AGENDA

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

June 20-22, 2017
AGENDA

Workshop, Regular Meeting, and District 3 Tour
of the Idaho Transportation Board

June 20-22, 2017

KEY:
A = Action
D = Discussion
I = Information
ADM = Administration
BRD = Board
CD = Chief Deputy
DIR = Director
OP = Operations

June 20, 2017
Workshop
District 3 Office
8150 Chinden Boulevard
Boise, Idaho

1. BUDGET BRIEFING
   Trends and state revenue – Economics and Research Mgr. Thomas .....2:30

2. BREAK.........................................................................................................................3:25

3. PROGRAM BRIEFING
   Draft FY18-24 Program - Senior Transportation Planner Hesterman.......3:40
   Next Steps – Public Involvement Coordinator Rush.........................4:25

4. FINAL DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS......................................................4:30

June 21, 2017

5. DISTRICT 3 TOUR
   Depart ITD Headquarters, 3311 West State Street, Boise; I-84 west...........8:00
   Arrive Amalgamated Sugar, Nampa; tour factory.................................9:00
   Depart Nampa; I-84 west, US-95 north .................................................10:45
   Lunch in route, location to be determined.........................................11:45
   Depart lunch site; US-95 north.............................................................12:30
   Arrive Council, view alternate route....................................................1:45
   Depart Council; US-95 south, I-84 east, SH-44 east .........................2:15
   Arrive ITD Headquarters, tour ends.....................................................4:45

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule.
June 22, 2017
District 3 Office
8150 Chinden Boulevard
Boise, Idaho

Pre-meeting agenda review

A 6. BOARD MINUTES – May 17-18, 2017 .............................................................6
     – May 31, 2017 ........................................................................................................28

A 7. BOARD MEETING DATES ...................................................................................30
     July 20-21, 2017 – District 6
     August 16-17, 2017 – District 1
     September 20-21, 2017 – District 4
     October 18-19, 2017 – Boise

A 8. CONSENT CALENDAR ...........................................................................................31
     OP ___ CH2M term agreement extension .................................................................46
     OP ___ Old Highway 37, The Narrows, Oneida County – Keller Assoc. extension...47
     OP ___ Advance Ramsey Road Union Pacific Railroad Upgrade to FY17 ..............48
     OP ___ Approval of contract award .............................................................................49
     OP ___ Contracts for rejection ..................................................................................55
     OP ___ Annual Idaho state highway functional classification map .......................73
     CD ___ Public Transportation Advisory Council appointment correction, Dist. 1...79

I 9. INFORMATIONAL CALENDAR
     ADM ___ State FY17 financial statements ................................................................80
     ADM ___ Monthly report of federal formula program funding through May ...........93
     ADM ___ Non-construction professional service contracts ........................................95
     OP ___ Contract award information and current advertisements ..........................96
     OP ___ Professional services agreements and term agreement work tasks report ....101
     OP ___ Innovative project contracting update .......................................................111
     OP ___ Additional GARVEE information, follow up from May meeting .............112A

10. DIRECTOR’S REPORT .........................................................................................8:35

11. AGENDA ITEMS ....................................................................................................9:15
     ADM A ____ Review of draft FY18-24 Idaho Transportation Investment Program ....113
                  (Resolution on page 114)
     CD I ____ Division of Motor Vehicles outages at county offices - update ..........115
               Fogdall/Victory
     OP A ____ 129,000 pound trucking request, US-95 – District 2 .........................116
               (Resolution on page 175)

12. BREAK ..................................................................................................................10:00

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule.
   Time: 10:15

14. **DISTRICT 3 REPORT**: District Engineer Amy Revis  
   Time: 10:20

15. **AGENDA ITEMS, continued**

   | OP | I   | **Enterprise Risk Management** – introduction for the Board | 10:40 |
   |    | McGrath/Yankovich |

16. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** (working lunch**)

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

17. **AGENDA ITEMS, continued**

   | OP | A   | **Siphon Road interchange agreement** | 1:30 |
   | Bala |
   | OP | A   | **Annual update of Safety Rest Areas and Oasis Partnerships** | 1:50 |
   | Spoor |
   | OP | A   | **FY18-21 Strategic Plan for the Division of Financial Management** | 1:55 |
   | Shea |
   | BRD | A   | **Big Creek 4 Airstrips** | 2:00 |

18. **AGENDA ITEMS, continued**

   | OP | I   | **Toward Zero Deaths award** | 2:10 |
   | Tomlinson |
   | OP | I   | **Learfield Sports partnership** | 2:25 |
   | Tomlinson/Moore |
   | OP | A   | **Highway Safety Plan** | 2:35 |
   | Tomlinson |

19. **ADJOURN** (estimated time)
   Time: 3:00

**The meal will be served and reimbursed by the department. Meal reimbursement will not be claimed by any employee participating in the working lunch. Attendance is mandatory.**

SSH: June2017agenda.doc; 6/14/17

*All listed times are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule.*
JUNE 20-22, 2017
BOARD MEETING IN DISTRICT 3

Travel and Lodging Accommodations

Tuesday - June 20, 2017
2:30 PM  Boise  Budget/STIP workshop; District 3 Office, 8150 Chinden Boulevard; Phone #208-334-8300

Overnight at Oxford Suites, 1426 S. Entertainment Ave., phone #208-322-8000
Coleman - #48997  Kempton - #49002
Gagner- #48998  Vassar - #49003
Horsch - # 49001

Wednesday - June 21, 2017
7:30 AM  Boise  Depart Oxford Suites

8:00 AM  "  Bus departs Headquarters; tour begins

4:45 PM  "  Tour ends at Headquarters

5:00 PM  "  Bus arrives at Oxford Suites

6:30 PM  "  Dinner at Bella Aquila, 775 S. Rivershore Lane, Eagle

Thursday - June 22, 2017
8:30 AM  Boise  Business meeting at the District 3 Office

3:00 PM  "  Estimated time of adjournment; depart
The Idaho Transportation Board met at 8:30 AM on Wednesday, May 17, 2017 in Pocatello, Idaho. The following principals were present:

Jerry Whitehead, Chairman
Lee Gagner, Vice Chairman – District 6
Janice B. Vassar, Member – District 2
Jim Kempton, Member – District 4
Dwight Horsch, Member – District 5
Brian W. Ness, Director
Scott Stokes, Chief Deputy
Larry Allen, Deputy Attorney General
Sue S. Higgins, Executive Assistant and Secretary to the Board

Representative Julie VanOrden, Representative Neil Armstrong, and Bannock County Commissioner Evan Frasure were also present.

District 5 Tour. The Board visited the National Weather Service to learn about its responsibilities and partnerships, including the collaboration with the Department. It traveled I-86 east and I-15 south to the Inkom Port of Entry. After a demonstration on the weigh-in-motion system, the Board traveled north on I-15 and US-91 to Blackfoot, with a stop at the location of a proposed I-15 and Siphon Road interchange.

The Board had an informal lunch at the Blackfoot Maintenance Shed, and then toured Premier Technology. Some concern was expressed with the steel truss bridge on the local system that may impede shipping large components from the manufacturing plant. Blackfoot Mayor Paul Loomis emphasized the need to replace the bridge. The city has been working with the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) on funding options. He asked the Board to support efforts to replace the structure. Mayor Loomis joined the Board as it traveled in Blackfoot to view various transportation improvements and concerns.

The Board returned to Pocatello via I-15 south. Staff reported on various projects throughout the day.

WHEREUPON, the tour ended at 3:10 PM.

May 18, 2017

The Board convened at 8:30 AM on Thursday, May 18, 2017 in Pocatello, Idaho. All members were present except Members Jim Coleman, District 1 and Julie DeLorenzo, District 3.
Revisions to Agenda. EAB Higgins requested the addition of a contract award to the agenda. The bids on the SH-3, St Maries Railroad and St. Joe River Bridge project were opened too late to get the item on the agenda, and the contract award needs Board approval.

Vice Chairman Gagner noted that items are being added to the agenda at meetings often. He encouraged staff to avoid these late submittals. Member Horsch concurred.

Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion to amend the agenda to add the contract award for the SH-3, St Maries Railroad and St. Joe River Bridge project, to the agenda. Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed unopposed.

Board Minutes. Member Vassar made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on April 20-21, 2017 as submitted. Member Kempton seconded the motion and it passed unopposed.

Board Meeting Dates. The following meeting dates and locations were scheduled:
- June 20-22, 2017 – District 3
- July 20-21, 2017 – District 6
- August 16-17, 2017 – District 1

Consent Items. Chairman Whitehead commented on the number of low bids that exceeded the engineer’s estimate. Division of Engineering Services (DESA) Blake Rindlisbacher agreed and said efforts are underway to improve the quality of the engineer’s estimates.

Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB17-12

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 FY18 out-of-state travel budget; extending the Hells Canyon Scenic Byway; delaying the Orofino Creek Road Bridge to FY18; contracts for award; and contracts for rejection.

1) FY18 Out of State Travel. The FY18 out-of-state travel request is $368,200. The request is essentially the same as the FY17 request.

2) Request to Extend the Hells Canyon Scenic Byway. Staff requests approval to extend the Hells Canyon Scenic Byway to include SH-71 from Cambridge to the Brownlee Dam and the 12 mile stretch of road that is owned and maintained by Idaho Power from Brownlee Dam to Oxbow, Oregon. The expansion will encompass an additional 40 miles, making the entire length of the byway 258 miles. The appropriate entities, such as the Byway Advisory Committee, Washington County, the Payette National Forest, and District 3, have reviewed the extension request and support it. The expansion is expected to promote economic development in the area,
but will not require any funding from ITD. The byway has local funding and support to help sustain, promote and maintain it.

3) Delay Orofino Creek Road Bridge to FY18. At the request of LHTAC and the project sponsor, Clearwater County, staff requests delaying the Orofino Creek Road Bridge project, key #12019, to FY18. Staff also requests authority to adjust the Program to utilize the $1,108,000 that would become available in FY17.

4) Contracts for Award. The low bid on the following projects was more than ten percent over the engineer’s estimate, requiring justification. The main differences between the engineer’s estimate and the low bid on key #19063 - US-2, FY18 District 1 Americans with Disabilities Act Improvements, was in the Miscellaneous Pavement, Special Remove and Reset Sign, and Special Hot Mix Asphalt Roadway Patching items. Staff did not see any evidence of bid manipulation. There is a possibility that the cost difference between the engineer’s estimate and the low bid is due to the remote project location and the fact that there are small quantities of asphalt. The District recommends awarding the project. Low bidder: W M Winkler - $423,349.

The primary difference between the engineer’s estimate and low bid on key #13103 - I-15, Sand Road to Interchange 89, District 5 was in the Hot Mix Asphalt and Cold Milling items. The engineer’s estimate used the unit price for the most recently awarded I-15 project for the Hot Mix Asphalt item, but in hindsight, staff believes the unit price used was not representative because it was based on production from a stationary plant close to the project with almost no haul requirement. The apparent low bidder indicated that the late bidding date drove up the cost of the Cold Milling item. Completing the project this construction season is important because the existing pavement is deteriorating rapidly. The District recommends awarding the project. Low bidder: Staker & Parson dba Jack B. Parson Companies - $8,429,052.

Granular Borrow, Open-Graded Base Class I, Concrete Class 40 AF Schedule #2, Loose Rip Rap, and Mobilization accounted for the majority of difference between the engineer’s estimate and the low bid on key #13056 – East Lake Fork Road Bridge, District 3. In LHTAC’s review of the low bid, it did not see any discrepancies showing the bid as irregular. An above-average winter snow pack resulted in high runoff, which may have affected the bidding. Rebidding the project would likely cause the project to be delayed a full year. Due to the condition of the existing bridge, the sponsor, Valley County, and LHTAC recommend awarding the contract. The sponsor will provide the additional funds as part of its match. Low bidder: Cannon Builders - $1,843,743.

The two pay items with the largest variance compared to the engineer’s estimate on key #18777 – SH-128, Lewiston and Moscow Concrete Grinding, District 2, were in the slab
replacement and crack and joint sealing items. Staff believes the requirement to finish work during the University of Moscow’s summer break resulted in fewer bidders and higher bids. The work is not urgent, so the District recommends rejecting the bid and re-advertising the project later. Low bidder: Penhall Company - $1,339,573.

Informational Items. 1) State FY17 Financial Statements. Revenues to the State Highway Account from all state sources were 4.1% ahead of projections as of March 31. Of that total, receipts from the Highway Distribution Account were 3.3% or $4.9 million more than forecast. State revenues to the State Aeronautics Fund were ahead of projections by 4.9% or $99,000. Operational expenditures were ahead of planned budgets by $700,000. Usage and orders of winter material were ahead of planned amounts by about $7.6 million. Personnel costs had a savings of $12.8 million or 13.4% due to vacancies and timing between a position becoming vacant and being filled. Contract construction payments of $190 million to date were the lowest of the past three years. The trend is contributing to the increased cash and investment balance. It is also contributing to a lower recovery from the Federal Indirect Cost Allocation Plan with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). ITD is $8.6 million short on this recovery.

The balance of the long term investments was $161.4 million at the end of March. These funds are obligated against construction projects and encumbrances. The combined total of cash and investments is $241 million. FY17 expenditures in the Strategic Initiatives Program Fund were $38.1 million to date.

2) Monthly Reporting of Federal Formula Program Funding through April. Idaho received obligation authority through April 28 via a continuing resolution. Obligation authority is $155.1 million. This corresponds to $154.1 million with match after a reduction for prorated indirect costs. Congress passed a one-week continuing resolution through April 28 with an expectation that a continuing resolution for the remainder of the year would be passed within the week. Apportionments through April 30 are $294.8 million, which includes Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds. This is $1.8 million less than in the FY17 Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act apportionment tables. Allotments have not been reduced yet, providing congress time to act on a final continuing resolution. Currently, obligation authority is 52.6% of apportionments. Of the $154.1 million allotted, $6.6 million remains.

3) Non-Construction Professional Service Contracts Issued by Business and Support Management (BSM). The BSM Section processed one professional service agreement for $23,710 in the previous month.


Key #19002 - I-90, Northwest Boulevard to Sherman Avenue, Coeur d’Alene, District 1. Low bidder: Interstate Concrete & Asphalt Company - $19,853,892.

Key #19813 – SH-33, Henry’s Fork Snake River Bridge, District 6. Low bidder: Depatoc, Inc. - $663,183.
Key #19694 - Intersection Holmes Avenue and Elva Street, Idaho Falls, District 6. Low bidder: TMC Contractors Inc. - $383,804.

Key #13054 - SH-44, Farmway Road/SH-44 Notus-Parma Highway District #2, District 3. Low bidder: Central Paving Company Inc. - $1,290,253.

The list of projects currently being advertised was provided.

5) Professional Services Agreements and Term Agreement Work Tasks Report. From March 30 through April 27, 62 new professional services agreements and work tasks were processed, totaling $8,884,480. Four supplemental agreements to existing professional services agreements were processed during this period in the amount of $120,300.

6) Draft FY18-21 Strategic Plan for the Division of Financial Management. Idaho Code requires state agencies to submit a Strategic Plan covering a minimum of four years to the Division of Financial Management by July 1. The document is to include the Department's vision and/or mission statement, goals, objectives, external factors, and performance measures and benchmarks. Additionally, as a result of the Governor's Executive Order 2017-02, a progress report for implementing the Center for Internal Security controls and National Institute of Standards and Technology's framework must be included in the Plan.

Director's Report. Director Ness thanked District 5 for its hospitality during his annual visit with employees earlier in the week and for the Board meeting. He provided an update on the various landslides and road issues throughout the state. Efforts are continuing on the recently authorized GARVEE Program and a Program Manager is being solicited. At the Congressional level, a pilot project to transform the federal aid highway program to one that is outcome based is being discussed. ITD is one of the states being considered for the pilot project because of the performance management system in place.

Director Ness provided an update on some of the results from last year's Rapid Innovate Event and said another Rapid Innovate Event will be held this year. He mentioned Department accomplishments and recognized employees. Chief Human Resources Officer Brenda Williams was recently selected as vice chair of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials’ Subcommittee on Personnel and Human Resources. Division of Motor Vehicles Modernization Manager Ed Pemble has been nominated for a lifetime achievement award from the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators.

Chief Deputy Stokes thanked the FHWA Idaho Division Office for its assistance with the SH-5 slide. Congress passed an appropriation bill for the rest of FY17. He introduced Jason Brown, the recently-hired Public Transportation Manager.

Chief Operations Officer Travis McGrath reviewed some of the initiatives he is focusing on, including a risk management program in conjunction with Chief Administrative Officer Char McArthur and Internal Review Manager Michelle Yankovich. The Highway Leadership Team identified and prioritized a number of items to address, such as improving project delivery and enhancing the safety culture. Subject matter experts and emerging leaders will work on these issues.
The entire Director’s Board Report can be viewed at http://itd.idaho.gov/Board.

Chairman Whitehead thanked the team for the informative report.

129,000 Pound Truck Route Requests, District 1. Freight Program Manager (FPM) Jeff Marker said the applicants on all seven of the District 1 route requests expect a 15-25% reduction in truck trips if they can haul up to 129,000 pounds. The Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) confirmed that US-95, Milepost (MP) 430.56 to 538.56 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 33 bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. There are no major safety concerns on the route.

Three public hearings on the seven routes were held in District 1 in Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint, and Coeur d’Alene. A total of 29 comments were received. Generally, the comments were not specific to a route. Several comments opposed all of the route requests and some supported 129,000 pound routes, according to FPM Marker. Some of the specific comments on the US-95 route concerned pavement conditions and sight distance in Bonners Ferry.

FPM Marker said the Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes met on April 19. It approved motions concurring with the Chief Engineer’s analyses and recommendations to approve all seven of the routes requested in District 1, and recommending Board approval of the routes.

Member Kempton added that there were also comments about the use of compression brakes; however, that is an enforcement issue. He said that Member Coleman participated at the April 19 Subcommittee meeting and supported designating all of the District 1 routes for vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds.

Member Kempton made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB17-13

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 1: US-95, Milepost (MP) 430.56 to 538.56; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the engineering and safety analyses, a 30-day public comment period was held, including an opportunity for verbal testimony,

May 18, 2017
and 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, 1 supporting the specific route and 5 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the US-95, MP 430.56 to MP 538.56 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

FPM Marker said DMV confirmed that US-95, MP 371.69 to 430.56 falls under the red route category. The bridge analysis determined that the 30 bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. Although the highway is generally in good condition, there are some deficient pavement sections. The District has several rehabilitation projects scheduled to address the deficient pavements. There are no major safety concerns.

Member Kempton made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB17-14 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 1: US-95, Milepost (MP) 371.69 to 430.56; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, and 1 supporting the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the US-95, MP 371.69 to 430.56 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

FPM Marker presented the request to designate SH-1, MP 0.0 to 11.175 and MP 521.76 to 522.86 for vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds. DMV confirmed that SH-1 falls under the red route category. There are no bridges on this section of highway, nor any safety concerns. The pavement is in good condition.

Member Kempton made a motion, seconded by Member Horsch, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB17-15

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 1: SH-1, Milepost (MP) 0.0 to 11.175 and MP 521.76 to 522.86; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, and 1 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the SH-1, MP 0.0 to 11.175 and MP 521.76 to 522.86 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

DMV confirmed that US-2, MP 64.35 to 80.18 falls under the red route category, according to FPM Marker. The bridge analysis determined that the two bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. Overall, the pavement is in fair condition. There are no safety concerns on the route. He added that some public comments expressed concern with sight distance in Moyie Springs.

Member Kempton made a motion and seconded by Member Vassar to approve the following resolution:
RES. NO. ITB17-16
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 1: US-2, Milepost (MP) 64.35 to 80.18; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; and
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WHEREAS, upon completion of the engineering and safety analyses, a 30-day public comment period was held, including an opportunity for verbal testimony, and 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, 2 supporting on the specific route, and 1 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the US-2, MP 64.35 to 80.18 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

Regarding the sight distance concerns, Member Horsch said vehicle combinations up to 105,500 pounds operate on the highway in Moyie Springs. Because 129,000 pound vehicle combinations have more axles and more brakes, the Subcommittee did not believe the heavier vehicles would be more of a safety concern. Member Kempton concurred. He added that the Subcommittee asked about 105,500 pound vehicles operating on some of the other highways. If pavement condition was a concern, the Subcommittee noted that the vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds have a lighter footprint and would do less damage to the pavement. The Subcommittee also reviewed the pavement projects scheduled on the routes.

The motion to approve the above resolution passed unopposed.

FPM Marker said US-2, MP 0.0 to 28.73 and US-95 Interchange falls under the red route category. The bridge analysis determined that the six bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. There are no safety concerns on the route. Some sections have poor pavement condition, but there are projects scheduled to address that.

Member Kempton made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. WHEREAS, Senate Bill 1117 was enacted in 2013 allowing the Idaho ITB17-17 Transportation Board to designate state highways for permitted vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds upon request; and
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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 1: US-2, Milepost (MP) 0.0 to 28.73, MP 10.0 to 10.05, MP 29.74 to 29.81, and MP 475.0 to 475.73; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, and 1 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer's analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer's analysis and recommendation on the US-2, MP 0.0 to 28.73, MP 10.0 to 10.05, MP 29.74 to 29.81, and MP 475.0 to 475.73 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

FPM Marker said SH-41, MP 18.98 to 39.06, falls under the red route category. The bridge analysis determined that the two bridges on the route will safely support vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds, assuming the axle configuration conforms to the legal requirements. There are no safety concerns on the route. There were some public comments related to the pavement condition. District 1 is planning a project in 2022 to address the pavement concerns.

Member Kempton made a motion, seconded by Member Horsch, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

May 18, 2017
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 1: SH-41 Milepost (MP) 18.98 to 39.06; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, and 2 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the SH-41, MP 18.98 to 39.06 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

FPM Marker presented the request to designate SH-54, MP 0.0 to 8.08 as a 129,000 pound truck route. DMV confirmed that SH-54 falls under the red route category. There are no bridges on this section of highway and no safety concerns.

Member Kempton made a motion and seconded by Member Horsch to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. 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

ITB17-19
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 1: SH-54, Milepost (MP) 0.0 to 8.08; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 29 comments were received with 3 supporting 129,000 pound trucking in general, 10 opposing in general, and 3 opposed on the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer presented his analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on April 19, 2017, with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 May 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the SH-54, MP 0.0 to 8.08 route and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 1.

Vice Chairman Gagner noted that the pavement is in poor condition on some segments, and asked if the poor pavements were considered. Member Kempton replied that yes, the Subcommittee discussed the pavement conditions on all of the routes. Additionally, District 1 Engineer (DE) Damon Allen provided information on the projects that are planned to address the pavement conditions. Member Horsch added that the footprint of vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds is lighter because of the additional axles.

The motion to approve the above resolution passed unopposed.

The Board thanked FPM Marker for the presentation.

Adopt-A-Highway Presentation (AAH). District 5 AAH Coordinator Sharon Short thanked the University 10th Ward for participating in the AAH Program. She also recognized the
Idaho Department of Fish and Game for its partnership with a new “adopt a wildlife fence” program. Volunteers will walk along wildlife fences to inspect the fence. The group is expected to perform minor fence repairs and to notify ITD if major repairs are needed.

Division of Motor Vehicles’ Organizational Update. Motor Vehicles Administrator Alan Frew and the Program Managers summarized the Division’s re-organization. They elaborated on how various roles are being redefined and why, the progress to date, and how the effort is driving innovations that are improving efficiency and customer service. The re-organization is intended to facilitate team work and cross training. The Operations Section oversees programs such as overlegal permitting, drivers’ licenses, and registration. The Compliance Section oversees the ports of entry. Its focus is on enforcement, customer service, and uniformity in carrying out its responsibilities. The Policy and Program Management Section provides support to the business operations, streamlines processes, and provides quality control. The Supporting, Transforming and Reporting Section helps standardize processes and training and provides data.

The Board thanked staff for the informative overview.

Public Transportation Intercity Funding Project Recommendations. Grants/Contracts Officer (G/CO) Rachel Pallister said the 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program provides funding assistance for feeder services and intercity bus providers. The objective of the program is to support the connection between rural areas and the larger regional or national system of intercity bus service. The services must make meaningful connections wherever possible. Two providers applied for funds. She recommended funding Salt Lake Express’s three routes for $702,705 and to dedicate the remaining $468,727 to the renewal of Northwestern Stage Lines’ current contract.

Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO.  WHEREAS, the Public Transportation Office is required to spend 15% of its
ITB17-20 annual apportionment for intercity bus transportation projects in 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, funding source is derived from the overarching 5311 Rural Formula
Funding program as a subset source known as the 5311(f) Intercity Bus Services
Program; and

WHEREAS, the objective of the intercity program is to support the connection
between rural areas and the larger regional or national system of intercity bus
service and the services must make meaningful connections wherever possible;
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 project.
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NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board acknowledges the project proposed and approves the project for Salt Lake Express in the amount of $702,705 for submittal to FTA for final approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the intercity project is submitted for inclusion in the FY17-20 Statewide Transportation Investment Program and programmed in FY17.

Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) Appointments, Districts 1, 3, and 5.
G/CO Pallister said members were solicited to fill PTAC appointments in Districts 1, 3, and 5. The incumbent from District 1, George Eskridge, declined to seek re-appointment. David Sims was the lone applicant for that appointment. The incumbents from Districts 3 and 5, Maureen Gresham and Kathleen Lewis, respectively, were the only applicants for those two seats.

Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion, seconded by Member Vassar, and passed unanimously, to approve the following resolution:
RES. NO. WHEREAS, Idaho Statute 40-514 states that public entities that use public funds to provide public transportation services within the state shall report not less than semiannually to the department the amount of funding expended, audits conducted, the number of passengers carried, the agency vehicles used and the vehicle miles driven to provide transportation for Idaho Citizens. This group was created as the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) to advise the Idaho Transportation Department on issues and policies regarding public transportation in Idaho. The PTAC shall participate in planning activities, identify transportation needs, and promote coordinated transportation systems. Before setting programs and priorities, the PTAC shall seek pertinent information, facts and data from local government agencies and providers regarding the rural public transportation issues; and

WHEREAS, the PTAC shall be comprised of six (6) members appointed by the Idaho Transportation Board. These members shall be representatives for local governments and agencies, private organizations, citizens groups and private providers that have an interest in public transportation, and people with disabilities and the elderly who utilize public transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Board shall appoint said members from recommendations submitted by said organizations, groups’ providers, users and state agencies in each district. One (1) member shall be appointed from each of the six (6) transportation department director districts as provided in section 40-303, Idaho Code; 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 vacated position in District 1, District 3, and District 5; and the Department received one
application in each District. The applications from David Sims, Maureen Gresham, and Kathleen Lewis were brought forward to PTAC members in April 2017 for review; and

WHEREAS, the ITD – Public Transportation Office hereby brings forth three nominations that have been reviewed by the seated members of the PTAC and all found by unanimous consensus to be fit candidates for the open seat in Districts 1, 3, and 5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board has determined to appoint David Sims as the District 1 PTAC member for a term from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board has determined to appoint Maureen Gresham as the District 3 PTAC member for a term from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board has determined to appoint Kathleen Lewis as the District 5 PTAC member for a term from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020.

Toward Zero Deaths Award. Highway Safety Manager (HSM) John Tomlinson commended Oneida County and Idaho State Police for their efforts on highway safety. For the second year in a row, Oneida County reported zero highway fatalities in 2016.

District 5 Highway Safety Presentation. Bingham County Sheriff Craig Rowland said he is working on establishing a Driving Under Impairment (DUI) Task Force in eastern Idaho. The task force will aim to conduct 12 campaigns annually, especially during major events. He requested the Board’s support for this task force.

Sheriff Rowland expressed concerns with the attraction the solar eclipse is drawing to eastern Idaho. The region expects a large number of visitors for this event in August. Although no one knows how many visitors will be in eastern Idaho, which is directly in the path of the eclipse, some projections are up to 2 million people. Officials are working together to prepare for the eclipse and to collaborate on efforts on the general safety of the visitors. ITD has been involved in the discussions and planning efforts.

Chairman Whitehead thanked Sheriff Rowland for the report and for his service.

Idaho Traffic Safety Commission (ITSC) Annual Report. HSM Tomlinson summarized the ITSC and its members. It meets twice a year. The Commission is concerned with the increasing fatalities. Distracted driving has been a focus area. A pilot project is underway to develop toolkits for employers to use to encourage its employees to drive attentively. It also has a research project on school bus stops in rural areas. The ITSC plans on focusing on seatbelts next and expanding partnerships.
Highway Safety Plan. HSM Tomlinson presented the draft FY18 Highway Safety Plan. The document, required by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, was developed to reduce traffic crashes, deaths, and injuries. The ITSC approved it earlier this month. He highlighted three new projects: establishing traffic safety teams for the Idaho Falls and Nampa Police Departments and funding for outreach and education for the Idaho Walk Bike Alliance.

Chairman Whitehead thanked HSM Tomlinson for the highway safety reports.

District 5 Report. DE5 Ed Bala reported on the winter maintenance efforts. The District's roads were not significantly impeded 73% of the time, which met the goal. All of the FY17 projects were delivered by January 25, 2017. To date, 50% of the FY18 projects have been delivered, with 100% due by October 1. He recognized a number of employee achievements and some of the District's partnerships.

The Board thanked DE Bala for the report and for his efforts.

