho

4:00 PM

ACTION ITEMS

1. Welcome and Preliminary Matters – Chair Dwight Horsch
   - January 21, 2020 Subcommittee meeting minutes
   
   1  4:00

2. Oral comments submitted on Case #201708: US-93 – Milepost 244.33
   to 350.82 and Case #201709: SH-75 – Milepost 219.5 to 244.33,
   District 6 – Communication Manager Trimboli

   44

3. Discussion and Recommendation: Case #201708: US-93 – Chair Horsch
   Application

   5

   Chief Engineer’s (CE) Analysis and Recommendation

   7

   Written public comments on two route requests (received earlier)

   17

   4:10

4. Discussion and Recommendation: Case #201709: SH-75 - Chair Horsch
   Application

   12

   CE’s Analysis and Recommendation

   14

   4:15

INFORMATION ITEMS

5. Status of applications – Executive Assistant Higgins

   73

   4:20

6. Adjourn (estimated time)

   4:25
Idaho Transportation Board

129,000 Pound Truck Route Subcommittee

January 21, 2020

Idaho Transportation Board (ITB) 129,000 Pound Truck Route Subcommittee Chairman Dwight Horsch called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM on Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at the Idaho Transportation Department in Boise, Idaho. ITB Members Jim Thompson and Bob Hoff were present.

Principal Subcommittee staff members and advisors present included Deputy Attorney General Larry Allen, Chief Engineer (CE) Blake Rindlisbacher, Program Specialist (PS) Lance Green, Communication Manager Vince Trimboli, Bridge Asset Management Engineer Dan Gorley, and Executive Assistant to the Board Sue S. Higgins. ITB Member Jan Vassar and Local Highway Technical Assistance Council Safety Manager Kevin Kuther were also present.

Chairman Horsch said that because the verbal comments submitted at the two December public hearings have not been transcribed and presented to the Subcommittee, no action will be taken on the two route requests. Staff will present its analyses and the written comments.

Case #201708: US-93, Milepost (MP) 244.33 to 350.82. PS Green presented the Chief Engineer’s analysis on the US-93 route. The Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) reported that the sections of US-93 from milepost 244.33 to 263.85 and from milepost 304.7 to 350.82 are designated as red routes, allowing 115-foot overall vehicle length and a 6.5-foot off-track. The section of US-93 from milepost 263.85 to 304.7 is designated as a blue route and all trucks must adhere to the 5.5-foot off-track and 95-foot overall vehicle length criteria. The bridge analysis determined that the 29 bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. The pavement is in good condition with no deficient sections. The Office of Highway Safety reported one non-interstate high accident intersection location and four high accident location clusters on the route. The Chief Engineer’s analysis recommends proceeding with the request.

Member Thompson noted one or two comments supported the route designation, but the vast majority opposed it. He asked if someone knows if the verbal comments support or oppose the route designation. Member Hoff said he was the hearing officer at the two public hearings, one in Salmon and one in Challis. He recalls the verbal testimony generally opposed the route designation due to safety concerns, increased traffic, and concerns with motorcyclists and recreational vehicles on the highway. The comments were the same basic concerns expressed in the written testimony.

PS Green said the majority of comments received were on the US-93 route and specifically the blue route segment. Member Hoff added that it appeared citizens do not understand the vehicle configurations for commercial trucks that may operate up to 129,000 pounds. Most seem to believe that the trucks would be bigger than those that currently operate on the highway.
Chairman Horsch asked if the bridges are short-span or if some are long enough that the entire truck would be on the structure at once. Bridge Asset Management Engineer Gorley replied that there are some longer spans; however, the bridges can handle the additional weight.

CE Rindlisbacher concurred that the public comments don’t align with the engineering analysis. The analysis reviews items such as bridges, pavement condition, and safety. Few of the crashes on US-93 involved commercial vehicles and of those vehicles that were involved in a crash, the main contributing factor to the crash was driving too fast for conditions. The cause was not related to the weight of the vehicle. He believes it is important to educate citizens on the operation of 129,000 pound vehicles. Although he does not intend to trivialize the comments, he does not believe the majority of comments directly relate to commercial vehicles operating at weights up to 129,000 pounds. Chairman Horsch added that winter weather conditions are generally harder on the pavement than the 129,000 pound vehicles.

PS Green concurred with CE Rindlisbacher’s assessment. There were no major concerns related to the designation of the route for vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds.

Member Hoff noted some comments suggested using I-15 instead of US-93. He asked if that is a viable option. Member Thompson said that route is significantly farther. He asked about the horsepower of the vehicle combinations. DAG Allen said he believes the administrative rule requires adequate power to maintain a speed of around 20 miles per hour.

Member Thompson made a motion to table the request to designate US-93, milepost 244.33 to 350.82 as a 129,000 pound truck route. Member Hoff seconded the motion and it passed unopposed.

Minutes: May 23, 2019. Chairman Horsch said the May 23, 2019 meeting minutes were distributed earlier and stand as submitted.

Case #201709: SH-75, MP 219.5 to 244.33. PS Green said the DMV confirmed that this section of SH-75 falls under the red route category allowing 115-foot overall vehicle length and a 6.5-foot off-track. The bridge analysis determined that the eight bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. The pavement is in good condition with no deficient sections. There are no safety concerns and the Chief Engineer’s analysis recommends proceeding with the request. He added that there were a few comments in support of this designation and no opposition.

Member Hoff made a motion to table the request to designate SH-75, milepost 219.5 to 244.33 as a 129,000 pound truck route. Member Thompson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PS Green said a public hearing will be held next month for the I-84 Business route designation in District 3 and two public hearings will be scheduled for four route requests in District 4 in March.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.
Respectfully submitted by:
SUE S. HIGGINS
Executive Assistant & Secretary
Idaho Transportation Board
Request For Designated Routes Up To 129,000 Pounds
Idaho Transportation Department

This form is designed to be completed electronically. If completing manually and additional space is needed, continue the narrative on the reverse side. Correspond the number of the section on the front with the continuation on the reverse.

Company Name: Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc.
Contact Person's Name: Andy Lott
Contact Phone Number: 208-280-2554
Fax Number: 208-324-8668
E-Mail Address: andy.lott@agltrucking.com
Company Address: P.O. Box 110
City: Jerome
State: ID
Zip Code: 83338

State Highway Route(s) Requested
Vehicles operating on the requested routes cannot exceed the maximum overall length or off-track as shown on the Extra Length Map at http://www.idot.idaho.gov/dmv/poe/documents/extra.pdf. Submit a map with requested route(s) along with this completed form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Number</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>350.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75</td>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>219.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Route(s) Requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Name(s)</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
<th>Jurisdiction Name</th>
<th>Date Request Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reasons for Request - Continue on reverse side if necessary, corresponding the number of the section with the continuation.

1. Justification
Enlarge the 129,000 route, to enhance the transport of Molybdenum from Clayton, ID, to MONTANA BORDER.

2. Associated Economic Benefits
Reduce congestion, decrease carbon and increase Efficiency

3. Approximate Number of Trips Annually
1000 currently at 105,000 lbs.

4. Commodities Being Transported
Molybdenum

5. Anticipated Start Date to Use Requested Routes: 12-1-2017

Requestor's Printed Name: Andy Lott
Requestor's Signature:
Date: 11/9/17

Requestor is required to submit a completed application to ITD (see below) and to city, county, and/or highway district officials where the requested state route (or state route segment) is contiguous to respective jurisdiction(s).

Idaho Transportation Department
Attn: Chief Engineer
PO Box 7129
Boise ID 83707-1129
Fax: (208) 334-8195
Email: officeofthechiefengineer@idt.idaho.gov

ITD Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hwy Review</th>
<th>Proceed</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Review</th>
<th>Proceed</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief Engineer Proceed Reject Date
Sub-committee Proceed Reject Date

Cc: Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC)

*WRITE IN CHANGES COORDINATED WITH REQUESTER.*
Executive Summary
Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. submitted a request for 129,000 pound trucking approval on US-93 between milepost (MP) 244.33 at the intersection with SH-75 and MP 350.82 at the Montana Border for transportation of Molybdenum. Currently 1000 trips are made annually at 105,500 pounds. The requested section of US-93 has a split designation, milepost 244.33 to 263.85 and milepost 304.7 to 350.82 are designated as red routes and as such all trucks must adhere to the 6.5-foot off-track and 115 foot overall vehicle length criteria. Additionally from milepost 263.85 to 304.7 of US-93 is designated as a blue route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 5.5-foot off-track and 95 foot overall vehicle length criteria. ITD Bridge Section confirms the twenty-nine bridges on the route will safely support 129,000 pound vehicles. District 6 analysis shows this section of road in good condition. The Office of Highway Safety analysis shows this section of US-93 has one Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Location (HAL) and has four HAL Clusters. Department of Motor Vehicles, Highway Safety, Bridge Asset Management and District 6 all recommend proceeding with this request.

Detailed Analysis
Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Review
All Idaho Transportation Department routes are currently categorized by their ability to handle various extra-length vehicle combinations and their off-tracking allowances. The categories used when considering allowing vehicle combinations to carry increased axle weights above 105,500 pounds and up to 129,000 pounds are:

• Blue routes at 95 foot overall vehicle length and a 5.50-foot off-track
• Red routes at 115 foot overall vehicle length and a 6.50-foot off-track.

Off-tracking is the turning radius of the vehicle combination, which assists in keeping them safely in their lane of travel. Off-tracking occurs because the rear wheels of trailer trucks do not pivot, and therefore will not follow the same path as the front wheels. The greater the distance between the front wheels and the rear wheels of the vehicle, the greater the amount of off-track. The DMV confirms that the requested routes falls under one of the above categories and meets all length and off-tracking requirements for that route. **More specifically, the requested section of US-93 from milepost 244.33 to 263.85 and from milepost 304.7 to 350.82 is designated as a red route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 6.5-foot off-track and 115 foot overall vehicle length criteria. The requested section of US-93 from milepost 263.85 to 304.7 is designated as a blue route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 5.5-foot off-track and 95 foot overall vehicle length criteria.**

Bridge Review
Bridges on all publicly owned routes in Idaho, with the exception of those meeting specific criteria, are inspected every two years at a minimum to ensure they can safely accommodate vehicles. A variety of inspections may be performed including routine inspections, in-depth inspections, underwater inspections, and complex bridge inspections. All are done to track the current condition of a bridge and make repairs if needed.
When determining the truck-carrying capacity of a bridge, consideration is given to the types of vehicles that routinely use the bridge and the condition of the bridge. Load limits may be placed on a bridge if, through engineering analysis, it is determined the bridge cannot carry legal truck loads.

ITD Bridge Asset Management has reviewed the twenty-nine bridges pertaining to this request and has determined they will safely support the 129,000-pound truck load, provided the truck’s axle configuration conforms to legal requirements. To review load rating data for each of the bridges, see the Bridge Data chart below.

**ITD District 6 Evaluation**
This segment has been evaluated and the District recommends proceeding. District 6 has evaluated the roadway characteristics, pavement condition, and traffic volumes on US-93 M.P. 244.33-350.82 in response to the request to make this segment a 129,000-pound trucking route. The District has found no concerns with this action and recommends proceeding. Details of the evaluation are provided below.

**Roadway Characteristics**
This roadway is a major rural collector with the roadway geometry outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Terrain</th>
<th>Left Turn Lane Type</th>
<th>Right Turn Lane Type</th>
<th>Right Paved Shoulder Width (ft)</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>2 – 1 each direction 12'</td>
<td>Hills</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>2 – 1 each direction 12'</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.60</td>
<td>2 – 1 each direction 12'</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* City of Challis has a TWLTL that is 14’ wide M.P. 245.9-246.7.
* City of Salmon has a TWLTL that is 14’ wide M.P. 303.7-305.2.

**Passing lanes have been added on US93 Ascending:**
M.P. 343.6-344.2
M.P. 345.5-346.05
M.P. 346.6-346.8
M.P. 347.8-350.82

**Pavement Condition**
The requested section of highway is asphalt and is in generally good condition and is not considered deficient in cracking rutting or ride. US93 MP 280.821-305.242 received an overlay in 2015, and MP 244.33-350.82 received a seal coat in 2016. US93 MP 337.00 - 350.82 received an overlay in 2019. Spring breakup limits do not pertain to this section at this time.
**Table 2. 2016 TAMS Visual Survey Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cracking Index</th>
<th>Roughness Index</th>
<th>Rut Average (in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244.325-250.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.500-256.464</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.464-256.683</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.683-257.196</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.196-263.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.000-268.660</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.660-269.639</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.639-273.896</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.896-278.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.000-285.900</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.900-292.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.500-299.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299.000-304.300</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.300-304.675</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.675-305.213</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.213-310.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310.000-315.592</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.592-316.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316.000-326.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326.000-343.629</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic Volumes**

The speed limit of the highway varies between 25 and 60 mph. There are 2 stop lights in this segment located in the city of Salmon. The traffic volumes are provided below.

**Table 3. 2016 Traffic Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>CAADT</th>
<th>% TRUCKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244.325-246.444</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.444-246.598</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.598-246.992</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.992-299.452</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299.452-304.262</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.262-305.081</td>
<td>5790</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.081-305.369</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.369-306.364</td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306.364-326.346</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326.346-350.819</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Truck Ramps**

No runaway truck ramps exist.
Port of Entry (POE)
The POE does maintain one rover site on this section of highway US-93 (MP 308.80).

Highway Safety Evaluation

This US 93 segment has one Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Location (HAL) and has four HAL Clusters. The locations are shown in the table below with their statewide ranking.

Analyses of the 5-year accident data (2011-2015) shows there were a total of 317 crashes involving 412 units (8 fatalities and 181 Injuries) on US 93 between MP 244.325 and MP 350.819 of which only 10 crashes involved tractor-trailer combinations. Of the crashes involving tractor trailers, the most prevalent contributing circumstance was speed too fast for conditions. Two injuries and no fatalities resulted from the crashes with tractor trailers. Implementation of 129,000 pound trucking is projected to reduce truck traffic on this route.

Table of HAL Segments US 93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Statewide Rank</th>
<th>Milepost Range</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>305.215</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>321.987-322.487</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>310.903-311.403</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>286.5</td>
<td>307.804-308.304</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>271.819-273.319</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Data:

Bridge Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number:</th>
<th>US 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Bridge Asset Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>SH 75 Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milepost:</td>
<td>244.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Montana State Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milepost:</td>
<td>350.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Number</th>
<th>Milepost Marker</th>
<th>Bridge Key</th>
<th>121 Rating (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>244.51</td>
<td>17830</td>
<td>348,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>244.84</td>
<td>17835</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>246.74</td>
<td>17840</td>
<td>246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>251.39</td>
<td>17846</td>
<td>276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>254.77</td>
<td>17850</td>
<td>378,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>254.87</td>
<td>17855</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Mile Post</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>254.96</td>
<td>17860</td>
<td>378,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>256.79</td>
<td>17866</td>
<td>312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>263.84</td>
<td>17870</td>
<td>154,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>268.39</td>
<td>17876</td>
<td>688,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>281.91</td>
<td>17880</td>
<td>234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>305.24</td>
<td>17885</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>309.03</td>
<td>17890</td>
<td>166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>309.75</td>
<td>17895</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>310.26</td>
<td>17900</td>
<td>238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>315.56</td>
<td>17905</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>319.01</td>
<td>17910</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>320.93</td>
<td>17915</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>324.36</td>
<td>17920</td>
<td>364,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>326.27</td>
<td>17925</td>
<td>235,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>327.26</td>
<td>17930</td>
<td>232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>333.73</td>
<td>17935</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>336.88</td>
<td>17940</td>
<td>344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>341.35</td>
<td>33340</td>
<td>464,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>341.40</td>
<td>33345</td>
<td>282,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>342.29</td>
<td>33350</td>
<td>596,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>342.37</td>
<td>33355</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>345.63</td>
<td>33360</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>346.23</td>
<td>17946</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\): The bridge is adequate if it has a rating value greater than 121,000 pounds or is designated as "OK EJ" (okay by engineering judgment).
Request For Designated Routes Up To 129,000 Pounds
Idaho Transportation Department

This form is designed to be completed electronically. If completing manually and additional space is needed, continue the narrative on the reverse side. Correspond the number of the section on the front with the continuation on the reverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Contact Person’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc.</td>
<td>Andy Lott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Phone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
<th>E-Mail Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208-280-2554</td>
<td>208-324-8668</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andy.lott@agltrucking.com">andy.lott@agltrucking.com</a></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>83338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Highway Route(s) Requested

Vehicles operating on the requested routes cannot exceed the maximum overall length or off-track as shown on the Extra Length Map at [http://www.idt.idaho.gov/dmv/peo/documents/extra.pdf](http://www.idt.idaho.gov/dmv/peo/documents/extra.pdf). Submit a map with requested route(s) along with this completed form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Number</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>247.5 244.33*</td>
<td>268.16 350.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75</td>
<td>244.33*</td>
<td>219.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Route(s) Requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Name(s)</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
<th>Jurisdiction Name</th>
<th>Date Request Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reasons for Request - Continue on reverse side if necessary, corresponding the number of the section with the continuation.