Executive Session on Personnel and Legal Issues. Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion to meet in executive session at 12:10 PM to discuss personnel and legal issues as authorized in Idaho Code Section 74-206 (b) and (f). Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed 4-0 by individual roll call vote.

The personnel matter related to the evaluation of an employee. The legal matters discussed related to operations.

The Board came out of executive session at 1:10 PM.

Siphon Road Interchange Agreement. DE Bala said the draft agreement for the public private partnership to construct an I-15 interchange at Siphon Road is not ready yet. It is expected to be ready for the Board's consideration next month. He believes the various concerns about the project that the Board expressed earlier are being addressed. ITD would not contribute financially until the connecting infrastructure is essentially in place. The developer, Millenial, will provide letters of credit to ensure its financial commitment. ITD will retain 10% of its funding until the project is complete. The details, such as who will complete the design of the project and what standards will be used, are included in the agreement. He confirmed that the Department can legally participate in this partnership. DE Bala emphasized that the Department wants to do this project right because he believes it will be used as a model for future partnerships in the state.

Vice Chairman Gagner thought an earlier discussion included that the Department would wait until 50% of the interchange is constructed before contributing financially retain 50% of its funds until the project is essentially complete. Overall, he believes the Board's concerns are being addressed.

Chairman Whitehead thanked DE Bala for the update on this partnership.

Add Siphon Road Interchange, Chubbuck to FY17. DESA Rindlisbacher requested the addition of the Siphon Road Interchange, Chubbuck project to FY17 of the 2017-2021 Idaho
Transportation Investment Program. Funding is limited to preliminary engineering and preliminary consultant engineering to complete the environmental re-evaluation. A Finding of No Significant Impact was approved in 2013. In order to comply with FHWA regulations, a re-evaluation needs to be completed under a new project name and key number. The re-evaluation is needed for design work currently underway on the nearby Wye Interchange project in Pocatello. DESA Rindlisbacher emphasized that this action is independent of the partnership agreement the Board just discussed. This re-evaluation is needed for the Wye project.

Member Horsch made a motion, seconded by Vice Chairman Gagner, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB17-22

WHEREAS, an environmental decision (EA/Finding of No Significant Impact) and an Interstate Justification Report were completed under a planning project, key #9000, Siphon Road Interchange; and

WHEREAS, work on the Siphon Road Interchange planning project is complete and the project (key #9000) has been closed; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board has approved a project to study the I-15 Wye Overpass, key #19183, in FY17 of the FY17 - FY21 Idaho Transportation Investment Program; and

WHEREAS, Siphon Road Interchange environmental document and interstate justification report need to be re-evaluated as part of the I-15 Wye Overpass study; and

WHEREAS, Federal Highway Administration procedures require that the re-evaluation occur under a new project identification and key number.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to add a project to FY17 of the current approved FY17 – FY21 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding for the environmental re-evaluation will be scheduled in FY17 for $15,000 Preliminary Engineering and $75,000 Preliminary Consultant Engineering in State funds.

Big Creek 4 Airstrips. Chairman Whitehead provided some background on four airstrips in the Frank Church Wilderness. The airstrips, Dewey Moore, Simonds, Mile Hi, and Vines, are known as the Big Creek 4. The United States Forest Service has jurisdiction on the airstrips, but it prefers to not maintain them and designate them for emergency use only. Other entities, including the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Idaho Aviation Association would like the airstrips maintained and open for public use. Chairman Whitehead invited the three parties to provide information and share their perspectives on the issue.

District Ranger Anthony Botello, U.S. Forest Service, provided a summary of the referenced airstrips. According to the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980, the Forest Service cannot close the airstrips that are in regular use without concurrence from the state. When the
Forest Service developed its initial management plan, it sought public comments. In March 1982, ITD submitted comments stating that it supports letting the airstrips revert back to a natural state and along with that action, prohibit use except by prior permission or in an extreme emergency. Although regular public use is discouraged, Mr. Botello said the airstrips have not been closed. Prior to 2012, the Division of Aeronautics did not show these four airstrips on its chart. It added the airstrips in 2012 with no differentiation from other open airstrips, indicating the Big Creek 4 airstrips were open to the public.

Mr. Botello said there are several other open airstrips in the Big Creek 4 area. He believes some solutions to address the use of these airstrips are to consider opening other airstrips in the area to the public or developing a new management plan after seeking public comment. He understands the importance of providing access to the wilderness, but also expressed concerns with the safety of inexperienced pilots landing at those airstrips.

Member Kempton does not believe the number of other airstrips available in the area is relevant, but rather the issue relates to the Central Idaho Wilderness Act. Mr. Botello replied that the Act indicates that any landing strips that are in regular use shall not be closed or made unserviceable without the state’s concurrence. It was noted that there is no definition of regular use.

Vice Chairman Gagner asked if the Forest Service believes the regular use provision is being exceeded. Mr. Botello said that when the management plan was developed in 1982, it was determined that the airstrips were not in regular use. He reiterated that the definition of regular use is in question.

Department of Fish and Game Deputy Director Ed Schriever thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss this important issue. He summarized Fish and Game’s responsibilities, focusing on wildlife management. Access to the wilderness is essential to conduct its operations.

Fish and Game Deputy Attorney General Kathy Trevor distributed historical information. She believes some essential information has been missing from the record. She provided a letter from General Darrell Manning from 1977. General Manning was the director of ITD at the time, and in his comments to the U.S. Department of Agriculture regarding the management plan for the wilderness area, he states that the airstrips inside the wilderness area should remain open for public access. This position coincides with then-Governor Cecil Andrus’s position. She emphasized that the Department of Fish and Game supports keeping the Big Creek 4 airstrips open for public use.

Andrew George, Idaho Aviation Association President, thanked the Board for the invitation to present information. The Association desires to be a good partner and a good steward of the land. Regarding the 1982 letter from ITD referenced above, he noted that it was signed by a staff member. He does not believe the comments in support of letting the airstrips revert back to a natural state came from the Board. He also pointed out discrepancies and errors in a February 1982 letter that the Forest Service sent to the transportation department. For example, the letter says that none of the airstrips are in regular use, but Mr. George said that a flight log from the McCall Airport indicated aircraft land at the airstrips up to 20 times a day. That letter also states that the airfields are not public facilities, but Mr. George said there is documented history that they were available to the public. He emphasized that the Association
wants to work with ITD, the Forest Service, and Fish and Game on all of the airstrips. Both aviation and access to the wilderness are so important. He added that he would appreciate knowing the Board’s and Department’s position on the Big Creek 4 airstrips.

Chairman Whitehead thanked the parties for the additional information. He appreciated the new material that was provided and would like time for the Board to consider it. He hopes a compromise can be found.

Expansion and Congestion Mitigation Program. DESA Rindlisbacher summarized Senate Bill 1206 that specifies ITD is to receive 1% of Sales Tax revenue after revenue sharing with local governments and receive distribution of Cigarette Tax revenue after all of the fixed distributions have been satisfied. Revenue from these sources is estimated at $18 million. Projects that mitigate traffic times and congestion, and improve traffic flow are eligible. He believes roads that have a level of service of E would be appropriate candidates. He provided a comparison of traffic today with projected travel in 30 years. New areas of projected daily congestion were identified.

Chairman Whitehead thanked DESA Rindlisbacher for the presentation.

GARVEE Corridor Considerations. Transportation System Manager (TSM) Caleb Lakey presented information on the GARVEE corridors eligible for funding. Some of the information included safety, traffic, and congestion.

Member Kempton compared the average daily traffic to the serious injuries and fatalities. He believes this comparison provides a better picture of the safety concerns than if the safety data is considered separately.

Member Kempton said he discussed the US-93, Twin Falls Alternate Route and Snake River Crossing corridor with DE4 Devin Rigby. The Environmental Impact Statement has not been completed, and DE Rigby discouraged pursuing the US-93 corridor at this time.

Vice Chairman Gagner said that DE6 Jason Minzghor does not believe the US-20, St. Anthony to Ashton corridor is a high priority for GARVEE funding.

Vice Chairman Gagner asked if the TREDIS model could be run on the corridors. TSM Lakey replied in the affirmative. He said he will provide more information on these corridors at a future meeting, including traffic counts and additional safety information.

The Board thanked TSM Lakey for the additional information.

FY18 Idaho Airport Aid Program. Senior Airport Planner Bill Statham presented the FY18 Idaho Airport Aid Program with a funding base of $1 million. The base amount may increase with the addition of Uncommitted funds recovered from prior years’ grants currently in the Trustee and Benefits budget. The Program provides funding for Commercial Service airports, General Aviation – NPIAS airports, General Aviation - community airports, and small emergency projects. The projects were available for public review and comment through the STIP update process. The Aeronautics Advisory Board approved the FY18 Program last month.
Member Vassar made a motion, seconded by Member Kempton, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board has the authority to locate, design, construct, reconstruct, alter, extend, repair and maintain state aeronautical facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Board has the authority to expend funds for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of publicly owned aeronautical facilities.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho airport aid program for state fiscal year 2018, as shown as Exhibit #480, which is made a part hereof with like effect, be approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Division of Aeronautics to issue grant offers for state fiscal year 2018; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board adopts the proposed airport funding formulas.

Contract Award for SH-3, St. Maries Railroad and St. Joe River Bridge. DEI Allen said the bids were opened for the SH-3, St. Maries Railroad and St. Joe River Bridge project, keys #13383 and #13384, on May 9. The low bid was more than ten percent over the engineer's estimate, requiring justification. The Department does not have a lot of history with design-build projects. Staff presumably estimated the geotechnical drilling, design and foundation construction cost too low. The low bidder proposes maintaining two lanes open to traffic during construction and finishing 200 days sooner than its competitors, which would be of great value to the travelling public. To offset the additional costs, staff will consider partial advance construct of the FY18, I-90 Interchange #68 to East of Mullan project for $10.7 million to FY19 with conversion from statewide balancing and/or a combination of statewide balancing with other projects.

Vice Chairman Gagner made a motion, seconded by Member Horsch, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department solicited Design Build Teams to develop and construct the SH-3, St. Maries Railroad Bridge and the St. Joe River Bridge, keys #13383 and #13384; and

WHEREAS, ITD applied the Design Build procurement process, which yielded a winning proposal of RSCI Inc.; and

WHEREAS, ITD is interested in getting these bridges constructed quickly and with minimal disruption to the City of St. Maries and the travelling public.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board awards a contract to RSCI Inc. at $17.3 million; and
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BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the offset for additional funding costs will come from partial delay of FY18, I-90 Interchange #68 to East of Mullan ($10.7 million) to FY19 with conversion from statewide balancing and/or a combination of statewide balancing with other District projects.

WHEREUPON, the Idaho Transportation Board's regular monthly meeting officially adjourned at 4:10 PM.

JERRY WHITEHEAD, Chairman
Idaho Transportation Board

Read and Approved
___________, 2017
___________, Idaho
Idaho Transportation Board Chairman Jerry Whitehead called a special session of the Idaho Transportation Board at 2:30 PM on Wednesday, May 31, 2017. The following principals were present at the Idaho Transportation Department in Boise, Idaho:

Jerry Whitehead, Chairman
Brian W. Ness, Director
Scott Stokes, Chief Deputy
Larry Allen, Lead Deputy Attorney General

The following participated via videoconference or teleconference:
Lee Gagner, Vice Chairman – District 6
Jim Coleman, Member – District 1
Janice B. Vassar, Member – District 2
Julie DeLorenzo, Member – District 3
Jim Kempton, Member – District 4
Dwight Horsch, Member – District 5

Update on Proposed I-15 and Siphon Road Interchange. District 5 Engineer (DE) Ed Bala reiterated the need for a new I-15 interchange at Siphon Road and provided some history on the proposed public private partnership. The developer has acquired all of the right-of-way and selected a design-build firm. ITD participated in the selection of Wilson/Wadsworth, using the qualification based process with safeguards against favoritism. The Federal Highway Administration is involved in discussions on the proposed interchange, and the re-evaluation of the earlier environmental document is underway.

DE Bala said the current estimate to construct the interchange is under $9 million, including a 10% contingency. This estimate is consistent with similar projects in the area. The current proposal caps ITD’s participation at $5 million. The local entities, the Cities of Chubbuck and Pocatello and Bannock County, are contributing to construct the connecting roads. The developer will provide the additional funds needed to complete the connecting roads and interchange.

DE Bala reported that he recently learned that Idaho law does not allow the contract model that the partnership has been pursuing. A developer may contribute to a project, but ITD must control the project, which transfers more of the risk to the Department. The next steps could include restructuring the agreement so ITD is the project owner and the development community is a cash contributor for approximately $3 million; restructuring the agreement so the connecting infrastructure is a cooperative agreement between ITD and the local government entities; if legal, have ITD assume management of the existing design-build contract; and recognizing the Department will have additional risk, anticipate contributing approximately $7 million. DE Bala identified some District 5 projects that could be delayed to provide the additional funding.
Vice Chairman Gagner noted that a design-build firm has already been selected. He asked what will happen to that contract if the Board does not approve the agreement and funding for the new interchange. DE Bala responded that if the Board does not approve this project, the design-build contract will be addressed at that time.

Vice Chairman Gagner asked how confident staff is with the $9 million interchange construction estimate, noting that earlier this year, the estimate for this interchange was between $12 and $15 million. DE Bala replied that the earlier estimate was on the high side, partly because he would rather have a bid that is below the estimate than over the estimate. He also clarified that the $8.4 million estimate is for construction only. It does not include right-of-way acquisition.

In response to Chairman Whitehead’s question, DE Bala said the design-build firm of Wilson/Wadsworth has an impressive record, including construction of the I-15 Chubbuck Interchange and I-15 McCammon Interchange in District 5.

Millenial Development Partners representative Buck Swaney emphasized that over $1.5 million has been spent on this project to date and the right-of-way has been acquired. Millenial Development Partners is committed to this project; however, he indicated that no additional commitments will be made until the Board approves the agreement.

In response to Vice Chairman Gagner’s question, Mr. Swaney said the right-of-way acquisition process was done in accordance with federal requirements.

Executive Session on Legal Issues. Member Horsch made a motion to meet in executive session at 3:08 PM to discuss legal issues as authorized in Idaho Code Section 74-206, (c), (d), and (f). Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote.

Discussions were held on legal matters related to the proposed Siphon Road Interchange.

The Board came out of executive session at 4:02 PM.

WHEREUPON the special session of the Transportation Board adjourned at 4:06 PM.

__________________, 2017
_________________, Idaho

Jerry Whitehead, Chairman
Idaho Transportation Board

Read and Approved
_________________, Idaho
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<td>23 24 25 26 27 28 29</td>
<td>27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 X 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>8 X 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>29 30 31</td>
<td>26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>24 X 26 27 28 29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Other dates of interest:  
September 25-28: AASHTO annual meeting – Phoenix, AZ  
September 25-27: Idaho Association of Counties’ annual conference – Boise

Action: Approve the Board meeting schedule.
RES. NO. ITB17-25

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 CH2M term agreement extension; Old Highway 37, The Narrows, Oneida County – Keller Associates extension; the advance of Ramsey Road Union Pacific Railroad Upgrade from FY18 to FY17; a contract for award; contracts for rejection; the updated state highway functional classification map; and the Public Transportation Advisory Council appointment correction for District 1.
Meeting Date June 22, 2017

Consent Item X Information Item □ Amount of Presentation Time Needed ______________

Board Agenda Item

Presenter's Name
Amy Revis, PE
Preparer's Name
Daris Bruce, PE

Preparer's Title
District 3 Engineer
Manager

Initials
AR
DB

Subject
CH2M Term Agreement Extension

Key Number
13948/13949

Route Number
US-95 Bridge Replacement Projects

Background Information

The purpose of this agenda item is to request the Board's approval to exceed the $1,500,000 term agreement limit for CH2M on this project per Board Policy 4001.

CH2M was hired by the Department, through the RFI process to prepare the requisite environmental documentation for this design build project. This project consists of the replacement of eight (8) bridges on US-95 between Cambridge and New Meadows. During the initial environmental investigations the Department discovered potential archeological artifacts at one of the bridges. Through an iterative process the Department has determined that additional archeological investigation is necessary during construction.

The Department is rapidly approaching date when this work must happen as not to delay the design build firm's progress.

The preliminary estimate for the additional work is $100,000. CH2M has reached the $1,500,000 limit. By awarding this additional work to CH2M the department would exceed the limit by approximately $100,000.

Recommendations

Approve request for CH2M to exceed the consultant term agreement limit of $1,500,000 per Board Policy 4001.

Board Action

□ Approved □ Deferred □ Other ________________
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Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date  June 22, 2017

Consent Item  Information Item  Amount of Presentation Time Needed

Presenter's Name  Presenter's Title  Initials
Monica Crider  CSE  MC
Preparer's Name  Preparer's Title  Initials
Holly McClure  CS  HM

Subject
Old Hwy 37, The Narrows, Oneida Co. – Keller Associates Extension

Key Number  District  Route Number
09894  5  STC-1701

Background Information
The purpose of this board item is to request approval, per Board Policy 4001, to exceed the $1,000,000 limit for consultant work on The Narrows Project, Oneida County.

Keller Associates was selected via RFP in September 2011 to perform engineering design services for the roadway improvements along Old Hwy 37 between Rockland and Holbrook. The project selection process included concept and roadway design, topographic survey, environmental studies and document, materials reports, preliminary roadway design, hydraulic studies, public involvement, final roadway design, PS&E submittal, and right-of-way plans.

Keller was contracted for concept design and environmental studies, through Design Approval. The intent was to realign the roadway out of the narrows area, but the tribal consultation disagreed with that concept. The final improvements will be along the existing roadway and is included in the Environmental Assessment being processed for final signatures at this time from FHWA and Forest Service. Since we now know what the improvements will be, final design can begin on the project. This additional agreement will provide final design, Materials Reports, Retaining Wall Designs, Design of five creek crossings, PS&E submittal, and final bidding documents.

Additional services are being requested by LHTAC to have Keller provide the additional design services as part of their contract. The current value of Keller's contract is $899,808. The additional services are estimated to cost $300,000.

For project continuity and project knowledge, LHTAC recommends and hereby requests that Keller be retained to complete this work.

Recommendations
Approve request for Keller to exceed the $1,000,000 limit for consultant work on The Narrows Project, Oneida County, per Board Policy 4001.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other

Page 1 of 1
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date  June 22, 2017

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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Crider</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparer's Name</th>
<th>Preparer's Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Miles</td>
<td>LHTAC, Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Advance RAMSEY RD UPRR UPGRADE, LAKES HD from FY 2018 to FY 2017 of the ITIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18755</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STC-5762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

The purpose of this consent item is to advance STC-5762, RAMSEY RD UPRR UPGRADE, LAKES HD in the Local Highway Safety Program from FY 2018 to FY 2017 for the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC), the project sponsor Lakes Highway District, and the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO).

The estimated project cost is $353,000. The scope of the project includes installation of crossing warning signals with flashing lights, gates and new crossing surface of insulated concrete planking. The Railroad Construction Agreement was signed April 17, 2017 by all parties; ITD, UPRR, and Lakes HD in the interest of expediting this safety work.

Funds have been identified to cover the above amount and are available through several project closeouts.

The KMPO Transportation Improvement Program has been modified to reflect these changes.

Recommendations

Approve advance of STC-5762, RAMSEY RD UPRR UPGRADE, LAKES HD from FY 2018 to FY 2017 (KN 18755) for $353,000 and authorize staff to adjust the program accordingly.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
## Board Agenda Item

**Meeting Date**  
June 22, 2017

**Consent Item** [X]  
**Information Item** [ ]  
**Amount of Presentation Time Needed** [__________]

### Presenter's Name
Blake Rindlisbacher, PE  
**Presenter's Title**  
Engineering Services Administrator

### Preparer's Name
Monica Crider, P.E.  
**Preparer's Title**  
Contracting Services Engineer

### Reviewed By
~VG <A

### Subject
Board Approval of Contracts for Award

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

Justification is attached for awarding of contracts.

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

### Board Action
- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Deferred
- [ ] Other

---
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## Monthly Contract Status Report to the Board

**CONTRACT(S) FOR BOARD APPROVAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>ENGINEER ESTIMATE</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
<th>% of Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dist: 3  Route: US-20  OPENING DATE: 5/16/2017  CONTRACTOR: Sunroc Corporation  Number of Bids: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
<th>% of Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19727</td>
<td>$2,360,058</td>
<td>$3,149,707</td>
<td>$789,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19727  MYRTLE, FRONT & BROADWAY  RESURFACING, BOSIE

19727  RESURF/RESTO& REHAB  FEDERAL
DATE OF BID OPENING - MAY 16, 2017 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A019(727)
Myrtle, Front, Broadway Resurfacing, Boise
Ada County, Key No. 19727

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of milling existing asphalt pavement, inlay of new HMA pavement, and micro surfacing along US-20 from MP 48.131 to 46.594 (Front), MP 48.131 to 49.681 (Myrtle) and MP 50.159 to 52.546 (Broadway)

BIDDERS:

Sunroc Corporation
Boise, ID 83714
$3,149,706.70

Staker & Parson Companies Dba Idaho Materials Construction
Nampa, ID 83653-1310
$3,177,641.00

Central Paving Co., Inc.
Boise, ID 83715-5010
$3,396,338.71

3 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $2,360,057.66

LOW BID - 133 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 District’s justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the District’s recommendation.

Monica Crider, P.E.
Contracting Services Engineer

Date 6/21/17

052
DATE: 18 May 2017

TO: Monica Crider, P.E.

FROM: Amy Revis, P.E.
District 3 Engineer
US-20/26, Front, Myrtle, Broadway Resurfacing

RE: Bid Justification

District 3 has reviewed the bid results for the reference project. There were two bids received for the project, with the low bid at $3,149,706.70. The Engineer’s estimate was $2,360,057.66. The other two bids were competitive at $3.18M and $3.40M, indicating that plans and specifications were clear, and that prices were fair. Sunroc Corporation submitted the low bid at 133.5% of the Engineer’s estimate.

This project is on a high volume section of urban highway. Potholes and other deterioration accelerated last winter, and resurfacing this pavement is a priority before the roadway deteriorates any further. Most of the cost of this project is straightforward milling and paving, but there is also a significant amount of subcontracted work such as pedestrian ramps. The traffic volumes also require that work affecting traffic occur at night. The restrictions on this work do not allow for high production rates, and significant traffic control is required in order to accomplish the work.

The District has examined other methods of accomplishing this work that either increased production requirements or relaxed time restrictions, but they fail due to substantial increases in congestion and greatly reduced safety. It appears that certain subcontracted items bid higher than normal, owing in part to overtime for labor and low subcontractor availability, but this is unlikely to change in the near term.

The main differences between the Engineer’s estimate and the Sunroc Corporation low bid are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item and Quantity</th>
<th>Engineer’s estimate</th>
<th>Sunroc Corporation bid (% and $ over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superpave HMA (13,000 tons)</td>
<td>$45.00/ton</td>
<td>$58.80/ton (131%, $179,400.00 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Sidewalk/Curb &amp; Gutter; Install Curb &amp; Gutter; Pavement/Special Markings; Inlet Modifications; Landscape and Brick Repair;</td>
<td>$138,293.50 (sum)</td>
<td>$534,531.70 (387%, $396,238.20 over)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has an unavoidable compressed schedule due to the time of day restrictions and resulting low production rates. Overtime, multiple shifts and standby equipment is expected to be required. The Engineer’s estimate did not adequately take into account the additional labor and equipment costs. Higher costs resulting from the late season bidding and amount of transportation work already under contract, particularly for subcontractor work was also not adequately anticipated.
The basis for the Engineer's estimate was primarily the Average Bid Unit Prices where available. For item 405-435A (Superpave HMA), the Engineer's estimated unit price was not appropriately increased for the low production rates.

Items including Removal of Sidewalk/Curb & Gutter, Install Curb & Gutter, Pavement/Special Markings, Inlet Modifications, and Landscape and Brick Repair are typically subcontracted, and suffered from a tight schedule, time of day work restrictions, the resulting overtime/shift premiums, and low subcontractor availability.

If the Engineer's estimate is revised to match the bid for these items, then the bid is within 9% of the Engineer's Estimate.

Re-bidding this project would not likely result in lower bid prices or additional bidders without significantly changing the timing and duration of the work, which would result in unacceptable congestion and safety impacts, and would delay implementation of the needed improvements at a potential higher cost to address further deterioration of the pavement.

The District has worked with HQ Planning Services to identify a funding offset from recent deductive change orders on another project in the amount needed to cover the bid overrun.

Thus, the District recommends awarding the project to Sunroc Corporation. It is our belief that proceeding with award is the best course of action to preserve remaining pavement life, and in light of the current bidding environment.
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date: June 22, 2017

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, PE</td>
<td>Engineering Services Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCM</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, P.E.</td>
<td>Contracting Services Engineer</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

Board Approval of Contracts for Rejection

Key Number  District  Route Number

Background Information

In accordance with board policy 4001, the construction contracts on the attached report exceeded the engineer's estimate by more than ten percent (10%) and are recommended for rejection with board approval.

Justification is attached for rejecting of contracts

Recommendations

In accordance with board policy 4001, the construction contract(s) on the attached report is(are) recommended for rejection with board approval.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
## Monthly Contract Status Report to the Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 2 Route: OFFSYS</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/16/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: Braun - Jensen Inc.</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13450/19536 ROBINSON PARK ROAD BRIDGE</td>
<td>$1,089,159</td>
<td>$1,629,000</td>
<td>$539,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13450/19536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 1 Route: OFFSYS</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/23/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: T. LaRiviere Equipment &amp; Excavation</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHTAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12308</td>
<td>$284,576</td>
<td>$596,900</td>
<td>$312,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12308</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. GOVERNMENT WAY, HANLEY AVE. to PRAIRIE AVE.</td>
<td>RESTO &amp; REHAB LOCAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 3 Route: SH-45</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/23/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: Intermountain Slurry Seal Inc.</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20225</td>
<td>$722,449</td>
<td>$966,263</td>
<td>$243,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20225</td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-45, DEER FLATS to I-84 MICROSEAL</td>
<td>RESTO/RESTO &amp; REHAB FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 3 Route: I-84</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/16/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: Knife River Corporation -NW</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19814</td>
<td>$2,455,442</td>
<td>$3,456,379</td>
<td>$1,000,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19814</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-84, KARCHER IC, NAMPA IMPROVEMENTS STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE OF BID OPENING - MAY 16TH, 2017 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A013(450) & A019(536)
Robinson Park Road Bridge
Latah County, Key No. 13450 & 19536

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of replacing the Robinson Park Rd bridge just east of Moscow & install curve-advanced warning signs, chevrons.

BIDDERS:

Braun-Jensen, Inc.
Payette, ID 83661
West Company Inc
Airway Heights, WA 99001

2 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $1,089,158.60

LOW BID - 150 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 District's justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the District's and LHTAC's recommendation.

Monica Crider, P.E.
Contracting Services Engineer

Date 4/21/17
DATE: June 1, 2017
TO: Monica Crider, P.E.
   Contracting Services Engineer
FROM: Jeff R. Miles, PE
       Administrator
RE: JUSTIFICATION OF BID REJECTION

Bids were opened on May 16, 2017 for the referenced project in Latah County. Two bids were received. The apparent
low bid was 150% of engineers estimate amounting to $539,841 above estimate. The next low bid was 157% above
engineers estimate amounting to $624,991.

LHTAC and the Sponsor, North Latah County Highway District, wish to reject the bids in order to modify the proposal to
obtain a more favorable bid.

The bridge project and safety project were bid together to coordinate the construction and detour with one contractor,
and obtain competitive bids. While Davis-Bacon wages are exempt from the off-system bridge project, there may have
been some confusion whether the safety project was also exempt.

The biggest cost difference in the bridge project were concrete unit prices, which were approximately 250% above the
Engineer's Estimate. Contractors have indicated the concrete suppliers are overbooked and the current lead-time for
pre-cast girders is about 12 weeks. The tight construction schedule likely also increased these bid prices.

The biggest cost difference in the safety project were the removal of asphalt, Superpave HMA, surveying, and
mobilization. These are indicators that contractor workloads are full for this summer.

In summary, LHTAC and Local Sponsor recommends rejecting the bids since the high cost is not in the best interests of
the public. LHTAC believes advertising the projects in fall of this year with construction to occur in 2018 with a more
flexible schedule, will attract more bidders and result in lower costs for the public.

Sincerely,

Jeff R. Miles, PE
Administrator

Cc: Dan Carscallen – North Latah County HD
DATE OF BID OPENING - MAY 23, 2017 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A012(308)
N Government Way; Hanley Ave to Prairie Ave
Kootenai County, Key No. 12308

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of reconstructing and widening roadway to five lanes with bike lanes, curb/gutter, sidewalk and traffic signal on SMA-7155 N Government Way; Hanley Ave to Prairie Ave

BIDDERS:
T. Lariviere Equipment & Excavation Inc. $5,667,824.88
Athol, ID 83801

1 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER’S ESTIMATE - $4,236,284.15

LOW BID - 134 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 District’s justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the District’s and LHTAC recommendation.

Monica Crider, P.E.
Contracting Services Engineer

Date
Date: June 1, 2017

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

From: Jeff R. Miles, PE 
Administrator

RE: Justification of Bid Rejection

Project No.: A012(308)
Key No.: 12308

Project Identification, County
SMA-7155, N Government Way; Hanley Ave to Prairie Ave
Coeur D'Alene, Kootenai Co

Bids were opened on May 23, 2017 for the referenced project in Kootenai County. LHTAC has reviewed the bid results. There was only one responsive bidder and was 133.8% of the Engineer's Estimate. This lone bid was $1,431,540.73 more than Engineer's Estimate. LHTAC and Local Sponsor (City of Coeur D'Alene) has reviewed the bid, believes that the lone bid is not a competitive bid, and recommends rejection.

Eight bid items were significantly higher than Engineer's Estimate. The Engineer's Estimate was $4,236,284.15. T. LaRiviere Equipment & Excavation submitted a bid ($5,667,824.88). The major difference between the Engineer's Estimate and the low bid was mainly in eight items:

- 203-005A Rem of Obstructions
- 203-015A Rem of Bituminous Surf
- 205-005A Excavation
- 303-022A ¾" Aggr Ty B for Base
- 605-450A Manhole
- 614-015A Sidewalk
- 5901-05G SP - Steel Sign Post
- 2629-05A Mobilization

Eight prime bidders were on the plan holders list. Discussions with responsive low bidder and contractor inquiries during bid advertisement indicated that the tight schedule and concrete suppliers current work schedule has increased the bid prices and prime bidders not willing to submit a bid.
In summary, LHTAC and Local Sponsor recommends rejecting the bid, since the very high cost is not in the best interests of the public. LHTAC believes the public would receive a better price if the project was to be repackaged with a more flexible schedule and re-advertised in a more favorable market condition.

Sincerely,

Jeff R. Miles, PE
Administrator

Cc: Chris Bosley – CDA
May 31, 2017

Dan Coonce, PE
LHTAC
3330 W. Grace St.
Boise, ID 83703

Re: Government Way, Hanley Ave to Prairie Ave
Project No.: A012(308); Key No.: 12308
Location: Coeur d'Alene, ID

Subject: BID REJECTION

Dear Mr. Coonce:

The City of Coeur d'Alene Engineering and Administration have met to discuss the bid results for the Government Way project. We strongly feel that the high bid received is a result of the spring bid advertising and the short allowable construction window. The estimated overage that would be funded by the City is not within our available budget. We recommend rejecting the bid, changing the construction time, and rebidding the project at a more favorable bid time, such as fall, when contractors are securing work for the following year.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (208) 769-2216.

Sincerely,

Chris Bosley, PE
Coeur d'Alene City Engineer

Cc:
Odo Grandi, PE; LHTAC
Eric Shanley, PE; Lakes Highway District
Alan Soderling, PE; City of Hayden
Mayor Steve Roberge; City of Dalton Gardens
Jim Hammond; City of Coeur d'Alene
Sam Taylor; City of Coeur d'Alene
Tim Martin; City of Coeur d'Alene
DATE OF BID OPENING - MAY 23, 2017 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A020(225)
SH-45, Deer Flat to I-84B Microscal
Canyon County, Key No. 20225

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of placing a microscal on the SH 45 from Milepost 22.22 (Deer Flat Road) to Mile Post 27.725 (I-84B) in the city of Nampa, Idaho

BIDDERS:

Intermountain Slurry Seal. Inc.
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
$966,263.00

1 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $722,448.60

LOW BID - 133 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 District's justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the District's recommendation.

Monica Crider, P.E.
Contracting Services Engineer

Date 1/2/11
DATE: May 31, 2017

TO: Monica Crider, P.E.

FROM: Amy Revis, P.E.
District 3 Engineer

RE: Bid Justification

District 3 has reviewed the bid results for the reference project. There was one bid received for the project, at $966,263.00 from Intermountain Slurry Seal, Inc. The bid is 133.75% of the Engineer’s estimate.

The engineer’s estimate was $722,448.60, which was sourced from the Average Unit Price Report and other recent bids. Bid pricing was compared to identical item numbers in two recently bid projects in Ada and Canyon counties: key numbers 13154 and 19727. Revising the engineer’s estimate with actual bid pricing only reduced the bid overage to 119.17%.

The primary differences between the engineer’s estimate and the Intermountain Slurry Seal, Inc. low bid are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item and Quantity</th>
<th>Engineer’s estimate</th>
<th>Sunroc Corporation bid (% and $ over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP Polymer Modified Asphalt (280 tons)</td>
<td>$600.00/ton</td>
<td>$750.00/ton (125%, $42,000.00 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Micro Surfacing Aggregate (2,236 tons)</td>
<td>$98.00/ton</td>
<td>$120.00/ton (122%, $49,192.00 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drums (385 each)</td>
<td>$10.00/each</td>
<td>$50.00/each (500%, $15,400.00 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Working Light (LS)</td>
<td>$12,500.00/LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00/LS (320%, $27,500.00 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (LS)</td>
<td>$65,677.15/LS</td>
<td>$110,000.00/LS (167%, $44,322.86 over)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project is on a high volume section of urban highway. The traffic volumes require that work affecting traffic occur at night. There is significant traffic control required in order to accomplish the work.

An unanticipated issue with this project is scheduling conflicts with City of Nampa projects. Two LHTAC projects for HAWK lights were originally programmed for completion prior to the start of the ITD project. Due to obligation authority issues, the LHTAC projects are now scheduled for bid on June 20, 2017, with 105 working days. These projects may include saw cutting the pavement which would likely occur after the microseal. City of Nampa is also intending to construct center raised medians this summer, which has an advertisement date still to be determined.

Delaying and rebidding this project would avoid these construction conflicts. The District 3 Materials Engineer has advised this project could be delayed without risk to the current pavement condition.

Thus, the District recommends rejecting the bid of Intermountain Slurry Seal, Inc. and re-advertising this project after City of Nampa has completed their projects.
DATE OF BID OPENING - MAY 16, 2017 - STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Project No. A019(814)
I-84, Karcher IC, Nampa
Canyon County, Key No. 19814

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of improving the I-84 Exit 33 on/off ramps and intersection with Karcher/Midland Road, including removing the "B" off ramp and reconstructing the "A" off ramp, signal and signing modifications and various related work on I-84, MP 33.595

BIDDERS:

Knife River Corporation -Northwest $3,456,379.00
Boise, ID 83709

Staker & Parson Companies Dba Idaho Materials Construction $3,649,000.00
Nampa, ID 83653-1310

2 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $2,455,442.11

LOW BID - 141 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 District's justification for Award or Rejection of the Bid. Contracting Services concurs with the District's recommendation.

Monica Crider, P.E.
Contracting Services Engineer

Date 6/16/17
DATE: June 5, 2017

TO: Monica Crider, PE
Contracting Services Manager

FROM: Amy Revis, PE
District Engineer Interchange

RE: Justification to reject bids

This project includes work improving the I-84 Exit 33 on/off ramps and intersection with Karcher/Midland Road, including removing the "B" off ramp and reconstructing the "A" off ramp, signal and signing modifications and various related work on I-84, MP 33.595; I-84, Karcher IC.

The project advertised from April 24, 2017 to May 16, 2017.
Two bids were received:
   Knife River, Boise $3,456,345.80
   Staker & Parson Companies, Caldwell $3,649,000.01

The engineer's estimate was:
   $2,468,642.01
The low bid was 140% of the engineer's estimate.

The engineer's estimate was sourced from the 2015 Average Unit Price Report, other recent bids for ITD D3, and City of Nampa projects. There were numerous price differences between the engineer's estimate and Knife River's apparent low bid. The table below summarizes items that are over $20,000 more than the estimated value and references the 2016 Average Unit Prices (now available) for comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item and Quantity</th>
<th>Engineer's estimate</th>
<th>2016 Bid Average or Typical Costs</th>
<th>Knife River's bid (% and $ over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rem of Obstructions (LS)</td>
<td>$10,000/LS</td>
<td>N/A (varies per project)</td>
<td>$50,000/LS (500%, $40,000 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rem of Bituminous Surf (12,242 SY)</td>
<td>$2.35/SY</td>
<td>$3.01/SY</td>
<td>$4.00/SY (170.2%, $20,199 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (12,500 CY)</td>
<td>$10.50/CY</td>
<td>$8.70/CY</td>
<td>$15.00/CY (142.9%, $56,250 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Borrow (4,600 CY)</td>
<td>$16.00/CY</td>
<td>$7.80/CY</td>
<td>$22.00/CY (137.5%, $27,600 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil (3&quot;) – (1,138 CY)</td>
<td>$7.00/CY</td>
<td>$9.90/CY</td>
<td>$28.00/CY (400.0%, $23,898 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot; Aggr Ty A for Base (9,750 Ton)</td>
<td>$13.00/Ton</td>
<td>$14.50/Ton</td>
<td>$17.00/Ton (130.8%, $39,000 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superpave HMA Pave Incl Asph, SP-3</td>
<td>$55.00/Ton</td>
<td>$58.00/Ton</td>
<td>$74.87/Ton (136.1%, $77,420 over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Ty C (1,619 SF)</td>
<td>$22.50/SF</td>
<td>$21.23/SF</td>
<td>$35.00/SF (155.6%, $20,237 over)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This rejection recommendation is based on the following three points:

- There were less than three bids submitted.
- The proposed construction schedule was constrained due to the possible winter weather, likely causing acceleration of work and/or additional costs for winter shut down.
- It appears the current bidding environment is not favorable:

It is anticipated that evaluating temporary closures, extending construction schedule, and re-bidding this project for spring construction may result in a more favorable result to ITD and the City of Nampa. Thus, the City and District recommends rejecting all bids and re-advertising this project at a later date.
June 6, 2017

Idaho Transportation Department
Amy Revis
8150 Chinden
Boise ID 83714
Email: amy.revis@itd.idaho.gov

Re: City of Nampa Support for Delay of Karcher and I84 Interchange Modification Project

Dear Ms. Revis,

The attached Staff Report was presented to Nampa City Council June 5, 2017. The Nampa City Council supported the decision to reject all bids due to the likelihood of winter shutdown. The Council further supported rebidding the project this winter.

Minutes for this Council meeting will be available by June 20, 2017.

Sincerely,

Michael Fuss, P.E.
Public Works Director

MF/js
Karcher and 184 Interchange Modification Project

In the past few years traffic volume at the Karcher and 184 Interchange has increased significantly. The success of the Treasure Valley Marketplace, the building and future expansion of the new St. Luke’s Hospital, and plans for additional development in the area will further increase traffic and associated congestion. New development of a hotel and commercial businesses on the northeast corner of the interchange clearly identified the need for improvements. The City of Nampa (City) began the discussion for improvements to this interchange bottleneck by beginning design and funding the Interchange Modification Report (IMR) with impact fees. Nampa’s efforts were successful as the IMR clearly identified the need. The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) understood the need and found $2,288,200 to fund the project. The Federal Highway Administration promptly reviewed and approved the IMR, design was completed, and the project was readied to bid. The funding and approval process was very fast, and it appeared time for development would be sufficient to complete the project prior to winter. A solution to the congestion appeared imminent.

The City and ITD entered into a State Local Agreement (SLA) for the final design and construction of the Karcher and 184 Interchange Modification project. In the SLA, the City’s initial $500,000 (Impact Fees) was acknowledged, ITD committed a maximum of $2,288,200, and the City was to increase its funding by $566,220. The SLA further states the City must fund all overages beyond the Engineer’s Estimate and ITD contribution was capped. The City funded the additional $566,220 through a budget amendment in April 2017. Costs to complete this project were increasing but a solution to the congestion was moving forward.

The City has the largest construction schedule for infrastructure improvements in the last 10 years. ITD also has several major projects in Canyon County. City project construction bids are beginning to increase, and the number of contractors for roadway work is declining. On two projects the City received no bids, and only single bids on others. On May 16, 2017, ITD opened the bids for the Karcher Interchange project. Only two contractors bid the project and the bids were close; however, both were well over budget. The low bid was $3,456,379. Pursuant to the SLA, ITD has asked the City to fund the overage of $1,033,221.

City Staff have reviewed the fiscal year 2017 street budget and project list. Staff has already reduced scope on projects and delayed others to ensure projects remain within the budget. All current impact fee balances are committed to projects that are currently under contract. Impact fees are being generated at approximately $1M per year. The Karcher Interchange is identified in the Impact Fee Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) but not at the level needed to fund the project. Funding is available from the street fund balance but would impact the future of the pavement management progression without additional funding from other sources. Funding could be contributed from the general fund provided additional resources were available. No clear
solutions are available within the current budget. In Staff's opinion, the best solution is the current solution of funding through impact fees. However, to fund through impact fees the CIP must be modified to reflect the current budget and this takes time. The Impact Fee Advisory Committee should review the modification and either eliminate other projects from the CIP or potentially increase the impact fees to fund the plan with the increased costs. The difficulty is that all funding options take time. Time has now become a factor in the project.

All participants in the Karcher Interchange project - the City of Nampa, Idaho Transportation Department, Federal Highway Administration, and Consultants have moved forward with all due speed. However, the delay in securing final funding, and the process to review and approve a project 30% over the estimate and submit to the ITD Board for approval have decreased the likelihood of project completion prior to winter. A winter shutdown is now likely. ITD and City staff are now looking to reject all bids due to weather limitations and rebid the project late this fall or winter for construction next year. It is City staff and ITD's opinion that it would be better to not start a project than potentially impact congestion further due to ongoing delays and/or construction shutdowns during the holiday season and/or winter driving conditions.

A rebid of the work will allow all project participants to review the bid documents for items that may have unusually increased the cost of the project. A review of construction sequencing, outside of all other work in Canyon County, may also lower the costs. The City would have opportunity to secure the increased funding through a standard budgeting process. Time would also allow a potential review of impact fees or at least time to allow impact fees to accrue to fund the project.

While this may not be the best of news, staff believes rebidding the project when more time is available is the best solution to avoid increased congestion during the busy holiday season and winter driving conditions. Winter driving brings issues of its own, but there will be a solid plan for construction of this Karcher and 184 Interchange Modification project in early 2018.

2nd and 3rd Streets South Rebuild Project

On May 9, 2017, a letter signed by many downtown businesses regarding the rebuild project on 2nd and 3rd Streets South was sent to Mayor Henry, Nampa City Council, and copied recipients (see Attachment A).

Prior to receiving this letter, City staff had met with a downtown businesses and individuals in rotating block meetings as part of the design process. Construction is anticipated in fiscal year 2018. Staff had gathered several questions and project suggestions. A letter of response to all comments and questions has been drafted by City staff (see Attachment B) and will be hand delivered to the signatories and copied recipients.
Nampa Transportation Master Plan

The first of three community workshops for the Nampa Transportation Master Plan is scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2017, at the Nampa Civic Center from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. An invitation (see Attachment C) was sent to over 400 stakeholders from across the community. The first meeting is scheduled to provide the group with background and to focus on identifying goals, objectives and critical success factors of the plan. Staff will provide Council with updates and a Council Workshop as the plan progresses.
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date June 22, 2017

Consent Item □ Information Item □ Amount of Presentation Time Needed None

Presenter's Name
Maranda Obray Transportation Planner MO

Preparer's Name
Maranda Obray Transportation Planner MO

Subject
Annual Idaho State Highway Functional Classification Map

Background Information
In accordance with Board Policy 4060, an updated Functional Classification Map of the State Highway System is to be presented to the Board for approval each year.

There have been no changes to Idaho's State Highway Systems Functional Classification map since approval by FHWA October 28, 2016.

Functional classification is the process by which "streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide". Basically, this process is the recognition that individual roads and streets do not serve travel independently; rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads.

Functional classification carries with it expectations about roadway design, including its speed, capacity and relationship to existing and future land use development. Transportation agencies often describe roadway system performance, benchmarks and targets by functional classification. As agencies continue to move towards a more performance-based planning approach, functional classification will be an increasingly important consideration in setting expectations and measuring outcomes for preservation, mobility and safety.

Federal Highways Administration distributes transportation funding based on functional classification designations; federal funding is available to projects on Interstate, Other Freeways and Expressways, Other Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial and Major Collector designations.

Recommendations
Request approval of the annual update as the Idaho State Highway Functional Classification Map dated October 28th, 2016.

Board Action
☐ Approved ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
Meeting Date June 22, 2017

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>Rachel T. Pallister</td>
<td>Grants/Contracts Officer</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td></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>Rachel T. Pallister</td>
<td>Grants/Contracts Officer</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject
Public Transportation Advisory Council Appointment Correction: District 1

Key Number District Route Number
N/A 1 N/A

Background Information
After the May board meeting, the Public Transportation Office discovered a discrepancy with the PTAC terms: that the District 1 appointment should have been to complete the current term of George Eskridge, which expires in 2018. This board agenda item is to correct that: to appoint David Sims for the remaining one-year term for the recently resigned District 1 PTAC member, and to reappoint Mr. Sims to serve an additional period of three (3) years, expiring June 2021.

Recommendations
Board approval to modify D1 PTAC Member’s term dates: correct David Sims’ appointment to complete the current three-year term being vacated by George Eskridge, with that term to expire on June 30, 2018, and to reappoint Mr. Sims to a full three-year term from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2021.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
Meeting Date: June 20-22, 2017

Consent Item □  Information Item ☑  Amount of Presentation Time Needed __________

Presenter’s Name: David Tolman  Presenter’s Title: Controller  Initials: DT

Preparer’s Name: David Tolman  Preparer’s Title: Controller  Initials: DT

Subject:
State Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Statements

Background Information

July 01, 2016 thru April 30, 2017, Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Statements

The financial operations of the Department as of April 30, 2017 continues this fiscal year with revenue coming in ahead of year-to-date and operating expenditures being stretched within appropriated budgets.

- Revenues to the State Highway Account from all state sources are ahead of forecast by 3.8%. Of that total, receipts from the Highway Distribution Account are ahead of forecast by 2.6% or $4.2M. State revenues to the State Aeronautics Fund are ahead of forecast by 4.8% or $103,000.

- Operational expenditures are ahead of planned budgets YTD by $100k. The differences are timing differences between planned and actual expenditures plus encumbrances estimated through the first nine months of the year. Usage and orders of winter material (salt and deicing chemicals) are ahead of planned amounts by about $7.6M. Personnel costs have savings of $14.4M or 13.6% due to vacancies and timing between a position becoming vacant and filled.

- Contract construction cash expenditures for July 1 - April 30 are the lowest of the past three years: FY17 = $199 M; FY16 = $228 M; FY15 = $246 M. This trend is contributing to the increased cash and investment balance. This trend is also contributing to a lower recovery from the Federal Indirect Cost Allocation Plan that ITD has with FHWA. ITD is short on this recovery $9.3M.

The balance of the long term investments as of the end of April is $161.7 Million. These funds are obligated against both construction projects and encumbrances. The combined total of cash ($93.3M) and investments is $255 M.

Expenditures in the Strategic Initiatives Program Fund (GF Surplus) for the eight months were $38.7 M. Projects obligated from these funds will continue to payout as work continues.

Recommendations

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
### Idaho Transportation Department

**SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS**

**STATE HIGHWAY ACCOUNT AND STATE AERONAUTICS FUND**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 4/30/2017**

*(all amounts in '000)*

### Funds Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Highway Account</th>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Forecast</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reimbursements</td>
<td>211,458</td>
<td>185,457</td>
<td>231,349</td>
<td>-12.3%</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Inc. H.D.A.)</td>
<td>255,244</td>
<td>264,866</td>
<td>255,055</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>8,531</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>-46.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Highway Account:</strong></td>
<td><strong>475,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>454,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>490,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aeronautics Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reimbursements</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>184.5%</td>
<td>-35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Aeronautics Fund:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,459</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,455</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Received:</strong></td>
<td><strong>477,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>457,381</strong></td>
<td><strong>492,552</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disbursements (includes Encumbrances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Budget</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Payouts</td>
<td>230,666</td>
<td>199,924</td>
<td>318,756</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Budget</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>131,889</td>
<td>142,339</td>
<td>161,603</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>27,286</td>
<td>28,968</td>
<td>32,966</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17,098</td>
<td>18,343</td>
<td>21,329</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>-30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations Expenses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>180,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>192,939</strong></td>
<td><strong>219,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>13,024</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers:</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,082</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,527</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Disbursements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>424,055</td>
<td>405,390</td>
<td><strong>4.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-26.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Budget</th>
<th>FY17 to FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>89,107</td>
<td>91,572</td>
<td>105,997</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>58,558</td>
<td>72,848</td>
<td>72,747</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>20,740</td>
<td>18,686</td>
<td>25,453</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Grantee</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>9,834</td>
<td>15,359</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Operations Expenses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>180,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>192,939</strong></td>
<td><strong>219,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Construction</td>
<td>230,666</td>
<td>199,924</td>
<td>318,756</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (excluding Transfers):</strong></td>
<td><strong>410,973</strong></td>
<td><strong>392,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>538,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Highway Fund 0260
Fiscal Year 2017
State Revenue Source Forecast vs Actual
April - For Period Ending 4/30/2017

Includes Equipment Buy Back Program
Misc. Revenue (RTA $874,163) and Transfers - In
State Highway Fund 0260
Fiscal Year 2017
Expenditures
April - For Period Ending 4/30/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY15 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY16 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>FY17 Current</th>
<th>FY17 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>50.917</td>
<td>50.203</td>
<td>58.348</td>
<td>74.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>117.427</td>
<td>113.246</td>
<td>120.371</td>
<td>165.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>189.659</td>
<td>171.532</td>
<td>163.661</td>
<td>242.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>238.322</td>
<td>210.812</td>
<td>202.889</td>
<td>296.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>275.703</td>
<td>254.413</td>
<td>240.383</td>
<td>340.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>309.481</td>
<td>292.240</td>
<td>282.297</td>
<td>385.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>335.409</td>
<td>320.437</td>
<td>316.027</td>
<td>418.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>362.533</td>
<td>351.327</td>
<td>341.550</td>
<td>457.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>391.734</td>
<td>378.930</td>
<td>366.385</td>
<td>494.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>426.442</td>
<td>408.990</td>
<td>390.985</td>
<td>536.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>462.484</td>
<td>453.451</td>
<td>508.839</td>
<td>582.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>529.482</td>
<td>508.839</td>
<td>845.089</td>
<td>845.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2017
State and Interagency Revenue Sources Forecast vs Actual
April - For Period Ending 4/30/2017

Includes Misc. Revenue and Transfers - In
Misc. Revenue and Transfers - In
Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2017
Expenditures
April - For Period Ending 4/30/2017

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund 0221 Aeronautics</th>
<th>Fund 0260 State Highway</th>
<th>Fund 0270 Strategic Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash on Hand (Change Fund)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank (Daily Cash Operations)</td>
<td>2,013,546</td>
<td>2,061,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Long Term Investments)</td>
<td>805,927</td>
<td>807,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash &amp; Investments</strong></td>
<td>2,819,473</td>
<td>2,868,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables - Other</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Due From Locals (Project Overruns)</td>
<td>25,126</td>
<td>30,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inter Agency</td>
<td>7,847</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receivables</strong></td>
<td>32,973</td>
<td>33,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory on Hand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets:</strong></td>
<td>2,852,446</td>
<td>2,902,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue (Local Projects Match)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable Overpayment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Retained % (In Lieu Of Performance Bond)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Encumbrance</td>
<td>372,496</td>
<td>371,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>2,479,950</td>
<td>2,531,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td>2,852,446</td>
<td>2,902,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,852,446</td>
<td>2,902,963</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 4/30/2017**

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Sources</th>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2017</th>
<th>Budget Fiscal Year: 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FHWA - Highway</strong></td>
<td>195,390,429</td>
<td>160,858,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FHWA - Indirect Cost Allocation</strong></td>
<td>21,143,387</td>
<td>11,873,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Transit Authority</strong></td>
<td>11,025,505</td>
<td>6,779,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NHTSA - Highway Safety</strong></td>
<td>3,789,315</td>
<td>3,301,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Federal Aid</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,744,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Federal Sources:</strong></td>
<td>231,348,636</td>
<td>185,456,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Sources</strong></td>
<td>24,824,852</td>
<td>27,533,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Buy Back</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenues</strong></td>
<td>24,824,852</td>
<td>27,533,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Sources:</strong></td>
<td>24,824,852</td>
<td>27,533,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sources</strong></td>
<td>3,693,685</td>
<td>4,592,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match For Local Projects</strong></td>
<td>3,693,685</td>
<td>4,592,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Local Sources</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Sources:</strong></td>
<td>3,693,685</td>
<td>4,599,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REVENUES:

| **259,867,173** | **217,589,716** | **17,866,439** |

### TRANSFERS-IN

| **Highway Distribution Account** | 163,833,000 | 168,064,668 |
| **Fuel/Registration Direct** | 50,781,005 | 52,760,610 |
| **Ethanol Fuels Tax** | 13,666,100 | 14,322,755 |
| **Cigarette Tax** | 1,950,000 | 2,184,351 |

### TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:

| **230,230,105** | **237,332,384** | **21,703,401** |

### TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:

| **490,097,278** | **454,922,100** | **39,569,839** |

### Percent Remaining:

| 50.59% | 52.51% | 26.60% | 6.34% | 49.88% | 100.00% | 39.50% | 70.57% | 70.52% | 49.53% | 13.99% | 12.89% | 12.13% | 43.99% | 14.07% | 35.68% |
Idaho Transportation Department

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
BUDGET TO ACTUAL
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 4/30/2017

Fiscal Year: 2017
Budget Fiscal Year: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</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>Operations Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Staff Salaries</td>
<td>71,135,675</td>
<td>60,225,217</td>
<td>5,401,666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,910,458</td>
<td>15.34%</td>
<td>87,084,325</td>
<td>26,859,108</td>
<td>30.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, Hourly, OT, Shift Diff</td>
<td>231,448</td>
<td>1,341,248</td>
<td>94,825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,109,800)</td>
<td>-479.50%</td>
<td>315,150</td>
<td>(1,026,098)</td>
<td>-325.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>33,691,190</td>
<td>29,120,659</td>
<td>2,762,771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,570,531</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td>40,840,295</td>
<td>11,720,266</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Travel Expense</td>
<td>1,121,753</td>
<td>1,050,880</td>
<td>126,101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,873</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>1,354,885</td>
<td>304,005</td>
<td>22.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Travel Expense</td>
<td>287,163</td>
<td>205,168</td>
<td>31,529</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,995</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
<td>350,480</td>
<td>145,312</td>
<td>41.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>70,562,660</td>
<td>59,976,528</td>
<td>10,883,869</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(297,737)</td>
<td>-0.42%</td>
<td>86,103,985</td>
<td>15,243,588</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment Expense</td>
<td>23,944,843</td>
<td>13,450,015</td>
<td>3,906,097</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,588,731</td>
<td>27.52%</td>
<td>26,232,413</td>
<td>8,876,301</td>
<td>33.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facilities Expense</td>
<td>1,382,744</td>
<td>681,563</td>
<td>180,879</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135,203</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
<td>3,338,699</td>
<td>2,091,158</td>
<td>62.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3,108)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3,108)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>14,923,000</td>
<td>9,650,574</td>
<td>617,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,272,246</td>
<td>35.33%</td>
<td>16,752,300</td>
<td>7,101,726</td>
<td>42.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations Expense:</td>
<td>217,280,477</td>
<td>175,704,960</td>
<td>15,281,895</td>
<td>15,355,944</td>
<td>26,219,572</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>262,373,163</td>
<td>71,312,258</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Travel Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>9,168,850</td>
<td>5,415,612</td>
<td>193,538</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,676,178</td>
<td>34.53%</td>
<td>26,780,761</td>
<td>20,778,089</td>
<td>77.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,235</td>
<td>(75,755)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(75,755)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>308,277,310</td>
<td>191,844,209</td>
<td>7,987,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116,239,481</td>
<td>37.71%</td>
<td>548,851,549</td>
<td>356,813,720</td>
<td>65.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
<td>1,807,072</td>
<td>569,134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(497,072)</td>
<td>-37.94%</td>
<td>7,083,257</td>
<td>5,276,185</td>
<td>74.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract Construction:</td>
<td>318,756,160</td>
<td>199,114,734</td>
<td>8,750,405</td>
<td>808,914</td>
<td>118,832,512</td>
<td>37.28%</td>
<td>582,715,567</td>
<td>382,791,919</td>
<td>65.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td>536,036,637</td>
<td>374,819,694</td>
<td>24,032,300</td>
<td>16,164,859</td>
<td>145,052,084</td>
<td>27.06%</td>
<td>845,088,730</td>
<td>454,104,177</td>
<td>53.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS OUT</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>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,502,008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,502,008)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,502,008)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TRANSFERS OUT:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,527,008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,527,008)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12,527,008)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:</td>
<td>536,036,637</td>
<td>387,346,702</td>
<td>24,032,300</td>
<td>16,164,859</td>
<td>132,525,076</td>
<td>24.72%</td>
<td>845,088,730</td>
<td>441,577,169</td>
<td>52.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net for Fiscal Year 2017:</td>
<td>(45,939,359)</td>
<td>67,575,398</td>
<td>15,537,539</td>
<td>97,349,898</td>
<td>(137,764,207)</td>
<td>(189,174,746)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 4/30/2017**

### Fiscal Year: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Construction</th>
<th>Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>In State Travel Expense</th>
<th>Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Capital Equipment Expense</th>
<th>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year:</strong> 2017</td>
<td><strong>Budget Fiscal Year:</strong> 2017</td>
<td><strong>In State Travel Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Equipment Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Construction:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total In State Travel Expense:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Capital Equipment Expense:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 4/30/2017