1. Justification
   Enlarge the 129,000 route, to enhance the transport of Molybdenum from Clayton ID, to MONTANA BORDER.

2. Associated Economic Benefits
   Reduce congestion, decrease carbon and Increase Efficiency

3. Approximate Number of Trips Annually
   1000 currently at 105,000 lbs.

4. Commodities Being Transported
   Molybdenum

5. Anticipated Start Date to Use Requested Routes
   12-1-2017

Requestor’s Printed Name: Andrew Lott
Requestor’s Signature: [Signature]
Date: 11/9/17

Requester is required to submit a completed application to ITD (see below) and to city, county, and/or highway district officials where the requested state route (or state route segment) is contiguous to respective jurisdiction(s).

Idaho Transportation Department
Attn: Chief Engineer
PO Box 7129
Boise ID 83707-1129

Fax: (208) 334-8195
Email: officeofchiefengineer@itd.idaho.gov

ITD Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hwy Review</th>
<th>D-1</th>
<th>D-2</th>
<th>D-3</th>
<th>D-4</th>
<th>D-5</th>
<th>D-6</th>
<th>Proceed</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Review</td>
<td>Proceed</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>Proceed</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td>Proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cc: Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC)

*Write-in Changes Coordinated with Requester.*
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**Executive Summary**

Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. submitted a request for 129,000 pound trucking approval on SH-75 between milepost (MP) 219.5 and MP 244.33 at the Intersection with US-93 for transportation of Molybdenum. Currently 1000 trips are made annually at 105,500 pounds. The requested section of SH-75 is designated as a red route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 6.5-foot off-track and 115 foot overall vehicle length criteria. ITD Bridge Section confirms the eight bridges on the route will safely support 129,000 pound vehicles. District 6 analysis shows this section of road in good condition. The Office of Highway Safety analysis shows this section of SH-75 has no Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Location (HAL) and has no HAL Clusters. Department of Motor Vehicles, Highway Safety, Bridge Asset Management and District 6 all recommend proceeding with this request.

**Detailed Analysis**

**Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Review**

All Idaho Transportation Department routes are currently categorized by their ability to handle various extra-length vehicle combinations and their off-tracking allowances. The categories used when considering allowing vehicle combinations to carry increased axle weights above 105,500 pounds and up to 129,000 pounds are:

- Blue routes at 95 foot overall vehicle length and a 5.50-foot off-track
- Red routes at 115 foot overall vehicle length and a 6.50-foot off-track.

Off-tracking is the turning radius of the vehicle combination, which assists in keeping them safely in their lane of travel. Off-tracking occurs because the rear wheels of trailer trucks do not pivot, and therefore will not follow the same path as the front wheels. The greater the distance between the front wheels and the rear wheels of the vehicle, the greater the amount of off-track. The DMV confirms that the requested routes falls under one of the above categories and meets all length and off-tracking requirements for that route. More specifically, the requested section of SH75 from milepost 219.5 to 244.33 is designated as a red route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 6.5-foot off-track and 115 foot overall vehicle length criteria.

**Bridge Review**

Bridges on all publicly owned routes in Idaho, with the exception of those meeting specific criteria, are inspected every two years at a minimum to ensure they can safely accommodate vehicles. A variety of inspections may be performed including routine inspections, in-depth inspections, underwater inspections, and complex bridge inspections. All are done to track the current condition of a bridge and make repairs if needed.

When determining the truck-carrying capacity of a bridge, consideration is given to the types of vehicles that routinely use the bridge and the condition of the bridge. Load limits may be placed on a bridge if, through engineering analysis, it is determined the bridge cannot carry legal truck loads.
ITD Bridge Asset Management has reviewed the eight bridges pertaining to this request and has determined they will safely support the 129,000-pound truck load, provided the truck’s axle configuration conforms to legal requirements. To review load rating data for each of the bridges, see the Bridge Data chart below.

**ITD District 6 Evaluation**
This segment has been evaluated and the District recommends proceeding.
District 6 has evaluated the roadway characteristics, pavement condition, and traffic volumes on SH-75 Mp 219.5-244.33 in response to the request to make this segment a 129,000-pound trucking route. The District has found no concerns with this action and recommends proceeding. Details of the evaluation are provided below.

**Roadway Characteristics**
This roadway is a major rural collector with the roadway geometry outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Terrain</th>
<th>Left Turn Lane Type</th>
<th>Right Turn Lane Type</th>
<th>Right Paved Shoulder Width (ft)</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219.5</td>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>2 – 1 each direction 12'</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pavement Condition**
The road is asphalt pavement and is in good condition; it is not considered deficient in cracking, rutting or ride. SH75 M.P. 217-227 received an overlay in 2011, M.P. 226.6-227.4 was rebuilt and 2 bridges in this section replaced in 2013, and the whole road received a microsurface in 2017. Spring breakup limits do not pertain to this section at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cracking Index</th>
<th>Roughness Index</th>
<th>Rut Average (in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217.122 - 226.64</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.624-227.178</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.178-227.406</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.406-236.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.000-244.325</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic Volumes**
The speed limit of the highway varies between 25 and 60 mph. The traffic volumes are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileposts</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>CAADT</th>
<th>% TRUCKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219.5 – 244.33</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Truck Ramps**
No runaway truck ramps exist.
Port of Entry (POE)
The POE doesn’t maintain a site on this section of highway SH-75

Highway Safety Evaluation

This SH 75 segment has no Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Locations (HALs) and has one HAL Cluster. The location is shown in the table below with their statewide ranking.

Analyses of the 5-year accident data (2014-2018) shows there were a total of 27 crashes involving 34 units (1 fatality and 16 Injuries) on SH 75 between MP 219.5 and MP 244.325 of which only 1 crash involved a tractor-trailer combination. The one tractor trailer crash was a fatal crash resulting in one fatality with contributing circumstances of drug impaired and failed to maintain lane. Implementation of 129,000 pound trucking is projected to reduce truck traffic on this route.

Table of HAL Segments SH-75:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Statewide Rank</th>
<th>Milepost Range</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH 75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>219.399-221.399</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Custer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Data:

Bridge Data:
Route Number: SH 75
Department: Bridge Asset Management
Date: 1/4/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Milepost:</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Milepost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 93 Junction</td>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>near Clayton, ID</td>
<td>219.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Number</th>
<th>Milepost Marker</th>
<th>Bridge Key</th>
<th>121 Rating$^a$ (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>244.31</td>
<td>17825</td>
<td>424,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>244.20</td>
<td>17820</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>238.72</td>
<td>17815</td>
<td>188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>234.45</td>
<td>17810</td>
<td>374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>232.45</td>
<td>17805</td>
<td>344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>226.97</td>
<td>17801</td>
<td>258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>226.84</td>
<td>17796</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>220.57</td>
<td>17791</td>
<td>258,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$: The bridge is adequate if it has a rating value greater than 121,000 pounds or is designated as "OK EJ" (okay by engineering judgment).
An ad was carried by local news outlets in Challis, Salmon, and Clayton, about upcoming hearings on allowing 129,000 pound trucks to be permitted for US93 and SH75. The following is being offered as testimony regarding the applications.

Emails:

Dear Mr Green,

We are writing in opposition to granting a permit to Lott Trucking to operate oversized loads via Highway 93, a Scenic Byway along the Salmon River continuing over Lost Trail Pass to Montana.

Points of opposition include:
1. When Monida pass on interstate 15 is closed due to weather, Lost Trail Pass on U.S. 93 would be an even less appropriate route, being steeper and narrower, few passing lanes, sharp curves and fewer snow removal resources.
2. Making Highway 93 a reasonable alternative would require construction of frequent passing lanes, runaway truck escape lanes, a bypass route around the city of Salmon. Appropriate improvements on 93 for some 30 miles south of Salmon adjacent to the Salmon River would be close to impossible and certainly outrageously expensive.
3. Tandem trucks of these weight lack the maneuverability and especially stopping power to safely operate on road such as Highway 93 and should be, in the interest of public safety, be restricted to interstate or four lane Highway’s whenever possible. To do otherwise constitutes an avoidable and unacceptable public risk.

The short notice of the comment meeting and brief comment deadline might elicit suspicion of motives of the IDT to minimize negative reaction to the proposal.

In conversations with other local citizens I find then unanimously opposed to this permit. It is my hope that the IDT will do the right thing and refuse the lot trucking permit and any similar future applications.

Sincerely,
Gordon Lucas
RuthCampbell
Received 12/22/2019 10:36PM

Lance,
Please DO NOT Allow Expanded Truck & Trailer use on Hwy 93.
Many Thanks
Wil Wilkins
PO Box 14
North Fork, ID. 83466
Received 12/21/2019 9:22PM
Dear Lance,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed alternate truck route along Highway 93 and 75. I strongly urge the ITD to NOT ALLOW the increased truck/trailer weight along these routes as I do not feel they bring benefit, and may actually further burden our already financially strapped, rural communities. I also do not feel this proposal aligns with our rural values for the following reasons:

1) Safety for our children, tourists, hunters and fisherman, cyclists, and for our wildlife. This route is used by all these folks daily and with tourist and recreational traffic increasing substantially during summer. Many of these folks are going slow, pulling in and out of turn-outs with trailers, and conditions are particularly challenging when the road is covered with snow and ice or falling rocks. Adding heavier trucks to this mix is a bad idea as I have already experienced almost being back-ended and run over by one of these large trucks along Highway 75. Our wildlife are also at great risk with too many being killed along these routes. These are highly valued state resources that should not be placed at increased risk, particularly as these species concentrate on winter range at lower elevations.

2) This route is a Wild and Scenic Highway and is really not appropriate for the heavy truck traffic that we already experience. There are numerous accidents along the windy road and at least one of these trucks has gone into the river in the past.

3). The Salmon River is a an iconic river supporting many fish species that are highly valued Nationally. We cannot afford to place these species, or our water, at greater risk.

4) Wear and tear on our city and county roads cost our already strapped counties since my understanding is that there is no additional fees to cover these costs that are part of this proposal.

In the future, I would ask that the State of Idaho change its evaluation process to include a cost/benefit analysis that assesses safety and infrastructure impacts so that cities, counties, and taxpayers have a better foundation for considering these types of proposal.

Please help us retain our rural values, keep our children safe, and not place increased burden on our already strapped counties. Please do not permit this increased truck weight on this route.

Thank you,

Toni Ruth
PO Box 172
Carmen, Idaho 83467
Received 12/21/2019 5:25PM

Hi Lance,

A friend of mine brought this issue to my attention. These comments are written by my friend but I completely concur. And would vote NO on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.
First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

• This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
• U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
• If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
• Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
• Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
• Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I’m walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
• U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon’s downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
• Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
• More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
• This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.
Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,

Will

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why:
Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- I have lived in both Salmon and Challis with occasional commuting in between the two locations. Even in the comparatively few trips that I made between the two locations on US 93 for the comparatively short amount of time I lived in either place, I saw multiple accidents and often when conditions were fine--A rolled vehicle, a three vehicle motorcycle crash, a car in the river, a two vehicle collision including a livestock trailer; several of these were fatalities. The point I wish to make with this is that I was NOT a frequent commuter on US 93 and even in my relatively few number of trips, I personally was stuck in a disproportionate number of traffic stops because of vehicle accidents. THIS IS A DANGEROUS HIGHWAY. For the sake of the safety of their own drivers and other motorists on the road, these trucks should not be allowed on 93.

- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic. Furthermore, US 93 over Lost Trail is a popular route for recreational road bicyclists, as well as it is not uncommon to have bicycle tourists on other parts of Highway 93. Especially for much of the stretch of US 93 between Salmon and Challis, the road is against a canyon wall and the river; accidents on this highway can be and have been devastating. With trucks on this highway, it would not be a matter of if but when one of these big rigs was involved.

- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.

- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.

- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduce that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to the area.

- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. Salmon already has noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from the town. The town does NOT need more trucks coming through.

- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.

- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.

- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if road conditions are bad. They need to take into consideration local residents' lives over their own profits.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please consider these comments, as it is lives of both cities, truckers, and other motorists that will be affected by increased traffic.

Thank you for your time,

Brianna Goehring
Received 12/20/2019 11:12PM
Lance,

I don’t support large double trucks on Hwy 93. Our town’s geography and layout mean that there’s no poss of a bypass. And our regional roads are narrow and windy, already dangerous enough without more large truck traffic. send those suckers up I-15 please.

Last: please stop spraying salt on our roads! Go back to lava rock and plows. You’ll save a ton on repaving. And my car will stop dissolving into a heap of rust.

Thx

~ Chris Swersey
Salmon, Idaho
Received 12/20/2019 4:52PM

Dear Mr. Green,

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion on the proposed expansion of truck/trailer weight and length on Highway 93. As a nearly daily driver on 93 I strongly oppose these expansions.

This road is very narrow, windy and full of additional hazards. When anyone from out of the area comes to visit I always warn them about the windy road that quite often has rocks, snow and ice on it and almost always has wildlife too...not to mention that a misstep may land you in the river. We see a large number of tourists unfamiliar with the dangers of this road bring risks to themselves and others on the road through poor driving. It takes a lot of close attention and defensive driving to navigate this highway safely without the addition of bigger trucks. We have a lot of accidents just from the inherent risks on this highway. Big trucks will cause more risk and more accidents. They are slow and will necessitate more passing, they are slow to stop and cannot navigate sharp curves well putting them over the centerline or off the side of the road.

It is also important to think of the reasons people come here. One of the most popular is our river. Additional truck traffic puts out river at risk from accidents and contamination of our water. When we do have a truck accident here it is hours to get a capable wrecker here to deal with an accident. In the meantime our river is being polluted. We have vulnerable fish species that can ill afford yet another risk to their survival.

Wildlife is also of great concern. It breaks my heart to see the number of animals that are hit and killed on Highway 93. Bigger trucks are going to mean more animal deaths.
And, this is a biggie, for much of our area the only road is Highway 93. A big rig wreck could block our lifeline highway. Block our route to medical services and block our daily travel route.

Bottom line. Expanded truck/trailer weight and length on Highway 93 will do nothing but increase the risk to people, animals and environment. This is a bad idea.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Latham
Salmon, ID 83467
Received 12/20/2019 4:18PM

Dear Mr. Green

I urge you and the Idaho Dept of Transportation (IDT) to oppose the current proposal that would expand truck/trailer weight and length on Hwy 93.

My concerns are based on my own experience driving Hyw 93 regularly, especially the section between Salmon and Gibbonsville.

First, many big game animals including deer, elk, and bighorn sheep reside and especially winter in this corridor along Hwy 93. I urge you to drive this road section right now (Dec 20) and observe all of the wildlife adjacent to- and on- the road. The residents in this area have learned to drive slower speeds to avoid collisions with animals. Despite the locals preventive actions, many big game animals die each year on this stretch of highway. Truckers will not be so careful and likely have little concern for wildlife when they are on transport time lines.