Fiscal Year: 2017
Budget Fiscal Year: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>STATEM EN T OF REVENUES</strong></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>167,157</td>
<td>252,314</td>
<td>21,908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,157</td>
<td>50.94 %</td>
<td>204,300</td>
<td>(48,014)</td>
<td>-23.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>167,157</td>
<td>252,314</td>
<td>21,908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,157</td>
<td>50.94 %</td>
<td>204,300</td>
<td>(48,014)</td>
<td>-23.50 %</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>Statutory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,965,585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,965,585</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>10,965,600</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,965,585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,965,585</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>10,965,600</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>167,157</td>
<td>11,217,899</td>
<td>21,908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,050,742</td>
<td>661.00 %</td>
<td>11,169,900</td>
<td>(47,999)</td>
<td>-0.43 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES**

| Contract Construction - Capital Projects | 47,028,311 | 38,664,078 | 508,513 | 0 | 8,364,233 | 17.79 % | 63,104,784 | 24,440,706 | 38.73 % |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES:** | 47,028,311 | 38,664,078 | 508,513 | 0 | 8,364,233 | 17.79 % | 63,104,784 | 24,440,706 | 38.73 % |
| **TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:** | 47,028,311 | 38,664,078 | 508,513 | 0 | 8,364,233 | 17.79 % | 63,104,784 | 24,440,706 | 38.73 % |

Net for Fiscal Year 2017: (46,861,154) (27,446,179) (486,605) 19,414,975 (51,934,884) (24,488,705)
# Idaho Transportation Department

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 4/30/2017

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year:</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Fiscal Year:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fund: 0375 GARVEE Debt Service Fund

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</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>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,652</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,652</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(30,652)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>(30,652)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFERS-IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</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>Operating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,202,008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,202,008</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(17,202,008)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,202,008</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,202,008</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>(17,202,008)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>17,232,660</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,232,660</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(17,232,660)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</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>Bond Principal / Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,228,749</td>
<td>375,222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(57,228,749)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(57,228,749)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,228,749</strong></td>
<td><strong>375,222</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>(57,228,749)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>(57,228,749)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>57,228,749</td>
<td>375,222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(57,228,749)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(57,228,749)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net for Fiscal Year 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>(39,996,090)</td>
<td>(373,631)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(39,996,090)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,996,090</td>
<td>0.00%</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 4/30/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2017</th>
<th>Budget Fiscal Year: 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</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>Federal Sources - FAA</strong></td>
<td>278,513</td>
<td>178,740</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(99,773)</td>
<td>-35.82%</td>
<td>320,700</td>
<td>141,960</td>
<td>44.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</strong></td>
<td>276,678</td>
<td>307,747</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,069</td>
<td>11.23%</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>(10,747)</td>
<td>-3.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interagency Sources - Miscellaneous Revenues</strong></td>
<td>182,250</td>
<td>173,202</td>
<td>7,764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(9,048)</td>
<td>-4.96%</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>51,798</td>
<td>23.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>737,441</td>
<td>659,690</td>
<td>25,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(77,751)</td>
<td>-10.54%</td>
<td>842,700</td>
<td>183,010</td>
<td>21.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRANSFERS-IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>Operating</strong></td>
<td>1,717,585</td>
<td>1,799,461</td>
<td>137,771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,876</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>200,539</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>1,717,585</td>
<td>1,799,461</td>
<td>137,771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,876</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>200,539</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:

- **2,455,026**
- **2,459,151**
- **7,162**
- **0**
- **4,125**
- **0.17%**
- **2,842,700**
- **383,549**
- **13.49%**

## EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>Permanent Staff Salaries</strong></td>
<td>615,006</td>
<td>581,211</td>
<td>53,217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,795</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>754,007</td>
<td>172,796</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board, Hourly, OT, Shift Diff</strong></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>37,917</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td>284,164</td>
<td>265,509</td>
<td>24,915</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,655</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>345,893</td>
<td>80,584</td>
<td>23.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In State Travel Expense</strong></td>
<td>42,523</td>
<td>35,062</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>60,483</td>
<td>25,421</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of State Travel Expense</strong></td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,034</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>715,992</td>
<td>378,755</td>
<td>27,861</td>
<td>302,232</td>
<td>35,005</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td>977,217</td>
<td>296,230</td>
<td>30.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Equipment Expense</strong></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>26,637</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>52,672</td>
<td>45,691</td>
<td>36.55%</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>49,691</td>
<td>38.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Facilities Expense</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</strong></td>
<td>436,030</td>
<td>183,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252,869</td>
<td>57.99%</td>
<td>1,487,744</td>
<td>1,304,583</td>
<td>87.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td>2,275,145</td>
<td>1,523,286</td>
<td>112,324</td>
<td>354,904</td>
<td>396,955</td>
<td>17.45%</td>
<td>3,879,544</td>
<td>2,001,354</td>
<td>51.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>2,275,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,001,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net for Fiscal Year 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>2,275,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,001,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>2,275,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,001,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>2,275,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,001,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>2,275,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,904</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,001,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject____________________________________________________________

Monthly Reporting of Federal Formula Program Funding Through May 2017

<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 obligation authority through the end of the year (September 30th) via a continuing resolution signed on May 24, 2017. Obligation authority for the year is $273.2 million which corresponds to $271.8 million with match after a reduction for prorated indirect costs.

Idaho has received apportionments via notices through May 31st of $295.1 million which includes Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds. This is $1.5 million less than in FY 2017 Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) act apportionment tables. Program allotments have been reduced accordingly. Currently, obligation authority is 92.6% of apportionments.

The exhibits on the following page summarize these amounts and show allotments and remaining funds by program through May 31, 2017.

Recommendations

For Information

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ____________________________

☐ Other  ________________________________________
Exhibit One
Actual Formula Funding for FY2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per FAST Tables – Total Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Only</td>
<td>$296,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Match</td>
<td>$324,787</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>$295,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Match</td>
<td>$323,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation Limits through 9/30/2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Only</td>
<td>$273,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prorated $25M indirect costs w/Match</td>
<td>$271,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All dollars in Thousands.
2. ‘Approved Program’ amounts from the FY 2017 Board Approved Program (Sky Blue Book).
3. Apportionment and Obligation Authority amounts reflect available funds via federal notices received through May 31, 2017.

Exhibit Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Allotted Total Program Funding</th>
<th>Total Program Funding Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Other SHS Program</td>
<td>$153,625</td>
<td>$2,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARVEE Formula Debt Service*</td>
<td>$58,152</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning and Research*</td>
<td>$6,540</td>
<td>$493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning*</td>
<td>$1,764</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives (Urban/Rural)</td>
<td>$3,603</td>
<td>$2,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives – Safety</td>
<td>$1,844</td>
<td>$1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
<td>$1,705</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP - Local Urban+</td>
<td>$7,934</td>
<td>$3,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP - Transportation Mgt. Area</td>
<td>$8,913</td>
<td>$648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives (TMA)</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>($36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP – Local Rural</td>
<td>$12,411</td>
<td>$8,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bridge</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>($5,342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off System Bridge</td>
<td>$3,774</td>
<td>($2,770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local HSIP</td>
<td>$6,072</td>
<td>$2,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (excluding indirect costs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$271,801</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,723</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All dollars in Thousands.
2. Allotments based on the FY 2017 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 May 31st.
5. Advanced construction conversions of $20.5 million are outstanding for FY 2017.
6. These programs are provided 100% Obligation Authority. Other programs are reduced accordingly.
7. Obligations do not yet include $2.092 million payback of state OA loan to S. Valley Connector, Pocatello.
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Presenter's Name Michelle Doane
Presenter's Title Business & Support Mgr
Initials MD

Preparer's Name Michelle Doane
Preparer's Title Business & Support Mgr
Initials MD

Reviewed By DT

Subject
Non-Construction Professional Service Contracts issued by Business & Support Management

Key Number N/A
District N/A
Route Number N/A

Background Information
The purpose of this Board item is to comply with the reporting requirements established in Board Policy 4001 - 'Each month the Chief Administrative Officer shall report to the Board all non-construction professional service agreements entered into by the Department during the previous month.' Business and Support Management section executed the following professional service agreements in the previous month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Line Amount</th>
<th>Unit Name</th>
<th>Service From</th>
<th>Service To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendations
Information only

Board Action
☐ Approved ☐ Deferred ________________
☐ Other ________________
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date June 22, 2017

Consent Item □ Information Item □ Amount of Presentation Time Needed

Presenter's Name
Blake Rindlisbacher, PE

Preparer's Name
Monica Crider, P.E.

Presenter's Title
Engineering Services Administrator

Preparer's Title
Contracting Services Engineer

Initials

Reviewed By

Subject
Contract Awards and Advertisements

Key Number District Route Number

Background Information
In accordance with board policy 4001, Staff has initiated or completed action to award the contracts listed on the attached report.

Also attached is the Current Advertisement Report.

Recommendations
For Information Only.

Board Action
□ Approved □ Deferred
□ Other
# Monthly Contract Status Report to the Board

### CONTRACT(S) ACCEPTED BY STAFF SINCE LAST BOARD MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>ENGINEER ESTIMATE</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
<th>% of Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 2</th>
<th>Route: SH-8</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/23/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: Poe Asphalt Paving</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18848</td>
<td>Latah County Paving</td>
<td>$3,473,116</td>
<td>$3,555,356</td>
<td>$82,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist: 3</th>
<th>Route: I-84</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 5/23/2017</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: Penhall Company</th>
<th>Number of Bids: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19289</td>
<td>I-84, Five Mile to Orchard Rd &amp; Ramps</td>
<td>$2,100,061</td>
<td>$1,870,512</td>
<td>$229,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Contract Advertisement As of 06-02-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Job Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dist 1 Route: SH-58</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 6/13/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13375</td>
<td>FY18 D1 SH-58 SH-54 &amp; SH-3 SEALCOATS PM State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 1 Route: Offsystem</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 5/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12308</td>
<td>N GOVERNMENT WAY; HANLEY AVE TO PRAIRIE AVE RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 2 Route: Offsystem</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 5/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13450</td>
<td>ROBINSON PARK RD BR, LATAH CO BR/APPRS Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13450</td>
<td>ROBINSON PARK RD BR, LATAH CO BR/APPRS Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 3 Route: Offsystem</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 6/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18396</td>
<td>12TH AVE S; SHERMAN TO DEWEY BEACONS, NAMPA SAFETY/TRAFFIC OPER Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 3 Route: SH-55</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 6/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19414</td>
<td>PRIDE LN TO MIDDLETON RD, CANYON CO RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 3 Route: US-95</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 6/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19190</td>
<td>PAYETTE NCL TO WEISER RV BR RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist 3 Route: US-20/26</td>
<td>OPENING DATE: 6/13/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19602</td>
<td>US 20/26 TO SAND HOLLOW IC, CANYON CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dist. 3</strong></td>
<td>Route: I-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18723</td>
<td>CLEFT TO MP 90, ELMORE CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18723</td>
<td>CLEFT TO MP 90, ELMORE CO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13931</th>
<th>NORTHSIDE BLVD TO GRANT ST, CANYON COUNTY</th>
<th>RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dist. 3</strong></td>
<td>Route: I-84</td>
<td><strong>OPENING DATE:</strong> 5/16/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19814</td>
<td>KARCHER IC, NAMPA</td>
<td>SAFTY/TRAFL OPER</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19727</th>
<th>MYRTLE, FRONT, BROADWAY RESURFACING, BOISE</th>
<th>RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dist. 5</strong></td>
<td>Route: US-91</td>
<td><strong>OPENING DATE:</strong> 6/6/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19816</td>
<td>SHELLEY CITY LIMITS</td>
<td>RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For all of ITD:

Consultant Services processed fifty-two (52) new professional services agreements and work tasks totaling $7,573,240 and one (1) supplemental agreement to existing professional services agreements totaling $38,800 from April 28, 2017 through May 31, 2017.

### 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 Aero 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5 1 1 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrosion Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Compilation/Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Public Agency Projects</td>
<td>5 3 1 3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 2 9 9 4 9 2 1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For ITD District Projects:

Forty (40) new professional services agreements and work tasks were processed during this period totaling $6,561,500. One (1) Supplemental Agreement was processed totaling $38,800.

### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US95, Labrosse Hill St to Alderson Ln, Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Roadway Design Services</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>HMH, LLC</td>
<td>$616,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I90, Blue Creek Bay Bridge, WBL and EBL</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Bridge Design, Phase II: Preliminary Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>WSP USA, Inc.</td>
<td>Phase I: $344,800, Phase II: $497,200, Total $842,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US95, IC# 430 to Lacrosse Ave, Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Roadway Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>HMH, LLC</td>
<td>$689,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH41, Mullan Ave to E Prairie Ave, Post Falls</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Roadway Design, Ph III: Completion of Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>HDR Engineering</td>
<td>Phase I: $50,200, Phase II: $735,300, Phase III: $1,384,600, Total $2,170,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US95, N Corridor Access Improvements</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Roadway Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Welch Comer &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$113,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various District One Construction Projects</td>
<td>Resources not available: Materials Testing</td>
<td>Lab Augmentation &amp; Close-Out Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Geotek</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US95, N Corridor Access Improvements</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Phase 1 Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Allwest Testing</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2, BNSF RR Underpass, Sandpoint</td>
<td>Resources not available: Survey</td>
<td>Right-of-Way and Topographic Survey</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Glahe &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH11, Greer Bridge Repairs</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Biological Assessment</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Anderson Environmental</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH14, Peasley Creek Fish Passage</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>TD&amp;H Engineering</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>184 IC#90 to McMurtrey Rd and SH67, MP 0 to Jct 51, Elmore County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection Services</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>Horrocks</td>
<td>$349,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US20 Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Corrosion Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis of Bridge Railing Corrosion</td>
<td>Minor Agreement Procedures</td>
<td>Lisin Metallurgical Services</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Board Agenda Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Resources not available:</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US95, Payette NCL to Weiser Rv Br</td>
<td>Public Involvement Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers</td>
<td>$25,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH55, Eagle Rd: 184 to SH44</td>
<td>Public Involvement Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH55, Eagle Rd: 184 to SH44</td>
<td>Construction Engineering and Inspection Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Stanley Consultants</td>
<td>$93,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 D3 Bridge Repairs, 184 Ramp M-M Bridge Deck Preservation</td>
<td>Construction Engineering and Inspection Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>T-O Engineers</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></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>184, SH50 to Machine Pass, EBL, and Machine Pass to Valley Rd EBL</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Materials Sampling, Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>Individual Project Solicitation</td>
<td>Horrocks Engineers</td>
<td>$497,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH25, MP18 to Ridgeway IC, Jerome Co.</td>
<td>Roadway Design Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Civil Science</td>
<td>$241,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US26 Feasibility Study, Gooding County</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>AECOM Technical Services</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH46, Camas Co Ln to Jct US-20</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Garcia Land Surveying</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I86, Raft Rv Br, EB &amp; WB Lanes</td>
<td>Phase IV Materials Report</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>American Geotechnics</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 D4 Safety Study 2011-2015 Data</td>
<td>District Four Safety Study</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Keller Associates</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Board Agenda Item

### FY17 D4 Pre-Project Planning
- **Resources not available:** Planning
- **Evaluation of Transportation Needs in District Four**
  - **Direct from Term Agreement**
  - **Keller Associates**
  - **$100,000**

### SH25 N Canal Bridge, Jerome
- **Resources not available:** Materials
- **Materials Phase Reports**
  - **Direct from Term Agreement**
  - **American Geotechnics**
  - **$66,800**

## 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>SH34, Tincup Cr Br, Caribou County</td>
<td>Resources not available: Survey</td>
<td>Additional survey required for hydraulics report</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Keller Associates</td>
<td>Previous $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This $7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US89, 12th St OPass to Jct US30, Montpelier</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Metcalf Archaeological Consultants</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I15, Fort Hall IC#80, Bannock Co.</td>
<td>Resources not available: Surveying</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Dioptra LLC</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US91, Shelley NCL to York Rd</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Construction</td>
<td>Girder Inspection and Testing</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Materials Testing &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$7,300</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>US20, Chester to Ashton and Int SH47</td>
<td>Resources not available: Surveying</td>
<td>Boundary Survey</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>David Evans &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$169,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various District 6 construction projects</td>
<td>Resources not available: Construction</td>
<td>Materials Testing Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>$240,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 D6 Ballast Stabilization</td>
<td>Resources not available: Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental, Surveying, and Model Review Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers</td>
<td>$86,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US20, FY19 D6 Bridge Repair</td>
<td>Resources not available: Design</td>
<td>Roadway Design Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US26, Slope Monitors MP 373 to MP 402</td>
<td>Resources not available: Geotechnical</td>
<td>Geotechnical Explorations, Instrumentation and Monitoring</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Landslide Technology</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 D6 Pre-Project Planning</td>
<td>Resources not available: Planning</td>
<td>Road Safety Audit</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Six Mile Engineering</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 9

<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>Rail Data Compilation and Analysis</td>
<td>Special Expertise Required: Data Compilation/ Analysis</td>
<td>Rail Data Compilation and Analysis</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>CRS Consulting Engineers</td>
<td>$32,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aeronautics

<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>New Meadows Small Airport Planning Study</td>
<td>Special Expertise Required: Airport Planning</td>
<td>Airport Planning Study</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>GDA Engineers</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Small Airport Planning Study</td>
<td>Special Expertise Required: Airport Planning</td>
<td>Airport Planning Study</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>GDA Engineers</td>
<td>$31,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Supplemental Agreements to Existing ITD Professional Services 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>3</td>
<td>SH44, Corridor Preservation; Jct I84 to Eagle</td>
<td>AECOM Technical Services</td>
<td>10/2011, Corridor Preservation Services</td>
<td>Vertical Roadway Design and Conceptual Drainage Design</td>
<td>Original $572,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous Supp $340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Supp  $38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total  $950,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Agenda Item

For Local Public Agency Projects:

Twelve (12) new professional services agreements totaling $1,011,740 were processed during this period.

### Local Public Agency Projects

<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>Riverview Dr Guardrail Installation, Post Falls Highway District</td>
<td>Post Falls Highway District</td>
<td>Guardrail Design</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Ruen-Yeager &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$72,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Maries Sidewalks &amp; ADA Ramps</td>
<td>St. Maries</td>
<td>Construction Administration Assistance</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>ENRICO Consulting</td>
<td>$5,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Installations, Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>Architectural History Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Bionomics Environmental</td>
<td>$24,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joe River Rd Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>Shoshone County</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab, Ph 1: Concept Development</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>ENRICO Consulting</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Meyer Rd &amp; Boekel Rd, Rathdrum</td>
<td>Rathdrum</td>
<td>Roadway Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>David Evans &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$293,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US95 East St &amp; Sidewalks, Cottonwood</td>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>Construction Engineering &amp; Inspection Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>HMH, LLC</td>
<td>$38,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek Bridge, Idaho County</td>
<td>Idaho County</td>
<td>Bridge Design Phase II: Preliminary Design through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>TD&amp;H Engineering</td>
<td>Phase I: $204,000, Phase II: $274,000, Total: $478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St Sidewalk and ADA Ramps, Lapwai</td>
<td>Lapwai</td>
<td>Revise Plans &amp; Specifications for Rebidng of Project</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Keltic Engineering</td>
<td>Previous $19,600, This $1,000, Total $20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 Capital Maintenance, ACHD</td>
<td>Ada County Highway District</td>
<td>Engineer of Record Services</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Parametrix</td>
<td>Design: $458,500, Const: $15,000, Total $473,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Service/Design Type</td>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th St; Bonneville/Ped Crossings, Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Materials Testing Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Forsgren Associates</td>
<td>$4,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Holmes Ave &amp; Elva St, Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Materials Testing Services</td>
<td>Direct from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Forsgren Associates</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. E 17th St and S Woodruff Ave., Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement Design</td>
<td>RFI from Term Agreement</td>
<td>Six Mile Engineering</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations

For information.

### Board Action

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

---------------------------------------------------

---
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Consent Item □  Information Item £  Amount of Presentation Time Needed

**Board Agenda Item**

**UD2210 (Rev. 10-13)**

**Presenter's Name**: Monica Crider, P.E.  
**Presenter's Title**: Contracting Services Engineer  
**Initials**: MLC

**Preparer's Name**: Jared Holyoak  
**Preparer's Title**: Project Manager  
**Initials**: J LH

**Reviewed By**: BR

**Subject**

**Innovative Project Contracting Update**

**Key Number**  
**District**  
**Route Number**

**Background Information**

On an annual basis, the Districts are given the opportunity to nominate projects that would benefit from the design-build (DB) or construction manager/general contractor (CMGC) alternative contracting delivery methods. For this period, the Department has solicited nominations but did not receive any new projects for innovative contracting.

As a means to update the Board on the progress of the program, a brief update on all of the projects is provided below:

**Completed Projects**

- **[D3] SH-44, Linder Road to Ballantyne Lane, Eagle (FY2013 D-B)**: This project constructed improvements to the intersection at SH-44 and Linder Road and also reconstructed and widened SH-44 from Linder Road to Ballantyne Lane to five lanes. Substantial completion for this project was achieved in October 2013.

- **[D3] SH-55 North Fork Payette River Bridge, McCall (FY2014 D-B)**: This project removed the existing bridge and center piers and replaced them with a new 50' wide single span structure on the same alignment due to right-of-way restrictions. The new bridge was constructed upon a temporary structure just north of the existing bridge and laterally slide into place. The use of the lateral slide accelerated bridge construction method resulted in a significant reduction in road closure duration, approximately 2 months. Substantial completion for this project occurred in December 2014.

- **[D3] SH-55, Gold Fork River Bridge, Valley County (FY2016 D-B)**: This project reconstructed the bridge crossing the Gold Fork river. Substantial completion for this project occurred in November 2016.

**Active Projects**

- **[D3] SH-45, Snake River Bridge, Walter's Ferry (FY2017 CMGC)**: This project will provide bridge scour mitigation in the river channel, patch piers and joint replacements with the possibility of addressing deck rehabilitation. No right of way anticipated. Development activities involving the Department, Designer and CMGC Contractor are underway and the team expects to be completed with the final design stage by September 2017.

Once design is complete, the department will enter into the bidding stage of the CMGC process to determine construction costs. If costs are acceptable, a construction contract will be awarded to the CMGC contractor. The current construction budget for this project is $4,940,000.
Board Agenda Item

- [D3] US-95, MP 122-139 Bridge Replacements & Weiser River and Mud Creek Bridge (FY2017 D-B): This project will replace eight structures on US-95 on near-same alignment with the possibility of addressing tight roadway geometry as well. This project has been awarded and construction is underway. Substantial completion is anticipated November 2017. The current construction budget for this project is $8,200,000.

- [D1] SH-3, St. Joe River & St. Maries RR Bridges (FY2016 D-B): This project will reconstruct the structures over the St Joe River and over the railroad at St Maries. This project was originally scheduled for FY2017 but was advanced to FY2016. The Department has completed the procurement and has selected a design-build firm and is currently processing the award of the project. The current construction budget for this project is $17,315,800.

- [D1&2] Bridge Replacements (FY2017 D-B): This project will reconstruct seven bridge structures identified as deficient and in need of replacement in various locations in districts 1 and 2. Structures will be constructed on near-same alignment and within the existing right-of-way. The current budget for this project is $8,000,000.

- [D4,5&6] Bridge Replacements (FY2017 & 2018 D-B): This project will reconstruct seventeen bridge structures identified as deficient and in need of replacement in various locations in districts 4, 5 and 6. Structures will be constructed on near-same alignment and within the existing right-of-way. The current budget for this project is $25,000,000.

The table below provides a budget update to show total existing project costs as they compare to the twenty percent annual legislative threshold established under Title 40-904 and Title 40-905.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET UPDATE</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST OF SELECTED INNOVATIVE PROJECTS</td>
<td>$42,372</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% LEGISLATIVE THRESHOLD</td>
<td>$63,064</td>
<td>$69,776</td>
<td>$69,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABLE INNOVATIVE CONTRACTING CAPACITY</td>
<td>$20,692</td>
<td>$59,776</td>
<td>$69,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
For information only.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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Meeting Date 22 June 2017

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>Caleb Lakey</td>
<td>Trans System Manager</td>
<td>JCL</td>
<td></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>Caleb Lakey</td>
<td>Trans System Manager</td>
<td>JCL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject**

Follow up to the Board's questions at the May Board Meeting (17-18 May 2017) in D5

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

**Background Information**

During the “GARVEE” board agenda item at the May Board Meeting in District 5, the following additional information was requested from staff:

1) SH-16. The Board requested the traffic volumes on the roads around the proposed SH-16 corridor and also a breakdown of the current cost estimate.
   
   a. The traffic volumes on the roads surrounding the proposed SH-16 corridor are provided in Attachment A.
   
   b. The $90M estimate for the SH-16 corridor from US-20/26 to Ustick Rd. includes an estimated $18.9M in Right of Way acquisitions, $3.1M in Preliminary Engineering and $67.8M in Construction Costs. This does not include a new interchange at Ustick Rd. This option continues work in the corridor heading from North to South; however, there are other options that would start at I-84 and work northward that may be of interest to the Board.

2) SH-53/US-95 Intersection. The Board asked for traffic volumes on SH-53 at the intersection with US-95. The Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on SH-53 at the US-95 intersection is 4,500. The Commercial AADT (CAADT) on SH-53 at the US-95 intersection is 490 (11% of AADT). There has been no measured growth in traffic between 2011 and 2015 on SH-53 at the intersection.

3) US-20. A question was raised about US-20, North of St. Anthony (around milepost 353), where it goes from 4-lanes (divided) to 2-lanes (undivided). Specifically, was there a connection between that reduction in lanes, merging traffic and crashes? When the corridor crash locations were graphed by the 1/10th mile, there did not appear to be any definitive correlation between the crash locations and the reduction in lanes.

4) Crash rates on GARVEE corridors. During the meeting it was proposed that the (AADT) / (# of crashes) was a good indication of the “crash rate” along the corridors. A more customary metric is to use the crash rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (crash/100mvm), which accounts for corridor length. Attachment B includes the 5 year rates (crash/100mvm) for the corridors and the corresponding statewide averages. These rates may provide the Board a better tool for comparing safety concerns on these corridors. Comparing the corridor crash rate with the statewide average for the same type of facility (left to right on the chart) is an effective way to judge the safety concern within a corridor. Comparing crash rates between corridors of different types (top to bottom on the chart) is not effective because typically more controlled facilities like interstates will have lower crash rates even though they have higher volumes. From a purely safety perspective, locations that have fatal and serious injury crashes in the last 5 years and crash rates above the statewide average for the same type of facility, should be considered higher priorities.
## Board Agenda Item

### Recommendations

For information only

### Board Action

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A – SH-16 Corridor, Local Road Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>AADT*</th>
<th>CAADT*</th>
<th>Percent Growth**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-16, SH-44 to US 20/26</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can-Ada</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDermott</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cat</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Mile</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locust Grove</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Cherry Lane</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ustick</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinden</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2015 traffic numbers used  
** AADT Growth from 2011 to 2015

Overall growth is around 7% in the valley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US-95, Idaho 1 to Canadian Border</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US-95, Granite to Sagle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US-95, Intersection with SH-53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SH-16, Chinden to I-84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>US-95, Smokey Boulder to Hazard Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-84, Caldwell to Karcher Int</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-84, Karcher to Franklin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SH-75, Timmerman to Ketchum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US-93, Twins Falls Alt. Route and Snake River Crossing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US-30, Lava Hot Springs to Soda Springs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>US-20, St Anthony to Ashton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meeting Date June 20-22, 2017 Amount of Time Needed for Presentation 5 minutes

Presenter’s Name Presenter’s Title Initials
Joel Drake Manager FP&A JD
Preparer’s Name Preparer’s Title Initials
Nathan Hesterman Sr. Transportation Planner ndh

Subject
Review of the Draft FY 2018 - 2024 Idaho Transportation Investment Program

Route Number Project Number Key Number
NA NA NA

District Location
statewide NA

Background Information
From January through May, 2017, Department staff and our local partners from the metropolitan planning organizations (MPO’s) and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) collaborated to compile the Draft FY 2018 – 2024 Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP).

The listing of projects for the FY 2018 – 2024 program years has been provided under separate cover to Board members. Exhibits for the Workshop are also provided under separate cover which help analyze and explain the draft program.

The draft program is multimodal in nature and includes projects from the following categories: highway construction, planning, public transportation, alternative transportation (i.e. bicycle/pedestrian), and aeronautics.

The next step of the process is to proceed into a 30-day public comment period slated to occur during July, 2017. Board action on this item indicates concurrence to begin public involvement, and is not meant to indicate Board approval of the projects in the draft program. Final review and subsequent approval is scheduled for the September 2017 Board Meeting.

Recommendations

Board Action
☐ Approved ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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WHEREAS, it is in the public's interest for the Department to publish and accomplish a current, realistic, and fiscally constrained seven year Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP); and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Transportation Board to effectively utilize all available federal, state, local, and private capital investment funding; and

WHEREAS, the program update cycle requires cooperation with partner agencies in its calendar of activities; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Board has reviewed the list of projects and analysis for the Draft FY 2018 - 2024 ITIP; and

WHEREAS, the next activity in the program update cycle is public review and comment per 23 CFR 450.210; and

WHEREAS, public involvement and input from stakeholders and interested citizens allows the Transportation Board to better understand Idaho's various transportation needs; and

WHEREAS, project selection and program approval is scheduled for the Transportation Board's September meeting after incorporating public comment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board will commence public involvement in July with project and program information incorporated from the publication entitled Draft FY 2018 - 2024 ITIP, June Board Meeting.
Meeting Date 6/22/2017

Consent Item [ ] Information Item [ ] Amount of Presentation Time Needed 15 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie C. Fogdall/Chris Victory</td>
<td>DMV Operations Manager/CIO</td>
<td>BCF/CV</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>Bonnie C. Fogdall</td>
<td>DMV Operations Manager</td>
<td>BCF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject

DMV Outages at the County Offices -- Update

Key Number District Route Number
D9/HQ

Background Information

DMV has been experiencing weekly computer outages which affect county drivers licensing and vehicle registration offices.