Second, this route is heavily traveled by myself as well as tourists and hunters and fishermen that contribute to the local economies. Many of us haul trailers and also admire the wildlife and scenery. In addition to wildlife, Hwy 93 has other unique hazards including falling rocks and trees, sharp bends, steep banks, ice and snow, open range cattle, cattle drives, and a river paralleling most of the route. Adding heavier and longer trucks is unsafe and a bad idea. Such trucks will add additional hazards for regular traffic by increased stopping distance, decreased clearance on tighter corners, and their additional length.

Third, the Salmon River and its fish are unique and essential cultural, economic, ecological, and recreational resources. The Salmon River is a National Wild and Scenic River and it supports several species of fish that are protected under the Endangered Species Act. These include: Chinook salmon, Steelhead, Sockeye salmon, and Bull Trout. Additional heavier and longer trucks increase the risk that a truck will slide into the river and spill toxic fuel or other chemicals.

For the safety of everyone who drives Hyw 93; for the protection of the big game animals, native fish, and the Wild and Scenic Salmon River; and for the protection of the local economies that depend on these natural resources and a safe Hyw 93;
I strongly urge you and IDT to oppose the permitting of heavier and longer trucks.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Russ Thurow  
Salmon, Idaho 83467  
Received 12/20/2019 1:44PM

Hello Lance  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I strongly urge the ITD to NOT ALLOW the proposal that would expand truck/trailer weight and length on Hwy 93. I have used this Hwy daily to commute from my home near North Fork, Idaho to Salmon and for Challis for work, recreation and community activities for 43 years.  
Here are my concerns:  

1. This route is heavily traveled by tourists, hunters and fishermen for 9-10 months each year. Many of these folks are pulling trailers, admiring the scenery and pulling in and out of turn outs. Most are not familiar with the Hwy 93 and it’s peculiar hazards - wildlife, falling rocks and trees, sharp turns, steep banks, ice and snow, open range cattle, cattle drives, and a swift river along most of the route. Adding heavier and longer trucks to this mix is a bad idea. This highway is accident prone with current legal traffic.  
2. This is a Wild and Scenic Highway and should have require special restrictive considerations when planning for additional and arguably, more hazardous, traffic.  
3. Wildlife, especially big game animals such as deer, elk and mountain sheep, are heavily concentrated from Gibbonsville to Arco. These are very valuable state resources and unfortunately many die each year on this stretch of highway. Many of the truckers use very heavy grill guards and drive with little concern for wildlife and at speeds that may be legal but that are not prudent.  
4. Longer, heavier trucks will be an additional hazard for regular local traffic due to the increase stopping distance, decreased clearance on tighter corner and additional length will make safe passing more difficult.  
5. The Salmon River is known world wide as a spectacular Wild and Scenic River. It also has a number of fish species that are ESA listed; Chinook salmon, Sockeye salmon, steelhead, white sturgeon and Bull Trout. Additional trucks with hazardous cargos of additional weights will only increase the risk to these species should a truck end up in the river.  

Please refrain from permitting trucks of this size to use this route. It can only result in increased accidents.  
Thank you.

Jerry Myers  
North Fork, ID 83466  
Received 12/20/2019 12:12PM
Hi Lance,
Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.
Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

• This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
• U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
• If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
• Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
• Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
• Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions from inversions and woodsmoke. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I’m walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
• U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon’s downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
• Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
• More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
• This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.
• The safety of Salmon school students will be at a greater risk as the schools are along Highway 93 and 28.
• Interstates were built for purposes including truck routes, they should be used for this - not our wild and scenic highways.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.
I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.
Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.
I agree with all the above points stated by Jenny Gonyer.
Thank you for your time,
Kelsey Stansberry
Received 12/20/2019 12:08 PM
Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

• This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
• U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
• If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
• Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
• Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
• Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse.
• U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon’s downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
• Although this is a tourist town, this is NOT the kind of guests we want to be hosting. Or the type of businesses we want crowding our small town.
• Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have few to none alternatives to avoid construction.
• More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
• This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.
Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.
Thank you for your time,
Fallon Born
Received 12/20/2019 12:03PM
Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,

Alicia Edwards

Received 12/20/2019 10:41AM
Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route
As stated by a fellow land lover and friend: Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.

U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.

If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.

Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.

Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.

Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.

U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.

Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.

More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.

This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.
I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you,
Alicia McDermott
Received 12/20/2019 10:39AM

Lance,

My name it's Alicia Gilpin. I have been a resident of Salmon, Idaho for 20 years. I agreed fully with all of the email below, written by a colleague and friend of mine.

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:
- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits. And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,
Alicia Gilpin
Received 12/20/2019 10:36AM

Dear Mr. Green, I’m writing this to express our feelings against the proposed permit to allow oversized and increased weight truck/trailer traffic on Highway 93 through Salmon. We live on Highway 93 S. and being that the highway is only a two lane road this extra truck traffic would cause not only a safety hazard but also cause increased noise and wear on the Highway. Thank You, Robert and Tina Mauterstock, 211 Highway 93 S. Salmon Idaho
Robert Mauterstock
Received 12/20/2019 9:37AM

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I’ve heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass posses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.

U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon’s downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.

Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.

More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.

This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,
Jenny Gonyer
Salmon, ID 83467
Received 12/20/2019 9:36AM

I missed the meeting in Salmon last week for the proposed tandem semi truck corridor on Hwy 93. I do not think this is a good idea for a few reasons. The first reason is safety. Having huge trucks on tight, windy road from Challis to the town of Darby, MT is unsafe. Driving these roads anytime from August to May can be hazardous. The second reason is road quality. Heavy trucks wear the road surface down quickly. It takes a lot to get our roads repaired. Who pays for this and to repair our vehicles after driving on rutted roads? These large trucks should be relegated to the Hwy systems that are set up for their size and the ability for other vehicles to get around them. Thank you for letting me express my opinion.
Nancy Bolyard
Salmon, ID
Received 12/20/2019 8:51AM
Dear Sir: I am opposed to allowing 129,000-pound trucks on sections of U.S. 93 and Idaho 75.

My reasons include:
-- the risk of spillage of toxic substances into our beautiful watershed
-- the cost to our community that may incur if curbs and such are damaged as the over-sized trucks try to navigate our streets --the danger of reduced stopping distances available to trucks with such heavy loads - we have abundant wildlife that cause drivers to have to stop on a dime to avoid collision - what if such a large weighty truck is trailing such a car?—the passage of these trucks on these routes will bring zero benefits to our community while presenting risk of potential municipal expenditures.

I wish I were more eloquent on this topic but my objection should be clear. Thank you sincerely for considering my point of view.

Respectfully, Gayle McCampbell
Received 12/19/2019 4:33PM

---

Lance, thank you for the chance to comment on the application for the 129,000 pound trucks that would come through Salmon, Idaho. I have concerns that to use this route as an option for that size of truck creates an unacceptable burden on our community.

- The trucks would have to come through Main Street which is not compatible with our downtown area.
- I would not like this application, if approved, to establish a precedent that this route is used for various other trucking opportunities through Salmon.
- This route follows a wildlife corridor and the amount of wildlife killed on the highway would increase.
- This route also follows a Wild and Scenic corridor, a toxic spill into the Salmon River or its tributaries would be devastating.
- Who would be responsible for the cost of the wear and tear on our local highway, I assume state and county coffers? They are often in bad repair without this added use.

Respectfully,
Terry Myers
Received 12/17/2019 2:28PM

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the requested allowance of 129,000 lb. loads.

In my taped comments I was erroneously under the impression that the requested change was the allowance of very long trucks, not just the allowance of the heavier loads. My point during that recording was that these very long trucks were seriously dangerous on any freeway/highway used by other motorists. As the additional weight will make these already dangerous vehicles even more so, my most serious concern is still the danger they represent to other motorists.

My other concerns regarding the increased weight are:
1. More damage to the road surface, which will result in increased cost to taxpayers for the upkeep of these roads, plus the disruption of traffic during the resurfacing processes.

2. Mr. Lott of Arlo Lott Trucking, the company requesting this change, touted the safety of his equipment and drivers, but had to admit that a large spill of molybdenum which occurred in the past was his load, but not one of this trucks. This fact indicates that he is not always in control of who transports his loads.

3. If approved, this change will open these highways to all trucking companies wishing to carry these heavier loads, not just the anticipated 700 trips a year to and from anticipated by Arlo Lott Trucking alone.

4. This section of Hwy 93 follows the Wild and Scenic-designated Salmon River, resulting in a narrow and winding road with narrow shoulders, making it more likely that any equipment failure or driver error could result in a serious accident, possibly causing injury to other motorists, or one of these huge loads ending up in the river. Since no environmental studies are necessary for the allowance of the heavier loads, there is the very real possibility hazardous materials could end up polluting this river as the result of an accident. Also, any accident could cause the complete shutdown of this main north-south Idaho route.

5. There will be times during bad winter conditions when these trucks will be required to chain up, but I and other people in attendance at the Dec. 9 meeting had never seen any of these long trucks with chains on, and additionally we were alarmed by the fact that they often drove very fast for the conditions and many times would seriously tailgate other motorists.

FOR THESE REASONS, I AM AGAINST THESE HEAVIER LOADS.
Mary Carroll
Received 12/16/2019 11:57AM

Comments: I oppose approving larger truck (129,000 pound) transport from Clayton to the Montana line for several reasons. With the exception of the Lost Trail Pass ascent, the route is winding and narrow, with insufficient pullouts to safely accommodate passing such a large vehicle. The route receives considerable travel by large camp-trailers whose drivers may be inexperienced at driving such roads; they don’t need to encounter such large vehicles. Our towns are zero stoplight (Challis) and two stoplight (Salmon) communities and we don’t need huge trucks on our main street (Salmon) where there are pedestrians and people getting into and out of parked cars along Hwy 93. This request seems to be for the benefit of a single applicant, with no discernible benefit to the affected communities along the transportation route. I oppose granting this application for 129,000-pound vehicle use.

Evalyn Bennett
Received 12/7/2019 12:38PM
Hello,
I live south of Salmon on HWY 93 and my family and I are opposed to increased trailer traffic.

We’ve only lived here for 2 years and have seen trucks and trailers Wreck because they fail to make the curve of the road near our house.

The semi trucks we pass on the road often cross the center line while maneuvering the tight curves between Challis and Salmon.

Interstates are appropriate for large vehicles, NOT scenic byways.

Thank you,
Kelly Vanderveer
Received 12/6/2019 9:48AM

Phone Calls:
From Paul Werner of North Fork, ID 3 miles S. of Gibbonsville 12/20/2019

He wanted to make official comments regarding his opposition to the 129k application along US93. He was unable to attend the meeting and therefore is calling in. He is strongly opposed to allowing 129k on US93. The curvature of the road around Sheep Creek is dangerous. There is also a blindspot pulling out from Gibbonsville onto the highway, which is a danger. The wildlife that are constantly being hit along the road, pose a great safety hazard. He also doesn’t want to open up US93 to more heavy truck traffic. If Arlo Lott wants to put money where their mouth is they need to put money into Monida Pass to make in an alternate route. The fact that long trucks cross the center line is dangerous to the traveling public.

From David Dobbs of Salmon, ID 12/19/2019

He wanted to make official comments. He informed me that he is against the approval of 129K along US93. He mentioned 4 objections:
1) Who is going to pay for the additional wear and tear to the roadway that is caused due to weight.
2) What’s in it for Salmon? The truckers aren’t going to stop in Salmon, so there is little benefit to Salmon business or residents. This only benefits the hauler.
3) The turn from US93 on to main street is difficult. Can the trucks even clear this turn safely?
4) This invites more truck companies to use this road, causing more damage.
From John Black of Elk Bend, ID on 11/25/2019

He wanted to make some official statements. I did inform him of the meeting at the opportunity to have any questions or concerns he may have answered. He will not be able to attend the meetings as he doesn’t want to travel at night. He was going to see if he could get a petition together and have that delivered to us.

His concerns were about the road bedding and if the road could handle the weight, since there have been slides in this area and there are already cracks in the road since the last refinishing of the road. He is also concerned about the road bend and the tight angels the trucks would have to make. He is concerned about the speed limit, and feels it should be lowered. He is concerned about the accidents caused by animal strikes, that happen regularly in his area. He is concerned because this is a tourist corridor, and in the summer there is lots of slow moving traffic along this wildlife and scenic river corridor, along with bicyclists. He is not in favor of 129k being allowed on US93. He would like his concerns to be official recognized as a part of the public comment.

From Jessica, she lives in Salmon on 12/4/2019.

She had great concern with the allowance of 129k loads on US93, and wanted to know why the applicant doesn’t use a different route (US93 south to Arco). She will be at the meeting to make official public comments.

From V.J. Greenwood, who has lived between Salmon and North Fork for the last 50 years on 12/3/2019.

He is concerned with the speed that trucks are allowed to travel. He cites that loads have been lost along this route before due to speed. He also had great concern about the loss of animal life along thus route. His suggestion is that the speed limit along the road should be lowered. He may be able to attend the public hearing, but wanted to be sure that if not that his opinion was captured and heard.
Letters:

Jim Kopp, Challis, ID

I see less trucks & less wear & tear on the roadways. This is an advantage for the trucker, the customer and the highway department.

I fully support the heavier loads.

Why wouldn’t you do this?

---

Robin Phillips, Salmon, ID

I am against the proposal for permitting 90’ long rigs at 129,000 pounds on US93 because of the negative effects on our tourism and as a public safety issue. With 93 having so many curves it will be impossible for these rigs to maintain a reasonable speed and it will be a public safety risk trying to pass them. Route 93 doesn’t have the road structure to accommodate these rigs.

---

Dave Gusky, Salmon, ID

I DO NOT APPROVE OF THE PROPOSED TRUCKING REQUEST _ BASICALLY BECAUSE THE SCHEDULED MEETING IN SALMON _ DEC 9 – 4-6:30 WAS A B--- S--- SESSION AND NOT AN INFORMATIVE MEETING.

THE ONLY ENTITY THAT SHOwED UP WAS THE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. NO INFORMATION FROM TRUCKING Co., ETC.

WHAT A WASTE OF TIME!

---

Tom Stillwaugh, Challis, ID

I support allowing the increase in weight on Highway 93 + 75. The information provided shows that the trucks opperate safe at these weights plus then actual weight per square inch is less. That relates to less wear and tear on the roads. The business I work for will require less load, thus less trucks on the road. I hope Idaho Transportation Department will change the limits as proposed.

---
Mike Solterson, N. Fork, ID 12/1/19

MR. Green

In regards to truck trailer using Hwy 93. I strongly am against this due to the fact that this is a scenic byway. Truckers now Do not observe speed limit of 65 mph. (Which is way too fast for this road) There is too many semis on the road Hwy 93 the way it is now. This opens up a whole can of worms. I’ve lived here for 55 yrs in the Salmon- N. Fork area. Bad idea to increase weight of these vehicles.

Jerry Perry, Salmon, ID

I object to the heavy trucks using our hi ways because there is no money allocated for road up keep or replacement. I know they pay road use tax on all miles traveled but that money goes into one place for all road construction in the state. The big towns get fixed first and we have to live with bad roads. Your representative said it will not affect the roads because of the extra axles will distribute the weight. I say all truck traffic on the roads in this route will affect the roads with no upkeep.

The road from montana line to challis is very narrow and crooked. There is already accident on the sharp corners. The stop signs in to salmon is very adverce and trucks have a hard time getting started; worse when there is ice and snow. The stop signs at junction hw 93 and hw 28 is very sharp. Truck uses the sidewalk a lot.

The trucker would rather go through salmon instead of the freeway because of sage junction.

Virginia Perry, Salmon, ID

I object to the heavy trucks using our hi ways because there is no money allocated for road up keep or replacement. I know they pay road use tax on all miles traveled but that money goes into one place for all road construction in the state. The big towns get fixed first and we have to live with bad roads. Your representative said it will not affect the roads because of the extra axles will distribute the weight. I say all truck traffic on the roads in this route will affect the roads with no upkeep.

The road from montana line to challis is very narrow and crooked. There is already accident on the sharp corners. The stop signs in to salmon is very adverce and trucks have a hard time getting started; worse when there is ice and snow. The stop signs at junction hw 93 and hw 28 is very sharp. Truck uses the sidewalk a lot.