The purpose of this update is to keep the Board briefed on current actions and future solutions.

Recommendations

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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Subject
129K Pound Trucking Request - US-95, District 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Route Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>US-95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

A request for 129,000 pound trucking operations was submitted for US-95 from Lewiston to the Canadian border. This specific request is for approval of the section of US-95 from Lewiston to the District 1-District 2 boundary with the section of highway from the District boundary to the Canadian border having been previously approved by the Transportation Board. The request specifics are as follows:

Case #201623US95D2: Milepost 311.92 (Lewiston) to milepost 371.69 (D1/D2 boundary)

This section of US-95 is classified as a red route allowing 115-foot overall vehicle length and a 6.5-foot off-track. The pavement and 16 bridges on the route will safely support 129,000 pound vehicles. The pavement is generally in good to poor condition with some sections being rated very poor and deficient. Deficient sections will receive a seal or preservation between now and the end of FY20.

Three public hearings were noticed and conducted. The first on March 20, 2017 in Lewiston; the second on March 21, 2017 in Deary; and the third on March 23, 2017 in Kamiah. Member Vassar presided and received written and verbal testimony. Following a 30-day period, public comment was closed. During the public comment period, four routes were under consideration with comments taken for all. While only one route, US-95, is being considered at this time, the comments for all are provided for proper context and transparency. General comments and those specific to the section of US-95 being considered are highlighted in the public comment information provided.

Based on analysis by DMV, Bridge Section, Materials Section, the Office of Highway Safety and District 2, Chief Engineer Allen recommends approving this request.

Recommendations

Approve the 129,000 Pound Trucking Subcommittee’s recommendation to approve the request for 129,000 pound trucking operations on the specified section of US-95. Resolution on p. 175.
Request For Designated Routes Up To 129,000 Pounds

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: Doug Andrus Distributing LLC
Contact Person's Name: Jonathan Andrus
Contact Phone Number: 208-533-6709
Fax Number: 208-533-6709
E-Mail Address: jon.andrus@dougandrus.com
Company Address: 6300 South 45th West
City: Idaho Falls
State: ID
Zip Code: 83402

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.itd.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>US95</td>
<td>311.92</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.175</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
   This is a major route between Idaho's only sea port and Canada. Increasing weights from 105,500 to 129,000 will be a massive boost to the efficiency of freight transportation.

2. Associated Economic Benefits
   Many products that are currently shipped out of Canada are routed around Idaho. Approving this route will allow carriers to take the shortest route bringing them through the state of Idaho. Doing so will require them to purchase fuel and pay road taxes in Idaho. It will allow residents and businesses in Northern Idaho, including the Idaho Transportation Department, to get the products they need in a more efficient manner and thus lower the cost of goods.

3. Approximate Number of Trips Annually
   916

4. Commodities Being Transported
   Road salt for the Idaho Transportation Department, fertilizer, and lumber.

5. Anticipated Start Date to Use Requested Routes 8/1/16

Requestor's Printed Name: Jonathan Andrus
Requestor's Signature: [Signature]
Date: 8/1/16

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@itd.idaho.gov

ITD Use Only

Hwy Review D-1 D-2 D-3 D-4 D-5 D-6 Proceed Reject Date
Bridge Proceed Reject Date Chief Proceed Reject Date Sub- Proceed Reject Date

NOTE

- CASE 2016-28US95D1: DISTRICT 1 MP 371.69 - 430.56
- CASE 2016-28US95D2: DISTRICT 2 MP 311.92 - 371.69
- US-95 FROM MP 430.56 BEING EVALUATED UNDER CASE 4 2016-22US95
Legend

- Designated routes for combinations of vehicles not exceeding one hundred fifteen (115) feet in overall length including load overhang (magenta-coded routes). A vehicle combination operating on routes designated for up to one hundred fifteen (115) feet shall be designed and assembled in a manner whereby its maximum off-tracking will not exceed six point five zero (6.50) feet.

- Designated routes for combinations not exceeding ninety-five (95) feet in overall length including load overhang (brown-coded routes). A vehicle combination operating on routes designated for up to ninety-five (95) feet shall be designed and assembled in a manner whereby its maximum off-tracking will not exceed five point five zero (5.50) feet.

- Local Routes

- Non Designated 129K routes. Use Extra Length Map for operating requirements.

Please Note: CARGO CARRYING UNITS FOR DOUBLES AND TRIPLES COMBINATIONS MAY NOT EXCEED 95 FT AND THE CARGO CARRYING UNITS FOR A FULL TRUCK AND TWO TRAILERS MAY NOT EXCEED 98 FT (INCLUDING THE CONNECTING DEVICES ON THE ABOVE).
Pavement Evaluations

Based on specific industry requests, the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) conducted a 129,000 pound trucking evaluation on US-95 in the Department’s District 2. As specified in the 129,000 Pound Trucking Charter, ITD conducted public hearings for the requested route and provided a 30-day public comment period. Based on public comments regarding road conditions on the requested route, ITD developed the following pavement condition table and projected projects on the requested portion of US-95.

Pavement Analysis

Case #201623US95D2 [Milepost (MP) 311.92 – MP 371.69]

The requested route is from the intersection with US-12 in Lewiston to the District 1–District 2 boundary where it joins a previously considered section of US-95 continuing to the Canadian border. The route ranges from very poor to good with the very poor sections located in Moscow. There are 5.19 miles rated as deficient accounting for 8.6% of the requested route. Details are provided in Table 1.

The following projects are projected for this section of US-95:
- FY-18 - Lewiston to Thorn Creek Road Seal - Seal Coat; Under Construction
- FY-18 - Latah County Paving - Pavement Preservation in Moscow on SH-8 & US-95; Bid Opens 5/23/17
- FY 18 - Four Mile Creek Bridge - Bridge Replacement
- FY-19 - Thorn Creek Road To Moscow - Reconstruct From 2 Lane To 4 Lane Divided
- FY 20 - Moscow North City Limit to Viola - Pavement Restoration
- FY 20 - Deep Creek Bridge - Bridge Replacement
- FY 20 - WM&I RR Bridge - Bridge Replacement
- FY 20 - Jct SH 6 & US 95 Turnbay - Turnbay, Safety
- FY 21 - Riverside Northbound Passing Lane - Passing Lane

Table 1 - US-95 Roadway Condition (Lewiston to District 1 – District 2 Boundary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Milepost From</th>
<th>Milepost To</th>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Deficient (yes/no)</th>
<th>Condition State</th>
<th>Deficient Reason (Cracking, Ride, Rut)</th>
<th>Cracking Index</th>
<th>Roughness Index</th>
<th>Rut Avg (In)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>311.920</td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>319.880</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>319.880</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.190</td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.190</td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>326.567</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Milepost From</td>
<td>Milepost To</td>
<td>Pavement Type</td>
<td>Deficient (yes/no)</td>
<td>Condition State</td>
<td>Deficient Reason (Cracking, Ride, Rut)</td>
<td>Cracking Index</td>
<td>Roughness Index</td>
<td>Rut Avg (in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>326.567</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326.617</td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326.617</td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>338.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338.500</td>
<td>339.300</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>339.300</td>
<td>342.200</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342.200</td>
<td>342.943</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342.943</td>
<td>343.601</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343.601</td>
<td>344.026</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.026</td>
<td>344.767</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.767</td>
<td>344.885</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.885</td>
<td>345.017</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.051</td>
<td>345.560</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.480</td>
<td>345.575</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.575</td>
<td>345.947</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.947</td>
<td>346.604</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>346.604</td>
<td>349.800</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>349.800</td>
<td>350.900</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350.900</td>
<td>352.130</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>352.130</td>
<td>354.655</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354.655</td>
<td>355.905</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355.905</td>
<td>356.538</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>356.538</td>
<td>357.100</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>357.100</td>
<td>359.400</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>359.400</td>
<td>360.300</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360.300</td>
<td>362.452</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362.452</td>
<td>362.660</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362.660</td>
<td>362.937</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362.937</td>
<td>366.593</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>366.593</td>
<td>371.605</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Doug Andrus Distributing submitted a request for 129,000 pound trucking approval on US-95 between milepost (MP) 311.92 and MP 522.0 for transportation of road salt for the Idaho Transportation Department plus fertilizer and lumber. This request covers the District 2 portion of the request from MP 311.92 to MP 371.69. The northern portion of the request, from MP 371.69 to MP 430.56, is being evaluated under case #201623US95D1, and MP 430.56 to MP 522.0 is being evaluated under request 201622US95 submitted by Pocock Trucking. Doug Andrus Distributing projects up to 916 trips annually which is a 15-25% reduction from current operations. This section of US-95 is coded a "Red Route," where vehicles with 115-foot overall length and 6.5-foot off-track are authorized. ITD Bridge Section confirms the 16 bridges on the route will safely support 129,000 pound vehicles. The Department’s Materials Section evaluation shows that the increased vehicle weight with a corresponding increased number of axles will reduce loads per axle compared to 80,000 or 105,500 pound vehicles and thereby produce lower loads on the road surface and subsurface resulting in equal or lesser damage. The Office of Highway Safety analysis shows this section of US-95 has 12 Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Locations (HAL) and has 12 HAL Clusters with details provided below. Department of Motor Vehicles, Materials Section, Highway Safety and Bridge Asset Management 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-95 from milepost 311.92 to 371.69 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 16 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.

Materials Section Review

The Idaho Transportation Department’s 129,000 pound pilot project report to the Idaho State Legislature in 2013 states, “For pavements, axle weight is a more significant determinant of pavement damage than gross vehicle weight. Truck weight limits that allow a higher GVW distributed over more axles do not necessarily lead to higher pavement costs and can even produce savings.” Based on the increased number of axles required for 129,000 pound vehicles to maintain legal axle weights, the equivalent single axle loads (ESAL) for 129,000 pound vehicles are lower than for 80,000 pound and 105,500 pound vehicles. The implementation of the 129,000 pound configuration also reduces the number of truck trips compared to performing the same work with 80,000 or 105,000 pound trucks. The reduction in truck traffic further reduces the pavement wear. Therefore, for this section of roadway, our assessment is the increased vehicle weight with a corresponding increased number of axles will reduce loads per axle compared to 80,000 or 105,500 pound vehicles and thereby produce lower loads on the road surface and subsurface resulting in equal or lesser damage.

Highway Safety Evaluation

This US-95 segment has 12 Non-Interstate High Accident Intersection Locations (HAL) and has 12 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 795 crashes involving 1,211 units (6 fatalities and 365 injuries) on US-95 between MP 311.92 and 371.689 of which 42 crashes involved tractor-trailer combinations. Of the crashes involving tractor trailers, the most prevalent contributing circumstances were inattention and improper lane change. Eighteen injuries and one of the fatalities were due to crashes with tractor trailers. Implementation of 129,000 pound trucking is projected to reduce truck traffic on this route.
## Table of HAL Segments US 95:

<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 95</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>345.349</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>(001547) 0.347</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>360.554</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>(001547) 0.186</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>(001553) 345.196</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>(001553) 345.256</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>297.042</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>(001547) 0.500</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>344.767</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>344.568</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>344.116</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>346.122</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>337.668-339.620</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349.863-352.363</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>360.554-361.554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>344.568-344.767</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>355.930-359.430</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>345.349-345.436</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>339.620-342.620</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>323.733-324.457</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>364.380-366.236</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>303.5</td>
<td>(001547) 0.186-0.347</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>324.360-326.360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>345.798-346.082</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>Latah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Data:

**Bridge Data:**

- Route Number: US 95
- Department: Bridge Asset Management
- Date: 11/8/2016
- From: North Lewiston
- Milepost: 311.92
- To: D-1/2 Boundary
- Milepost: 371.69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Number</th>
<th>Milepost Marker</th>
<th>Bridge Key</th>
<th>Rating (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>312.24</td>
<td>18805</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>319.06</td>
<td>18480</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>329.48</td>
<td>18487</td>
<td>226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>330.40</td>
<td>18491</td>
<td>912,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>332.37</td>
<td>18496</td>
<td>512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>332.99</td>
<td>18501</td>
<td>918,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>334.05</td>
<td>18506</td>
<td>916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>344.00</td>
<td>18511</td>
<td>198,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>344.79</td>
<td>18518</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>352.86</td>
<td>18520</td>
<td>168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>357.50</td>
<td>18525</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>360.29</td>
<td>18531</td>
<td>336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>360.46</td>
<td>18535</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>361.28</td>
<td>18540</td>
<td>316,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>361.54</td>
<td>18545</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>362.79</td>
<td>18547</td>
<td>OK EJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: 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).
Comments re: All Highway Routes Applied For

The Lewiston Tribune carried an ad about the upcoming hearing on allowing 129,000 pound truck routes on US 95, US 12, Idaho 3 and Idaho 8. The following is being offered as testimony regarding the applications.

1) Hwy. 95 Lewiston to Latah/Benewah County Line. No comment except the section between Lewiston and Moscow is ideal on the 4 lane portion. That is what the 4-lane was meant to be able to include. No traffic concerns there. Hwy 95 from Plummer to Moscow could be better for additional truck traffic but we hope that is in the long term plans for the highway dept. (assuming all the funds won’t go to the Boise area as some have proposed.)

2) US Highway 12 Lewiston to Montana border - Will you not ever leave that highway alone!!! We vehemently oppose heavier (and longer) trucks on that stretch of the highway. Most of that area is in the Scenic River designation. That means more recreation access, not major truck traffic. The road is curvy and allowing trucks that take longer to stop is not good management. We personally recreate on the section between Kamiah and Powell. There are bicyclists, motorcyclists, fishermen, rafters, camping, tourists taking in the beautiful river and mountains with cameras all along the road. These users deserve to have a feeling of safety when pulling in and out of a pull-off, or driving the curvy road. It will just take too long for a truck to safely stop at 50-55mph in an emergency.

We have personally witnessed accidents or near accidents on that road. Two are near the Wilderness Gateway campground entrance. One I was fishing just above the bridge and heard tires screeching. Upon looking up a large truck had overturned with a load of bees, not being able to
make the curve at his speed. Fortunately no vehicle was coming the other direction at that particular moment. Another incident was when a truck hauling toilet paper overturned on the curve just below the campground entrance, spilling his load down the embankment toward the river. Again, fortunately no other traffic was in the immediate area. The driver was just going too fast to make that curve. We always feel just a bit unsafe exiting the campground entrance as we cannot see much distance either way and that would be a bad situation for a larger truck with less stopping time to avoid us.

Another risky instance we witnessed was a small covered wagon pulled by a horse slowing making its way west a little below the Fish Creek raft launch. He was in the main path of his lane and on a curve. We were travelling east in the opposite lane. BUT what scared us is that a large truck coming up behind the horse drawn wagon would not see it in time to stop because of the curve. The driver probably would turn left into our lane to avoid the wagon. As luck would have it, we did not see another truck for about 12 miles going west. Was a scary situation however, and one we will remember a long time.

Just because it might meet the engineering specifications on weight does not mean it is safe. A driver’s perception of a safe roadway is as important as the engineering. How fair is it if ordinary driver’s fear the safety of the roadway just because some commercial enterprise wants to save a few bucks? By approving this you would be leaning too far in the direction of commercial use vs recreational use. Visitors to the Scenic Roadway have tolerated the trucks on the roadway as a compromise now but enough is enough. We know of some folks who avoid that area because they do not feel safe. We are getting to the point where we cautiously venture to the campgrounds and fishing in that area and are always
relieved when we get there and back to Lewiston safely.

You know, HWY 12 is not the only route available for the trucks to use. There is a very nice, safe 4-lane road between Missoula and Coeur d’Alene connecting with HWY 95. That is the route they should use to avoid potential safety issues and conflicts of use.

3) The portion of Idaho 3 and 8 from Hwy 12 to Bovill is not good either. These are just RURAL roads, not meant for huge trucking activities. Just because technically it meets the guidelines does not mean it should happen. Keep Idaho rural. The trucking enterprises will push as hard as they can to make more money at the expense of the regular traveler. We do not agree with the larger trucks on those roads either. We frequent that route often to go camping in that area and to visit Elk River. We do not want to be hassled by the larger trucks.

Thank you for taking our comments into consideration when making your decision.

----

I believe hauling 129,000 lbs on our highways will severely impact our roads, not in a positive way. We have seen through the years the impact on our road from 80,000 to 105,500 lbs. Our roads in central and northern Idaho are in poor shape now.

Even with more axles and less weight, it is still more tires, more weight down the lanes, on the edge of the roads.

Road maintenance and repairs are very expensive and are not getting cheaper. The impact will be greater and the funds are not and will not be available for repairs to the road. Therefore, the roads will be more expensive for the average Joe to use. (vehicle repairs, accidents).
The safety of our highways needs to be looked at very seriously. Our hills are very steep and sometimes very windy. You will not stop these heavy, heavy loads going down our cornery steep hills without many serious accidents, mainly in the winter. I feel the state of Idaho, the trucking industry, and the people of this state cannot afford this road weight limit change.

It’s going to be more trucks – heavier trucks and more of them. Our roads are already in need of repair. I feel heavier loads will not benefit in any way.

My concerns are the present condition of these roads, especially routes 3 and 8 are in bad repair already. I cannot help but think heavier loads can only worsen this condition. I do not believe this will lead to less trucks. I am also concerned about the extra weight turning off onto county roads that are already crumbling from the weight and constant use. I am also concerned for public safety in the bog down of larger, heavier trucks on upgrades. And the safety of longer trucks maneuvering around the many curves on these roads. To go slower around these bends leaves vehicles rounding those bends behind them at risk of an accident.

We are opposed to your proposal to allow these long and heavy trucks on our highways. For the most part they are only two-lane country roads. Larger trucks will create traffic jams and more accidents. Please do not allow this change.

I am forwarding my concerns and comments on increasing north
Idaho to 129,000 from a business leader that has his own fleet of chip trucks hauling 105,500 and as a retired battalion chief with Moscow Volunteer Fire Dept.

North Idaho and south are seriously 2 different geographic areas and the highway systems in the south can justify these increases to a point. North Idaho cannot support the configurations required by the trucking industry to handle these increased loads. Here are my points below.

1. Trucks hauling this increased weight will be slower (15 mph) on all of these passing lanes on the grades therefore being a hindrance to the lighter, faster trucks (25 mph) that pass them going up all the grades causing a delay for cars and pickup that will try to get by all of them and increasing traffic accidents.

2. In my years of Fire dept work I was involved in multiple extrication/ fatality situations on reisenauer hill (south of Moscow) a well known problem area for hwy 95 that has been awaiting realignment that keeps getting delayed by environmental groups for nonsense reasons. I have witnessed during winter ops multiples of accidents on this hill that I can imagine will be exacerbated by a truck pulling doubles and triples if this passes.

3. The highway infrastructure is narrow, and poor subgrade on a lot of failing highways that this increase will increase the dangers and the damage that occurs on the off shoot highway system that reaches companies that could benefit from this increase weight.

4. Bennett Lumber in Princeton Idaho is on hwy 6 in Princeton Idaho and we will be economically disadvantaged to our competitors due to this increase as hwy 6 cannot support the off track that these heavier weight truck configurations need.
5. Hwy 95 has too many problem areas between north Idaho and south Idaho along the river system that will not support properly trucks with doubles or triples to navigate safely. The areas are too narrow and windy.

6. There are several mills and operations on the off shoot highways that will be economically disadvantaged to someone else that will get the order file for purchase of their product due to the increased weight difference causing potentially fatal economic harm to the businesses.

I have been against this increase in Idaho since its inception due to the failing highways and poor budget up north compared to the south that has far less winter issues and geographic challenges. The highways have been rutting just with the increase that those of us have been able to improve our hauling configurations and even if it were approved it will be cost prohibited for us to change our equipment to handle these increases and it will put some truckers out of business trying to keep up with the demand of modifying our configurations with no increased value for doing so. (chip haul)

I oppose the 129,000 for north Idaho and am lobbying the cities and commissioners to follow suit for the same reasons. This increase will only help Clearwater paper and IFG. An increase without fixing the infrastructure to handle it will put the other small business out of business.

Specific Route: General routes

Comments: I strongly oppose the increase of gross vehicle loads to 129,000 pounds. The added weight significantly increases the stopping distance of those vehicles. This adversely effect the safety of the motoring public Additionally, this weight puts a huge burden on
the road beds that must be paid for by the citizens of Idaho. The carriers are reaping the benefits without shouldering the costs.

----

Comments re: U.S. 12

I am very concerned that you are proposing to allow oversized trucks of up to 129K to travel on non-interstate highways in Idaho. My specific concern is the use of Hwy 12, which is a winding, narrow and often dangerous highway. The high rate of accidents taking place on Hwy 12 in the relatively short distance it travels across our state speaks for itself. As a resident living along the Hwy 12 corridor, I urge you to put public safety first and do not compromise our welfare further by allowing these heavier, larger trucks to use Hwy 12.

----

I am writing concerning the application to haul 129K on Highway 12. I have been driving commercial trucks for over 30 years. I owned my own truck for 10 of those years. I have pulled both double and single trailer configurations. I have spent a lot of hours traveling Highway 12 and the past 2 years I have driven almost exclusively from Kooskia to Missoula. I haul shavings from Kooskia to Roseburg Fiber in Missoula and then reload with chips which are hauled from Missoula to Clearwater Paper in Lewiston. So all of my driving miles are on Highway 12. I can safely argue that I know this road as well as anyone.

I am very concerned with the proposal to haul 129K loads on Highway 12. This is a very difficult road with many corners that are difficult to see around. The road is in very poor condition and full of pot holes. This past winter this road has been like driving an obstacle course. Trees falling down into the roadway is a fairly common occurrence along with rock slides onto the roadway. Hauling additional weight and trailer lengths I do not feel would
be safe with these driving conditions.

On March 9, 2017 I came around sharp corner at mile post 97 and found a tree about 24 inches diameter across the road. The road had 6 to 8 inches on slush on road and I could not stop in time. The only choice I had was to go into river or hit the ditch. I chose the ditch and the tree hit the top of passenger cab tearing off exhaust stack, mirror and crushed top of cab. When the truck hit the ditch it broke off suspension bolts between suspension and frame causing drive axles to shift sideways. I rode back to Kooskia in a snow plow and we had to cut two trees out of road to get back to town. I then jumped in with wrecker and we had to cut 3 trees out of roadway to get back to truck. Once wrecker hooked onto truck we had to cut out 3 more trees on way back to Kooskia.

Earlier this winter a slide came road at 102 mile marker and we had to back down road to 100 mile marker to get turned around. You cannot back up double trailers if you were hauling 129K. The summer we have to deal with bicyclist, white water rafters, and tourist clogging up road.

The bottom line this is a very difficult road and it will only become more difficult for drivers trying to haul 129K. The road is not safe for heavier weights and longer trailer combinations.

Please do not allow a raise in the load level and size of commercial trucks on this highway. The longer trucks with pup trailers are a severe hazard to all us common folks trying to drive the road safely. Besides this, they will be spilling their polluting contents into the Wild and Scenic Lochsa River when taking the curves too fast.

----
I am very concerned about the proposal to increase the semi truck load limit on U.S. highway 12. Not only is this a wild and scenic corridor, but the road itself is very narrow and has many sharp turns due to following the river valley.

I have driven this road many times from Portland, Oregon to Missoula, Montana. Larger and longer trucks are completely unsuitable for this highway. If this is allowed there will be even more accidents and fatalities.

I hope your will do your job and deny this proposed load limit increase.

---

We all know that the Transportation Department’s yellow warning sign (Winding Road next 99 Miles) is really the equivalent of 'Fake News'. Running 129,000 pounds of dual trailers makes perfectly good sense under the Republican controlled Idaho government.

What does a few more lives matter when stacked up against corporate profit? It’s perfectly understandable, making money is the most valued principle of the Republican Party.

But please don’t insult our intelligence if these larger loads are allowed on Highway 12 between Lewiston and the Montana border. Approval will be based on profit, money, greed; not public safety!

Keep up the good work!

---

I am against increasing the size of trucks allowable on Highway
It is already hazardous given current allowable trucks. Please keep focused on the beauty this drive provides, unparalleled, many agree.

I am opposed to allowing heavy, longer loads on US 12 from its junction with US 95 to the Montana border. I just drove over 12 from my home in Missoula to visit my folks in Lewiston and must report that the section from the MT border to Lowell is in bad shape with lots of potholes and breakup. I attribute the damage to the current truck traffic and hard winter. I would even go a step further to suggest that the road be closed to all trucks above a certain size in the winter, much like Teton Pass is now.

I also oppose larger, heavy, longer loads over 12 because of safety issues especially in the summer with recreational traffic is at its peak over the scenic highway. Add to that the increasing number of long distance cyclists that use the road and you have the potential for increased incidents.

As a health professional, recreational user, and Idaho resident, I am in strong opposition to the proposal to increase truckloads to 129,000 lbs. along the Highway 12 corridor.

The proposed increase in load size will result in more fatalities along the most dangerous road in Idaho. Our family has seen the spills into the Lochsa River from trucks and deaths from accidents along this treacherous route. Putting heavier and longer trucks on this highway will result in more damage to the recreation and more deaths.

Safety is supposed to be the ITD and Otter's main concerns/priorities, as it is Idaho citizen's. Because the Lower Snake River gets negligible barge traffic, it should not be a consideration.

12.
Highway 12 should be protected and not be an industrial corridor for large trucks. The ITD needs to listen to Idaho residents and users of the highway. ITD should reject this proposal from the trucking company. Thank you, and I would like to receive a response.

-----

Please consider the following comments:

ITD’s key mission is “providing the safest transportation system possible.”

ITD's measurements of safety are “reduction in fatalities” and “reduction in serious injuries.”

However, the following ITD data does not reflect the agency is meeting its goals:

- 2011-2014 total fatal Idaho crashes increased 5.7%, and 2014-2015, 13.1%.
- Injury crashes increased 3.1% and 10.1% respectively.
- Commercial Vehicle fatal crashes, 2011-2014, increased 22%, and 2014-2015, 36.4%.

This data suggests 129,000 loads on HWY 12 will further increase crashes and decrease safety.

I've driven HWY 12 for 8 years and have shared the road with bikers, hikers, and that dangerous, slow-moving "Jesus Saves" wagon from Summer 2016 (yikes!). I, along with many others, also cross HWY 12 to access recreation opportunities. 129,000-pound trucks, barreling around corners, will not increase safety.

Our state government has expressed a need for safety as a highest priority:
Idaho Governor Butch Otter, in reference to designating other short highway segments in Idaho as 129,000-pound routes, said: “Safety must be the highest priority, addressing necessary and prudent restrictions on use of designated routes.”

Idaho State Senator Shawn Keough, in reference to Grangeville-to-Kooskia State Highway 13’s possibly becoming a 129,000-pound route, said: “Undoubtedly, allowing 129 GVW (gross vehicle weight) trucks on this route will mean more accidents, more injuries and more deaths. This type of increased suffering seems needless, and I direct conflict to the Legislature’s codified concerns about safety, the governor’s writing concerns about safety, and ITD’s own rules and procedures that place a priority on safety.”

Here are some other pieces of information to consider:

- According to data from 1994-1998, U.S. 12 has the highest fatality accident rate in Idaho.

- Lewiston Morning Tribune, February 13, 2000, headline: “U.S. Highway 12 Is a Scenic but Unforgiving Corridor That Has the State’s Highest Fatality Accident Rate.”

- Idaho State policeman Lt. Mark Peterson, in reference to U.S. 12’s having no room for driver error, said: “You either have a cliff or the river. You don’t have room to make mistakes.”

No doubt much of this push is coming from the Port of Lewiston and the trucking industry.

The Port of Lewiston’s barging numbers have declined for two decades, and a return is not likely in the future. The Port of Portland isn’t bouncing back anytime soon. The truck industry’s current request to ITD to have U.S. 12 designated as a 129,000-pound-trucking route defends a dying port and elevates trucking economic
So many unique places line U.S. HWY 12. Designations include Lewis-Clark National Historic Trail, Nez Perce National Historic Trail, segment of the Nez Perce National Historical Park, Northwest Passage Byway, Lochsa-Clearwater Wild & Scenic River corridor, segment of the TransAmerica Bicycle Route, and its legendary wildness, beauty, and historical richness. Our state economy relies on recreation and tourism. Let's not replace that with the trucking industry.

Just don't do it. Stop with these terrible administrative rules already.

Really?

You have driven the road haven't you?

I can understand why industry would want to increase the weight limit. What I can't understand is how IDT could ever justify such a change as being to the benefit of Idaho citizens.

I no longer live in Idaho but I have driven the Lewis-Clark Highway recently and have, in the past, recommended the drive to friends who are planning Western vacations. With the larger trucks that a 129,000 pound limit would entail, I'm not sure that I could do that in good conscience. Those trucks would transform what is now a scenic drive and a great introduction to Idaho's mountains into a harrowing stressful couple of hours. There is no pressing need for, or benefit to, Idaho for such a change.

Specific Route: U.S. 12

Comments: Increasing the load limits to 129,000 lbs would, first and
foremost, increase the number of serious accidents and fatalities on this very narrow and winding road. It would also damage Idaho's third largest economy, recreation and tourism, and in turn would damage the economy of the entire state. The importance of maintaining the pristine condition of this Wild and Scenic corridor cannot be overemphasized. A spill into the river would do irreparable damage to the fish and other creatures that depend on its quality to survive. In reference to the port of Lewiston being a "major hub", the US Corp of Engineers categorizes the Lower Snake River "waterway" as "of negligible use". Please deny this request as completely unacceptable. Thank you!

Let’s just stay with the current HWY 12 weight load, you do not have the capability to manage above that in a responsible and professional manner...You way too political to trust with our Public Resources.....You are just not reliable or trustworthy people!!!!

Specific Route: Hwy 12

Comments: I just read that ITD is considering a high weight limit and long trucks on the Lolo Pass Hwy US 12. That is insane. Every time I drive that road some truck is over the line on a sharp curve. I've encountered many accidents in my 30 years of driving that road. Many of these accidents were by truckers in a hurry and the sharp curves catch them by surprise. Yes, the many grain trucks that used to use it are reduced in numbers just now, but the sharp curves still remain. With long trucks and drivers pushing to meet miles there will be more trucks over the line and that means dead innocent people. Do we really want to have more accidents where it takes a helicopter to get the victims out to medical care? Second, that is a Wild and Scenic River Corridor and that kind of haulage violates the spirit of the W&SR act. You just lost a court case on that; why try again?
This request smacks of greed for perceived economic growth from industry while discounting economic growth from tourism and with little regard for public safety.

Highway 12 is a designated National Scenic Byway on 99 + miles of winding road and follows a designated Wild and Scenic River. This attractive area for scenic driving, whitewater rafting, quality fishing, birdwatching, etc. is matched by limited similar experiences. Economics generated from tourism exceeds would be industrial traffic to the tax subsidized Port of Lewiston.

Safety appears to play a small part in the decision making process with “a set agenda.” We’ve lived through the grain truck destruction of life and property of the 1970’s, ‘80’s and more recently the countless spills of cargo from lumber to oil with costly outcomes.

The state’s inability to properly fund our infrastructure needs are on full display this year on Highway 12. Don’t add to the problems.

When considering Highway 12 for 129,000 GVW the first consideration should be SAFETY, SAFETY, SAFETY. Then you should take a serious look at the economic attributes of tourism in this great state.

NO to 129,000 GVW on Highway 12!

Re: Comments on request for 129,000 lb. trucks on U.S. 12

ITD repeatedly claims public safety is its highest priority. Governor Otter has stated that public safety must be the number one consideration in the approval or disapproval of requests to designate
any section of highway in Idaho as an approved route for trucks weighing up to 129,000 lbs.

Safety

My driveway joins Highway 12 at Milepost 77.4. I previously lived at Milepost 80.4. I have driven on Highway 12 for business and personal reasons for many years and presently drive this highway almost daily.

During the era of heavy grain truck traffic in the 1970s - 1980s, four of my close neighbors—Winslow, Winslow, Johnson, Trainer—were KILLED by trucks on Highway 12 in three separate accidents within ten miles of my home.

A truck crash three miles upstream from my home coated the surface of the Middlefork with diesel fuel and produced a pungent odor in the valley. Highway repair costs necessitated by this spill were enormous.

A lumber truck accident filled the Middlefork with loose boards and entire units of lumber.

Dead pigs floated down the Lochsa and Middlefork after a truck tipped over in the river.

Three years ago a truck traveled for 100+ yards with one side of its wheels in the barrow pit until it hit my driveway, then tore out four-foot chunks of pavement across the driveway apron and miraculously returned to the roadway. Based on tire tracks, any driver and passengers of a vehicle in the opposing lane in that vicinity would have been killed.

Two years ago my wife and I could not gain access to Highway 12 from our home because of the lumber scattered across our driveway and for approximately 100 yards of both lanes of Highway 12. The crushed cab of the lumber truck sat in the ditch just 20 yards upstream of our driveway.

Also two years ago another lumber truck drove into the Middlefork of the Clearwater one mile below our driveway.
ITD now claims Highway 12 is a safe route for larger, heavier trucks on the only Highway in Idaho that warns drivers “winding road next 99 miles.”

Highway 13 between Kooskia and Grangeville poses many of the same problems that Highway 12 presents, only for far fewer miles. Here’s what Idaho State Senator Shawn Keough said about the possibility of 129,000 lb. trucks on Highway 13:

“Undoubtedly, allowing 129 GVW (gross vehicle weight) trucks on this route will mean more accidents, more injuries and more deaths. This type of increased suffering seems needless and in direct conflict to the Legislature’s codified concerns about safety, the governor’s writing concerns about safety and ITD’s own rules and procedures that place priority on safety.”

II. Associated Economic Benefits

ITD’s analysis predicts fewer trucks on Highway 12 if the road is approved for 129,000 lb. designation. This claim is misleading at best. The application from Doug Andrus points to what is likely the major push for this route designation—possible increased grain truck traffic to the Port of Lewiston. The applicant suggests the amount of truck traffic on Highway 12 will increase with route approval, which is highly likely. The applicant further claims that the Port of Lewiston is “an ideal location for shipping and receiving many commodities.” With the exception of an extremely limited amount of sawdust/wood chips that were formerly shipped to the Port of Wilma, the only commodity shipped to or from the POL is grain. The Port ships no lumber, paper, paperboard, pulp, petroleum, or pulse. The decline in shipment of all these commodities began long before the demise of all container shipping on the Lower Snake River. Further, despite years of effort, the Port has been unable to attract any upstream freight for the Bakken oil fields, Alberta tar sands or other interior locations. The Port is largely a taxpayer subsidized real estate development and property management government entity.
Lewis-Clark Terminal, Inc., a private corporation that ships grain from its own property over its own docks, will be the most likely beneficiary of any increased grain truck traffic on Highway 12.

As ITD is well aware, Highway 12 is a National Scenic Byway and All-American Road (one of 30 in the nation), parallels and/or crosses the Nez Perce and Lewis & Clark National Historic Trails, and for 100 miles lies within a federally-designated Wild and Scenic River Corridor. The Lochsa River is also one of the finest white-water rivers in America. In April and May traffic along the Lochsa River travels at 15 mph, with cars of spectators and rafting equipment squeezed onto every turnout and wide shoulder along the route.

Tourism is a major industry in Idaho and particularly so in north-central Idaho. From 2002 to 2013 I personally guided over 5000 visitors from all over the U.S. between Lewiston and Missoula, operated Elderhostels in the region, and was an outfitter on the Lewis & Clark and Nez Perce National Historic Trails. I thus have first-hand knowledge of the tourism industry along Highway 12. Permitting this route to become a major thoroughfare for heavier trucks will discourage tourism in north central Idaho. As so often is the case, ITD is considering only unlikely benefits, e.g. to the Port of Lewiston, while ignoring predictable costs to many of the businesses and private citizens of north central Idaho as well as to ITD itself in road repairs. Replacing sections of highway after an oil spill (highly likely), damaging one or two of America’s original 8 Wild and Scenic Rivers, increasing risk to Idaho’s threatened and endangered salmon and steelhead. . . . What about those potential and predictable costs?

Summary

A February 13, 2000 article in the Lewiston Morning Tribune began: “U.S. Highway 12 is a scenic but unforgiving corridor that has the state's highest fatality accident rate.” Idaho State Police Lt. Mark Peterson accurately described much of the length of Highway 12: “You either have a cliff or the river. You don’t have room to make mistakes.”
In the safety evaluation portion of ITD’s response to the request in question, ITD states that in the past 5 years there have been 41 crashes involving tractor-trailer combinations. Of the crashes involving tractor trailers, the most prevalent contributing circumstances were inattention, speed too fast for conditions, and failure to maintain lane.

I have repeatedly witnessed truck drivers making all of these errors of judgment on Highway 12. If the ITD Transportation Board cares about public safety the board will deny the request to permit 129,000 lb. loads on Highway 12. If the board cares about negative economic impact, it will deny this request. The approval of this route for 129,000 lb. loads would clearly demonstrate that ITD and Idaho’s government are ruled by special interests at the expense of taxpayers, small business owners and ordinary citizens.

We’re writing to weigh in on ITD’s proposal to increase the weight limit for trucks on U.S. Highway 12 from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds. Setting health and safety concerns aside for the moment, this is poor policy for the Clearwater River and two of its tributaries protected as Wild and Scenic Rivers: the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and Lochsa rivers.

Idaho Rivers United has long worked to protect and uphold the qualities for which these rivers were protected and has maintained consistent involvement in federal and state government processes that could threaten those qualities, which include scenery, water quality, fisheries habitat and others. Raising the weight limit for trucks within the river corridor would further industrialize the corridor and degrade the natural environment and the specific Outstandingly Remarkable Values for which the corridor was designated Wild and Scenic under the original 1968 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Second, raising the weight limit for trucks on Highway 12 would make an already dangerous highway more unsafe. Highway 12 is the only
road in Idaho that has a sign proclaiming: “Curves the Next 99 Miles.” The highway is often obscured by fog, snowstorms, rain storms or smoke from forest fires. What’s more, the members and supporters of IRU are frequent users of the river, river corridor and its many pull-outs and recreation facilities. Heavier, slower-to-stop trucks on Highway 12 are a direct threat to the health and safety of people using this federally-recognized river corridor to camp, hike, raft, hunt, fish and other activities.

In addition to the increased safety risks to citizens, we are concerned about an increased risk of environmental degradation. It is not uncommon to read reports of trucking accidents along Highway 12 and, on occasion, these accidents directly impact the aquatic environment. In the petition to increase weight limits on Highway 12 one of the proposed actions is hauling loads of road salt from Montana to ITD maintenance stations. If a 129,000 pound load of road salt were to be introduced into the Lochsa or Clearwater rivers, the effects could be disastrous for federally listed species of salmon steelhead and bull trout.

Lastly, and only loosely related to rivers and river users, heavier trucks are clearly established to take a heavier toll on roads. All Idaho motorists pay for upkeep of our highways, and we object to regulations that will cost Idahoans more for the negligible benefits to a handful of truckers who will haul heavier loads.

In sum, we have three fundamental objections to this proposal.

1. Highway 12 goes through two federally protected Wild and Scenic River corridors. These corridors were protected to uphold the values of clean water, wild fish and the natural landscape. They are not suitable places for further industrialization.

2. Raising the weight limit makes rural, winding Highway 12 less safe for people who live, recreate and visit the area to experience its abundant natural beauty, public lands and world-class whitewater.
3. Studies show that impacts to roads increase with additional weight placed on them. The cost of this weight limit adjustment would be borne by all Idaho motorists and taxpayers.

For the above reasons, Idaho Rivers United respectfully objects to the proposal to increase weight limits on U.S. Highway 12 from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds.

Please deny all requests to increase the load limits to 129,000 pounds for trucks on Highway 12. Please deny all requests to haul hazardous materials on Highway 12. Such hauls jeopardize the Lochsa River.

Thank you for denying the request that 129,000-pound loads be allowed on U.S. Highway 12 in Idaho.

As a Washington State teacher who transported his wife and three daughters over this road each summer for three years to gain an advanced degree and improve my ability as a teacher I'm aware of the value of maintaining the optimal safety for this route to the University of Montana. **Highway 12 was then classified as the most dangerous highway in Idaho,** Tanker-truck accidents that have sent oil spills into the Wild & Scenic Lochsa and Middlefork Clearwater rivers have caused significant public inconvenience, environmental damage, fish losses, and huge clean-up costs as well as endangered other drivers. Increased numbers and sizes of truck loads traveling US 12 will, in addition to threatening the welfare of families will damage tourism and recreation one of Idaho's largest economic sectors.

Specific Route: Highway 12
Comments: Having lived on Highway 12 for thirty seven years, I am well acquainted with the logistical challenges every driver faces on a regular basis. Although there are stretches of 12 such as the Lewiston area where the highway appears wide and fairly straight, the majority of the remaining miles to the Montana line are narrow and unforgiving. The attempt to legalize these mini megaloads will almost certainly result in disastrous outcomes. Highway 12 can best be described as the only highway that could be constructed in very difficult geography. The length factor will cause these trucks to cross over into oncoming traffic in places like the Kamiah Narrows. The only responsible decision the IDT can make is to deny access to these over length loads.

Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: I spend 2 to 3 months every year on the Lochsa River for the last 35 years. I've witnessed countless accidents and fatalities on this beautiful but very dangerous roadway. I absolutely oppose heavier and larger truck limits and loads. It was never designed for that type of traffic, nor could it be due to the geography. Use the freeway system, it was constructed for these options. Please consider my objections.

Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: Why do we have to continue to speak up about keeping highly dangerous vehicles like the 129,000 trucks off of highway 12? Have you ever driven a car on that highway and then have to pass a huge vehicle? Have you ever stopped to view the beautiful scenery? I could continue with question mark comments but the point is simply that this is a highway for viewing beautiful country and NOT for having to avoid ways for some corporation to make more $$$ at the cost of human enjoyment and/or convenience. Your planners should get a grip on what being a human is all about! (and that is not for individuals to wait for "trickle down" prosperity to come their way.)
Enough is enough. Stop hoping that environmentally cognitive people will let you slip by.

Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: I am against the increase in truck weight on this wilderness highway, which is already suffering from overpopulation by humans. Also, the amount of road kill of different species is already out of control. To increase the weight that truckers can haul on that highway will just increase the slaughter.

Specific Route: U.S. Highway 12

Comments: OPPOSED to INCREASED LOAD LIMITS on U.S. Highway 12. My husband and I are strongly opposed to increasing the load limits from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds for large trucks on HWY 12 along the Lochsa and Clearwater rivers through the Lochsa-Clearwater U.S. 12 Wild & Scenic River corridor.

We spent three weeks along the Lochsa River last summer and speak from personal experience. We believe the standing of Highway 12 as a National Scenic Byway should exempt it from use as a heavy industrial transportation corridor for which it is not designed.

We believe the transportation of larger loads jeopardizes the corridor and all it represents in terms of archeology, history, culture, recreation, and scenery. We offer two supporting points: 1) For normal traffic, it is a mentally and physically demanding stretch of road to drive because of the relentless curves, some with speeds as low as 25 mph. It is a two-lane road. These factors contribute to increased risk of accident in transporting larger or longer loads.

The increased risk of accident and proximity of the highway to the Lochsa River and tributaries poses an unacceptable risk to the river.
The Lochsa is also a river used by salmon returning to Idaho to spawn. This area of the Bitterroot Range also contains the priceless archaeology, culture, and history of the Nez Perce Native American tribe and the 1805 trails of the Lewis & Clark Expedition.

The river and its surrounding landscape should be protected. We oppose increasing the load limits for large trucks on HWY 12 from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds, which would expose the Lochsa River and the area's archaeology, history, culture, scenery, and recreation to the risk of damaging accidents caused by the transportation of larger loads under the demanding conditions of this winding, two-lane road: U.S. Highway 12.

2) There are signs on U.S. Highway 12 all along the Lochsa River that designate the highway as a "Wild and Scenic Byway." The U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration National Scenic Byways Program began in 1991 to recognize roads having outstanding archaeological, (and) cultural, (and) historic, (and) natural, (and) recreational, and scenic qualities. In 1996, the first roads were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation as National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads—recognized today as America's Byways. The Northwest Passage Scenic Byway (U.S. Highway 12) is included as one of only "300 Best Drives in the U.S." in the Guide to Scenic Highways and Byways published by National Geographic. This Scenic Byway should be protected.

Increasing load limits from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds exposes the Lochsa River, tributary, and surrounding area to unacceptable risk and contradicts the following quote from Ray LaHood, as U.S. Secretary of Transportation. "America's Byways offer us the opportunity to explore our nation in a truly unique way. The U.S. Department of Transportation is committed to preserving these scenic routes to ensure travelers experience the best of U.S. History, culture, and nature. The beauty of these roadways helps tell our American story, whether traveling across the country or close to home." -- Ray LaHood, U.S. Secretary of Transportation.
We oppose increasing load limits from 105,500 to 129,000 pounds through the Lochsa-Clearwater U.S. 12 Wild & Scenic River corridor.

Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: Please do NOT allow an increase in load limits for trucks on Hgwy 12. Already a dangerous road, it will only lead to more tragedy if this is allowed to happen. Don't allow the self-serving financial incentives of very few to jeopardize the safety of the many good folks that need to use this road on a routine basis. Thank you for considering this input.

Friends of the Clearwater is submitting the following comments on the proposal to upgrade Highway 12 to the routine use of 129,000 pound trucks from the current maximum of 105,500 pounds. We oppose this proposal for three crucial and important reasons. They are listed below.

- SAFETY: Highway 12 is a winding road, by geographic and topographic necessity, which makes it a more dangerous road. There have been lumber spills and diesel spills in the Wild and Scenic River Corridor. Diesel spilled into the Lochsa or Middle Fork Wild and Scenic Rivers or the main stem Clearwater River threaten water supplies of local communities down river. The heavier trucks could increase fatalities, especially since there will be no requirements for reduced speeds for trucks that would be between 20% - 25% heavier. Highway 12 already has a high fatality rate.

- INDUSTRIALIZATION/DEGRADATION OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT: The Wild and Scenic River Corridor already received considerable truck traffic. Making
it available to larger vehicles will increase the industrialization of this important natural area. This would further degrade the natural values in this area.

- IMPACTS TO ROADS: Studies by the University of Idaho show markedly increased impacts from heavier loads. This affects Idaho citizens and had a negative economic impact on local citizens.

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) already has abundant information and data that clearly demonstrate safety concerns, increases in impacts to roads, and impacts to the natural environment. We encourage you to do right by the citizens and reject this proposed increase. Rather than increase load sizes, ITD should consider regulations that could reduce accidents and toxic spills into rivers. This proposal is going in the wrong direction for the safety and health of Idaho citizens and others travelers on Highway 12.

The trucking industry is NEVER satisfied unless we the public pay for its existence: cutting expenses by increasing driver hours, shortening driver distances via back country roads, increasing truck loads, more trailers or higher speeds. It is insane to use hwy 12 for anything but local traffic: we have driven it and it demands one's utmost attention.

The trucks almost forced us off the road by tailgating and swerving, passing close to corners etc. So now they want even more payload??? Boycott them! Already we pay for the ships on the rivers by having no salmon etc!

Big trucks bearing heavy loads on the narrow Hi-Way 12 of the Wilderness Lochsa River is a tragedy almost certain to happen. Now
Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: Public Safety is the #1 mission of ITD: “providing the safest transportation system possible.”

Governor Otter, in reference to designating other short highway segments in Idaho as 129,000-pound routes, said: “Safety must be the highest priority, addressing necessary and prudent restrictions on use of designated routes.”

Increasing load and length limits will do a lot to increase traffic accidents and fatalities on Hwy. 12. As the highway sign cautions as the road enters the Wild and Scenic Corridor: “Winding Road Next 99 Miles.”

Several years ago Swift stopped using Hwy 12 for the majority of their trucks (a few local owner-operators who know the road well are still allowed to use it). Why? There were way too many 'incidents' on 12. Mostly speeding and going into the river. A few involved hazmat.

So, basically the road was not safe enough to haul even “normal” loads. As a local resident who drives Hwy. 12 frequently I feel the increased load limits will DECREASE the driving safety along the river corridor for myself and my family. The corridor already has the highest accident rate in the state. Why do you want to increase that rate? These same issues apply to Highway 13 between Kooskia and Grangeville. A couple of years ago I came within inches of being crushed between the jersey rail and a truck hauling a double wide trailer up this grade - a "normal" oversize load. For the safety of ALL highway users, please do not increase load limits to 129,000 lbs.
Specific Route: U.S. Highway 12

Comments: I oppose the weight increase on the Lochsa Highway. Larger and heavier trucks represent too great a conflict with the natural values found in the canyon, which is one of America's treasures. I have driven the canyon many times and truck traffic is already as great as it should be.

----

Specific Route: Highway 12

Comments: You are not proving anything when you give in to large corporations who want to monopolize/ruin/"use" our highways. What you need to prove is that you care about our natural areas and the people who make use of them in humanistic ways. Shame on you!

----

Specific Route: Route 12, Lochsa Highway

Comments: Dear ITD - Do NOT increase the truck load limit from 105,500 pounds to 129,000 pounds on Route 12. The trucks that travel this winding road along the Wild & Scenic Lochsa River are quite large and heavy enough. Route 12 is a Scenic Byway of spectacular beauty, not a road to be further commercialized. Larger and heavier trucks would not only degrade the experience of travelling this road for the rest of us, but also would increase the risk involved. After the megaloads issue, I would have thought that you at the Idaho Dept. of Transportation would have gotten the message by now about the importance of protecting this scenic route.

----

Specific Route: US 12
Comments: To whom it may concern: Please do NOT increase the load limit on US 12 from 105,500 pounds to 129,000 pounds. Such an increase would put public safety at risk, and the increased heavy truck traffic could harm North Central Idaho’s recreation and tourism economy.

My name is Wally Burchak and I am Vice President and part-owner of KBC Transport LLC ("KBC") located in Kooskia, Idaho. Please accept this letter as my comment in opposition to the request to designate Highway 12 as a route for 129,000-pound trucks ("129 GVW").

My biggest concern with the proposed application is from milepost 86 to milepost 174. This section of Highway 12 has numerous tight corners with poor sight lines. It is also section of road that is prone to rock slides, tree blow downs and avalanches. Highway 12 has a very high accident rate and fatality rate on this section of roadway given the traffic volume. This section of highway has very poor sight lines, very few passing lanes, and very small margin of error when drivers lose control. There has also been 3 major fuel spills from fuel tankers over turning along highway 12 in the last 10 years.

In previous letters to ITD (most recent being January 16, 2016), we reference a brake study by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration ("NHTSA") dated October 2010. This study illustrates the effects of driver reaction times to obscured unforeseen obstacles on highways with poor sight lines like Highway 12. Drivers have difficulty anticipating obstacles in roadway if they cannot see them. The NHTSA report and other studies show that stopping distances for commercial trucks range from 500 feet to 600 feet at 60 mph. The poor sight lines and corners on Highway 12 will not allow larger loads to stop in time to avoid unforeseen obstacles in roadway.

We have also documented in previous letters to ITD that not all brake positions are the same. A study by Commercial Vehicle
Safety Alliance ("CVSA") tested differences in stopping distances when tractor brakes were degraded by 20% versus a 20% degradation of trailer brakes. The increased stopping distance more than doubled when tractor brakes degraded over trailer brakes degraded. Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 121 (Brake Standard) is based on tractor's having to do majority of braking in panic stopping situations. Article in July 2013 Heavy Duty Trucking magazine states "in panic situations, which the 60-mph requirement FMVSS 121 simulate, vehicle weight shifts forward, putting more load on tractor brakes". So the problem with most 129K configurations is overall weight is being increased but no additional braking is being done by the tractor. The physics in this situation is straight forward. If the mass is increased, the amount of force \(F = \frac{mv^2}{2}\) takes to stop vehicle also increases. Unless tractor brakes are enhanced with higher performing disc brakes, 129K configurations will not stop as quickly as 109K or 80K configurations. This is a bad combination on dangerous roads like Highway 12.

On March 9, 2017 a KBC Transport truck hit a downed tree around milepost 97 on Highway 12. The driver came around a sharp corner and was unable to stop in time to avoid a 24 inch diameter tree across the highway. The driver had to make a choice either go into the river or hit the ditch. This all happened with a 53 foot chip trailer loaded with shavings having a gross weight of 63,000 pounds.

The driver chose the ditch and ducked across the seat as the tree smashed top of cab and exhaust stack. The driver rode back into town with snow plow and they had to cut two trees out of road to make it back to Kooskia. KBC driver then jumped in with wrecker and they had to cut 3 trees out of road to make it back to truck and 3 more trees on the way back to town. This all happened between 2am and 4am in the morning during a bad storm, but it is not unusual to have downed trees across the road. The stretch of highway from milepost 86 to milepost 174 is remote section of
highway that has very difficult weather conditions. If this was fuel truck carrying a 129K load, it would have resulted in a major fuel spill.

I believe 129K loads can be hauled safely, but I do not believe roads like Highway 12 are safe for these loads. The combination of poor sightlines and unstable hillsides just make this too dangerous road for 129K loads.

---

I am firmly opposed to enlarging trucks & loads on the scenic, dangerous highway.

---

I would respectfully request that the IDT **NOT** allow for increased heavy truck load limits on Highway 12. I have seen so many bad accidents over the years on this road, and so many of them seem to involve large trucks. Since speed enforcement appears infrequent at best (through no fault of the police - just due to budget limitations and many other priorities), one mechanism for improving the dismal safety stats on this road, would be to ensure there are not more trucks carrying even heavier loads. Please consider this input - I’d be grateful as would my family.

---

Between Lewiston and the Montana line, Highway 12 is a beautiful drive, but a dangerous, curvy road, and mostly just enough room for traffic to flow both ways.

The experimental oversize truckloads caused a lot of expence and annoyance for the oil companies and the public. What makes the ITD think that bigger, longer trucks wouldn't cause more expence, annoyance, and the possibility of damage to the environment and quite possibly an increase of deaths? The possibility of making more money will not outweigh the danger the oil companies and the public would face.
I am opposed to increasing the load limit on Route 12 along the Lochsa River. This is a very dangerous route for normal-sized semi trucks, much less for longer rigs. Please do not allow heavier trucks on this Wild and Scenic route along the river.

COMMENT AGAINST ALLOWING 129,000-POUND TRUCKS/LOADS ON U.S. HIGHWAY 12 IN IDAHO:

Approval of increasing load limits on U.S. Highway 12 from 105,500 pounds to 129,000 pounds would decrease public safety, increase truck-involved accidents and fatalities, and damage North Central Idaho's recreation and tourism economy. Approval should NOT be granted.

According to ITD's mission, “providing the safest transportation system possible” is ITD’s number-one goal. Among ITD’s measurements of safety are “reduction in fatalities” and “reduction in serious injuries.” According to ITD crash data, commercial vehicle fatal crashes in Idaho from 2011-2014, increased 22%, and 2014-2015, 36.4%. Should ITD be expanding truck weights and resulting lengths on U.S. Highway 12 that will almost surely further increase crashes, rather than increase safety? Clearly not. Doing so would exhibit a disregard for all-vehicles' driver and passenger safety on U.S. 12. ITD could not publicly nor legally justify such disregard.

Idaho Governor Butch Otter, in reference to designating other short highway segments in Idaho as 129,000-pound routes, said: “Safety must be the highest priority, addressing necessary and prudent restrictions on use of designated routes.”

ITD has wisely posted a warning sign, downriver from my home, at approximately Milepost 75.5 on U.S. 12: “Winding Road Next 99 Miles.” I've driven the full 174-mile Lewiston-to-Lolo-Pass route
many many times, and can solidly say that almost the entire route is “winding.” ITD can not now ignore the already existing and acknowledged U.S.12 safety risks of which “Winding Road” warns.

Idaho State Senator Shawn Keough, in reference to Grangeville-to-Kooskia State Highway 13’s possibly becoming a 129,000-pound route, said: “Undoubtedly, allowing 129 GVW (gross vehicle weight) trucks on this route will mean more accidents, more injuries and more deaths. This type of increased suffering seems needless, and I direct conflict to the Legislature’s codified concerns about safety, the governor’s writing concerns about safety, and ITD’s own rules and procedures that place a priority on safety.” Like U.S. 12, State Highway 13 is a “winding road.”

This morning I drove down my driveway along the Middle Fork Clearwater River to enter U.S. Highway 12. At the bottom, I waited about 20 feet up the drive for a west-bound normal-size semi-truck to round the long curve immediately upriver of my driveway. I waited those 20 feet up because I’ve grown accustomed to having semis round that curve fast, too fast, so that one once ran into the ditch for about 100 yards before crumbling the paved entry to my drive, careening into the left lane before being able to cross back into its lane on yet another curve and continuing on (one tire missing) to Lewiston, where it was halted (thanks to my phone call) by police. Had I or one of my neighbors, friends or welcome tourists been approaching from the west, he or she would have been struck, likely killed, by that semi-truck. And that’s not the first time a regular-size semi has swung off-road across my driveway along U.S. 12! This morning, the semi driver swung across the yellow center line to avoid heading into the ditch and my drive. His avoidance driving isn’t unusual. Semi-trucks crossing the yellow line on curvy Highway 12 is common.

That Has the State’s Highest Fatality Accident Rate.” With no exaggeration, Idaho State policeman Lt. Mark Peterson, in reference to U.S. 12’s having no room for driver error, said, “You either have a cliff or the river. You don’t have room to make mistakes.”

Since the mid-sixties, when I came to north central Idaho, I’ve seen or heard about lots of regular-size semi-truck loads landing in the river - lumber, pigs, oil, trucks themselves, etcetera. Four Middle Fork neighbors and other friends on other stretches of U.S. 12 have been killed in semi-truck/car accidents. I drive U.S. 12 almost every day, as does my husband, my daughter and son-in-law and two grandchildren. My second daughter, son-in-law and three grandchildren frequently drive U.S. 12 upriver from Lewiston for camping, hiking, and such. Dozens of my friends and neighbors drive U.S. 12 several times a week if not daily. Because of the curves, narrow highway in much of U.S. 12’s distance, rock bluffs, narrow-to-no shoulders, and most of all semi-trucks, I worry about all of these family members, friends, and neighbors. U.S. 12, by its very nature - plus regular-size semi-trucks - is already not safe. Adding 129,000-pound vehicles will surely increase the highway’s danger.