The trucker would rather go through salmon instead of the freeway because of sage junction.
Paul A. Edstrom, North Fork, ID

Mr. Lance Green,

I’ve lived along Highway 93 north of North Folk for 30 years. This narrow twisting, turning route from North Fork to Lost Trail Pass is in an area of considerable wildlife and is in fact a big game wintering area. The deer and elk killed along this stretch of the highway is staggering. Part of the problem is brush and trees are allowed to grow close to the blacktop blocking visibility. Then the 65 mph speed limit is too fast for large trucks.

These large trucks cannot brake fast enough to avoid the game. To a trucker time is money and so they go to beat hell knowing their large bumpers and front end guards (that rival locomotive cow catchers) will protect them from any damage. I walk the highway a lot for exercise and find and report to fish & game many animals either dead or in need to be dispatched. I can tell passenger vehicle kills from truck kills because large truck kills leave no glass and plastic part fragments at the impact site.

Therefore I am against any more and larger trucks. Also, lower the truck speed limit between North Fork and Lost Trail pass and do some clearing of brush and trees along the highway right of way.

Bob Russel, Salmon, ID

I do not believe those heavy vehicles should be allowed – these roads are not built for heavy loads, damage will result. There is often wildlife crossing these roads, and such heavy loads cannot stop to let them pass. Rocks and other debris are often falling into the road which requires quick response by drivers – in this case it would increase the danger to other drivers with these loads dodging debris.

The main street of Salmon, ID is already extremely busy with traffic – these loads would exacerbate that problem. There are numerous cross-walks requiring traffic to stop quickly.

The city of Salmon has only one bridge crossing the Salmon River- if one of these loads were to break down on that bridge it would cripple traffic throughout the community. Also the bridge is getting some age on it and these heavy loads may put it out {????}/

Interstate Highways are designed for this type of traffic – please confine it to the interstate highways and deny this request for an exception.

Randall G. Thomas, P.E., Salmon, ID

These segments of US93, and ID75 already have congestion issues with slow moving vehicles which either: Ignore Idaho's slow vehicle pullover statute, or:
Drive at less than the yellow advisory speed in every corner, and then speed up to above the speed limit in every straight away, (aka "Passing Zone").

I would be neutral on this issue if new slow vehicle pullouts were constructed at maximum ten mile increments, and additional signing erected.

With the current roadway geometrics, I must oppose this proposal to increase the number of slow vehicles on the roadway.

Glenn and Camilla Hugunin, North Fork, ID

We are opposed to the proposed truck weight limit increase to 129,000 lbs. on Highways 93 and 75 for the following reasons:

A. SAFETY

1. Highway 75 and 93 were not designed to handle vehicles of this weight. We have been commuting and driving on these roads for 42 years. These backroads already have lots of traffic, especially from spring thru fall. These highways were also not designed for a 65 mph speed limit. There are too many obstacles on this road such as school bus stops, children, joggers, bicyclists, motorcyclists, curves, ice, snow, mud slides, avalanches, rocks, big game, cattle, horses, tourists, commuters, farm machinery, trucks and logging traffic. Do we really need larger, more dangerous trucks as well? My wife has been an R.N. at Steele Memorial Hospital, in Salmon, for 40 years. She has seen far too many injuries and fatalities already on these two highways. Allowing 129,000 lb. trucks will only increase these numbers. Interstate 15 was designed to handle longer, heavier trucks and increased traffic safely.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL

1. These sections of Highways 75 and 93 are adjacent to the Salmon River, A National Wild and Scenic River. Adding 129,000 lb. trucks that are loaded with mining equipment and products, will greatly increase the likelihood of an accident, and spill into the Salmon River. Again, Interstate 15 is far more suited to handle such an emergency.

Dear Mr Green:

I say "NO" to the apparent decision which has been made to allow heavier loads on tandem semi-trailers and trucks to negotiate US Hwy #93 from Challis to Salmon to the Montana state line. A commercial vehicle corridor encompassing US Hwy #93 from Challis to Arco, and proceeding from Arco via State Hwys #26, 33 and 22 to I-15 at Dubois, is the PERFECT truck route to Montana.

I worked in the Challis area while residing in Salmon for 20 years and very familiar with the disastrous history of commercial trucking in this corridor. In addition, I have lived adjacent to US Hwy #93 for the last 40 years in Salmon. Truck traffic from Montana through Salmon and into southern Idaho has increased demonstrably in the last 25 years following the decision made by former Governor Batt to allow increased loads which began the
accelerated surface deterioration of US Hwy #93 during that period. I must say now that the proposal to allow for even heavier and longer trailers and semi’s on this section of US Hwy #93 is a complete joke. Tight curves, blind corners, tourists unfamiliar with the road and distracted by the spectacular scenery, coupled with large, big game wildlife populations often confined to the river road corridor make this area an extremely unsafe and difficult route to travel through during ANY season.

Believe me, the last thing the city of Salmon “needs” is additional and heavier commercial trucking on Main Street. I am concerned about accelerated air pollution, and the dust, dirt, diesel fumes and noise associated with commercial trucking, the inadequacy of the existing route through Salmon to handle such traffic as demonstrated by tight, blind turns and crushed highway signs due to narrow right of ways, and increased commercial traffic passing through school zones. Main Street has already failed to accommodate lengthy cattle trucks and wide loads headed to Dakota’s oil fields, without special preparation. We already have the worst “engineered” turn on the entire length of US Hwy #93 running from Mexico to Canada. It’s a real winner – a 90 degree turn which is seldom negotiated cleanly by current tractor trailer vehicles.

US Hwy #93 has been repaved this summer and is currently in the best condition it has been in its entire existence. However, the highway is in no way able to accommodate increased commercial loads and tandem trailers safely especially during winter even with pouring more money into the road by salt application and accelerated plowing. Snow and ice will always persist during winter in the 4000-7000ft elevations, requiring truckers to chain up which they will resist, and thereby compromising safety for ALL vehicle traffic.

**Bottomline:**

- A perfectly good, year-round (in most cases) truck route exists to meet the commercial trucking needs. Lost Trail Pass in winter should not be considered as a reliable, nor viable, substitute for commercial trucking via I-15 and Monida Pass in Montana.

- Salmon, Idaho cannot handle more dirt, dust, diesel fumes, school zone violations, crushed highway signs and associated noise on Main Street.

- Expanded commercial trucking will be detrimental to our wildlife populations, and tourism values found in our unparalleled wild and scenic corridor.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I hope you will seriously consider the public comments that I know you have received from knowledgeable and concerned local citizens who also do not support this proposal.

Sincerely,

s/s William C Osborne

William C Osborne
22 N Dogwood Lane
Salmon, ID  83467
December 20, 2019

Mr. Lance Green
DMV Program Specialist
Idaho Transportation Department
3311 W. State Street
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8427

Electronically Submitted: lance.green@itd.idaho.gov


Dear Mr. Green:

Please accept our comments regarding the proposed changes to Idaho Highway 75 and U.S. Highway 93 to allow Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. to transport molybdenum from Clayton, Idaho through Challis and Salmon to the Montana border. Since 1973, the Idaho Conservation League (ICL) has worked to protect and enhance Idaho’s clean water, wilderness, and quality of life through citizen action, public education, and professional advocacy. The Idaho Conservation League has a long history of involvement with mining and environmental protections. As Idaho’s largest statewide conservation organization, ICL represents over 30,000 supporters who have a deep personal interest in ensuring that mining operations, including material transportation, are protective of our land, water, fish, and wildlife.
We have serious concerns regarding the proposal to allow trailered trucks to transport 129,000-pound loads on US-93, particularly during the winter months. First, molybdenum is not a benign substance, despite concentrate being relatively insoluble in water; extended exposure poses long-term risks to aquatic life. Further, molybdenum concentrates likely contain additional components which may pose hazards to human life and the environment and the applicant should reveal and list any additional constituents being transported. Transporting these increased loads requires modifying accepted trucking and transportation limitations on small-size local highways just upstream of the the Congressionally-designated Salmon River Wild and Scenic corridor.

On January 19, 2019, ICL spoke with you (Mr. Lance Green) about questions we have regarding unconfirmed information pertaining to Lott Trucking’s reason for the modification request. We learned that truck length will not change due to established restrictions on US-93 between Challis and Salmon (a Blue-designated section, allowing 95’ truck/trailers). However, we did confirm that this modification request is based on seeking an alternative route to I-15 during winter. According to Mr. Green, Lott Trucking justified the request by citing adverse conditions on I-15 during severe storms, stating that the interstate is not well kept, tends to gather snow drifts, and often closes during severe weather. Further, US-93 was cited as being better maintained and usually remains open when I-15 closes. We do not believe using Lost Trail Pass, which receives up to 300” of snow per year and can have high winds with significant drifting and snowpack/icing issues on a narrow, winding mountain road, serves as a realistic nor functional alternative to a closed federal highway. State Highway Patrol offices and Transportation Departments do not close routes due to adverse conditions without considerable thought and reasoning. We believe if the preferred route is closed due to adverse conditions, operators should wait until conditions improve, reducing risks to human health, company infrastructure (by proactively avoiding an accident), and the environment.

Our concerns regarding the potential for accidents and spills directly below the Wild and Scenic corridor are grounded in recent history. In May of 2018, a truck owned by Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. crashed into a guardrail near the Big Hole River, dumping 48,000 pounds of molybdenum. Fortunately, there were no injuries and no materials reached the Big Hole River. While this incident occurred in Montana, it does not preclude the possibility of an accident in Idaho along the same route, particularly during the winter when US-93 would be used as an alternative route.

US-93 contains two sections that currently maintain length and off-track restrictions based on the winding and mountainous nature of the highway. Moreover, the increased truck traffic through downtown Challis and Salmon, Idaho will increase congestion and the potential for vehicle and pedestrian accidents. While analysis may indicate road and bridge conditions are sufficient to support 129,000 pound loads, traveler and environmental safety must remain the most important factors in this equation.
ITD’s proposal evaluation indicates that 1,000 trips of 105,500 pounds annually occur under current conditions, and the hand-modified application for a 129,000 pound route designation (dated 11/9/17) justifies the changes as increasing weight limits to enhance the transportation of molybdenum and to “reduce congestion, decrease carbon, and increase Efficiency.” While we commend Lott Trucking for their environmental consciousness and desire to reduce their carbon footprint, we do not believe the inherent risks associated with transporting larger sized loads of hazardous materials outweigh the potential carbon footprint reduction. By our estimation, the established Arco route encompasses 330 miles as opposed to the proposed US-93 route of 230 miles. We do not believe the 100 mile difference justifies the increased threat to human safety and the environment.

We believe allowing heavier loads on US-93 poses risks to human health and the environment that cannot be justified, and we encourage the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) to reject this proposal. Making an exception can quickly lead to establishing a standard, and ICL does not believe these mountain passes and roads, particularly through river corridors, should be used for over-sized material transportation. We confirmed that, should ITD approve this request, it will establish a precedent for additional trucking companies to follow, which could lead to greatly increasing traffic densities, congestion, and the risk for accidents. Before these types of programmatic decisions be made, ITD should conduct a thorough analysis of roads and associated infrastructure to ensure that the existing road widths, bridges, engineering designs, and emergency facilities (such as runaway truck ramps, chain-up/brake test areas, etc.) are sufficient to withstand consistent use by trucks carrying 120,000-pound loads. Moreover, ITD should conduct a safety study focused on the impacts to towns along the proposed route and define the potential for increased risk to human health prior to making such binding decisions.

Should ITD choose to approve this load alteration proposal, we believe the department should enact several mitigation measures. First, the applicant and ITD should install additional spill containment caches along route corridor described in the application. These caches should include materials necessary to contain and facilitate any spills on land or in the water containment. These could include both absorbent pads, straw bales, and booms. The applicant and ITD should schedule loads to avoid transporting materials on days with high traffic volumes, such as nationally recognized holidays, weekends, and local significant events. ITD should work with the applicant to update safety protocols regarding winter weather advisories, and US-93 should not serve as the primary transportation route during winter storm events due to the increased levels of ice, snow and winds associated with Lost Trail Pass. Chains should be required during potentially freezing conditions. Finally, we recommend the applicant and ITD review and update molybdenum storage and containment protocols.

However, the best path forward is for ITD to prohibit the use of US-93 N through Salmon as a transport option for this large, molybdenum-bearing trucks due to the concerns identified above.
Thank you for reviewing our comments regarding this proposal. If you have any questions about our comments, or if we can provide additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to working with the Idaho Transportation Department on this, and other issues in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

John Robison
Public Lands Director
Idaho Conservation League
jrobison@idahoconservation.org
(208) 345-6933 ext. 13
BEFORE THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
DISTRICT SIX

IN RE:

129K HEARING
SALMON and CHALLIS, IDAHO.

__________________________________________

TRANSCRIPTION OF DIGITAL RECORDING
RE: 129K HEARING -- PUBLIC COMMENTS
BEFORE
ITD HEARING OFFICER ROBERT HOFF

Reported by: Lori A. Pulsifer, RDR, CRR, CSR No. 354
THE HEARING OFFICER: I'm the hearing officer, and I've got Vince here with me.

Just start by stating your name and your address and who you're representing, if you're not representing yourself.

And you can -- any questions, you need to ask the crew out there. I'm not here to answer questions. So just --

CHUCK FELTON: My name is Chuck Felton. I'm from Challis, Idaho. I'm a city councilman here. I travel the roads of Eastern Idaho quite extensively.

I understand the configuration on these trucks, and if they go -- if they go to that configuration, you know, it's okay. I mean, they're putting less pressure on the highway than the ones they have now.
And I'm just kind of here to complain about the roads. I drove them today. The road between Craters of the Moon and Arco and Richfield -- they're just a travesty for the state of Idaho.

They're rough. I broke a spring on the road between Craters and going through Carey -- that area -- one time on my AT -- or on my RV. And they're just really bad roads.

And it's like the road between INL and Blackfoot. I'm afraid to even drive the speed limit on that road. I mean, in a truck -- or in a pickup -- I should say -- or something like that -- the roads are just bad.

I wrote a letter to ITD and asked them about the -- one of them and if they have plans, if they're under contingency to repair them; and I never got any response back. So anyway -- so I'm just kind of complaining.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Did you go to the district engineer, or did you go to Boise?

CHUCK FELTON: No, I didn't. I just sent a letter to ITD is all.

THE HEARING OFFICER: But that highway, I think, is District Five. I think it is.

MALE SPEAKER: It is.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
MALE SPEAKER: It's actually District Six.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Is it in District Six?
MALE SPEAKER: I believe so, yeah.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).
CHUCK FELTON: The maps out here show --
THE HEARING OFFICER: It's District Six.
CHUCK FELTON: -- the red area is going through
that part of the (indiscernible). Yeah.
MALE SPEAKER: The one he's talking about --
THE HEARING OFFICER: Give me a call, if you
want. I'm on the Board, and my number will be on the
Internet.
CHUCK FELTON: On the Internet?
THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
CHUCK FELTON: Okay. Yeah. And your name was?
THE HEARING OFFICER: Bob Hoff.
CHUCK FELTON: Hoff?
THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. I don't mind a
call.
MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).
THE HEARING OFFICER: Are you out of Rigby?
CHUCK FELTON: No. I'm southeast
of (indiscernible). (Indiscernible) Farms, southeast of
THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, out there? Oh, okay.

CHUCK FELTON: I'll do that.

THE HEARING OFFICER: I can't promise results, but I can take complaints.

CHUCK FELTON: Yeah, I know. I'm on the city council. Remember? We do what we can. Sometimes it's out of our hands.

But, you know, like I say, I just drove it today; and it's not good. I don't know how people in Arco even stand to not be screaming every day about that road.

And I know they ground off the road going into Carey, coming in from the Twin Falls -- from the Shoshone side. My wife even commented on it today.

She said, "Holy cow. What's wrong with this road here?"

And I said, "Well, they ground it off," because it was so rutty from them trucks.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Hmm.