Even though Doug Andrus Distributing is a private business and the Port of Lewiston’s barging numbers have trended steeply downward for at least two decades, the truck industry’s current request to ITD to have U.S. 12 designated as a 129,000-pound-truck highway says:

“This is a key stretch of highway that will allow Doug Andrus Distributing to better serve the Idaho Transportation Department in delivering road salt to different maintenance sheds. Increasing weights from 105,500 to 129,000 will be a massive boost to the efficiency of road salt transportation, allowing Doug Andrus and other competitors help ITD lower the cost of transportation in the future. Also, Lewiston is a major hub in the shipment of sea going goods. The waterways coming into Lewiston from the ocean make it an ideal location for shipping and receiving many commodities. Getting these commodities to and from Lewiston in
an efficient manner has a major impact on the viability of the port. Increasing the allowable weights on U.S. 12 will help keep Lewiston competitive as a shipping location.”

In reference to the above industry statements, I say:

Delivery of road salt (on behalf of one private business or more than one) is NO VALID REASON to further endanger public safety on U.S. 12.

“Major hub,” referring to the Port of Lewiston, is BLATANTLY FALSE. The US Corps of Engineers categorizes the Lower Snake River waterway as “of negligible use” - that includes Port of Lewiston. A look at the POL’s shipping numbers over the last couple decades quickly tells you why.

Finally, North Central Idaho’s economy must be considered. According to ITD’s mission, its second goal is to “Provide a mobility-focused transportation system that drives economic opportunity.” In North central Idaho, there is no “economic opportunity” based upon salt delivery. There is no “economic opportunity” based upon 129,000-pound trucks whizzing (or careening) by. There is, however, a thriving economy based upon tourism and recreation, thanks to the U.S. 12 Wild & Scenic designation, its Northwest Passage Scenic Byway designation, its Nez Perce National Historic Park designation, its Lewis & Clark Trail designation, its top-billed status as a superb motorcycle route, its being a segment of the Trans-continental Bicycle Route, its Lochsa Historical Ranger Station, its National Forest designations, its nearby Selway Bitterroot Wilderness designation, and its exceptional ability to lure recreationists of all sorts - cross country skiers, snowshoers, snowmobilers, 4-wheel enthusiasts, backcountry horsemen and horsewomen, fishers, hikers, birders, wildflower identifiers, swimmers, picnickers, rafters, whitewater and quiet water kayakers, campers, sightseers, photographers, and more. What a treasure the
U.S. 12 corridor now is! Damaging it by adding heavier, lengthier truck traffic makes NO sense nor cents.

Increased numbers and sizes of truckloads traveling U.S. 12 will damage North Central Idaho's (and the state's third largest) economic sector: tourism and recreation. U.S. 12's designations and its legendary wildness, beauty, and historical richness - draw in-state, national and international recreationists and tourists to North Central Idaho. Turning 129,000-pound truckloads loose on U.S. 12 will in effect industrialize U.S. 12 and make the route much less safe for non-bigrig drivers and, thereby, discourage recreationists and tourists from exploring North Central Idaho and endanger the lives of all travelers on U.S. 12.

The answer to the question of whether or not to allow 129,000-pound loads couldn't be more obvious: NO.

Comments re: U.S. 95

Specific Route: U.S. 95

Comments: It makes more sense to extend the 129,000 lb zone on US 95 to Lewiston instead of cutting it off at the Benewah-Latah County Line. The two primary beneficiaries of the higher weight limit will be businesses hauling to the Port of Lewiston and chip trucks hauling to Clearwater Paper. Neither of them will receive any benefit from the new weight limit if they can't haul to Lewiston.

I live two blocks East of HWY 95 in Moscow. I turn off a side street without a light onto 95 to get into town. I do not want to encounter heavier or longer trucks, it is already a compromising situation at times with all the wood-chip trucks we must deal with.

I am thinking these heavier trucks will probably be louder as they go by and will make more noise with their brakes also. The sound from
highway trucks in our neighborhood is quite loud already. There are a number of busy intersections in Moscow that HWY 95 encounters and the potential for a mishap or fatality would be greater with heavier trucks and our bikers, pedestrians and cars. These concerns far outweigh any possible road surface benefits.

Comments re: U.S. 12 and Idaho 13

I am opposed to granting the request of the trucking industry to increase the allowable weight to 129,000 pounds on both highways 12 and 13. I have a personal relationship with both highways. I've cycled both of them as well as driven, of course. Also my parents' memorial (their only memorial) is on 12 near Weir Creek.

1. Increased weight means longer units, trucks plus pups. This length is particularly dangerous on curves. Curves are the most attractive and dangerous feature of both roads.

2. Increased load capacity makes trucking cheaper so truck traffic would be increased.

3. Increased truck traffic and longer trucks would result in more accidents.

   a. Fatal Idaho crashes have increased a lot, nearly doubled: 5.7% to 13.1% from 2014 to 15.
   b. Commercial vehicle fatal crashes have increased from 22% to 36% from 2014 to 15.

4. Highway 12 has Idaho's highest fatal accident rate. Do you want to increase this rate in the name of commercial trucking?

5. Motorists, motorcyclists, and bicyclists are at greater risk of death and injury with increased weights, lengths, and traffic. You should go hang out some summer day at any of the pleasant turnouts along the
Locsha and count the lines of motorcyclists, especially. But there are always bicyclists as well.

I humbly drive an old Subaru Legacy. Does a truck have more right to use 12 than I do? Is his reason for being there better than mine?

6. Increased danger of fatalities and injuries will damage Idaho’s vital economic sector of tourism and recreation. Highway 12 has a list of designations based on its beauty that is exceptional. People searching for a natural and peaceful and slow and gorgeous route are drawn to 12. And 13 as well. Increasing weight and length and amount of trucks will discourage people from coming to north Idaho and damage local economies.

Don’t kill a number of families and motorcyclists and bicyclists and say, "sorry, but that’s business."

7. The Lochsa river is specially clean and bigger and more trucks mean more accidents and that means mean more spills.

Highway 12 runs through sacred country for me; you don’t have to be Nez Perce to revere the living Earth in the Lochsa area.

Living but violated. Living but under attack. Living but with less and less each day. Living but more and more precious as other remnants and islands of biodiversity and beauty die. Beauty is a value in itself and must be protected. Biodiversity is the foundation of life.

Every move ITD makes trying to make highway 12 (and 13) industrial routes to serve commercial interests is a move in the wrong direction, fouling and harming where we came from and what we must cherish and protect and remain connected to. Commerce isn’t the highest value a developed society has. Health is more important.

Do the right thing. Deny this request.
Comments re: Idaho 8

My family has owned a home on the east edge of Deary for over 50 years. There has been a steady increase of traffic on Hwy 8 over that time.

Trucks are a large part of it. My dad was a logger and a truck driver. I have nothing against truck drivers. But it seems they have gotten more less considerate over the years. They are the biggest, noisiest rigs on the road. Every small and large town has a sign or two posted at city limits “No Compression Brakes” but they are ignored more often than not. The highway has gotten so noisy that I have to stop conversations when a trucker rides his brakes past my house and diesel fumes stink up the air.

If the Canadian company re-opens the Simplot Clay pit out of Bovill we don’t know what kind of hauling on Hwy 8 that will entail. So, yes I am concerned when the state talks about allowing bigger rigs to haul on N. Idaho hiways.

Our highways are narrow and curvy w/few passing lanes and treacherous weather conditions sometimes.

I think it’s a terrible idea to allow bigger trucks to go through our towns.

As I look at the hiways today esp. # (highway number left out of comment) and #8 I can’t help but believe that 105,500 is too heavy for our roads much less adding to that – the ruts on #3 are actually dangerous especially when it rains. Doesn’t seem like extra axles do any good.

Comments re: Idaho 3

Don’t think large trucks should come up hwy 3.
Comments re: Use of Salt

I am concerned salt being used on roads is causing pavement damage. Also it is causing more wiring damage than mag chloride. Also causing structural damage to steel frames and components.

Verbal Comments

My concerns with the 129,000 gross vehicle weight is not only the length but I know they have to meet off-track but when you start pulling that much weight, it creates an unsafe pulling behind you, especially with that many corners and the height of their loads and especially with the dangerous river conditions.

On a daily basis, you run across trees across the road, big boulders and rocks, elk and deer in a plethora, more than a lot of other roads that I've been on. And like I said, I get -- on a daily basis, you see, if not one but all of these things combined and when you pack in 129,000 pounds, your stopping distance and your safety of getting stopped for these increases for things that can happen, some hazards, you know, losing your load, getting out of control, especially when you're pulling doubles is to rather packing your weight like they do on a set of -- like a 53-foot trailer.

And then the winter conditions, there's a lot of slides. There is sometimes several feet of snow on the road and that makes it difficult for a truck that's pulling 129,000 pounds. And to me, it just creates another safety issue of the drivers that are able to pack -- not saying it can't be done but a lot of times, these outfits that are looking to do this aren't hiring completely ones that are used to packing that much weight so they bump up to it and there's a difference in how you handle it.

If somebody hasn't pulled that much weight before, it's a lot different than anything that you've ever pulled and it doesn't seem like a lot but 28,000 pounds or so of difference is a lot of weight.
And as I said, I'm not so much concerned about the road surface. I understand that that probably could be even an improvement with the more axles. But to me, it's the lesser of the evil than, you know, pulling that much weight in my opinion.

But just one thing I wanted to throw at them is somebody that's - like I said, I've got a million and a half miles logged up there and I do it every day, 365 days a year almost.

And I go to Missoula every day and you see a lot on that road and I've done it for right at 15 years now. And to see starting increasing this much weight to me creates a hazard and I see -- the reason I say that, when you see this configuration, I see tankers that come down the river all the time with fuel. And a lot of times, they're the ones that get out of control the most because they're pulling a four-axle pup. And with that many corners and the road conditions, if you go up there right now, you'll see the road conditions. It is ugly up there. Right now, there's big old potholes. There's big ruts in the road.

And that throws that trailer around like this and you start stacking that much weight like it does those tankers, I've seen dozens and dozens of them tanker wrecks and they're only packing 105. So you start stacking way more weight on them, it makes that pup a lot more squirrely.

And it likes to do this and to me, they're the ones -- especially going down the pass -- Lolo Pass is very windy and steep and they're the ones that -- their trailers want to pass them all the time because of that and if you start adding that much more weight back there, to me, it -- it increases that risk by quite a bit.

The other thing that I have -- I wonder about is I know that Idaho brought out -- and this is for their bridges is fine but what about the bridges in Montana on that stretch? I know that that's not our concern as an Idahoan but that's what we ran into just a couple weeks ago when they closed the bridge down at Lolo Hot Springs. They said it was unsafe to travel. They had to go in and shore it up and the road was shut down.
Now, if we start adding more weight to that, you know, I know it gets -
- Idaho gets out of sight and out of mind but for me that travels it
every day, that much more weight is going to tear them couple of
bridges that are in Montana down. If they don't fix them, we don't get
to run our route. So to me, that's a little bit more concern too.

Right now, they barely let us go across the bridge there at Lolo Hot
Springs as it is so if you bump up to 130,000 every day, is it just going
to tear that bridge apart and then we won't get to travel it.

So that was a concern of mine too. I'm like, okay, so I know our Idaho
bridges can handle that but the other concern is, you know, I know
right now we're using a lot of salt on the road up there. Using like a 70
percent salt mix. That's absolutely tearing the snot out of our road.

I mean I love it for the sense that, yeah, it keeps our road - the Idaho
pass has never been so good in all these years and I've drove it a lot of
years but there's a downfall to that. There's huge potholes. The road is
coming apart at the seams. You pack that much weight, it makes it that
much more challenging.

And what happens is too is then they get into Montana. Montana don't
keep their roads like that so what happens is that these drivers - I seen
it six times this year. They top over the top of Idaho just fine and they
start down Montana, there's been about six to seven truck wrecks. I just
came across one on Friday. Same way. The road was slicker than snot.
Montana didn't keep it up and they wreck.

You know, that's what happens. I can climb up Lolo Pass just fine and
I start down the Montana side and it's slicker than snot. And you don't
know that because they don't have any signs up there or nothing. Their
road crew is no where near as good as Idaho's. I mean I'll pat Idaho on
the back. They've done a phenomenal job of keeping our road clear.

But that's the other factor is that just on the Montana side, they're
going to have a lot more accidents with more weight and -- but the
other thing is have any of you guys made a trip to Missoula in the last
month?
I encourage you to drive up there from here to there. You'd be surprised at how much - my parents live in Montana. We own a construction outfit over there and, like I said, I drive over there on my time off, whatever. And as I was coming home last night, I was sideways in the road in my personal pickup I don't know how many times from hitting potholes. The potholes right now are deep and there's thousands of them.

And again, I fully understand that those axles will not have an effect on the road surface. What I'm saying is that road conditions now, their ability to maintain that machine on the road is increased. And that's what bothers me because I meet them on the road and I have been literally just about run off the road I don't know how many times by the tankers pulling these pups - this style of pup and they - they can't keep it in control because a lot of them are trying to avoid the potholes. A lot of them are trying to meet their off-track, things like that.

And then again, then you add into the element that - their imperfections of not being a good driver, perhaps speeding a little bit. But then you throw that much more weight at them, their ability to slow it down, get it stopped and get it under control is lessened by a lot and they're the ones that I'm meeting on the road. I don't want to get hit by them and that's what kind of concerns me. It concerns me quite a bit, actually.

So that's what concerned me too is when they do that, they're going to get more fuel capacity and I've been on six fuel spills up there so far in my time and it's - is that going to get worse? Hope not. I haul garbage that way so - mine is I don't want to put any garbage in the river.

But this - it comes from me, you know, and in my time of driving, I don't have a ticket or an accident on my driving record. I've never been so much as pulled out of the ditch up there so I know what it takes to maintain safety and it's a pretty good record that I'm proud of.

And for all the years that I've been driving to not have any mishaps or anything but - and like I said, I've hauled a lot of - 130 up to 250 to 300,000-pound loads. Rock crushers and stuff like that, you know, that
get pretty heavy and it takes a certain person to do it. It really does. Your objective thinking is to go slow, be careful and be proactive of what you're going to find up there. Like I said, every day, it changes. Every day, that road changes and I mean the elk that come up out of the river and fly right in front of you. You hit that elk, it sends you in another lane. You're trying to get it under control. It happened to me. I had an elk come up out of the river. I hit it. My hood flew up and I couldn't see where I was going and my headlights hit the ground to where you can't see plus your hood's blocking. It was raining. It's hard to get stopped.

I had a light load of shavings on. It was only, at that time, I had maybe 70,000-pound total load. Got stopped pretty quick but for a guy that's pulling that much weight, sometimes that don't happen and when I ended up getting stopped, I was right near the edge. I'm like I think of other people in that same scenario that that can happen to, you know.

---

I go to Kendrick at least once a month, often twice a month. And I go to Lewiston. I've been along Highway 3 numerous times in the last six weeks. It's horrible.

I know all about axle weight, tire weight, distribution of load. I understand it. I do not think this is going to mean fewer trucks. I think it's going to be just as many or more trucks and they will be heavier. And it's a real crying shame that the Legislature doesn't have the nerve to spend the money, to appropriate the money, to fix the roads. I am opposed to heavier trucks on Highway 3.
Idaho Transportation Board
129,000 Pound Truck Route Subcommittee

May 25, 2017

Idaho Transportation Board (ITB) 129,000 Pound Truck Route Subcommittee Chairman Jim Kempton called the meeting to order at 1:40 PM on Thursday, May 25, 2017. Chairman Kempton was in the District 5 Office in Pocatello, Idaho with ITB Member Dwight Horsch. ITB Member Jan Vassar participated via video conference from the District 2 Office in Lewiston, Idaho.

Principal Subcommittee staff members and advisors participating via video conference from either the Lewiston Office or ITD Headquarters in Boise included Deputy Attorney General Larry Allen, Chief Engineer Kimbol Allen, Freight Program Manager (FPM) Jeff Marker, Public Involvement Coordinator (PIC) Adam Rush, Bridge Engineer Dan Gorley, Permitting Supervisor Lance Green, District 2 Engineering Manager Doral Hoff, District 2 Port of Entry Supervisor Ron Morgan, Executive Assistant to the Board Sue Higgins, Highway Safety Manager (HSM) John Tomlinson, and Idaho State Police (ISP) Lieutenant Scott Hanson.

ITB Chairman Jerry Whitehead and Representative Caroline Nilsson Troy were also present at Headquarters and District 2, respectively.

April 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes. Member Horsch made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2017 meeting as distributed. Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Chairman Kempton said that because the Subcommittee is comprised of three members, motions will not require a second. He also outlined the Subcommittee’s options, including holding an application for additional information or recommending the full Board reject or approve it.

Opening Remarks on District 2 Route Requests. Chief Engineer Allen asked FPM Marker to present the applications and analyses, as he just returned to the office after an extended vacation.

FPM Marker addressed some general concerns raised by the public. A number of comments objected to “longer” trucks. FPM Marker emphasized that the commercial vehicles operating up to 129,000 pounds are not longer. The maximum truck length, which must meet the off-track requirements, is the same as those commercial vehicles already authorized to operate on the routes. Regarding concerns with the braking capabilities of trucks up to 129,000 pounds, he referenced the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration rules. Trucks must comply with these rules. He added that three of the routes under consideration today, US-95, SH-3, and SH-8 don’t present concerns with stopping distance. He admitted that there are some locations on US-12 where the sight distance is a concern. In the 5-year crash data evaluation, there were no crashes where braking distance exceeding sight distance was a causal or contributing factor.
Case #201623: US-95, Milepost (MP) 311.92 to 371.69. FPM Marker said the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) confirmed that this section of US-95 from Lewiston north to the Latah/Benewah County line 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 16 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 condition ranges from very poor to good condition. Just over 5 miles are rated as deficient. A list of projects planned to address the pavement condition were presented. There are no major safety concerns and the Chief Engineer’s analysis recommends approving the route.

Table 1 – US-95 Roadway Condition (Lewiston to District 1 – District 2 Boundary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Milepost From</th>
<th>Milepost To</th>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Deficient (yes/no)</th>
<th>Condition State</th>
<th>Deficient Reason (Cracking, Ride, Rut)</th>
<th>Cracking Index</th>
<th>Roughness Index</th>
<th>Rut Avg (in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>311.920</td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>319.880</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317.410</td>
<td>319.880</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.190</td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.190</td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>326.567</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323.360</td>
<td>326.567</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326.617</td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326.617</td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337.668</td>
<td>338.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338.500</td>
<td>339.300</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>339.300</td>
<td>342.200</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342.200</td>
<td>342.943</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342.943</td>
<td>343.601</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343.601</td>
<td>344.026</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.026</td>
<td>344.767</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.767</td>
<td>344.885</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344.885</td>
<td>345.171</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.171</td>
<td>345.560</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.560</td>
<td>345.575</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.575</td>
<td>345.947</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345.947</td>
<td>346.364</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>346.604</td>
<td>349.800</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>349.800</td>
<td>350.900</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350.900</td>
<td>352.130</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>352.130</td>
<td>354.655</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354.655</td>
<td>355.905</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355.905</td>
<td>356.538</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>356.538</td>
<td>357.100</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>357.100</td>
<td>359.400</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIC Rush summarized the public comment process. Three public hearings were held in District 2. A total of 54 comments were received. Some comments were general in nature, but the majority was on US-12.

In response to Member Vassar’s question, FPM Marker confirmed that if the Board approves this route request, that would designate US-95 from Lewiston north to the Canadian border as a 129,000 pound truck route.

Member Vassar made a motion to recommend that the Transportation Board approve the 129,000 pound truck route request for US-95, milepost 311.92 to 371.69. The motion passed unanimously.

Case #201627: US-12, MP 10.13 to 174.41. FPM Marker said DMV confirmed that US-12 from MP 10.13 to 14.87 is designated as a red route, allowing 115-foot overall vehicle length and a 6.5-foot off-track, and the section from MP 14.87 to 174.41 is designated as a blue route where trucks must adhere to the 5.5-foot off-track and 95-foot overall vehicle length criteria. The bridge analysis determined that the 32 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 generally in good to poor condition. There are nine projects planned to address the US-12 pavement condition.

Regarding safety, FPM Marker reported that there were a total of 716 crashes in the past five years and 41 of those crashes involved tractor trailers. The crashes were generally due to inattention, speed too fast for conditions, and failure to maintain the lane. There was one fatality with a tractor trailer due to the commercial vehicle crossing the center line. Additionally, a five-year accident data analysis that also included 3-axle trucks indicated that there were 52 accidents. Of those, 32 were due to the commercial vehicles’ failure to negotiate the turn. Speed too fast for conditions was also a contributing factor in nine of those 32 crashes. West-bound traffic was responsible for 28 of those 32 crashes and almost all of them were on the highway between Kamiah and the Montana border.

Based on the Chief Engineer’s analysis, FPM Marker recommends forwarding the application to the full board with a recommendation to approve the route request.

PIC Rush reported that all 38 comments submitted specifically on US-12 opposed the 129,000 pound truck route designation. There was also one comment submitted on US-12 and SH-13 that opposed the designation.
Table 3 – US-12 Roadway Condition (Lewiston to Montana Border)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Milepost From</th>
<th>Milepost To</th>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Deficient (yes/no)</th>
<th>Condition Status</th>
<th>Deficient Reason (Cracking, Roughness, Rut)</th>
<th>Cracking Index</th>
<th>Roughness Index</th>
<th>Rut Avg (in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-12</td>
<td>10.130</td>
<td>10.430</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.430</td>
<td>14.901</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.901</td>
<td>15.780</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.780</td>
<td>20.200</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.200</td>
<td>20.500</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.500</td>
<td>21.140</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.140</td>
<td>23.440</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.440</td>
<td>23.940</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.940</td>
<td>26.290</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.290</td>
<td>26.671</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.671</td>
<td>26.938</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.938</td>
<td>27.462</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.462</td>
<td>30.610</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.610</td>
<td>31.550</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.550</td>
<td>33.830</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.830</td>
<td>34.700</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.700</td>
<td>34.959</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CI and RI</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.004</td>
<td>38.133</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.133</td>
<td>38.400</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.400</td>
<td>39.730</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.730</td>
<td>43.300</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.300</td>
<td>43.963</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.963</td>
<td>44.200</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Vassar noted that the route request is controversial. Although the safety analysis indicates that sight distance hasn’t been a factor, she expressed concern with the heavy recreation traffic and motorcyclists on the route.

HSM Tomlinson concurred that the route is popular for recreationists.

Lt. Hanson said the narrow shoulder or lack of shoulder along most of US-12 is a concern. Insufficient shoulders can lead to crashes because there is no place for the motorist to go, and there are stretches along that route where officers cannot pull motorists over because there are no shoulders. He expressed some concerns with designating this route for vehicle combinations up to 129,000 pounds and would appreciate further discussions.

Chairman Kempton provided some history on US-12 and its intent to help promote commerce. He mentioned that the Tribe has concerns with the use of the highway and he acknowledged that the route can be difficult to traverse because of the mountainous terrain and adverse weather conditions. He has driven the route several times and encountered a number of motorcyclists, recreationists, and wildlife. He also acknowledged the lack of enforcement, and questioned the use of cameras to help with enforcement and the need for a port of entry along the route.
route. He believes more discussions should be held on the route before the Subcommittee makes a recommendation to the Board.

Member Horsch said he is conflicted on this request. Because 105,500 pound vehicles operate on US-12, he believes 129,000 pound vehicles should be able to because theoretically, the commercial vehicles that haul at the higher weight limit have better braking capabilities. With no shoulders along the route, if a truck has to cross the center line, it probably doesn’t make any difference if the truck is hauling 80,000 pounds or 129,000 pounds. He also supports holding this request for further information and discussion, specifically ways to enhance safety.

Member Horsch made a motion to hold the US-12, MP 10.13 to 174.41 route request for additional information. The additional information should include, but is not limited to, ways to address safety through engineering, permitting, and ports of entry. The motion passed unopposed.

Case #201625: SH-3, MP 0.0 to 29.00 and Case #201636: SH-8, MP 26.32 to 36.68. Chairman Kempton noted that the SH-3 and SH-8 routes connect to US-12. Until action is taken on US-12, he does not believe the Subcommittee should consider these two applications.

Member Vassar made a motion to hold the route requests for SH-3, MP 0.0 to 29.00 and SH-8, MP 26.32 to 36.68. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:
SUE S. HIGGINS
Executive Assistant & Secretary
Idaho Transportation Board
POST MEETING NOTE:
Although the speed limits along US-12 were not specifically discussed at the meeting, they are being included below as additional information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>15.226</td>
<td>Jct US-95</td>
<td>0.25 mi E of SH-3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.226</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>0.25 mi E of SH-3</td>
<td>1.5 mi E of Nez Perce County</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>1.5 mi E of Nez Perce County</td>
<td>East Jct SH-7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Orofino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>65.53</td>
<td>East Jct SH-7</td>
<td>W of Kamiah</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.53</td>
<td>65.871</td>
<td>W of Kamiah</td>
<td>Kamiah</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kamiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.871</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>Kamiah</td>
<td>0.25 mi E of Clearwater Bridge</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kamiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>0.25 mi E of Clearwater Bridge</td>
<td>West Swinging Wood Bridge</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>90.35</td>
<td>West Swinging Wood Bridge</td>
<td>Syringa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Syringa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.35</td>
<td>96.63</td>
<td>Syringa</td>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.63</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>174.415</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Montana State Line</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2: US-95, Milepost (MP) 311.92 to 371.69; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer and ITD Staff received the application and reviewed the proposed route by conducting an engineering and safety analyses of the route; 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 54 total comments were received with nine affecting the requested route; five opposed to 129,000 pound trucking in general, one recommending and supporting 129,000 pound trucking on US-95 from Lewiston to the Canadian border and one opposing the specific route; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer’s representative presented the Chief Engineer’s analysis to the Board Subcommittee on 129,000 Pound Truck Routes at its meeting on May 25, 2017 with a recommendation to approve the route; and

WHEREAS, after the Board Subcommittee reviewed the Chief Engineer’s analysis and public comments, it passed a motion to recommend approval of 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 June 22, 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the Chief Engineer’s analysis and recommendation on the US-95 route, MP 311.92 to 371.69 and the recommendation of approval from the Board Subcommittee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs the Chief Engineer to issue a Letter of Determination that approves the referenced route request in District 2.
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Subject
Toward Zero Deaths Award

Key Number  District  Route Number

Background Information
Valley County and the Sheriff's Office will be honored for having zero fatalities on their roadways in 2016. Idaho State Police will also be recognized for their efforts to keep the roads safe in District 3. This is the second year in a row with zero fatalities in Valley County. Valley County joins Oneida County as the only two counties with zero fatalities in 2016.

Recommendations

For information.

Board Action
□ Approved  □ Deferred
□ Other
Subject
Learfield Sports Partnership

Background Information
Brent Moore will discuss the partnership between Learfield Sports and the Office of Highway Safety. Last year, the partnership included spots at all football and basketball games at Boise State, University of Idaho and Idaho State University. The crowd was given a multiple choice question, and they texted what they thought was the correct answer. Then, participants were sent to the OHS social media sites to learn more about highway safety. The partnership will continue next year, and Moore will discuss what the future looks like.

Recommendations
For information.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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<tr>
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**Background Information**

Each year the Office of Highway Safety must submit a Highway Safety Plan to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. OHS is seeking Board approval of the FFY 18 HSP, and if approved, will be sent to the Region 10 NHTSA office for review and approval.

**Recommendations**

Approve Highway Safety Plan for FFY 2018. Resolution on page 79

**Board Action**

- □ Approved  
- □ Deferred  
- □ Other
WHEREAS, Idaho experienced 24,018 reportable traffic crashes, 216 traffic deaths, and 13,207 people injured in 2015; and

WHEREAS, the economic cost of traffic crashes in Idaho for 2015 was nearly $3.8 billion; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department's goal is to have zero traffic deaths; and

WHEREAS, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) may allocate about $3.8 million in funding behavior safety programs for Idaho to reduce traffic deaths and serious injuries; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission and the Office of Highway Safety have developed the Highway Safety Plan for Federal Fiscal Year 2018 to work toward the elimination of Idaho traffic deaths, serious injuries, and economic losses; and

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety Plan is required by NHTSA in order to receive funding from NHTSA.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board adopts the Highway Safety Plan for Federal Fiscal Year 18, which is on file in the Office of Highway Safety.
### Background Information

The purpose is to introduce the Board to ITD's proposed Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. The format will be an approximate 40-minute presentation, plus 20 minutes for questions and discussion. The presentation will outline the principles and proposed approach to ERM, the roles of the Board, SLT, and ITD employees, and proposed timeline for implementation.

### Recommendations

Information only

### Board Action

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

---
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Idaho Transportation Department
Update to the Board:
Enterprise Risk Management at ITD

June 22, 2017

TOPICS

- What is Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)?
- What will ERM Look Like at ITD?
- Why ERM?
- The road to implementation, what are the steps?
- Where are we at now and who is involved in ERM at ITD?
- Next Steps
- Closing - Comments
What is Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)?