CHUCK FELTON: It's just -- I just hate driving it. The fact is I need to drive -- I need to take my motorhome over -- down through Arco and Carey and Twin Falls. You know, I hate to even drive it over that road; but I have no other alternative.
So I won't take my motorhome between Blackfoot and the INL at all. You know, when it gets slick, why, the roads are tough. They're tough to drive. You know, you have to go slower.

But, still, they're slick roads. They throw you around. You've got to be very alert all of the time. Anyway, that's my complaint.

MALE SPEAKER: Very good. Thank you, sir.

CHUCK FELTON: Thanks for listening.

(End of audio file.)

... 

(The audio file labeled z000008 contains no verbal content.)

... 

(The audio file labeled z000007 contains no verbal content.)

... 

(Following is a transcription of the audio file labeled z000006.)

THE HEARING OFFICER: -- supposed to have all of the answers out there.

MEGAN STARK: (Indiscernible) on the recording.

THE HEARING OFFICER: We're just going to listen.

JESSICA McALEEESE: Okay.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Just relax and make the case.

JESSICA McALEESE: My name is Jessica McAleeese; and I live on Highway 93 north, just a couple of miles from town and --

MEGAN STARK: Can you state your address?

JESSICA McALEESE: Oh. 193 Highway 93 North, Salmon, Idaho.

MEGAN STARK: Perfect.

JESSICA McALEESE: Number one: We have a local paper that comes out in Salmon once a week. And so this was in the paper, apparently, twice. But for those of us who don't read the paper or get the paper -- I live on 93, and I had no idea about this until somebody brought it to my attention.

So perhaps in the future, you might want to consider a little bit more direct communication with people who are actually living along the route that's being proposed to be a change of.

THE HEARING OFFICER: This is what we put out -- like, I see on fences -- sometimes when there's a zone change, is there a notice out?

MEGAN STARK: Usually not, huh-uh.

JESSICA McALEESE: Yeah. That actually would be a good idea, just a little tent out -- you know,
like, a little sandwich board or something.

MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

JESSICA McALEESE: Anyway -- so I've been a little bit -- very, very concerned about the increase in the weight limit because, living in Salmon, living in this region, we drive the roads every single day.

And particularly in the summer -- we have a small farm business. So we're driving from Salmon to Stanley and back once a week, and we see -- boots on the ground -- what is going on on this highway.

I live right down the road from the weigh station, the port-of-entry weigh station, which isn't open all of the time. So I have a pretty good handle on what kind of trucks are going by, what kind of activities are used on this highway corridor.

And there might not be a really good representation of those activities when you just have engineers crunching numbers.

Sure. The numbers work out for this type of load. But what I am concerned about is that the cultural perspective hasn't been taken into account. This is a scenic corridor, the Lewis and Clark Scenic Byway.

We have a tremendous amount of motorcyclists who -- motorcycle gangs, Rolling Thunder -- we joke
about it because we're outside in our field every single
day in the summer, and Rolling Thunder goes by.

MALE SPEAKER: I'm one of those.

JESSICA McALEESE: Well, so is my dad.

But motorcyclists use this route as a
non-freeway route, which is fine; but there are certain
qualities to the scenic byway that they're utilizing it
for. And they stop in Salmon and they provide us an
economic, you know, piece of the puzzle.

In addition to motorcyclists, there are an
increasing number of bicyclists who use this route for
cross-country traffic. I probably see about two to
three cyclist groups per week in the summertime using --
and there's no shoulder.

If you -- did you drive this route on your way
from Idaho Falls, or did you come up 28?

MEGAN STARK: 28.

THE HEARING OFFICER: We came up 28.

JESSICA McALEESE: I would recommend, on your
way home, to drive through Challis.

THE HEARING OFFICER: We'll go that way.

JESSICA McALEESE: Good. Because, then, you'll
see some of the concerns -- I'm pretty sure. I hope.

Cyclists use it. Kids -- going to and from
school, at least two bicycles per week pass our farm,
with young kids riding their bicycles into town. No
shoulder whatsoever.

And then the great western flavor of cattle
drives that pop up around every single blind turn that
you're not expecting throughout all times of year. More
than once, we are stuck in a cattle drive on this
particular highway.

And there's no flagging. There's no warning to
when these cows move. You'll often be driving around a
corner near Clayton and Challis, on U.S. 93, before --
between Ellis and Challis, and you'll come across, you
know, eighty head of cows in the middle of the highway,
a bunch of horses, people on ATVs, dogs. Everyone is
moving cows.

And I'm driving a light truck -- you know, a
little pickup -- loaded with veggies. Sometimes it's,
like, "Whoa," slam on your brakes because, here, you
have cattle.

With an increased weight limit to these
trucks -- Lance was just saying -- the engineer in
there -- that there's been studies done that it is more
difficult to slow down with the added axle.

I'm really concerned about -- not just that
they're going to be carrying molybdenum from Butte.
They've already had an accident up near Wisdom.
Last year, they dumped a 48,000-pound load of molybdenum almost into the Big Hole River. Our steelhead and salmon in this region are hanging on by a thread -- by a thread.

And if they're carrying ammonium sulfate -- what they just said -- they're carrying salt. They're carrying molybdenum.

It takes a driver who's sleepy. It takes a driver that's not used to this heavier load. I don't know about their training. He was trying to be transparent, but he's also -- he was also being bureaucratic.

So I don't know what their training schedule is for their drivers, and they -- he said they're choosing to use this route as an alternate route when I-15 is closed at Monida, which means bad weather.

And these roads are not good-weather roads. Nobody leaves the valley when a snow storm is happening. Sure, Monida is closed. I can tell when Monida is closed because all of the traffic comes through this way, and it's super dangerous.

That kind of stuff isn't taken into account with the engineers, not to mention the scenic byway. Our town is the highway. If you've driven through it, you know it.
There's a certain unfortunate matter when your highway is your main street. People don't stop. Trucks don't stop. Trucks don't see pedestrians. There's dust. There's increased, you know, confusion in traffic, especially during the summer months.

These trucks aren't going to be stopping here. They're not going to be fueling here. We have the most expensive gas. Why would they stop here to get gas?

And so I just -- I just would really hope that, as our District Six representative, you really consider the scenic qualities of this particular stretch of road.

I know that they want to use it as an alternative trucking route; but, really, it opens up the door to not just them but every single trucking company that's, like, "Sweet. Now we can use it as a direct route from Montana into Idaho."

And with our one port of entry that's rarely open -- or it's not consistently open every day -- that's pretty easy to just sneak by with heavy loads, sneak by with illegal loads.

There's not necessarily a state police or Idaho Department of Transportation state police representative here all of the time. We have local police, but there's not a lot of oversight in Lemhi County.

And I'm sure this company would try to do the
best they can, but I'm just not confident that this is
the route that they need to increase their loads.

What else am I missing?

MEGAN STARK: Take your time.

JESSICA McALEESE: Yeah, I know.

THE HEARING OFFICER: If you miss something,
you're welcome to come back.

MEGAN STARK: Yeah.

JESSICA McALEESE: And -- yeah. I'll write
letters and -- oh, the other thing I really liked during
this particular comment session was somebody would like
to see a cost-benefit analysis of the costs that it's
going to be -- increased loads on our roads, Lemhi
County, our highways that we drive every single day, on
our one single bridge that goes across town -- that's
it, one bridge, not to mention up and over Lost Trail
Pass, all of the other rest of the roadway.

But what is the cost of that increased load and
the number of trucks that might be using it? How many
of all of the routes in Idaho that are now the
129,000 -- once they were approved for the heavier
loads, how many more loads went on those roads?

Because it's not just this one single trucking
company that is going to benefit. We're going to have a
lot of trucking companies that take advantage of the
increased weight limit.

So I want to know: What is the cost to our highways?

And that is taxpayers. I pay those. I make probably about three to five cents an hour, if you want to do the math, because I'm a farmer. I just don't want to pay to increasingly repair these roads so that this guy can haul toxic substances around.

They can use the freeway. He can use the freeway. That's what it's there for. It's a straight route, a safe route, and not, you know, waiting for a disaster, which -- accidents will happen.

They're much more severe when it's in a corridor like this. Much more severe. And who is going to pay that cost?


JESSICA McALEESE: Yeah. So at any rate, I appreciate it. I know it's kind of -- I don't know. Living in Idaho Falls, you are probably a little bit removed from the community up here.

But we really care about our corridor, and there's really good things happening here.

THE HEARING OFFICER: I appreciate that.

JESSICA McALEESE: And to have a company just
wanting to use our route as an alternative route so they save a little bit of money -- it's not really worth it to us because there's -- there's a lot here besides just some savings.

So thank you very much.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you very much.

(End of audio file.)

(Following is a transcription of the audio file labeled z0000005.)

MARTHA EDGAR: First? What was it? Martha Edgar. Am I supposed to --

MEGAN STARK: (Indiscernible).

MARTHA EDGAR: Martha Edgar, 38 Dogwood Lane, Salmon, Idaho. What else? Oh, I'm representing myself.

MEGAN STARK: Perfect.

MARTHA EDGAR: I have land that fronts Highway 93, two miles out of town.

I'm very concerned with the fact that it's not only a scenic river but that it's going to be dangerous. Those bigger trucks, which some of them already -- I mean, I've already seen them.

And there was a horrible jack-knife about two weeks ago, on the way to Missoula, from just a regular
semi. I mean, it happens all of the time -- or -- okay -- enough so that it's pretty disturbing.

And I fear for our tourism because, once people get behind these trucks, it's worse than those big, rolling houses that people use in the summer, you know, to try to get around.

So people are going to be stuck. We're not going to be able to get where we can go. There are no shoulders. We don't even have hard shoulders or even hard -- well, we can't even ride bicycles on the side of the road all the way out the highway, to 93.

So -- and like they were talking about, to stop in time, it's dangerous. And those people -- okay. I can't ask.

The drivers, when they get tired -- they're just not as good of drivers. And I'm wondering to myself if they want to come this way so they don't have to abide by the interstate highway rules of the eight hours, where they have to stop and take a nap. If that's the case, that's even more of a concern to me.

I did figure a little bit of -- if they're going to Butte from Thompson Mine, it's, like, 243 miles. Now, we don't know if they're going to Butte. If they go through Mackay, it's 344 miles.

But I'm saying that from -- almost all the way
up to the top, they're going to have a thirty-five to forty-mile-an-hour minimum of how they can -- how fast they can travel, which is going to be about a seven-hour trip.

And they can probably average sixty miles an hour if they go south, which is going to be a six-hour trip.

So if all they're doing is trying to save some diesel, that's offensive to -- going through, as usual, a small town with few voices, where you're not going to have huge gatherings, where people are going to stop those trucks if they get angry.

This is typical of rural America, having not much say in their personal life. And most of us moved here to have quiet and to be -- to feel safe and to be relaxed.

It's a terrible idea. Whoever is listening:

It's a terrible, terrible idea.

So I guess that's about all I've got to say.

Thank you for listening.

MEGAN STARK: Is that it?

MARTHA EDGAR: Yeah.

MEGAN STARK: Okay.

THE HEARING OFFICER: If you think of something else, you're free --
(End of audio file.)

(Following is a transcription of the audio file labeled z0000004t.)

MARY CARROLL: You just want to know how I feel about it; correct?

MEGAN STARK: Yes. So state your name and your address, if you can.

THE HEARING OFFICER: And just relax. We're just going to listen.

MEGAN STARK: Yeah. We're --

MARY CARROLL: Okay. You're not intimidating. So --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

MARY CARROLL: Okay. My name is Mary Carroll. My address is 71 Blythe Lane, Salmon, Idaho, 83467. Okay. My comments are that passing through Salmon will make it necessary to make two very tight turns, because of these very long vehicles -- one at the intersection of Highway 28 and 93 and again at the sharp turn where it turns, where Highway 93 heads north. Vehicles of this length will need both lanes of this two-lane highway. I have had just the normal length force me to wait for them or move over. So it will require other motorists to yield to them during...
these turns.

Also, their inability to stop quickly makes them more dangerous when going through town. These unbelievably long vehicles are horribly dangerous because, in many instances, they are unable to stop in time to avoid serious injuries or sometimes death to other motorists during an emergency.

This problem is made even worse in dangerous driving conditions. Additionally, they are very dangerous and difficult to pass on a two-lane highway.

Unfortunately, these long vehicles are already allowed to drive on interstate highways in Idaho; but a four-line, divided highway allows options for other motorists to react to any immediate danger to them posed by these dangerous vehicles. They should only use the interstate for transporting their loads.

And I will additionally comment that this is a scenic highway. It is quite dangerous between here and Challis. The road curves. It's almost impossible to pass. There are pull-out lanes. These vehicles will be so long that they will probably barely even fit in them.

So passing them on a curving road is going to be almost impossible, and they -- in bad weather, rain, snow, they throw up ice and snow. You can see nothing.

And you're supposed to be able to go -- to pass
these huge, long vehicles with no sight -- no nothing -- going in the opposite lane of traffic. I mean, it's unbelievably dangerous. Unbelievably dangerous.

And I have experienced, on the interstates, driving with these trucks. And I'm sure most of the drivers are very courteous, and they do follow the speed limits; but a good number of them absolutely do not, and they ride your bumper. They're extremely dangerous.

And I will just end by saying I know an individual, a Fish and Game officer, who was driving on the interstate in the Jerome area. There was an accident.

All of the motorists and cars were able to stop. One of these big, heavy trucks was unable to stop, crashed into him, killing him instantly.

And I watch video after video after video on news programs showing these trucks and the horrible damage.

So other than, you know, the destruction and grooving of the highway, which is already pretty grim, it's the danger. It's the danger that I object to in this.

It's just outrageous to expect the rest of the motorists to share the highways with these vehicles. So that is my statement.
Thank you so much for letting me --

MEGAN STARK: Is there anything else you would like to add? You're welcome to come back if you have more later.

MARY CARROLL: No. I think I've pretty well covered it. I just want to stress that my main objective here is the danger of these vehicles.

So the more roads that are opened up to these vehicles, it just exacerbates the incredible problem. I follow the hay trucks on Highway 93, which are allowed to be those big, long ones.

MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

MARY CARROLL: I have seen them come around curves too fast. I'm coming the other way. I see that last trailer almost fall over. If it did, it would fall right in front of me.

So I just -- it's incomprehensible to me that this would even be considered.

MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

MARY CARROLL: So thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

(End of audio file.)

...
(Following is a transcription of the audio file labeled z0000003.)

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: You talked to me on the phone. I'm Priscilla Woodward.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, good. Yeah, you called me.

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Yeah.

THE HEARING OFFICER: That's great. Thank you.

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: I will.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Let me give this back to you.

My name is Robert Hoff. I am an Idaho Transportation board member in District Six. I will be the hearing officer of this hearing.

With me is the following staff: This is Megan Stark. She's our recorder.

To give a statement, please begin by stating your name and your address and who you're representing, other than yourself.

Courtesy is expected in the hearing room to minimize or eliminate interference.

You don't look like you're too rowdy.

This is not a forum for question-and-answer. I don't answer any questions. The hearing officer may ask

HEDRICK COURT REPORTING (208) 336-9208
questions to clarify testimony.

An information room is available in there for any questions. We thank you. You're free to leave and come back if you want to --

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: No.

THE HEARING OFFICER: -- add to your testimony.

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Okay.

THE HEARING OFFICER: So you can start.

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Do you want me to start now?

MEGAN STARK: Begin by (indiscernible).

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: My name is Priscilla Woodward. I am a resident of Salmon, Idaho, 32 Island Farm Road.

I am seventy-seven years old, and I'm a good driver. I drive a safe car, and I haven't had an accident in my whole life that was anything more than hitting a deer.

I've been to Missoula on medical business, meeting family at the airport, taking them back three times in the last two weeks.

And I shudder at the fact of meeting an oversized truck on that pass, because it wasn't built for that. There's not two lanes of traffic anywhere for an extended period of time.
And it is now -- it does have a ski resort at the top. We have a huge amount of people who go up there -- teenagers, too -- that go up there every day this ski season. It's full of people.

And we have a school bus that goes up there on Fridays when we don't have school. It's full of kids going skiing. It's -- the entire highway is considered by the federal government to be a back-country byway.

And then -- so in the summertime, we have lots of tourists, lots of bicycles, lots of motorcycles. And it's not built to accommodate double trailers. None of it is four-lane.

There are very few places to pass on the highway. We've had more than one a year -- resident -- drive into the highway by -- or into the river and drown, because it doesn't have, of course, barriers between the highway and the river.

Many times there's elk or deer or bears -- I've seen all of them -- between here and Challis. I have followed deer down the highway at five miles an hour until they decided they were going to move.

I have been a business person a great deal of my life, and I understand the need to economize as much as you can. However, in their wisdom, the engineers built us an interstate highway that goes from this part,
that part of the country down there, to Missoula.

   It's two lanes in both directions the whole way. The curves are built for people to be able to maintain their speed.

   Interstate highways are safe. I mean, people get mad about them because people drive fast; but it's a whole lot safer than a two-lane road going through mountain passes and going through a very narrow canyon highway, with the inclusion of tourists and wildlife and bicyclists.

   I think it's a recipe for disaster. I understand that once it's marked as kind of a highway that other types of loads can be carried on it.

   And I have real concerns about somebody transporting something that, perhaps, would damage the ecology of our river if the truck fell in the river -- because one is going to. I mean, it's going to happen; we know that.

   I am not against progress; but I am against people taking advantage of the fact that we have something here that is precious to us, that is precious to the people who come to share their free time with us, for companies to be able to save few gallons of diesel fuel getting up into Montana.

   MEGAN STARK: Is that it? Do you have any
more?

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: I can't -- I mean, I'm sure I'll think of something and hit myself in the head when I get home; but I -- we are -- Salmon is now one of the weigh stations on the Continental Divide. So we have a lot of those hikers that come down, and then they hike down the highway.

And it's just never been turned into part of the coming 21st century. We're still very much -- I've had to stop for people herding their cattle down the road, down the highway.

You know, you understand. They've got to get from that pasture to this pasture because it's fall, and we understand that sort of thing. You know?

But opening the door -- if it were just this company and they were going to do it for six months and it was something that they had to do to stay in business, I think everybody would say, "Okay, that's reasonable."

But you're opening the door. A lot of our hay gets shipped to China. If they can put it on a -- if they can drive it up to Missoula and put it on empty containers -- and that's what they put it in is the containers that come over here full and go back empty. So they fill them with hay.
The Chinese have decided they like beef, and they don't have any grassland.

What's going to be next? You know, is somebody going to open up some kind of a mine that has -- that has a material that will destroy our wild river that we've spend so many millions and millions of dollars trying to protect?

I think this is foolishness. And I don't understand how it got this far, that it wasn't just said, "Go drive on the four-lane highway."

My very last concern -- and I don't know -- because I'm not an engineer -- I asked my son to write a letter, and hopefully he will because -- he's a professional engineer.

We were looking at the underpinnings of the road up the pass. Those were built a long time ago, when they didn't have anything anywhere near that heavy, not as heavy as anything that our dump trucks are driving around.

And it's not built on solid rock. It's built on platforms, and you can see it in the fall when there's no leaves on the trees. They just redid that entire road last summer.

It was in horrible shape, just from the occasional trucks. And they are occasional. Not many
trucks come over that hill because it's a long way up
and a long way down.

As a matter of fact, it's so unimportant as a
road that they don't even keep our restroom open in the
wintertime up there -- the rest stop.

They lock it, which is pretty offensive, since
it's a long way from anywhere to anywhere. They don't
even have it out. I mean, you know, the forestry
service puts out outhouses; and it's locked in the
wintertime.

And I think that we're going to have a horrible
consequence of this and everyone is going to say, "Oh,
my God. Why did it ever happen in the first place?"
And I don't think it should.

MEGAN STARK: Okay.

THE HEARING OFFICER: That's good testimony.

MEGAN STARK: Very good. Are you happy with

that?

PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Yeah. I'm fine.

MEGAN STARK: Okay.

(End of audio file.)

...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case#</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201708US93</td>
<td>US93 from Challis to the MT border</td>
<td>Public Notice</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>12/9/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201709SH75</td>
<td>SH75 from the Mine in Clayton to Challis</td>
<td>Public Hearing Held</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201804I84B</td>
<td>I84B (Centennial Way) from SH19 to I84</td>
<td>Board Approved</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201901SH79</td>
<td>SH79 by Jerome, going over the Interstate</td>
<td>Letter of determination sent</td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4/2/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201902SH46</td>
<td>SH46 Wendel over the interstate</td>
<td>End of Public Comment and Comments Collected</td>
<td>1/20/2020</td>
<td>2/6/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201903SH46</td>
<td>SH46 From Wendel to Buhl</td>
<td>Board Approved</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201904US93</td>
<td>US93 from Washington St. to the MT border</td>
<td>Receive Application</td>
<td>10/16/2019</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201804I84B</td>
<td>I84B (Centennial Way) from SH19 to I84</td>
<td>Public Notice</td>
<td>2/21/2020</td>
<td>3/5/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201901SH79</td>
<td>SH79 by Jerome, going over the Interstate</td>
<td>Board Approved</td>
<td>5/20/2020</td>
<td>5/20/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201902SH46</td>
<td>SH46 Wendel over the interstate</td>
<td>Letter of determination sent</td>
<td>5/20/2020</td>
<td>6/4/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
129,000 Pound Trucking Requests

Scott Luekenga
Freight Program Manager

Case #201709SH75 (SH75)

Case #201708US93 (US93)

Submitted on behalf of Arlo G. Lott Trucking Inc., a request for 129K trucking approval from Clayton, ID to the Montana border for the purpose of transporting Molybdenum.

Subcommittee recommends the Transportation Board approve both route requests

April 16, 2020

129K Map Evaluation of SH75

Route Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Clayton; POP: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Applications Trips</td>
<td>1000/105,000lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Decrease</td>
<td>818/129,000lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>6 Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Characteristics</td>
<td>Major Rural Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWLTL</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Lanes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions</td>
<td>Asphalt; Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit(s)</td>
<td>25-60 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Ramp</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19% Reduction in Truck Traffic

Route Type

Blue Routes: 95' overall vehicle length and 5.50' off-track
Red Routes: 115' overall vehicle length and 6.50' off-track
129K Safety Evaluation of SH75

Case #201709SH753

Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td>1 HAL &amp; 4 HAL Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Crash Causes</td>
<td>Involving a Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>Animals/Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit(s)</td>
<td>25-60 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Lights</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School on Route</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Avg. 22” Snow; Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Cross Walks</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Milepost</th>
<th>Driver Action</th>
<th>Most Harmful Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227.100</td>
<td>Negotiating Curve</td>
<td>Fire/Explosion</td>
<td>11/1/2016</td>
<td>Fatal Accident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129K Evaluation of SH 75

Case #201709SH75

- **DMV Recommend Approve**
  SH 75 (MP 219.5 to 244.33) is designated a red and must adhere to the 6.5” off-track and 115” vehicle length

- **ITD Bridge Recommend Approve**
  8 bridges pertaining to this request and has determined they will safely support 129K truck load, provided the truck’s axle configuration conforms to legal requirements

- **District 6 Recommend Approve**
  District 6 evaluated roadway characteristics, pavement conditions and traffic volumes and found no concerns with this request

- **Highway Safety Recommend Approve**
  SH 75 segment has no Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Location (HAL) and 1 HAL Clusters. Five year (2014-2018) accident data shows 34 accidents of which 1 involved trucks.
129K Map Evaluation of US93

Case #202008US93

Route Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Challis: POP: 1,080 Salmon: POP: 3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Applications Trips</td>
<td>Expected Decrease 1000/105,000lbs 819/129,000lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>29 Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Characteristics</td>
<td>Major Rural Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWLTL</td>
<td>1 City of Challis 1 City of Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Lanes</td>
<td>4 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions</td>
<td>Asphalt; Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>8-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit(s)</td>
<td>25-60 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>One; MP 308.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19% Reduction in Truck Traffic

Route Type
Blue Routes: 95' overall vehicle length and 5.50' off-track
Red Routes: 115' overall vehicle length and 6.50' off-track

129K Safety Evaluation of US93

Risk Factors
Case #202008US93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td>1 HAL &amp; 4 HAL Clusters; 10 Accidents Involving Trucks Factor: Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Crash Causes</td>
<td>Animals/Speed/Failure to Maintain Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>8-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit(s)</td>
<td>25-60 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Lights</td>
<td>1 Challis, 0 Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Ramps</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools on Route</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Avg. 22&quot; Snow; Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked Pedestrian Cross Walks</td>
<td>Challis: None Salmon: 12 (US93/Main St)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milepost Driver Action</th>
<th>Most Harmful Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 353.729</td>
<td>Turning Curve</td>
<td>8/9/2014</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 369.001</td>
<td>Going Straight</td>
<td>6/1/2016</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 304.100</td>
<td>Turning Right</td>
<td>6/16/2016</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 305.340</td>
<td>Turning Left</td>
<td>12/14/2015</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 306.055</td>
<td>Turning Curve</td>
<td>4/5/2015</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 312.057</td>
<td>Going Straight</td>
<td>6/21/2016</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 322.001</td>
<td>Turning Curve</td>
<td>12/10/2015</td>
<td>Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 322.200</td>
<td>Turning Curve</td>
<td>6/9/2015</td>
<td>Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 328.100</td>
<td>Going Straight</td>
<td>5/8/2014</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 329.900</td>
<td>Going Straight</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
129K Evaluation of US 93
Case #201708US93

✔ DMV Recommend Approve
US 93: (MP 244.33 to 263.85 & MP304.7 to 350.8) are designated red routes and as such all trucks must adhere to the 6.5’ off-track and 115’ vehicle length. (MP 263.85 to 304.70) is designated a blue route and as such all trucks must adhere to the 5.5’ off-track and 95’ overall vehicle length.

✔ ITD Bridge Recommend Approve
29 bridges pertaining to this request and has determined they will safely support 129K truck load, provided the truck’s axle configuration conforms to legal requirements.

✔ District 6 Recommend Approve
District 6 evaluated roadway characteristics, pavement conditions and traffic volumes and found no concerns with this request.

✔ Highway Safety Recommend Approve
US 93 segment has 1 Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Location (HAL) and 4 HAL Clusters. Five year accident data shows 317 accidents of which 10 involved trucks.

Public Comments

• Public Comments submitted:
  • Written (e-mail & public hear): 34
  • Oral: 5
  • Total: 39

• Support Request: 3
• Against Request: 36

• Comments:
  • Safety - increase truck traffic, congestion, competition with cars, cyclists, hikers etc...
  • Environmental – increase in emissions, accident involving water shed
  • Impact of additional weight on infrastructure
  • Impact on wildlife being hit by trucks
Scott Luekenga
Idaho Transportation Department
scott.luekenga@itd.idaho.gov
(208) 334-8057
129,000 Pound Route Application  
Case #2002008US93 and Case #202009ID75  

Resolution

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 1117 was enacted in 2013 allowing the Idaho Transportation Board to designate state highways for permitted vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds upon request; and

WHEREAS, the Board established a Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes to implement provisions of the legislation; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department has received a request for a 129,000 pound route in District 6: United States Highway (US) 93, Milepost (MP) 244.33 to 350.82; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department has received a request for a 129,000 pound route in District 6: Idaho State Highway (ID) 75, Milepost (MP) 219.5 to 244.33; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD Staff received the applications and reviewed the proposed routes by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the routes; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the engineering and safety analyses, a 30-day public comment period was held, including an opportunity for verbal testimony, and 39 comments were received with three in support, and thirty-six were adversarial on the specific route(s); and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analyses to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on February 18, 2020, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analyses and public comments, it passed a motion to approve the route request; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and the Board Subcommittee presented their analyses and recommendations to the full Board at the regularly scheduled Board meeting of April 2020.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analyses and recommendations on the United States Highway (US) 93, Milepost (MP) 244.33 to 350.82 route, and

FURTHERMORE, that the Idaho State Highway (ID) 75, Milepost (MP) 219.5 to 244.33 route, and

FURTHERMORE, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 6.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, following the fourteen day public appeals period, this resolution is effective 30 April, 2020
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020

Consent Item  □  Information Item  □  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  20 Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Minzghor</td>
<td>District Engineer</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>LSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparer's Name</td>
<td>Preparer's Title</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Layton</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Relinquishment of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access

Key Number  District  Route Number
ORN 22676  6  

Background Information

Met with the Board Sub-Committee on November 20, 2019 and January 21, 2020 to discuss:

1. Relinquish and abandon to COUNTY by official notification from the Idaho Transportation Board, consisting of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto.

Madison County Commissioners met at their public meeting on February 24, 2020 to sign Road Closure and Maintenance Agreements for the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access.

They also met at their public meeting on March 9th to sign Resolutions to adopt the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access.

Met with the Board Sub-Committee on March 18, 2020 and received their approval to present this to the Transportation Board.

Recommendations

Approve the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement for the two above referenced relinquishment which will go to Madison County.  Resolution on page 198.

Board Action

- [ ] Approved  - [ ] Deferred  - [ ] Other

Page 1 of 1
OFFICIAL MINUTE

WHEREAS, Madison County is willing to assume jurisdiction of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access; and

WHEREAS, Madison County and District 6 have negotiated a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement as provided in Idaho Code, Section 40-203B; which Madison County has executed pursuant to that statute and

WHEREAS, during its March 18, 2020 meeting, the Board's Subcommittee on Adjustments to the State Highway System voted to recommend to the full Board approval of the District’s request to transfer this segment of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access to Madison County.

WHEREAS, the full Idaho Transportation Board has considered this matter and voted to approve the District's request to transfer this segment of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access to Madison County.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, as directed in the agreements, jurisdiction of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access can be transferred to Madison County, and that same section of highway hereby is removed from the State Highway System effective immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Department will cooperate with Madison County upon request in providing all right-of-way information in its files associated with the transfer of this section of highway.

APPROVED:

Chief Engineer

Date

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD:

Chairman

Vice Chairman

Member

Member

Member

Member
ROAD CLOSURE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT
East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access
Madison County, Idaho

PARTIES

This Agreement is made and entered into this 24th day of April, 2020, by and between the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT, hereafter called the State, and MADISON COUNTY, hereafter called COUNTY.

PURPOSE

This Agreement is entered into pursuant to Idaho Code, Section 40-203B. The State intends to abandon that portion of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, as shown on the attached print marked “Exhibit A” and made part of this Agreement, and COUNTY intends to take the abandoned East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access into its jurisdiction upon the terms and conditions set forth herein.

The Parties agree as follows:

SECTION I: That the State will:

1. Relinquish and abandon to COUNTY by official notification from the Idaho Transportation Board, consisting of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto, as shown on Exhibit A.

2. Program a project in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 of the FY2021-2027 Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP). Upon approval of the FY2021-2027 ITIP by the Idaho Transportation Board (anticipated in September 2020) the State will proceed with item 3.

3. Pay the sum of $850,000.00 to COUNTY to defray the cost of the operation and maintenance of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access. Provided however, nothing herein shall be construed to require COUNTY to maintain the facility to any certain specification.

SECTION II: That COUNTY will:

1. Pass a resolution pursuant to I.C. 40-203B consenting to the abandonment by the State and accepting the jurisdiction of and responsibility for that portion of the existing facility identified above and known as the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto, as shown on Exhibit A, as of the date of the approval of this agreement by the Idaho Transportation Board, subject to the terms of this agreement.

Agreement No. 1036
2. Once a resolution is passed, the County will execute this agreement and forward the executed agreement, together with a copy of the resolution, to the District Engineer identified below. The District Engineer will present the agreement executed by the County to the Idaho Transportation Board for its consideration.

3. Upon approval of this agreement by the Idaho Transportation Board, and receipt of the funds from the State, the County shall maintain and administer the identified roadway as an existing public facility at its own expense.
SECTION III: Approval and Effect

This Agreement will become effective upon its execution by the parties and the approval of the Idaho Transportation Board.

EXECUTION

This Agreement is executed for the State by its Chief Engineer; and executed for COUNTY by the COUNTY Commissioners, and attested to by the COUNTY Clerk.

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Blake Rindiisbacher, P.E.
Chief Engineer

RECOMMENDED BY:

District Engineer

MADISON COUNTY

COUNTY Clerk
County Commissioner
County Commissioner

(SEAL)

By regular/special meeting on

8/24/2020
RESOLUTION NO: 443

RESOLUTION ADOPTING ROAD CLOSURE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT FOR THE EAST SIDE FRONTAGE ROAD/FARM FIELD ACCESS IN MADISON COUNTY, IDAHO.

WHEREAS, the Madison County Commissioners have been in discussions with the Idaho Transportation Board by and through the Idaho Transportation Department, regarding the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access;

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department has agreed to relinquish and abandon to Madison County this roadway including the appurtenant right-of-ways;

WHEREAS, upon approval by the Idaho Transportation Board for funding, it will pay monies to Madison County to defray the costs of operation and maintenance of this road;

WHEREAS, Madison County now desires to pass this resolution pursuant to I.C. §40-203B, consenting to the abandonment by the Idaho Transportation Department and accepting the jurisdiction of and responsibility for that portion of the existing facility identified as the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto; and,

WHEREAS, Madison County and the Idaho Transportation Department has formalized their understanding by way of a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement signed by Madison County, Idaho, on or about February 24, 2020.

WHEREAS, Madison County desires now by resolution, and pursuant to Idaho Code to formally adopt the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, Madison County now desires to the following actions:

1. Madison County adopts the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement, signed by the Commissioners on February 24, 2020.

2. The Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement is attached hereto and adopted herein.

3. This resolution shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purpose.

4. This resolution is effective immediately when signed.

5. Where the provisions of this resolution are in conflict with existing local laws, the provisions of this resolution will govern and such provisions of existing laws which are in conflict are hereby rescinded.

DATED THIS 7 day of March, 2020.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Madison County, Idaho

By: ____________________________
Jon Weber, Commissioner
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ATTEST:

Kim H. Muir, Clerk

Todd Smith, Commissioner

Brent Mendenhall, Commissioner
Board Meeting

Date 4/16/2020

EAST SIDE FRONTAGE ROAD
Road Closure & Maintenance Agreement

Resolution No. 443
Official Minute

WHEREAS, Madison County is willing to assume jurisdiction of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access; and

WHEREAS, Madison County and District 6 have negotiated a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement as provided in Idaho Code, Section 40-203B, which Madison County has executed pursuant to that statute; and

WHEREAS, during its March 18, 2020 meeting, the Board’s Subcommittee on Adjustments to the State Highway System voted to recommend to the full Board approval of the District’s request to transfer this segment of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access to Madison County; and

WHEREAS, the full Idaho Transportation Board has considered this matter and voted to approve the District’s request to transfer the segment of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access to Madison County; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, as directed in the agreements, jurisdiction of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access can be transferred to Madison County, and that same section of highway hereby is removed from the State Highway System effective immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Department will cooperate with Madison County upon request in providing all right-of-way information in its files associated with the transfer of the section of highway.

APPROVED:
____________________________________
IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
____________________________________
Chief Engineer Chairman
____________________________________
____________________________________
APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Vice Chairman
____________________________________
____________________________________
Legal Counsel Member
____________________________________
____________________________________
Date Member
____________________________________
Member
____________________________________
Member
____________________________________
Member

ITD Resolution

Relinquishment of East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access Resolution

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County staff have drafted and signed a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to transfer a portion of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access to Madison County; and

WHEREAS, Madison County passed and signed a resolution (#443) on March 9, 2020 to enter into said Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement with the Department; and

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County have negotiated a one-time cash payment of $850,000.00 from the Department to the County to offset the initial cost of maintenance on the roadway; and

WHEREAS, Department staff have met with the Board Subcommittee on State Highway System Adjustments and that subcommittee passed a motion to present this state highway system adjustment to the Board with a recommendation to approve it; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement between the Department and Madison County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to program a fiscal year 2021 project in the amount of $850,000.00 as directed in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board approves the official minute, as shown as Exhibit #1, which is made a part hereof with like effect, to relinquish the roadway as described in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to Madison County.
Relinquishment of East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access

Resolution

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County staff have drafted and signed a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to transfer a portion of the East Side Frontage Road/Farm Field Access, to Madison County; and

WHEREAS, Madison County passed and signed a resolution (#443) on March 9, 2020 to enter into said Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement with the Department; and

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County have negotiated a one-time cash payment of $850,000.00 from the Department to the County to offset the initial cost of maintenance on the roadway; and

WHEREAS, Department staff have met with the Board Subcommittee on State Highway System Adjustments and that subcommittee passed a motion to present this state highway system adjustment to the Board with a recommendation to approve it.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement between the Department and Madison County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to program a fiscal year 2021 project in the amount of $850,000.00 as directed in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board approves the official minute, as shown as Exhibit #1, which is made a part hereof with like effect, to relinquish the roadway as described in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to Madison County.
Meeting Date  April 15, 2020

Amount of Presentation Time Needed  20 Minutes

Subject
Relinquishment of SH 33/ Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road

Background Information
Met with the Board Sub-Committee on November 20, 2019 and January 21, 2020 to discuss:

1. Relinquish and abandon to COUNTY by official notification from the Idaho Transportation Board, consisting of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road segment code 005414 mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto.

Madison County Commissioners met at their public meeting on February 24, 2020 to sign Road Closure and Maintenance Agreements for the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road SH 33.

They also met at their public meeting on March 9th to sign Resolutions to adopt the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road SH 33.

Met with the Board Sub-Committee on March 18, 2020 and received their approval to present this to the Transportation Board.

Recommendations
Approve the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement for the two above referenced relinquishment which will go to Madison County. Resolution on page 213.

Board Action
☐ Approved   ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
SH 33 Realignment

"Exhibit A"

Existing State Highway System

To be relinquished to Madison County
WHEREAS, Madison County is willing to assume jurisdiction of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587; and

WHEREAS, Madison County and District 6 have negotiated a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement as provided in Idaho Code, Section 40-203B which Madison County has executed pursuant to that statute; and

WHEREAS, during its March 18, 2020 meeting, the Board’s Subcommittee on Adjustments to the State Highway System voted to recommend to the full Idaho Transportation Board approval of the District’s request to transfer this segment of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 to Madison County.

WHEREAS, the full Idaho Transportation Board has considered this matter and has voted to approve the District’s request to transfer this segment of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 to Madison County.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, as directed in the agreements, jurisdiction of the SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 can be transferred to Madison County, and that same section of highway hereby is removed from the State Highway System effective immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Department will cooperate with Madison County upon request in providing all right-of-way information in its files associated with the transfer of this section of highway.

APPROVED:  

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD:

Chief Engineer  

Chairman

Date  

Vice Chairman

Member

Member

Member

Member.
RESOLUTION NO: 444

RESOLUTION ADOPTING ROAD CLOSURE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT FOR THE SUGAR CITY HALF INTERCHANGE CONNECTOR ROAD STATE HIGHWAY 33 IN MADISON COUNTY, IDAHO.

WHEREAS, the Madison County Commissioners have been in discussions with the Idaho Transportation Board by and through the Idaho Transportation Department, regarding the Sugar City half interchange connector road on state highway 33 in Madison County, Idaho;

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department has agreed to relinquish and abandon to Madison County consisting of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road segment code 005414 mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto;

WHEREAS, upon approval by the Idaho Transportation Board for funding, it will pay monies to Madison County to defray the costs of operation and maintenance of this road;

WHEREAS, Madison County now desires to pass this resolution pursuant to I.C. §40-203B, consenting to the abandonment by the Idaho Transportation Department and accepting the jurisdiction of and responsibility for that portion of the existing facility identified herein;

WHEREAS, Madison County and the Idaho Transportation Department has formalized their understanding by way of a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement signed by Madison County, Idaho, on or about February 24, 2020; and,

WHEREAS, Madison County desires now by resolution, and pursuant to Idaho Code to formally adopt the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, Madison County now desires to the following actions:

1. Madison County adopts the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement, signed by the Commissioners on February 24, 2020.

2. The Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement is attached hereto and adopted herein.

3. This resolution shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purpose.

4. This resolution is effective immediately when signed.

5. Where the provisions of this resolution are in conflict with existing local laws, the provisions of this resolution will govern and such provisions of existing laws which are in conflict are hereby rescinded.

DATED THIS ___ day of March, 2020.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Madison County, Idaho

[Signature]

instrument # 429482
REXBURG, MADISON, IDAHO
3-9-2020 02:19:43 PM No. of Pages: 2
Recorded for: MADISON COUNTY
Kim H. Muir Fee: 0.00
Ex-Officio Recorder Deputy
BY:
Jon Weber, Commissioner

Todd Smith, Commissioner

Brent Mendenhall, Commissioner

ATTEST:
Kim H. Muir, Clerk
ROAD CLOSURE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT
Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road
State Highway 33
Madison County, Idaho

PARTIES

This Agreement is made and entered into this ___ day of ___ , 20___, by and between the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT, hereafter called the State, and MADISON COUNTY, hereafter called COUNTY.

PURPOSE

This Agreement is entered into pursuant to Idaho Code, Section 40-203B. The State intends to abandon that portion of State Highway 33 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road, as shown on the attached print marked "Exhibit A" and made part of this Agreement, and COUNTY intends to take the abandoned State Highway 33 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road into its jurisdiction upon the terms and conditions set forth herein.

The Parties agree as follows:

SECTION I: That the State will:

1. Relinquish and abandon to COUNTY by official notification from the Idaho Transportation Board, consisting of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road segment code 005414 mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto, as shown on Exhibit A.

2. Program a project in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 of the FY2021-2027 ITIP. Upon approval of the FY2021-2027 ITIP by the Idaho Transportation Board (anticipated in September 2020) the State will proceed with item 3.

3. Pay the sum of $3,100,000.00 to COUNTY to defray the cost of the operation and maintenance of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road segment code 005414 mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587. Provided however, nothing herein shall be construed to require COUNTY to maintain the facility to any certain specification.
Also for the construction of an improvement Project known as the "City of Sugar City Railroad Ave/3rd South Improvement".

Road Closure & Maintenance Agreement
Page 1
SECTION II: That COUNTY will:

1. Pass a resolution pursuant to I.C. 40-203B consenting to the abandonment by the State and accepting the jurisdiction of and responsibility for that portion of the existing facility identified above and known as State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road segment code 005414 mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, including the right-of-way appurtenant thereto, as shown on Exhibit A, as of the date of the approval of this agreement by the Idaho Transportation Board, subject to the terms of this agreement.

2. Once a resolution is passed, the County will execute this agreement and forward the executed agreement, together with a copy of the resolution, to the District Engineer identified below. The District Engineer will present the agreement executed by the County to the Idaho Transportation Board for its consideration.

3. Upon approval of this agreement by the Idaho Transportation Board, and receipt of the funds from the State, the County shall maintain and administer the identified roadway as an existing public facility at its own expense.
SECTION III: Approval and Effect

This Agreement will become effective upon its execution by the parties and the approval of the Idaho Transportation Board.

EXECUTION

This Agreement is executed for the State by its Chief Engineer; and executed for COUNTY by the COUNTY Commissioners, and attested to by the COUNTY Clerk.

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Blake Rindlisbacher, P.E.
Chief Engineer

RECOMMENDED BY:

District Engineer

ATTEST:

COUNTY Clerk

County Commissioner

(SEAL)

MADISON COUNTY

County Commissioner

County Commissioner

By regular/special meeting on

2/24/2020
SH 33
Relinquishment

Road Closure & Maintenance Agreement
Resolution No. 444

Resolution Adapting Road Criteria and Maintenance Agreement for the Sugar City Half-Interchange Connector

WHEREAS, the Madison County Commissioners have been in discussion with the Idaho Transportation District and the City of Sugar City regarding the addition of a Sugar City half-interchange connector to the state highway system in Madison County, Idaho;

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation District has expressed interest in providing a half-interchange connector to Sugar City on State Highway 33 in Madison County, Idaho;

WHEREAS, Madison County has agreed to relinquish ownership of State Highway 33 to the City of Sugar City to facilitate the development of the half-interchange connector;

NOW, THEREFORE, Madison County, by and through the Board of County Commissioners, hereby authorizes and directs the execution of the following:

1. The Commissioner of Transportation is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the City of Sugar City for the construction of a half-interchange connector on State Highway 33 in Madison County, Idaho.

2. The agreement shall be in accordance with the standards and specifications established by the Idaho Transportation District.

3. The agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Madison County Commissioners.

4. The agreement shall include provisions for the transfer of ownership of State Highway 33 to the City of Sugar City.

5. The agreement shall provide for the transfer of any rights, titles, and interests in State Highway 33 to the City of Sugar City.

6. The agreement shall include provisions for the payment of any costs associated with the construction and maintenance of the half-interchange connector.

7. The agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Idaho Transportation District.

The resolution shall be effective upon its adoption by the Board of County Commissioners.

Dated this 17th day of February, 2020.

[Signature]

Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners

SH 33 Relinquishment

Existing State Highway System
To Be Relinquished to Madison County
Official Minute

WHEREAS, Madison County is willing to assume jurisdiction of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587; and

WHEREAS, Madison County and District 6 have negotiated a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement as provided in Idaho Code, Section 40-203B which Madison County has executed pursuant to that statute; and

WHEREAS, during its March 18, 2020 meeting, the Board's Subcommittee on Adjustments to the State Highway System voted to recommend to the full Idaho Transportation Board approval of the District's request to transfer this segment of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 to Madison County.

WHEREAS, the full Idaho Transportation Board has considered this matter and has voted to approve the District’s request to transfer this segment of SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 to Madison County.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, as directed in the agreements, jurisdiction of the SH-33 from milepost 337.478 to 339.759 and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from milepost 100.00 to 100.12 and 100.367 to 100.587 can be transferred to Madison County, and that same section of highway hereby is removed from the State Highway System effective immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Department will cooperate with Madison County in providing all right-of-way information in its files associated with the transfer of this section of highway.

APPROVED:
____________________________________
Chief Engineer
Chairman
____________________________________
____________________________________
APPROVED AS TO FORM: Vice Chairman
____________________________________
____________________________________
Legal Counsel
Member
____________________________________
____________________________________
Date
Member
____________________________________
Member
____________________________________
Member

ITD Resolution

Relinquishment of Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road – SH 33

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County staff have drafted and signed a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to transfer a portion of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, and the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, to Madison County; and

WHEREAS, Madison County passed and signed a resolution (#444) on March 9, 2020 to enter into said Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement with the Department; and

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County have negotiated a one-time cash payment of $3,100,000.00 from the Department to the County to offset the initial cost of maintenance on the roadway; and

WHEREAS, Department staff have met with the Board Subcommittee on State Highway System Adjustments and that subcommittee passed a motion to present this state highway system adjustment to the Board with a recommendation to approve it.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement between the Department and Madison County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to program a fiscal year 2021 project in the amount of $3,100,000.00 as directed in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to program a fiscal year 2021 project in the amount of $3,100,000.00 as directed in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement; and
SH 33 Relocation

Map showing the relocation of SH 33 from MP 99.53 to 100.00 between Rexburg and Sugar City.
Relinquishment of Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road – SH 33 Resolution

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County staff have drafted and signed a Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to transfer a portion of State Highway 33 from mile post 337.478 to mile post 339.759, AND the Sugar City Half Interchange Connector Road from mile post 100.00 to mile post 100.12, and mile post 100.367 to mile post 100.587, to Madison County; and

WHEREAS, Madison County passed and signed a resolution (#444) on March 9, 2020 to enter into said Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement with the Department; and

WHEREAS, Department staff and Madison County have negotiated a one-time cash payment of $3,100,000.00 from the Department to the County to offset the initial cost of maintenance on the roadway; and

WHEREAS, Department staff have met with the Board Subcommittee on State Highway System Adjustments and that subcommittee passed a motion to present this state highway system adjustment to the Board with a recommendation to approve it.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement between the Department and Madison County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to program a fiscal year 2021 project in the amount of $3,100,000.00 as directed in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board approves the official minute, as shown as Exhibit #1, which is made a part hereof with like effect, to relinquish the roadway as described in the Road Closure and Maintenance Agreement to Madison County.
Meeting Date  April 16, 2020

Consent Item  Information Item  Amount of Presentation Time Needed  15 mins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Crider, PE</td>
<td>Contracting Services Engineer</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparer's Name</th>
<th>Preparer's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Crider, PE</td>
<td>Contracting Services Engineer</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Board Policy 4030 and Administrative Policy 5030 – Surface Transportation Block Grant Rural (STBGR) Exchange Program

Background Information

During the August 2019 Board meeting, Joel Drake from ITD HQ Financial Planning and Analysis Section, presented proposed changes to LHTAC managed program (Local Highway Rural Investment Program) for board consideration and approval. At the meeting, a resolution was approved that directs staff to draft revisions to Board and Administrative Policies, 4030/5030, respectively, for their review and that they have reviewed and approves the cap and exchange rate changes presented with an effective date of October 1, 2020.

To comply with the board’s direction, attached are the revised policy for the Board's review and approval. The Surface Transportation Program Rural Exchange program policies requires nomenclature changes due to federal law changes related to the funding source (block grant). Other policy changes include an increase to the cap of federal funds exchanged by LHTAC from $2.8 M to $4.0 M of their Rural funding and rate of exchange from $.6167 to $.80 of state funds for every $ of federal funds exchanged. These rates and numbers have not been updated for many years. Other changes include clarifications to the policy to align the program requirements with the policy.

Recommendations

Approval of the Resolution, page 225.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to authorize the Director to exchange Local Federal-Aid Surface Transportation Program Rural apportionments for State Highway Account monies and to establish a Local Rural Highway Investment Program for programming these funds.

Legal Authority
- Idaho Code 40-312(2) – Authority of Board to promulgate rules for the expenditure of all moneys appropriated or allocated by law to the Department or the Board.
- Idaho Code 40-317 – Authority to enter into cooperative agreements with the federal government and local governments.

The Director is authorized to exchange Local apportionments of Federal-Aid Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Rural (STBGPR) apportionments for State Highway Account dollars. This exchange will provide the opportunity for small cities, counties and highways districts to improve their level of investment in their public highway and street infrastructure under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP) as established below.

All Federal-Aid STBGPR apportionments exchanged by the Idaho Transportation Department for State Highway Account dollars shall be used on State Highway construction projects. All State Highway Account dollars exchanged for STBGPR apportionments shall be provided to the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) for use under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program.

The maximum STPR apportionments exchanged will be $4,540,295 after reductions for any Federal obligation authority limits applied to STPR apportionments. The rate of exchange shall be .6167 State Highway Account dollars for each apportionment dollar. Not more than $2,800,000 is annually available for exchange from the State Highway Account.

Effective Federal Fiscal Year 2021, October 1, 2020, the maximum annual STBGR apportionments exchanged will be limited to $5,000,000 after reductions for any Federal obligation authority limits applied to STBGR apportionments. The rate of exchange shall be .80 State Highway Account dollars for each STBGR apportionment dollar. Not more than $4,000,000 is annually available for exchange from the State Highway Account. Annually, an exchange agreement shall be executed with the LHTAC wherein LHTAC may request the amount of STBGR apportionments to be exchanged subject to the above maximum limit.
There is hereby established a Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP) governing the use of State Highway Account dollars exchanged under this policy. The Director is authorized to establish such administrative policies as necessary to enable the administration of the Program by LHTAC. The following minimum criteria are to be applied in the use of the pool of State Highway Account dollars provided under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program:

- Projects funded must be on a rural public highway outside urban areas with populations of 5000 or greater.

- The local highway jurisdiction must be assessing property taxes, or using a substitute property tax (forest funds, sales tax, payment in lieu of taxes, etc.), for funding roads and bridges.

- The local highway jurisdiction should be showing a 70%-30% split on their user(highway distribution account) non-user(property tax or substitute property tax) funding of their road budget as shown in the cost responsibility requirements in Chapter 6 of the Idaho Highway Needs assessment Study Update 1995.

- Any funds received by any one (1) jurisdiction in an amount greater than $50,000 shall be used for contracting out to private enterprise for the work or project to be accomplished.

All funds expended shall be done so in accordance with the State of Idaho Procurement Laws.

The continuation of this policy is contingent upon the continued availability of federal funding. This policy is subject to review by the Idaho Transportation Board in the event of changes in state or federal funding or related funding requirements.

Approved by the Board on:

______________________________  _________________________

Bill Moad  
Board Chairman
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT RURAL (STBGR) EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to authorize the Director to exchange Local Federal-Aid Surface Transportation Program Rural apportionments for State Highway Account monies and to establish a Local Rural Highway Investment Program for programming these funds.

Legal Authority
- Idaho Code 40-312(2) – Authority of Board to promulgate rules for the expenditure of all moneys appropriated or allocated by law to the Department or the Board.
- Idaho Code 40-317 – Authority to enter into cooperative agreements with the federal government and local governments.

The Director is authorized to exchange Local apportionments of Federal-Aid Surface Transportation Block Grant Rural (STBGR) apportionments for State Highway Account dollars. This exchange will provide the opportunity for small cities, counties and highways districts to improve their level of investment in their public highway and street infrastructure under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP) as established below.

All Federal-Aid STBGR apportionments exchanged by the Idaho Transportation Department for State Highway Account dollars shall be used on State Highway construction projects. All State Highway Account dollars exchanged for STBGR apportionments shall be provided to the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) for use under the LRHIP.

Effective Federal Fiscal Year 2021, October 1, 2020, the maximum STBGR apportionments exchanged will be limited to $5,000,000 after reductions for any Federal obligation authority limits applied to STBGR apportionments. The rate of exchange shall be .80 State Highway Account dollars for each STBGR apportionment dollar. Not more than $4,000,000 is annually available for exchange from the State Highway Account. Annually, an exchange agreement shall be executed with the LHTAC wherein LHTAC may request the amount of STBGR apportionments to be exchanged subject to the above maximum limit.
There is hereby established a Local Rural Highway Investment Program governing the use of State Highway Account dollars exchanged under this policy. The Director is authorized to establish such administrative policies as necessary to enable the administration of the Program by LHTAC. The following minimum criteria are to be applied in the use of the pool of State Highway Account dollars provided under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program:

- Projects funded must be on a rural public highway outside urban areas with populations of 5000 or greater.
- The local highway jurisdiction must be assessing property taxes, or using a substitute property tax (forest funds, sales tax, payment in lieu of taxes, etc.), for funding roads and bridges.

All funds expended shall be done so in accordance with the State of Idaho Procurement Laws

The continuation of this policy is contingent upon the continued availability of federal funding. This policy is subject to review by the Idaho Transportation Board in the event of changes in state or federal funding or related funding requirements.

Approved by the Board on:

______________________________  _________________________

Bill Moad
Board Chairman
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM BLOCK GRANT RURAL (STBGR)
EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Purpose
This policy implements Board policy 4030. It authorizes the Chief Engineer to enter into agreement
with the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council to exchange funds and provides criteria for
eligible participants in the Local Rural Highway Investment Program, for eligible projects, and for
administering these funds.

Legal Authority
• Idaho Code 40-312(2) – Authority of Board to promulgate rules for the expenditure of all
  moneys appropriated or allocated by law to the Department or the Board.
• Idaho Code 40-317 – Authority to enter into cooperative agreements with the federal
government and local governments.

Local Rural Highway Investment Program
The Idaho Transportation Board in conjunction with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and
the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) has developed the Local Rural Highway
Investment Program to assist the small cities, counties, and highway districts to improve their
investment in their public highway and street infrastructure.

The program is funded with a pool of up to $2,800,000 of ITD State Highway Account funds.
Effective Federal Fiscal Year 2021, October 1, 2020, the maximum annual STBGR apportionments
will be limited to $5,000,000 after reductions for any Federal obligation authority limits applied to
STBGR apportionments. The rate of exchange shall be .80 State Highway Account dollars for each
STBGR apportionment dollar. Not more than $4,000,000 is annually available for exchange from
the State Highway Account. At the request of the Idaho Transportation Board, the LHTAC has
agreed to administer this program and account for the expenditures of the funds based on criteria
established by the Idaho Transportation Board and the LHTAC. The LHTAC’s administration
expenses for this program will come from the Highway Investment Program pool of funds on an
annual basis.

The Chief Engineer shall enter into an agreement with the LHTAC authorizing the LHTAC to
administer the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP). The agreement shall insure that
the administration of Local Rural Highway Investment Program adheres to the requirements of Board
policy 4030 and this policy. The agreement shall commit the LHTAC to adherence to accepted
general governmental accounting principles in the receipt, budgeting, and expenditure of State
Highway Account funds provided by the Department for the Local Rural Highway Investment
Program.
Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds may be used for partial to full funding on the following:

1. Single highway projects,
2. A portion of a highway project’s expenses,
3. Match for a Federal-aid highway project,
4. Transportation Planning,
5. Signing projects, and
6. Emergency projects

Organizations eligible to receive funds under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program:

1. Must be a local highway jurisdiction (LHJ) with jurisdiction over roadways outside urban areas with 5000 population or greater,
2. Must be assessing property tax for roads and bridges, or using a substitute property tax (forest funds, sales tax, payment in lieu of taxes, etc.) for roads and bridges, and
3. Should be showing a 70%–30% split on their user (highway distribution account)/non user (property tax, or substitute property tax) funding of their road budget as shown in the cost responsibility requirements in Chapter 6 on the Idaho Highway Needs Assessment Study Update 1995.

Project Criteria:
The following criteria must be met in order for a project to be eligible for Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds:

1. The project must be on a rural public highway (outside urban area with 5000 population or greater).
2. Any funds received by any (1) jurisdiction in an amount greater than $50,000 shall be used for contracting out to private enterprise for the work or project to be accomplished.
3. There is a maximum limit of $100,000 to $250,000 on the amount of funds available to any one (1) jurisdiction in any given year. A jurisdiction could make application for up to three (3) years of expenditures in one (1) given application for a maximum of $300,000 over a three (3) year period. These would be rare occasions, but could be necessary for more complicated projects. It is not the intent of this program to cover the complete cost of a project, but merely enhance the funding available to improve the investment in the highway project.
4. Recipients of these funds will be required to notify LHTAC if the funds are utilized for project expenditures different than that shown on the approved application.
Administration:

Annually, LHTAC will take applications from the local highway jurisdictions eligible for this program. The applications with instructions will be sent out annually in September, the Fall.

Applications are to be returned in before December 31 so that State funds can be made available in approximately February of the following calendar year depending on the availability of Federal and State appropriations.

This Program encourages the use of these funds to make capital expenditures, such as materials and contracts on various projects. The funds could also be used for the non-Federal matching funds on a Federal-aid highway or planning project in a rural area. STP—Rural, STP—Enhancement, STP—Safety, Bridge and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality STBG—Rural, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Offsystem and Local Bridge, Local Safety and Federal Lands Access Program are among the Federal programs that could be matched.

The LHTAC shall maintain a program of the projects on which the Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds are used. The LHTAC shall report the status of projects, the balance of Program funds, and the annual costs of administration using Program funds to the Idaho Transportation Board on an annual basis.

__________________________________________ Date ____________________

Brian W. Ness
Director
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT RURAL (STBGR) EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Purpose
This policy implements Board policy 4030. It authorizes the Chief Engineer to enter into agreement with the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council to exchange funds and provides criteria for eligible participants in the Local Rural Highway Investment Program, for eligible projects, and for administering these funds.

Legal Authority
- Idaho Code 40-312(2) – Authority of Board to promulgate rules for the expenditure of all moneys appropriated or allocated by law to the Department or the Board.
- Idaho Code 40-317 – Authority to enter into cooperative agreements with the federal government and local governments.

Local Rural Highway Investment Program
The Idaho Transportation Board in conjunction with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) has developed the Local Rural Highway Investment Program to assist the small cities, counties, and highway districts to improve their investment in their public highway and street infrastructure.

Effective Federal Fiscal Year 2021, October 1, 2020, the maximum annual STBGR apportionments will be limited to $5,000,000 after reductions for any Federal obligation authority limits applied to STGBR apportionments. The rate of exchange shall be .80 State Highway Account dollars for each STBGR apportionment dollar. Not more than $4,000,000 is annually available for exchange from the State Highway Account. At the request of the Idaho Transportation Board, the LHTAC has agreed to administer this program and account for the expenditures of the funds based on criteria established by the Idaho Transportation Board and the LHTAC. The LHTAC’s administration expenses for this program will come from the Highway Investment Program pool of funds on an annual basis.

The Chief Engineer shall enter into an agreement with the LHTAC authorizing the LHTAC to administer the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP). The agreement shall insure that the administration of Local Rural Highway Investment Program adheres to the requirements of Board policy 4030 and this policy. The agreement shall commit the LHTAC to adherence to accepted general governmental accounting principles in the receipt, budgeting, and expenditure of State Highway Account funds provided by the Department for the Local Rural Highway Investment Program.
Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds may be used for partial to full funding on the following:

1. Single highway projects,
2. Match for a Federal-aid highway project,
3. Transportation Planning,
4. Signing projects, and
5. Emergency projects

Organizations eligible to receive funds under the Local Rural Highway Investment Program:

1. Must be a local highway jurisdiction (LHJ) with jurisdiction over roadways outside urban areas with 5000 population or greater,
2. Must be assessing property tax for roads and bridges, or using a substitute property tax (forest funds, sales tax, payment in lieu of taxes, etc.) for roads and bridges, and

**Project Criteria**
The following criteria must be met in order for a project to be eligible for Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds:

1. The project must be on a rural public highway (outside urban area with 5000 population or greater).
2. There is a maximum limit of $250,000 on the amount of funds available to any one (1) jurisdiction in any given year, $150,000 construction grant plus $100,000 emergency grant.
3. Recipients of these funds will be required to notify LHTAC if the funds are utilized for project expenditures different than that shown on the approved application.

All funds expended shall be done so in accordance with State of Idaho Procurement Rules.

**Administration**
Annually, LHTAC will take applications from the local highway jurisdictions eligible for this program. The applications with instructions will be sent out annually in the Fall.

Applications are to be turned in before December 31. State funds can be made available the following calendar year depending on the availability of Federal and State appropriations.

This Program encourages the use of these funds to make capital expenditures, such as materials and contracts on various projects. The funds could also be used for the non-Federal matching funds on a Federal-aid highway or planning project in a rural area. STBG- Rural, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Offsystem and Local Bridge, Local Safety and Federal Lands Access Program are
among the Federal programs that could be matched.

The LHTAC shall maintain a program of the projects on which the Local Rural Highway Investment Program funds are used. The LHTAC shall report the status of projects, the balance of Program funds, and the annual costs of administration using Program funds to the Idaho Transportation Board on an annual basis.

_________________________________________  Date _______________________

Brian W. Ness
Director
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, via prior Resolution (August 2019) the Idaho Transportation Board reviewed and approved cap and exchange rate increases to the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LRHIP) managed by the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council and

WHEREAS, via prior Resolution, the Idaho Transportation Board approved an effective date of these changes of October 1, 2020, and

WHEREAS, via prior Resolution, the Board directed staff to update the corresponding policies related to the Surface Transportation Program Rural Exchange Program which outlines the LRHIP parameters, to reflect these and other necessary changes, and

WHEREAS, staff in conjunction with LHTAC, revised Board Policy 4030 and Administrative Policy 5030 Surface Transportation Program Rural Exchange Program to reflect the above as well as any other necessary changes to align current process with policy, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves Board Policy 4030 Surface Transportation Block Grant Rural (STBGR) Exchange Program and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board concurs with changes to Administrative Policy 5030 Surface Transportation Block Grant Rural (STBGR) Exchange Program.