- ERM is a risk management process that spans across the entire organization

- We can look ahead at potential future events where we might not know the outcome, and then try to anticipate and respond to the related uncertainties and risk

- We can implement responses to help improve the outcome from the risk (reduce threats or enhance opportunities)

Commonly used terms and definitions

- **Risk Management Framework**: Set of components that provide the foundations and organizational arrangements for designing, implementing, monitoring, reviewing, and continually improving risk management throughout the organization

- **Risk**: Effect of uncertainty on objectives. Can manifest as a “threat” (potential loss) or “opportunity” (potential gain). Risks can be described qualitatively or quantitatively.

- **Risk Identification**: Process of finding, recognizing, and describing risks

- **Likelihood**: Chance of a risk occurring

- **Impact**: Result or effect a risk has on objectives. Some risks can lead to multiple types of impacts (e.g., financial, reputational, safety).
What is Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)?

Commonly used terms and definitions

- **Risk Assessment**: Overall process of risk identification, risk analysis and risk evaluation resulting in determining the level of risk
- **Risk Register**: Tool used to document and track risks, action items and progress.
- **Risk Tolerance**: The broad-based amount of risk an organization is willing to accept in pursuit of its mission (or vision)
- **Risk Response**: Development of a plan to modify the likelihood of a risk occurring, or manage the impact of the risk if it should occur
- **Residual Risk**: Risk remaining after risk response

What will ERM Look Like at ITD?

- We will have a baseline Risk Register that will serve as the foundation to guide us in the ERM process
- We will continue to build on this foundation as our ERM maturity level progresses
- We will have a process where new risks and updates can be made to the Risk Register
- We will have established metrics to measure our progress and success
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Initials: 
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Subject

Agreement for Northgate (Siphon) Interchange

Key Number: 20314
District: 5
Route Number: I 15 @ MP 73.6

Background Information

The purpose of this Board item is to request Board authorization to proceed with the public private partnership agreement for construction of the Northgate (Siphon) interchange and connecting road infrastructure.

The partnership consists of Millennial Development, City of Chubbuck, City of Pocatello, Bannock County, Pocatello Development Authority and Idaho Transportation Department. In general the terms of the agreement consist of ITD constructing the interchange portion of the project and the other partners constructing connecting road infrastructure. ITD and Millennial Developers will share costs of the interchange construction, and the other partners will share costs of the connecting road infrastructure. ITD's share is capped at $5 million.

Recommendations

Approve the resolution on page 185.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board supports the ITD mission of safety, mobility, and economic opportunity; and

WHEREAS, in that context the Idaho Transportation Department has been invited to become part of a public private partnership to construct a new interchange on Interstate 15 at Siphon Road; and

WHEREAS, the Board, at the March 16, 2017 Board meeting expressed support for the partnership; and requested clarifications and revisions to the partnership agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Board, at the May 18, 2017 Board meeting and the May 31 Special Board meeting expressed support for the partnership and requested clarifications and revisions to the partnership agreement; and

WHEREAS, the partners have made the requested revisions and clarifications; and

WHEREAS, ITD legal counsel has reviewed the agreement.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board authorizes ITD participation in the partnership agreement, capped at $5 million and contingent upon successful completion of connecting infrastructure and other concerns.
### Board Agenda Item
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**Consent Item**:  
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
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#### Subject

**Annual Update of Safety Rest Areas and Oasis Partnerships**

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

#### Background Information

In accordance with Board Policy 4044, attached is the annual update of the Safety Rest Area chart and map.

For 2017, the chart was updated to reflect the current (2016) Average Daily Traffic count data. All rest area facilities currently meet requirements in the first section. The second section reflects all rest area facilities that were identified as needing Rehabilitation/Expansion or Reconstruction, depending upon the assessment of the facility. District 5 has requested the Blackfoot Rest Areas be designated for possible closure and deletion, pending the development of an Oasis Public/Private Partnership on I-15 at Exit 113. All other rest areas listed in this second section would be future projects, and are not currently programmed. The third section reflects the addition of the potential Oasis Partnership Rest Area on I-15.

The chart also reflects rest area projects and partnership agreements available to travelers.

The attached resolution is to approve changes to the Safety Rest Area chart and map and direct District 5 to pursue negotiations for an Oasis Partnership Rest Area on I-15 at Exit 113.

#### Recommendations

Approve resolution 

#### Board Action

- [ ] Approved  
- [ ] Deferred  
- [ ] Other  
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SAFETY REST AREAS AND OASIS PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

BASIC PLUS – a public roadside facility that is located in areas directly accessible to low to medium volume State or US highways. A Basic Plus Safety Rest Area will provide the basic human needs to the traveling public plus furnish other amenities such as potable water, flush toilets, and picnic tables.

DELUXE – a public roadside facility that is located in areas directly accessible to medium to high volume State, US, or Interstate highways. A Deluxe Safety Rest Area will include all of the amenities of a Basic Plus Safety Rest Area plus vending machines, designated pet areas and traveler information. The preferred design includes vestibules, where climatic conditions warrant, and at least one family-assist restroom to accommodate people with small children and those assisting others with disabilities.

GATEWAY – a public roadside facility that is located in areas directly accessible to medium or high volume State, US or Interstate highway and located near important regions of the state or tourist entrances into the state. A Gateway Safety Rest Area will include all of the amenities of a DELUXE Safety Rest Area plus adequate space for a staffed Visitor Information Center.

SAFETY REST AREA CLASSIFICATION

### Existing Safety Rest Area Meeting Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG FY</th>
<th>REST AREA TYPE</th>
<th>REST AREA LOCATION</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>RTE</th>
<th>APPROX. M.P.</th>
<th>HWY ADT 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Sheep Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Mineral Mountain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Blacks Creek EB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Blacks Creek WB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Snake River View</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Bliss EB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Bliss WB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Cotterell EB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Cotterell WB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Hagerman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>US-30</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Juniper NB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Juniper SB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Timmerman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>US-20</td>
<td>177/101</td>
<td>1,500/2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Big Lost River</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>US-20/26</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Clark Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>US-26</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Safety Rest Area

(Rehabilitation/Expansion or Proposed Reconstruction Upgrade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG FY</th>
<th>REST AREA TYPE</th>
<th>REST AREA LOCATION</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>RTE</th>
<th>APPROX. M.P.</th>
<th>HWY ADT 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Huetter WB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Huetter EB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Lenore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Jerome EB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-84</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Basic Plus</td>
<td>Malad Summit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>North Blackfoot NB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>North Blackfoot SB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Deluxe</td>
<td>Massacre Rocks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public/Private & Oasis Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG FY</th>
<th>PUBLIC/PRIVATE STOP LOCATION</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>RTE</th>
<th>APPROX. M.P.</th>
<th>HWY ADT 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Oasis Partnership at Flying J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-15B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck Stop at McCammon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Winchester Rest Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td><em>Oasis Partnership Rest Area</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partnership Rest Area/Visitor Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG FY</th>
<th>VISITOR CENTER LOCATION</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
<th>RTE</th>
<th>APPROX M.P.</th>
<th>HWY ADT 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Visitor Center at Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>City of Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US-95B</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Rest Area at Lost Trail Pass</td>
<td>Montana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>US-93</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Rest Area at Lolo Pass (Gateway)</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service/ MDOT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US-12</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MR – Indicates rest areas that currently meet requirements and are included in the normal cycle and schedule for rehabilitation or reconstruction program.

RE – Indicates rest area projects not currently programmed that may need Rehabilitation or Expansion in order to meet requirements based on facility assessments.

Delete – Facilities that will be removed from the program and replaced with an OASIS Partnership Agreement.
Idaho Transportation Department
Safety Rest Areas and Oasis Partnerships Planning map
March 2017

Existing Rest Areas
- Existing Gateway
- Existing Deluxe
- Existing Basic Plus
- Flying J Oasis Partnership
- Partnership Visitor Center at Bonners Ferry
- Winchester Partnership

Facility Name
- Facility scheduled to close contingent upon entering into an Oasis Agreement

Existing Gateway
Existing Deluxe
Existing Basic Plus
Flying J Oasis Partnership
Partnership Visitor Center at Bonners Ferry
Winchester Partnership

Facility scheduled to close contingent upon entering into an Oasis Agreement
RES. NO. WHEREAS, Safety Rest Areas are an integral part of the transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department is committed to providing safe, secure, and sanitary rest area facilities at strategic locations on the state highway system; and

WHEREAS, the truck stops at I-15 Exit 113 provide potential for an Oasis partnership that would increase services available to motorists services and save ITD maintenance costs;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the revisions to the Idaho Transportation Department Safety Rest Areas and Oasis Partnership Program chart and map updating the current status of all facilities and identifying future public/private partnerships; and

NOW BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board directs District 5 to pursue negotiations for an Oasis partnership with the truck stops at I-15 Exit 113 and evaluate closing the North Blackfoot rest areas.
Board Agenda Item

Subject
FY 2018 - 2021 Strategic Plan for Submission to the Division of Financial Management (DFM)

Background Information
Idaho Code 67-1901—67-1904 requires all state agencies to annually submit a Strategic Plan covering a minimum of four years forward to DFM by July 1st. The format, structure and required elements for the Strategic Plan are set by DFM inclusive of the following:

- Vision and/or Mission Statement
- Goals
- Objectives
- External Factors
- Performance Measures & Benchmarks

Additionally, Governor Otter recently issued Executive Order 2017-02. The order directed all agencies to adopt the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Cyber Security Framework as standard policy and to implement the first five Critical Security Controls specified by the Center for Internet Security (CIS). Further, the order specified that a progress report for implementing the CIS controls and NIST framework must be included in each agency’s annual Strategic Plan to DFM. Our progress report is included in this Plan.

Please note that several of the performance measures may be updated following your approval of the Plan if new data for May 2017 is received by June 30th, i.e., before the final submission of the Plan to DFM.

Recommendations
Staff is requesting Board members approve ITD's Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2021 for submission to DFM prior to July 1, 2017. Resolution on page 203 B.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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Idaho Transportation Department

FY 2018 - 2021 Strategic Plan

Mission and Vision

The “Mission” of the Idaho Transportation Department is:

Your Safety.
Your Mobility.
Your Economic Opportunity.

The Department’s “Vision” represents what we need to become to fulfill and exceed the expectations of the citizens of Idaho. This overriding vision is:

- Continually getting better with the goal of being the best transportation department in the country.
- Being transparent, accountable, and delivering on promises.
- Being more effective and saving costs through increased efficiencies.
- Providing remarkable customer service.
- Using partnerships effectively.
- Valuing teamwork and using it as a tool to improve.
- Placing a high value on employees and their development and retention.

Goals

To achieve its mission, the Idaho Transportation Department has set three primary goals:

- Commit to having the safest transportation system possible.
- Provide a mobility focused transportation system that drives economic opportunity.
- Become the best organization by continually developing employees and implementing innovative business practices.

Measurable Objectives

The Department has set measurable objectives for each of the primary goals as detailed below:

- Commit to having the safest transportation system possible.
  - Reduce Fatalities
- Provide a mobility focused transportation system that drives economic opportunity.
  - Maintain the Pavement in Good or Fair Condition
  - Maintain the Bridges in Good or Fair Condition
  - Keep Highways Clear of Snow and Ice During Winter Storms
- Become the best organization by continually developing employees and implementing innovative business practices.
  - Hold Administration and Planning Expenditures Constant
Complete Project Designs On Time  
Hold Construction Cost at Award to Programmed Budget  
Hold Final Construction Cost to Contract Award  
Reduce the Time to Process Vehicle Titles  
Increase DMV Transactions on the Internet

**Key External Factors**

**Political**
- A $320 million transportation funding package for Idaho passed into law in April 2017, the second major funding increase in three years. In 2015, transportation revenues for public roads were increased for the first time in nearly 20 years.
- The department continues to work within new federal funding via the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act, or FAST Act, signed into law in early December 2015. It expires in 2020, allowing ITD to more safely plan for the next five years in regards to federal revenues.

**Social & Economic**
- Idaho’s population — 1.6 million people — continues to grow at a healthy rate resulting in corresponding increases in demands on the transportation system. Vehicle miles traveled and vehicle registrations, as well as transit and non-motorized demands, are also increasing.
- Idaho’s lowest fatality numbers on the highway corresponded to the highest gas prices; lower gas prices equate to more drivers on the road and a spike in fatalities — 252 last year.

**Technological**
- Customers expect increased innovation in how services are delivered, including timeliness, accessibility, and reliability. The public anticipates dramatic changes in motor-vehicle technology. Policy provisions will be needed soon for automation in vehicles up to and including fully autonomous cars and trucks. A significant policy component will be regarding the manner in which autonomous vehicles address issues for motor-vehicle safety standards.
- Citizens demand greater safety for all modes of transportation, including bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.
- Finally, our current social climate demands attention to the security of the transportation system. Both physical security and technological security are of high priority as we contemplate our transportation decisions and investments.
### Update on Cybersecurity

This report seeks to provide an update on the five items that required ITD’s action in Executive Order 2017-02. These five items are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Order Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt and implement NIST Cybersecurity Framework</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement first five (5) CIS Critical Security Controls</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and submit employee education and training plans for mandatory cybersecurity training</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require all state employees complete annual cybersecurity training</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a link to statewide cybersecurity website on all public websites</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

The Department’s current key performance measures and benchmarks are detailed on the following pages.
Five Year Fatality Rate per 100 Million Vehicle Miles
Goal: Reduce the five-year fatality rate to 1.10 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled for the 2016-2020 period.

Why This Is Important
Even one death on Idaho's highways is one death too many. An estimated total of 1052 people lost their lives on Idaho roads between 2012 and 2016. Each death is a personal tragedy for the individual's family and friends, and has an enormous financial cost to the community. Every life counts.

How We Measure It
The measure is calculated by dividing the number of fatalities that occur over a five-year period by the number of vehicle miles traveled over the same five-year period. The five-year rate for 2012 to 2016 is 1.28 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. (Note: This rate is based on Idaho's estimate of vehicle miles traveled rather than the required Federal estimate which is not yet available.)

What We're Doing About It
The department advances programs to eliminate traffic deaths, serious injuries, and economic losses. These programs focus on engineering, education, enforcement and emergency response.

Cumulative Fatalities on Idaho Roads by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The cumulative fatalities for 2016 and 2017 currently represent "estimates" for the months and years.
Percent of Time Highways Clear of Snow/Ice During Winter Storms
Goal: Maintain at least 73% unimpeded mobility for the current winter season.

Why This Is Important
Idaho travelers need safe and reliable highways during winter storms. Preventing the accumulation of snow and ice or quickly removing it from highways increases safety, mobility, and improves commerce.

How We Measure It
Idaho’s 4,984 centerline miles of highways are broken down into 217 sections. Over 46% of these highway sections, including the most heavily traveled corridors, have automated roadway condition sensors and weather information stations located where travel is deemed to be highly impacted by winter storms—high elevation summits, steep grades, bridge overpasses, etc. This measure tracks the percent of time those highway sections with automated sensors and weather information stations are clear of ice and snow during winter storms.

What We’re Doing About It
ITD is using this data from the automated roadway condition sensors and weather information stations to continuously improve the effectiveness of its winter maintenance efforts across the state. The Department accomplishes this by customizing snowplowing practices and de-icing treatments for all sections of Idaho highways.

Percent of Time Highways Clear of Snow/Ice During Winter Storms
Target: Maintain at least 73% unimpeded mobility during winter storms.

Goal Cumulative Percent for the Winter Season

---

196
Percent of Pavement in Good or Fair Condition
Goal: Sustain 80% of all state highways in good or fair condition.

Why This Is Important
Pavement condition has an impact on the operating costs of passenger and commercial vehicles. Regularly scheduled preventive maintenance, preservation and reconstruction treatments extend the useful life of pavements in the State Highway System.

How We Measure It
Roughness and rutting are measured by driving a specially equipped rating van over the entire State Highway System during spring and summer. Cracking is measured in the summer and fall by a visual inspection and digital video recordings of the System. The collected data and the visual inspections are then used to rate pavement conditions as good, fair, poor or very poor.

What We’re Doing About It
ITD focuses on internal efficiencies to maximize investments in the system. Investment decisions are prioritized to keep highways in good or fair condition to avoid costly replacement. The department has implemented new management systems to strategically schedule preventative maintenance and preservation projects at the optimal time across the state.
Percent of Bridges in Good Condition
Goal: Maintain at least 80% of all bridges in the State Highway System in good condition.

Why This Is Important
Ensuring that Idaho’s bridges are in good condition protects transportation investments and lowers repair costs while maintaining connectivity and commerce. Commerce depends on the carrying capacity and reliability of roads and bridges.

How We Measure It
The measurement is the ratio of deck area (or plan dimension) of bridges in good condition to the deck area of the entire inventory of state bridges stated as a percentage.

What We’re Doing About It
Idaho strategically schedules preservation and restoration projects to improve deteriorating bridges across the state. Over time, increased investments will be needed to achieve this goal.

Percent of Bridges in Good Condition

Number of State Bridges 50 Years or Older
(reflects the planned bridge replacements in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program)
Percent of Highway Project Designs Completed On or Ahead of Time

Goal: Have 100% of the projects scheduled for construction in Federal Fiscal Year 2017 designed and ready to bid by the target date of September 30, 2016

Why This Is Important
Completing highway infrastructure projects on time for Idaho's state highway system is an important aspect of credibility and customer service for ITD. Project activities include the planning, designing, environmental documentation, permitting, and securing of right-of-way to make projects bid ready. Stakeholders depend on the department to deliver projects in the year they are scheduled in the Idaho Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

Projects for which designs are completed on time cost less and provide ITD and the construction industry adequate lead times. This allows flexibility to plan and schedule resources for the construction phases of the projects.

How We Measure It
The measure monitors the dates when highway infrastructure projects are determined to be ready to bid. Infrastructure projects include highway paving, guardrails, traffic signals, signs, bridge repair, etc.

What We're Doing About It
ITD holds managers accountable for delivering infrastructure projects on time. Each project in the ITIP requires a Project Charter to clearly define scope, schedule and budget while utilizing ITD's Project Scheduling system to track and report on project activities and resource availability. Project management training is also ongoing to reinforce best practices and principles.

Note
This measure includes only infrastructure projects on the State Highway System and the design completion target dates have been set to ensure construction starts on time.

% of Highway Project Designs Completed On or Ahead of Time
(Federal Fiscal Years)

Target on Due Date  % by Target Date  % at FFY End  % on 5/31/17  % with Add'l. Projects as of 5/31/17

* Percentages based on projects in the Idaho Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) for FFY 2014-2018.
** Percentages based on projects in the ITIP for FFY 2015-2019.
*** Percentages based on projects in the ITIP for FFY 2016-2020 plus additional projects completed for FFY 2016.
**** Percentages based on projects in the ITIP for FFY 2017-2021 plus additional projects completed for FFY 2017.
Final Construction Cost as a Percent of Contract Award

Goal: Maintain Final Cost at 95% to 105% of the Contract

Why This Is Important
Stakeholders and the public expect ITD to deliver highway projects that improve safety, enhance mobility and drive economic opportunity. This requires projects to be well designed and delivered within budget—as close to the contract award amount as possible. Projects delivered within budget allow ITD to efficiently invest limited funding and maximize benefits.

How We Measure It
ITD totals the construction costs for projects which have had the final payment made in the given calendar year (excluding any additional costs that may have been paid for contractually specified adjustments), totals the bid amounts for these projects at contract award, and then compares the adjusted construction costs to the bid amounts at contract award.

What We’re Doing About It
ITD uses a variety of techniques to limit cost increases due to factors within its control including enhanced risk assessment and management on complex projects, regular process reviews and improvement implementations, ongoing training of staff, and annual post-construction reviews.

Final Construction Cost as a Percent of Contract Award
(Note: Historical percentages are subject to change following the final resolution of post-project contract claims and disputes.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower Goal (95%)</th>
<th>Upper Goal (105%)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>105.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>107.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>109.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>106.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>112.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Cost at Award as a Percent of Budget
Goal: Maintain Cumulative Construction Cost at Award within 10% of Budget

Why This Is Important
Stakeholders and the public expect ITD to deliver all highway projects to construction that are programmed each year. This requires projects to be delivered within budget. Projects on which costs at contract award are as close as possible to the project programmed amount allows ITD to better invest limited funding and maximize benefits.

How We Measure It
ITD totals the construction costs of projects awarded in the fiscal year and compares them to the total construction budget programmed at the beginning of the fiscal year for the same projects. GARVEE projects are not included.

What We're Doing About It
ITD employs value engineering and practical design principles to ensure projects provide the benefits desired at the lowest practical cost. ITD closely monitors construction bids and price trends to keep construction estimates accurate. Collectively, these methods allow more projects to be provided at or under the programmed amount.

Construction Costs at Award as a Percent of Budget
Federal Fiscal Year

Note: GARVEE projects not included.

Cumulative Construction Costs at Award as a Percent of Budget
Note: No projects were awarded in October/November 2011 (FFY 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2013</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2014</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2015</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2016</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2017</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administration and Planning Expenditures ($000,000)

Goal: Maintain administrative and planning expenditures between $27 and $31 million dollars.

Why This Is Important
Keeping administration and planning costs as low as possible allows more money to be spent on critical functions such as highway and bridge projects. This allows the department to make strategic investments that maximize safety, mobility and economic opportunity.

How We Measure It
The expenditures reflect the total administration and planning costs reported to the Federal Highway Administration's SF-4 Report.

What We're Doing About It
ITD has realigned its organizational structure to lower administrative costs (already among the lowest of the surrounding states) and to further maximize its ability to invest in roads and bridges.

Expenditure Trends ($000,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>619.0</td>
<td>656.8</td>
<td>585.8</td>
<td>496.2</td>
<td>500.6</td>
<td>479.9</td>
<td>490.8</td>
<td>427.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Planning</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Days to Process Vehicle Titles
Goal: Maintain an average six-day processing cycle including transit time from county offices.

Why This Is Important
Customers need titles to be issued in a timely manner to legally conduct vehicle sales and trades or to use titles as collateral for loans. The average title turnaround time is also a measure of staff efficiency and productivity that helps managers determine the best use of limited resources.

How We Measure It
Annual cycle times are calculated by dividing the sum of monthly cycle averages by twelve.

What We’re Doing About It
DMV recognizes the direct customer component of their services. The division prioritizes staffing and provides training so applications are submitted quickly and correctly in minimal time.

Average Days to Process Titles

--Current Status--
Title Processing Time (in days), by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DMV Transactions Processed on the Internet (in thousands)


Why This Is Important
Online services provide the public an alternative method of payment for motor vehicle services such as licenses and permits. These services minimize staffing requirements and eliminate the need for motorists to travel and wait in line.

How We Measure It
This measure captures only transactions by direct DMV customers who purchase online services for licenses, permits and endorsements.

What We’re Doing About It
ITD is working to expand the ability of customers to obtain licenses and permits on-line, and will focus on getting the word out for these options through targeted communications.

---CURRENT STATUS---
Cumulative DMV Transactions Processed, by Month (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>133.7</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>170.4</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>210.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>172.6</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td>220.6</td>
<td>245.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>184.9</td>
<td>211.8</td>
<td>234.1</td>
<td>260.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>155.7</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>197.4</td>
<td>226.3</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>277.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>194.7</td>
<td>216.9</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>266.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>146.3</td>
<td>168.4</td>
<td>187.4</td>
<td>206.1</td>
<td>224.3</td>
<td>256.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, Idaho Code 67-1901—67-1904 requires all state agencies to annually submit a Strategic Plan covering a minimum of four years forward to the Division of Financial Management (DFM) by July 1st; and

WHEREAS, staff has prepared the Strategic Plan in the format and structure containing the required elements of; Vision and/or Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives, External Factors and Performance Measures & Benchmarks; and

WHEREAS, Executive Order 2017-02 was recently issued that directed all agencies to adopt the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Cyber Security Framework as standard policy and to implement the first five Critical Security Controls specified by the Center for Internet Security (CIS); and

WHEREAS, the order specified that a progress report for implementing the CIS controls and NIST framework must be included in each agency’s annual Strategic Plan to DFM; and

WHEREAS, ITD’s progress report is included in this Strategic Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board accepts the recommendation of staff and approves ITD’s Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2018-2021 for submission to Division of Financial Management prior to July 1, 2017.
WHEREAS, the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980 (1980 Act), as well as the commitments, compromises, and values underlying its enactment, recognized the importance of maintaining the airstrips existing at the time of enactment to provide necessary access for public use and enjoyment, and for administration and management of the fish and wildlife, and other resources within the wilderness; and

WHEREAS, the 1980 Act specifically recognized the importance of airstrips as a means of providing such access, and directed that the federal government:

“shall not permanently close or render unserviceable any aircraft landing strip in regular use on national forest lands on the date of enactment of this Act for reasons other than extreme danger to aircraft, and in any case not without the express written concurrence of the agency of the State of Idaho charged with evaluating the safety of backcountry airstrips;” and

WHEREAS, on several occasions since 1980, the U.S. Forest Service has acted to close or to render unserviceable certain airstrips within the scope of this provision, without recognizing the state's role or otherwise proceeding based on incorrect information; and

WHEREAS, U.S. Forest Service has sought to identify Dewey Moore, Mile Hi, Simonds and Vines airstrips as “emergency use” - ostensibly not for closure to non-emergency use, but to limit their use by pilots without suitable experience, skill, or equipment; but this identification has created confusion as to these airstrips' status; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Forest Service's “emergency use” identification apparently has been used, both to call for prosecution of pilots with suitable equipment, skill and experience using the airstrips for the access purposes for which they were intended, and to argue against the performance of maintenance to keep the airstrips serviceable; and

WHEREAS, while these and other backcountry airstrips may pose unique challenges for pilots, the Federal Aviation Administration and Idaho Division of Aeronautics have used designations or warnings for other wilderness and backcountry airstrips other than “emergency use” to give pilots such advice; and

WHEREAS, continued availability of these strips for use by fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft for public and state and local government use is required by the express terms and underlying compromises and commitments of the 1980 Act; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board's primary concern is to ensure safety by advising pilots of the unique challenges and skills necessary for using airstrips within the Frank Church Wilderness Area.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Idaho Transportation Board does not concur with the closure of the airstrips, known as Dewey Moore, Mile Hi, Simonds, and Vines, on national forest system lands in the Frank Church Wilderness, and expressly finds that they should remain open to aircraft, both fixed wing and rotary wing; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Idaho Transportation Board opposes the closure or rendering unserviceable any airstrips within the wilderness within the scope of Section 7 of the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980 (part of which is copied above); and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Idaho Transportation Board directs the Idaho Transportation Department to work with the U.S. Forest Service, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, the Idaho Department of Lands, county government, and private aviation users. The parties shall discuss ways to ensure maintenance of all airstrips within the Frank Church Wilderness so they are not rendered unserviceable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Idaho Transportation Board directs the Idaho Transportation Department to work with the Federal Aviation Administration and the U.S. Forest Service to determine an appropriate portrayal of these open airstrips on maps and navigational charts to advise pilots of the unique challenges and skills necessary for using airstrips within the Frank Church Wilderness Area.
Proposed Legislative Idea - 2018 Legislative Session

Background Information

The attached Legislative Idea provides a brief description and fiscal impact for the 2018 staff proposal, which is:

- Allow Electronic Credentials/CMV Permits

This Legislative Idea is being presented to the Idaho Transportation Board (Board) at this time as information only. This will allow time for staff to act on any Board input or to make any recommended revisions.

If the Board has any proposals they would like to have staff pursue, this is a timely opportunity to do so and incorporate them into the process.

Legislative Ideas must be submitted to the Division of Financial Management (DFM) by July 14, 2017, for their review and approval.

DFM approval of Legislative Ideas authorizes the Department's staff to proceed with the development of draft legislation. Draft legislation proposals will be presented to the Board for their review and approval in August and must be submitted to DFM by August 18, 2017.

Recommendations

None. Information only.

Board Action

☐ Approved ☐ Deferred ☐ Other
Brief description of legislation and how it will "solve the problem":

Currently, §49-1004, Idaho Code, requires overlegal permits to be in writing, carried in the vehicle and upon demand be delivered for inspection to any peace officer or authorized agent charged with the care and protection of highways.

Modifying Idaho Code to state that overlegal permits may be stored in an electronic form instead of a hard copy would create efficiencies for both the Department and customers. This will allow rules and business processes to be updated and streamlined to allow electronic permits and attachments to be delivered via email or text. Customers could then display permits on their electronic equipment such as a smart phone, tablet or laptop. This would be a choice that the customer makes when applying for an over legal permit.

This change eliminates the necessity of carrying paper hard copies and map routes; which are easy to lose or get worn out. It would also reduce requests for duplicates or replacements.

FISCAL IMPACT:

FISCAL IMPACT NARRATIVE:

Has Impact
LEVEL OF IMPACT:

This change has the potential to save the Department approximately $10k annually by reducing or eliminating printing of permits and attachments, as well as postage costs. It would also reduce staff's time having to reprint and mail out lost or damaged overlegal permits.

IF BILL FAILS:

FISCAL IMPACT: None
LEVEL OF IMPACT:

FISCAL IMPACT NARRATIVE:

The Department will continue spending resources to print overlegal permits, attachments and mailing to customers. Department staff will continue to get requests for duplicate permits and attachments for those permits that are lost or damaged. Therefore, costs would remain constant.

Has this Idea or a similar idea been submitted in the past three years?:

No

If yes, provide Bill#: Year Proposed:

Comments: