AGENDA

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

April 9-10, 2013
AGENDA
Regular Meeting and District 2 Tour
of the Idaho Transportation Board

April 9-10, 2013

KEY:
A = Action
D = Discussion
I = Information

April 9, 2013

1. DISTRICT 2 TOUR
Meet at Missoula, Montana airport .........................................................8:30
Meet with Montana Transportation Commission and Montana
Transportation Department personnel at DOT office;
2100 West Broadway, Missoula .......................................................9:00
Depart Missoula, US-12 west .....................................................10:30
Arrive at Lolo Rest Area (note time zone change) .........................10:30
Depart Lolo Rest Area, US-12 west ........................................11:00
Arrive Powell Maintenance Shed; presentation on remote maintenance .11:15
Depart Powell Maintenance Shed, US-12 west ................................11:45
Arrive Lochsa Lodge; lunch ......................................................11:50
Depart Lochsa Lodge, US-12 west ............................................1:00
Arrive Lewiston, tour ends ......................................................5:00

*All listed times are in local time and are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the
time schedule.
### 2. BOARD MINUTES – March 19-20, 2013

**Board Meeting Dates**
- May 22-23, 2013 – District 5
- June 18-19, 2013 – Boise
- July 10-11, 2013 – District 6

### 4. CONSENT CALENDAR

| OP | A | Strategic Highway Safety Plan | 24A |
|ADM | A | Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) – Surface Transportation Program – Local Rural Program Changes to FY13-14 | 25 |
|ADM | A | LHTAC Local Highway Safety Improvement Program – two project removals in FY14 | 26 |
|ADM | A | Statewide Safety Program changes to FY15 | 29 |
|ADM | A | Safe Routes to School Program – three project removals in FY13-14 | 30 |
|ADM | A | Transit Program changes – add two FY12 Tribal Transit Discretionary Awards to FY13 | 34 |
|ADM | A | Transit Program changes requested by Valley Regional Transit and Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho to FY13 | 35 |
|ADM | A | Scenic Byways project delay from FY13 to FY14 | 37 |
|ADM | I | Service contracts issued by Business and Support Management | 38 |
|OP | I | Contract award information | 40 |
|OP | I | Professional services agreements and term agreement work task report | 49 |
|OP | I | IPLAN project monthly status update | 54 |

### 5. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. LEGISLATIVE REPORT:

- Government Affairs Manager Mollie McCarty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. PRESENTATION: Technology Transfer Study -

- Lance Holmstrom, Local Highway Technical Assistance Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. ADOPT-A-HIGHWAY PRESENTATION:

- Latah County Youth Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. AGENDA ITEMS

- **DIR I** Idaho Pathways Project introduction
- **Moore/Merrell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CD I** Public Transportation Advisory Council annual update and Kyrias/Smith/Wheeler
- **1-way leadership award**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All listed times are in local time and are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEMS, continued</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Transit Mobility Management Systems analysis</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Lower Payette River Heritage Byway project</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program &amp; Strategic Implementation Program</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>DISTRICT 2 REPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE SESSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Expansion project delay/GARVEE Program adjustments to FY13-14</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Highway Program policy discussion and update – Board Policy</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>Funding for FY14-18 Highway Investment Program Update</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>Monthly Financial Statements</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>POLICY REVIEW/APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Policy 4012, Protecting and Maintaining State Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consolidation of: B-05-16, Maintenance of State Highways</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-06-06, Winter Maintenance Standards</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-05-05, Roadside Vegetation Program</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-05-34, Closure/Restricted Use of State Highways</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All listed times are in local time and are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to move agenda items and adjust the time schedule.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time*</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. POLICY INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy 4016, Traffic Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consolidation of: B-12-03, Traffic Minute Entries</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12-06, Transportation Impact Studies</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12-07, State Highway Speed Limits within City Jurisdictions</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12-16, Traffic Control Devices</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. REPORT: BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE ON AUDITS</td>
<td>2:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised charter</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Board Policy, Office of Internal Review</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Administrative Policy A-01-05, Office of Internal Review</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. OLD/NEW BUSINESS</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ADJOURN (estimated time)</td>
<td>3:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APRIL 9-10, 2013
BOARD MEETING AND TOUR OF DISTRICT 2

Travel and Lodging Accommodations

Monday – April 8, 2013
Boise
Overnight at Oxford Suites, 1426 S. Entertainment Ave.; Phone #208-322-8000
Gagner - #41518

Lewiston
Overnight at Red Lion Hotel, 621 21st Street; Phone #208-748-1042; Fax #208-748-1039
Coleman - #86599 Whitehead - #86600

Tuesday – April 9, 2013
6:20 AM Boise
Depart Aeronautics: Cole, DeLorenzo, Gagner, Higgins, & Stokes

7:00 AM Burley
Arrive; pick up Horsch and Kempton

7:15 AM Burley
State plane departs

6:30 AM Lewiston
Charter flight departs Stout Flying Service
Coleman Vassar
Frew Whitehead
Ness

8:30 AM Missoula
Two groups arrive; District 2 tour begins

5:00 PM Lewiston
Arrive; tour ends
Overnight at Red Lion
Allen - #86601 Higgins - #86606
Cole - #86602 Horsch - #86605
DeLorenzo - #86603 Kempton - #86607
Gagner - #86604 Stokes - #86608

6:30 PM “
Dinner at Macullen’s Restaurant; 1516 Main Street

Wednesday – April 10, 2013
7:30 AM Lewiston
Depart hotel

8:00 AM “
Business meeting; District 2 Office, 2600 Frontage Road, Phone #208-799-5090; Fax #208-799-4301

3:10 PM “
Estimated time of adjournment; depart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>Charter plane departs: Cole, DeLorenzo, Gagner, Higgins, Horsch Kempton, &amp; Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>Charter plane arrives; drop off Cole, DeLorenzo, Gagner, Higgins, and Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charter plane departs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>Charter plane arrives; drop off Horsch and Kempton (then returns to Boise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed times are in local time.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD

March 19-20, 2013

The Idaho Transportation Board met at 8 AM on Tuesday, March 19, 2013 at the Idaho Transportation Department, Boise, Idaho. The following principals were present:
- Jerry Whitehead, Chairman
- Jim Coleman, Vice Chairman – District 1
- Jan Vassar, Member – District 2
- Julie DeLorenzo, Member – District 3
- Jim Kempton, Member – District 4
- Dwight Horsch, Member – District 5
- Lee Gagner, Member – District 6
- Brian W. Ness, Director
- Scott Stokes, Chief Deputy
- Larry Allen, Deputy Attorney General
- Sue S. Higgins, Executive Assistant and Secretary to the Board

Board Minutes. Vice Chairman Coleman made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on February 20, 2013 as revised. Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed unopposed.

Board Meeting Dates. The following meeting dates and locations were scheduled:
- April 9-10, 2013 – District 2
- May 22-23, 2013 – District 5
- June 18-19, 2013 – Boise

Consent Calendar. Member DeLorenzo referenced the justification for the low bid on key #11617, FY13 District 4 Districtwide Guardrail Upgrades. She asked for additional information on the contractor’s minimal work experience. Chief Engineer (CE) Tom Cole responded that the low bidder has not done a lot of work on the bridge rail retrofit item. The Department is required to accept the lowest responsive bid.

Member Vassar made a motion, seconded by Member Horsch, and passed unopposed, to approve the following resolution:
RES. NO. ITB13-06
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Public Transportation Advisory Council appointment for District 2, the impacts and results of temporary waiver of IDAPA 39.03.17 for the Movement of Multiple Units, and the amendment to Idaho Transportation Board resolution 13-05, and has received and reviewed the service contracts issued by Business and Support Management, the contract award information, the professional services agreements and term agreement work task report, and the report of speed minute entry changes for February 2013.

March 19, 2013
1) Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) Appointment for District 2. Because Carl Root’s term on PTAC is ending, staff solicited applications to fill that vacancy. Staff recommends appointing Deb Smith to represent District 2. Her term will expire in June 2016.

2) The Impacts and Results of Temporary Waiver of IDAPA 39.03.17 for the Movement of Multiple Units. In March 2012, the Idaho Housing Alliance requested a permanent change to IDAPA Rule 39.03.17, to allow for the movement of more than one manufactured home, modular building, or park model on a single hauling unit. This request was due to economic hardship in the transportation costs of single units as opposed to multiple units on a single hauling unit. Because staff had some concerns with a permanent rule change, the Board approved a temporary waiver for one year. To date, there have been no requests by the industry to allow multiple loads on a single hauling unit. Also, since the initial request, Montana determined that it would not allow such movements, so the industry is unable to deliver these units to their destination in North Dakota. Therefore, staff recommends that the temporary waiver expire.

3) Amendment to ITB13-05. Last month, the Board approved Resolution #13-05 regarding 129,000 pound vehicles. The background information referenced weight limits of Idaho’s surrounding states. The resolution said that vehicle combinations with gross vehicle weights and axle configurations as Pilot Project vehicles have been in continuous commercial operation in the neighboring states of Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana for over 30 years. This language was based on staff’s recollection of previous research, but it was not able to verify the statement at the time the resolution was proposed. The 30-year time frame was questioned later, and, upon further research, staff was not able to confirm the statement. Staff verified that the higher gross vehicle weight limits have been allowed in the referenced states for over 20 years and recommends amending ITB13-05 to reflect that.

RES. NO. ITB13-05
WHEREAS, in 2003, the Idaho Legislature authorized the 129,000 pound Pilot Project on specified routes; and

WHEREAS, Pilot Project vehicles have been operating on designated state routes, by permit, since July 2003; and

WHEREAS, Pilot Project vehicles have been operating on approved local routes by permit issued from the local authority having jurisdiction since July 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department has made regular reports to the Legislature in 2007, 2010, and 2013; and

WHEREAS, Pilot Project reports evaluated all important impacts, including impacts to safety, bridges, pavements, and the economy; and

WHEREAS, the final Pilot Project report concluded that no significant effects to safety, bridges, and pavements were observed as a result of pilot project vehicles; and

March 19, 2013
WHEREAS, the final Pilot Project report stated that participants benefitted from positive economic impacts due to reduced numbers of trips, fuel consumption, and personnel costs; and

WHEREAS, vehicle combinations with gross vehicle weights and axle configurations as Pilot Project vehicles have been in continuous commercial operation in the neighboring states of Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana for over 20 years; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board has reviewed and accepted the findings and conclusions of the Pilot Project report; and

WHEREAS, local highway jurisdictions will have routes included in the permitting process and are the most knowledgeable on their respective roads and should have authority to allow higher gross vehicle weights if appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Department’s strategic plan includes the primary goals of committing to having the safest transportation system possible and providing a mobility-focused transportation system that drives economic opportunity.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board finds that permitted 129,000 pound vehicles, operating on designated routes, enhance freight mobility and promote economic opportunity without compromising highway safety.

4) Service Contracts issued by Business and Support Management. From January 26 through February 24, the Business and Support Management Section processed four new service contracts for $179,541.


Key #12966 – I-90, Elizabeth Park Road to Osburn, District 1. Low bidder: Knife River Corporation - Northwest – $5,695,871.

Key #12297 – FY13 District 1 Bridge Deck Life Extension. Low bidder: The Truesdell Corporation - $478,478.

Key #12047 – South Midland Boulevard; Ustick to US-20/26, District 3. Low bidder: Nampa Paving and Asphalt Company - $731,992.

Keys #13031 and #12027 – US-95, Milepost 87.5 to Shoepeg Road and Cambridge to Alpine Store, District 3. Low bidder: Knife River Corporation – Northwest - $6,070,611.

Key #8107 – I-84, Junction I-84/US-93 Interchange, Stage 2, District 4. Low bidder: Western Construction, Inc. - $11,788,750.

March 19, 2013
The low bid on key #11619 – FY13 District 4 Sign Upgrades, was more than ten percent over the engineer’s estimate, requiring justification. The major differences between the low bid and engineer’s estimate were in the Breakaway Steel Sign Post Type A, Special Removal and Installation of Overhead Sign Lighters, and Installation of Step Down Transformer items. The low bidder said it was using sub-contractors and the prices used from the material suppliers influenced the higher cost for the bid items. The District does not believe re-advertising will result in better bids, so recommended accepting the low bid. Low bidder: Pavement Markings Northwest, Inc. - $131,874.

The low bid on key #11617 – FY13 District 4 Districtwide Guardrail Upgrades, was more than ten percent over the engineer’s estimate, requiring justification. The major differences were in the Granular Borrow, Special Bridge Rail Retrofit Type 2, and Flagging items. It appears the granular borrow item was higher due to the small amounts needed in several locations. The cost of setting up, the tight schedule of working days, and the labor necessary to complete the work in the time given were factors. The bridge rail retrofit type 2 item was influenced by the contractor’s lack of work experience. The flagging subcontractor’s bid costs were used with a small increase added to cover the administration costs. Staff does not believe re-advertising will result in better bids. The project needs to start so it can be completed in the 2013 construction season, so staff recommended awarding the contract. Low bidder: WF Construction and Sales, LLC - $659,550.

Key #11127 – US-91, Intersection Tyhee Road, Bannock County, District 5. Low bidder: Cannon Builders, Inc. - $380,903.


6) Professional Services Agreements and Term Agreement Work Task Report. From February 1 through February 28, 24 new professional services agreements and work tasks were issued, totaling $4,534,141. Five supplemental agreements to existing agreements were processed in the amount of $43,726 during this period.

7) Speed Minute Entry Changes for February 2013. The following District 2 speed minute entry was approved in February:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Beginning Milepost</th>
<th>Ending Milepost</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-95</td>
<td>361.300</td>
<td>362.237</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director’s Report. Director Ness reported on some recent activities. The Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee (JFAC) approved the FY14 appropriation. It eliminated 13.5 full-time equivalent positions and made other minor changes. (See later minute entry.) Director Ness attended a Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials’ Committee on Transport meeting. The committee’s goal is to make several inconsistent trucking laws that are a barrier to commerce uniform. The Design Conference will be held in Boise on April 2 and 3. Member Vassar will provide welcoming remarks.

March 19, 2013
Next fiscal year, ITD will begin saving $43,000 annually by changing how the Idaho Tax Commission is paid for conducting fuel audits. Instead of providing $100,000 in federal highway funds to pay for the audits, it will be funded through the Highway Distribution Account. The Department’s financial system was successfully upgraded earlier this month, with no issues or delays in creating time sheets, paying contractors, or ordering supplies. This was the first major upgrade to the system in five years. Director Ness also reported on a number of recognitions and awards received.

The Director’s entire report can be viewed at [http://itd.idaho.gov/Board/report.htm](http://itd.idaho.gov/Board/report.htm).

Chief Deputy Stokes reported that year-to-date, there have been fewer fatalities on Idaho’s highways than in 2012. The positive community norms pilot project will start next month in Lewiston, Blackfoot, and Twin Falls. He also reported that the continuing resolution for funding the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) expires on March 27.

**Delegation – Legislative Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE)**. Rakesh Mohan, Director, OPE, said OPE is a nonpartisan, independent legislative office. It conducts independent evaluations of state agencies, programs, and policies. It provides tools for state agencies, makes recommendations to state agencies and the legislature, and follows up on progress in implementing the recommendations. The Joint Legislative Oversight Committee assigns projects. He noted a performance audit was conducted on ITD several years ago.

Chairman Whitehead thanked Mr. Rakesh for the informative overview on OPE.

**Delegation – Legislative Services Office (LSO)**. LSO Legislative Audits Division Manager April Renfro summarized LSO’s structure and responsibilities. She elaborated on the Office’s charge to conduct legislative audits. The main financial or compliance audits and reviews include Statewide Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Statewide Single Audit Report, Management Reviews/Report, and Entity Financial Audits. Specific to ITD, the Department is considered a major fund and identified as a separate column in the state’s basic financial statements, which fall under CAFR. For Single Audit, ITD’s federal funds require inclusion in the statewide audit at least once every three years, and the management review is cyclical. This year the review will focus on areas not reviewed during CAFR and Single Audit work. The audit process includes fieldwork at the agency, then compiling the results. The reports are submitted to the JFAC co-chairs for approval and release.

Chairman Whitehead thanked Ms. Renfro for the thorough presentation.

**Annual Report on Audits**. Internal Review Manager (IRM) Carri Rosti and staff members presented the annual report on audits, including internal and external audits performed in 2012, work planned for 2013, and the status of audit resolution. Some of the activities conducted last year included an audit of Division of Motor Vehicles’ Motor Carrier Services Section’s internal controls and previous audit recommendations, a procurement performance audit in the Business and Support Management Office, consultant overhead rate reviews and pre-award reviews of consultant agreements, and employee training on internal controls.

March 19, 2013
Some of the work planned in 2013 includes additional internal control training, a follow-up review of the audit conducted in 2009 on the Division of Aeronautics, and providing contract procurement guidance to employees for the procurement of service agreements.

Chairman Whitehead thanked IRM Rosti and staff for the informative report.

**Legislative Report.** Government Affairs Manager (GAM) Mollie McCarty reported on the status of ITD’s legislation. Repealing language in Idaho Code regarding state designation of airports and repealing Idaho Code requiring that ITD review and approve local requests for federal grants have been signed into law. The proposals to repeal pilot registration requirements, increase aircraft registration fees, clean-up language related to relinquishing state routes to local agencies, stagger vehicle registrations year-to-year, and changes to the salvage titles issuance have been approved by both chambers.

Staff continues to monitor and analyze non-ITD bills, including some related to 129,000 pound weight limits and highway safety. Legislation to establish an Idaho Consumer Asset Recovery Fund requested by the Idaho Dealer Advisory Board has been approved by both chambers. The Transportation Economic Development Zone proposal failed in committee.

Chairman Whitehead thanked GAM McCarty for the report.

**Employee Service Awards.** The Board participated in the Employee Service Awards. Member Horsch provided remarks on behalf of the Board.

**Overview of Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).** Transportation Performance Administrator (TPA) Randy Kyrias summarized TAP funding for FY14. Idaho’s total apportionment is $5.2 million; however, the Board has options for funding and obligation authority. He proposed establishing an “Idaho Streets” program to implement TAP. This new program would be an umbrella program for the various funding categories that the Division of Transportation Performance oversees, including TAP and transit. It would support defined priorities, such as system preservation, economic opportunity, safety, and mobility. Un-awarded funding could be directed to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Curb Ramp Program. TPA Kyrias believes the program would be beneficial to locals, as it would be less burdensome, provide stability, establish a one-stop-shop, and improve cross jurisdiction coordination and communication. Internal benefits would be the administration of only one program, simplified policies, synchronization of processes with ITD’s partners, and it would be fully supported by the Division’s grant administration system. A start-up committee will meet soon to continue the establishment of this proposed new program.

In response to Member Gagner’s question, TPA Kyrias said that some funding is available for scenic byway activities. Efforts are still underway to determine if changes should be made to the Scenic Byway Program and Advisory Committee.

Member DeLorenzo asked for clarification on the “Anywhere” funding category. TPA Kyrias confirmed that those funds could be used for the ADA ramp program and projects could be funded in rural areas, urban areas, or in a transportation management area. Projects to
decrease wildlife-vehicle collisions or inventory outdoor advertising signs are some potential ITD activities that could be funded.

Member Gagner asked if the group created to develop the parameters and an implementation plan for the new program would be an on-going committee to oversee the program. TPA Kyrias responded that the initial focus of the group would be to help establish a program; however, one of its recommendations may be to create an on-going committee.

Member Kempton asked if this new program would oversee the Recreational Trails and TMA projects. TPA Kyrias replied that the program would be responsible for the Urban, Rural, and Anywhere sub-allocations. Member Kempton questioned the proposed “Idaho Streets” name, as streets conjure images of cities, and Idaho is a rural state. TPA Kyrias said the intent is to expand the program to transit projects; however, the name of the program can be revisited.

Discussion followed on the funding request. Two options were proposed. Both proposals included fully funding and providing obligation authority for appropriated amounts for the Recreational Trails program and the TMA. Option 1 would provide 92% funding and obligation authority for appropriated amounts for the Urban, Rural, and Anywhere allocations. Option 2 would provide 92% funding and obligation authority for appropriated amounts for the Urban and Rural allocations and a Board-determined percentage for the Anywhere allocation.

Member Gagner noted Option #2 provides more flexibility. He asked how much money would be available for that option. TPA Kyrias said the percentage would be up to the Board. He added that Option #1 would help support the ADA Ramp project. Member DeLorenzo requested confirmation that Option #1 states the percentage of funding; it does not dictate where the Anywhere funds would be directed. TPA Kyrias replied in the affirmative.

The consensus of the Board was to hold this item one month. Vice Chairman Coleman and Members DeLorenzo and Gagner will participate on the start-up committee to propose recommendations on the development and implementation of this program.

**Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) Charter and Nominations.** Program Planning and Development Specialist (PPDS) Maureen Gresham presented a draft charter for the FAC. The purpose of the Committee is to serve as a forum to discuss freight movement and infrastructure within Idaho; educate freight stakeholders regarding local, regional, and statewide transportation planning processes; provide access to improved freight data and a more consistent set of data; work with ITD to incorporate freight interests into transportation planning to improve freight infrastructure; and improve statewide understanding of the importance of freight transportation.

The recommendation is to appoint 13 members representing the rail industry, the highway/trucking industry, aeronautics, the port/barge industry, three from the agricultural industry, two from the natural resource industry, manufacturing/retail, carrier/shipping, freight logistics/warehousing, and a member at large. Representatives from federal and state governments and metropolitan planning organizations will be invited as ex-officio members. Upon Board approval, potential committee members will be contacted and the final nominations will be presented to the Board for approval.
Member Vassar made a motion, seconded by Member Horsch, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. ITB13-07

WHEREAS, it is in the public’s interest for the Idaho Transportation Department to facilitate the efficient and effective movement of freight; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Idaho Transportation Board to encourage partnerships between various transportation stakeholders that further safety, mobility, and economic opportunity; and

WHEREAS, the Department initiated a statewide analysis of freight that included participation from a diverse range of stakeholders that culminated in a Freight Study with six key recommendations endorsed by the Board December in 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Freight Study recommended continued coordination, communication and partnerships through a statewide Freight Advisory Committee to serve as a forum for discussion regarding freight movement within Idaho, improve the understanding of freight planning processes and importance of freight transportation, and provide access to improved and more consistent freight data, and incorporate freight interests into transportation planning processes; and

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) recommends state departments of transportation convene a statewide Freight Advisory Committee that includes both private and public freight stakeholder interests to guide freight planning; and

WHEREAS, the Board has authority to establish internal structures deemed necessary for its duties.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board creates the statewide Freight Advisory Committee that complies with the charter, as shown as Exhibit 422, which is made a part hereof with like effect; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to provide the necessary administrative support to the Freight Advisory Council for the efficient and timely disposition of its duties to the Board.

Member Gagner asked if there will be costs to ITD associated with the FAC. PP&DS Gresham said ITD will reimburse the members for their travel costs. With 13 members and presumably four meetings per year, the annual cost is expected to be between $3,000 and $6,000.

The motion passed 5-1, with Member Gagner dissenting. In explaining his vote, he said he supports the establishment of the FAC; however, he is concerned with the costs to ITD.

Executive Session on Personnel and Legal Issues. Vice Chairman Coleman made a motion to meet in executive session at 11:45 AM to discuss personnel and legal issues as
authorized in Idaho Code Section 67-2345(b), (c), (d), and (f). Member Horsch seconded the motion and it passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote.

A discussion was held on personnel and legal matters.

The Board came out of executive session at 2 PM. No final actions or decisions were made.

Member DeLorenzo left the meeting at this time.

Add Six Projects to the Initial Transportation Management Area (TMA) – TAP. Toni Tisdale, Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) Principal Planner, provided information on six projects the TMA is requesting. MAP-21 consolidated previous programs such as Safe Routes to School (SR2S), Enhancement, and Recreational Trails into TAP. TAP includes sub-allocations based on population categories, including a mandatory obligation to TMAs. In anticipation of the implementation of MAP-21, COMPASS solicited applications from its constituents for TAP funds.

Ms. Tisdale elaborated on the SR2S Coordinator project. It would enable the Treasure Valley YMCA to continue its SR2S Program. The requested $140,000 would pay for two full-time positions dedicated solely to the SR2S Program. A part-time/seasonal staff person is expected to be hired in FY13. The coordinators further policies that support the SR2S Program.

The Boise Bike Share Program, Phase 1 and 2, would implement a bike share program in downtown Boise. The project would include seven stations with 70 bicycles. Thorough research was conducted to determine the locations for the bike stations. This project is known as the “third generation” bike sharing system. It holds the rider accountable for use of the bike through a check-out and return system tied to the rider’s name and credit card information. Additionally, global positioning system units are located on each bicycle, tracking its location for security and usage patterns. Fees for using the bikes would be used for maintenance, redistribution of the bikes, promotion, and improvement or expansion of the system.

In response to Chairman Whitehead’s question on the cost to use a bike, Ms. Tisdale replied that the fee has not been determined yet. Member Horsch asked if helmets will be provided. Ms. Tisdale did not know.

Member Gagner commented that although he may not support some of the specific projects, he noted that the funding is dedicated to the TMA and selection of the projects should be a local decision.

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

RES. NO. ITB13-08
WHEREAS, it is in the public’s interest for the Idaho Transportation Department to publish and accomplish a current, realistic, and fiscally constrained five year Highway Development Program; and
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WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Idaho Transportation Board to effectively utilize all available federal, state, local, and private capital investment funding; and

WHEREAS, the President signed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) transportation act into law in July 2012 with state implementation requirements for FY13 and 2014; and

WHEREAS, subsequent Federal Highway Administration rulemaking requires obligation of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) sub-allocation to the Transportation Management Area (TMA; greater Boise area); and

WHEREAS, the Department currently has sufficient savings at award to meet this federal obligation for FY13; and

WHEREAS, in anticipation of the Idaho implementation of these provisions, the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho solicited this past fall and prioritized the following six applications to add to the Idaho Transportation Investment Program.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves the addition of Treasure Valley YMCA Safe Routes to School Coordinator for $140,000; Nature's Wood Duck Island Trail, Near Barber Park for $150,000; Union Pacific Railroad Rail with Trail Arterial Study, Meridian for $85,000; Boise Bike Share Program, Phase 1 for $287,000; Boise Bike Share Program, Phase 2 for $53,000; and the Ada County Highway District Stormwater Design Guide for $70,000 to the initial TAP-TMA Program.

Idaho Air Quality/Congestion Management Program, Mike Edwards, Air Quality Analyst, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, provided background on air quality and the related transportation planning process. There are national standards for six common pollutants: particulate matter (PM), ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and lead. Franklin County and Pinehurst are areas of concern for PM 2.5. For ozone standards, Boise is close to the standard and the Craters of the Moon has elevated levels. Previously, issues with PM 10 were identified in Northern Ada County and Pocatello, plus Northern Ada County had issues with carbon monoxide.

If violations occur, a State Implementation Plan is required. The plan must provide for control measures that clean the air and achieve clean air by the attainment date. Transportation plans and projects must be consistent with the Air Quality Plan. If conformity lapses occur, highway sanctions may be implemented. The federal Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program provides funding to address air quality issues. Some previous projects included funding for flusher and sweeper trucks, Compressed Natural Gas buses, signalization, and vanpools.

Chairman Whitehead thanked Mr. Edwards for the educational presentation.
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Monthly Financial Statements. Transportation Investments Manager John Krause said net obligations were $4,400,000 during February, resulting in total net cumulative obligations of $164,900,000. Of the net obligations, $179,300,000 were for current year projects. The remaining obligations are for adjustments for prior year projects plus advances of future year projects to FY13. The original budget amount for obligated FY13 projects was $173,400,000. Net cumulative obligations are above the historical trend of $141,100,000 for February.

Senior Budget Analyst Joel Drake summarized JFAC’s action on the Department’s FY14 appropriation. It reduced 13.5 positions. The salaries associated with the positions were retained, but 5% of FY14 personnel benefit cost increases were not allowed. An increase of $100,800 for additional Attorney General fees was included and an Idaho Power rate increase of $6,400 was added. The Risk Management expenditure was reduced by $115,300 for a total net reduction of $87,300 in spending authority.

Controller Gordon Wilmoth said FHWA Indirect Cost Allocation revenue through January was $16,592,000, which was above the projected amount of $16,185,000. Miscellaneous state funded revenue of $20,324,000 was $1,594,000 above the forecast. Highway Distribution Account revenue, excluding ethanol exemption elimination, was $109,758,000. The projected revenue was $107,466,000. Revenue from the ethanol exemption elimination was $9,427,000, which was .4% below the projected amount. Revenue to the State Aeronautics Fund from aviation fuels was $1,198,000, resulting in a 19% positive variance. Miscellaneous revenue to this account was $241,448, which was a 35% positive variance.

Total expenditures in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Title XII Fund for highway projects were $175,753,000, while $178,800,000 had been appropriated. Expenditures for public transportation were $8,944,000 of the $9,200,000 available.


Member Kempton made a motion to approve Board Policy 4013, Standard Specifications for Construction Projects (formerly B-04-02); 4014, Department Correspondence (formerly B-06-02); and 4015, Idaho Highway Map (formerly B-06-07). Member Vassar seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Policy Introduction. Highway Operations Engineer Greg Laragan presented four policies for review: B-05-05, Roadside Vegetation Program; B-06-06, Winter Maintenance Standards on State Highways; B-05-16, Maintenance of State Highways; and B-05-34, Closure or Restricted Use of State Highways. The intent is to consolidate the four policies into a new policy entitled Protecting and Maintaining State highways. Additionally, the only corresponding Administrative policy that would be retained is A-05-34, Closures or Restricted Use of State Highways. The content in the other administrative policies would be moved to the Maintenance Manual.

Tour of Area Highway Projects. The Board traveled to the SH-44 and Linder Road intersection to view the improvements underway at that location. The partnership project with
Ada County Highway District is the Department’s first design-build project. The Board then visited the construction site of the extension of SH-16 to US-20/26.

WHEREUPON, the meeting recessed at 4:50 PM.
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The Board reconvened at 8:00 AM on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at the Idaho Transportation Department, Boise, Idaho. All members were present.

**IPLAN Solution and Cost Assessment with Gap Analysis Executive Summary.** Transportation Planner (TP) Maranda Obray said the IPLAN project is on schedule. Deliverables completed to date include the framework, stakeholder meetings, the vision document, the requirements document, the draft data standards document, and the solution document with architectural assessment and gap analysis. Additionally, datasets for inclusion have been requested. The study should be completed soon, and then the next step will be the configuration.

Bio-West consultant Andrea Moser elaborated on the benefits of the web-based portal, such as the ease to search for specific data, the ability to share content, and a mechanism to display planning scenarios to identify and track performance measures. A gap analysis was performed to estimate the remaining costs for Phase 1. To implement Phase 1 internally, an additional $100,000 is needed for software, hardware, and licenses. There will be additional personnel costs, too; however, all of these additional expenses are planned within the Division of Highways’ budget. A return on investment exercise applied to the last five years of the Idaho Transportation Investment Program resulted in potential tangible savings of $2.2 million.

In response to Member Gagner’s question on the time frame for Phases 2 and 3, Ms. Moser replied that no time frame has been determined. Phase 1 is expected to be completed by the end of this year. The next phases are optional. CE Cole added that the intent is to pursue the next phases. Other areas to address will be identified. This initial phase is building the foundation, and then a determination will be made on what additional components are desired.

**Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).** Highway Safety Manager (HSM) Brent Jennings presented the draft SHSP. It is a data-driven, comprehensive plan that includes a goal, emphasis areas, and strategies to reduce traffic deaths and serious injuries. It focuses resources on education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency response. The document is being updated to revise emphasis areas, incorporate new goals, include emphasis area teams to work on the specific contributors to traffic deaths and serious injuries, develop actions and track work done, build and empower partnerships, and require evaluations.

HSM Jennings said more than 100 highway safety partners were brought together in November to develop goals and strategies for the highway safety focus areas, resulting in the updated SHSP, which the Board will be asked to approve next month. Although the total number of traffic fatalities decreased by 20.1% in 2011 from 2010, HSM Jennings noted that a lot of work still needs to be done, as even one fatality is too many.
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Chairman Whitehead thanked HSM Jennings for the presentation and for his efforts on this important program.

City of Mullan Sewer District, District 1 Engineer (DE) Damon Allen summarized a project to replace a 77-year-old bridge on the I-90 Business Route in Mullan. The project, to be constructed this summer, requires the relocation of a sanitary sewer line and manholes at an estimated cost of $16,000. The City of Mullan Sewer does not have sufficient funds to relocate its utilities in the project impact area. Due to the hardship the project is creating, the City of Mullan Sewer is requesting financial assistance. DE Allen said federal funds could be used for this expense.

Member Gagner asked if the Board would set a precedent if it provides financial assistance. CE Cole responded that the Board has provided assistance to local communities in the past to relocate utilities.

Member Kempton empathized with small communities; however, utilities within ITD’s right-of-way are their responsibility. He questioned the communities’ ability to use emergency bonding authority to fund this.

Vice Chairman Coleman concurred that it is a difficult decision. ITD allowed the city to locate its utility within the Department’s right-of-way, which was a convenience to the municipality. To some extent, it is a lack of planning that resulted in this situation now.

In response to Member Gagner’s question on whether the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) has been asked to help with funding, DE Allen said the project is ITD’s, not LHTAC’s. LHTAC Administrator Lance Holmstrom said no application has been received from the City of Mullan for this project. Member Gagner asked if LHTAC has emergency funds that may be available for this. LHTAC Administrator Holmstrom replied that relocating utilities would not qualify for emergency funds.

Vice Chairman Coleman believes there are two more local projects in District 1 where the cities do not have sufficient funds to relocate their utilities and will be requesting financial assistance. He suggested developing a policy to address this issue.

Member Vassar questioned delaying the request to provide assistance to the City of Mullan until a policy has been created. Member Gagner expressed concern with the timing, as the District was planning on constructing the project this summer. Although he is concerned with setting a precedent, he believes this issue needs to be addressed today.

Vice Chairman Coleman made a motion, seconded by Member Kempton, to approve the following resolution:

RES. NO. WHEREAS, the I-90 Business, South Fork Coeur d’Alene River Bridge 7th Street, ITB13-09 Mullan, key #12874 project in District 1, is of significance to the mobility along I-90B in Mullan, that will improve economic opportunity; and
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WHEREAS, this project will require the relocation of utility facilities owned by City of Mullan Sewer of a sanitary sewer line and adjusting three manholes located within the project right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, City of Mullan Sewer requested an Utility Hearing pursuant to Idaho Code 40-312(3), which was held on February 13, 2013, at the Idaho Transportation Department District 1 office in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, where City of Mullan Sewer presented oral and written testimony in support of this project, recognized its obligation to relocate and adjust the utility facilities located within the project right-of-way at its expense, but that it does not have adequate funds to perform this work; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mullan Sewer does request financial assistance, estimated at $16,000 from the Idaho Transportation Board for relocating and adjusting utility facilities within the project right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, the Board is allocated the power to order the relocation of utility facilities located within the limits of a federal-aid project by Idaho Code 40-312(3) and while Idaho Code stipulates the owner is responsible for the cost of relocating utility facilities located within the public right-of-way, it does not prohibit the Department from voluntarily participating in the cost of relocating utility facilities owned by another public entity if it is determined by the Board that it is in the public interest to do so; and

WHEREAS, Subsection 645.103(d) of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations specifies that federal-aid participation for utility facility relocation be governed by State law.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does determine that it is in the public interest to grant financial assistance to City of Mullan Sewer for relocating a sanitary sewer line and adjusting three manholes; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board directs staff to prepare a utility agreement with City of Mullan Sewer for this project by which the Department will approve the District’s recommendation of ITD participation in the utility relocation and adjustment within the project right-of-way at a cost not to exceed $16,000.

Member Kempton asked staff to draft a policy to address providing financial assistance for relocating utilities when communities demonstrate a hardship. Member Horsch commented on the difficult decision. Although $16,000 is not a lot of money in comparison to the total project, it is the city’s responsibility to relocate its utilities. He questioned providing a percentage of the requested funding.

Member Gagner asked if the city could reimburse ITD in the future for these costs. DE Allen believes that may be an option.
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The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Session on Personnel and Legal Issues. Member Gagner made a motion to meet in executive session at 9:15 AM to discuss personnel and legal issues as authorized in Idaho Code Section 67-2345(b), (c), (d), and (f). Member DeLorenzo seconded the motion and it passed 6-0 by individual roll call vote.

A discussion was held on personnel and legal matters.

The Board came out of executive session at 10:50 AM. No final actions or decisions were made.

Member Vassar left the meeting at this time.

Tour Western Aircraft. The Board toured Western Aircraft, which provides various aviation services such as maintenance, avionics sales and installation, aircraft parts sales, fixed-base operation services, airline fueling, and aircraft charters.

WHEREUPON, the Idaho Transportation Board’s regular monthly meeting officially adjourned at 2:30 PM.

JERRY WHITEHEAD, Chairman
Idaho Transportation Board

Read and Approved
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Idaho
2013 BOARD MEETING DATES

May 22-23, 2013 – District 5
June 18-19, 2013 – Boise/Headquarters
July 10-11, 2013 – District 6
August 14-15, 2013 – District 4
September 18-19, 2013 – District 1
October 23-24, 2013 – District 3

Other dates of interest:
May 1-8, 2013: American Assoc. of State Highway & Transp. Officials’ Subcommittee meeting
July 14-19, 2013: Pacific Northwest Economic Region conference – Anchorage, Alaska
August 2-8, 2013: Western Assoc. of State Hwy & Trans. Officials meeting – San Francisco, CA
August 18-23, 2013: AASHTO Subcommittee meeting
October 16-22, 2013: AASHTO annual conference – Denver, CO

Action: Approve the Board meeting schedule.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) – Surface Transportation Program – Local Rural Program Changes to FY13-14; LHTAC Local Highway Safety Improvement Program – two project removals in FY14; Statewide Safety Program changes to FY15; Safe Routes to School Program – three project removals in FY13-14; Transit Program changes – add two FY12 Tribal Transit Discretionary Awards to FY13; Transit Program changes requested by Valley Regional Transit and Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho to FY13; and Scenic Byways project delay from FY13 to FY14 and has received and reviewed the service contracts issued by Business and Support Management, the contract award information, the professional services agreements and term agreement work task report, and the IPLAN project monthly status update.
The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) was initially created in 2006, and is a data-driven, comprehensive plan that includes a goal, emphasis areas, and strategies to reduce traffic deaths and serious injuries. It focuses resources on education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency response. It is being updated to revise emphasis areas, incorporate new goals, include emphasis area teams to work on the specific contributors to traffic deaths and serious injuries, develop actions and track work done, build and empower partnerships, and require evaluations.

On November 29, 2012 more than 100 highway safety partners were brought together in a facilitated workshop to develop goals and strategies for the eleven data-driven focus areas of highway safety. The outcome of this day-long event was generation of the updated SHSP for 2013.

The draft SHSP is provided under separate cover for final Board acceptance.

Recommendations
Final acceptance of the SHSP, dated April 2013, by the Idaho Transportation Board.
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date: April 9-10, 2013

LHTAC - Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Local Rural Program Changes to FY 2013–2014

Route Number: STC-2847 & STC-4759
Project Number: A011(991) & A011(228)
Key Number: 11991 & 11228

District: 4 & 2
Location: STC-2847 MP 1-7 in Cassia County & STC-4759 MP 0-2.25 in Nez Perce County

Background Information

This Board item requests changes in the STP-Local Rural Program per Policies B-11-02 and 5011 and following Departmental procedures.

The Raft River Highway District requests advancing STC-2847, Old Hwy 81 South, Raft River Highway District, Cassia County from FY 2014 to FY 2013 and the Nez Perce County requests a delay to STC-4759, Webb Road, Nez Perce County from FY 2013 to FY 2014.

The adjustments in the current fiscal year result in additional funds to cover revised PS&E for the Off System, Stone Bridge, Fremont County project. The FY 2014 adjustment is possible due to $1.25 million unprogrammed balance in the STP-Local Rural program.

LHTAC STP - Local Rural Program Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost in Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance KN 11991</td>
<td>3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay KN 11228</td>
<td>-4,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase KN 10610 to</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Adjustment Balance</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Advance STC-2847, Old Hwy 81 South, Raft River Highway District, Cassia County (Key No. 11991) at $3,856,000 from FY 2014 to FY 2013 and delay STC-4759, Webb Road, Nez Perce County (Key No. 11228) at $4,717,000 from FY 2013 to FY 2014 in the STP-Local Rural program and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
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### Subject

**LHTAC Local Highway Safety Improvement Program (LHSIP) – Two Project Removals in FY 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP-7343 &amp; STC-7879</td>
<td>A013(490) &amp; A013(501)</td>
<td>13490 &amp; 13501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STP-7343 MP 69.4-77.42 in Ada County &amp; STC-7879 MP 10.4 in Canyon County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Background Information

This Board item requests removal of two projects in the LHTAC Local Safety Program per Policies B-11-02 and 5011, and following Departmental procedures.

The project sponsors requested removal of these two projects from the LHSIP program in FY 2014.

**STP-7343, Fairview Road and State Street, Meridian** removal was requested by the Ada County Highway District. LHTAC was notified in December that the City of Meridian chose to proceed with the pavement marking improvements themselves and would not need the Federal funding.

**STC-7879, Intersection Hawaii Avenue and Holly Street, Nampa** removal was requested by the City of Nampa. The city contacted LHTAC when they discovered that the Intersection at Hawaii Avenue and Holly Street did not meet *The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) traffic volume warrants. MUTCD defines the standards used by road managers nationwide to install and maintain traffic control devices on all public streets, highways, bikeways, and private roads open to public traffic.

The two project removals provide additional funds to increase STP-8213, Intersection Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue, Nampa to meet the revised engineers’ estimate of $499,000.

### LHTAC - Local Highway Safety Program Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost in Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove KN 13490</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove KN 13501</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase KN 13502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Adjustment Balance</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The balance of the $20k and $73k for their respective fiscal years goes back into the LHSIP program and is available for other funding needs that may arise.

### Recommendations

Remove STP-7343, Fairview Road and State Street, Meridian (Key No. 13490) at $53,000 and STC-7879, Intersection Hawaii Avenue and Holly Street, Nampa (Key No. 13501) at $280,000 from FY 2014 of the LHSIP program and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

### Board Action

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

Page 1 of 1
Laila Maqbool

From: Ryan Head <RHead@achdidaho.org>
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2012 9:56 AM
To: Laila Maqbool
Cc: Sabrina Anderson; Toni Tisdale
Subject: KN 13490 Fairview Avenue and State Street, Raised Pavement Markings

Laila;

ACHD has determined that the safety concerns are such that we are going to proceed immediately installing raised pavement markings on Fairview Avenue and State Street with local funding. We appreciate the federal support granted by LHTAC, but will not be able to wait until funds are available in order to proceed. We would appreciate the opportunity to use the funds on another project if at all possible, but understand that the money was granted based on sight specific conditions. Please let me know if there is a possibility of transferring those funds to another sight. Thanks.

Ryan Head
Transportation Funding Coordinator
Title VI Coordinator
Ada County Highway District
3775 Adams Street
Garden City, ID 83714
P. (208) 387-6234
F. (208) 387-6391
www.achdidaho.org
September 28, 2012

Laila Maqbool, P.E., Traffic Safety Engineer
Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
3330 W. Grace Street
Boise, ID 83703

RE: City of Nampa LHSIP Funded Projects

Dear Ms. Maqbool:

As discussed in our September 4th, 2012 meeting, the City of Nampa has completed our MUTCD Warrant analysis for the two intersections approved for funding under the LHSIP Program. The two projects approved for LHSIP funding include Key No. H375; Hawaii Avenue & Holly Street Signal and Key No. H376, Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue Signal.

The intersection of Holly Street & Hawaii Avenue does not currently meet the MUTCD warrants for a signal installation. However, the Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue intersection currently meets several of the MUTCD traffic volume warrants.

Therefore, the City of Nampa requests that the Hawaii Avenue & Holly Street project (Key No. H375) be removed from the current LHSIP funding list. Furthermore, we request that the Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue project (Key No. H376) funding is revised to more accurately reflect the full federal aid costs for the project. We request the project cost be increased to $499,000.

Our request for an increase in the funded amount results in a total funding request less than the original two projects. The “Cost / Benefit Ratio” resulting from the increased funding request is 41.5 to 1. This Cost / Benefit Ratio ranks the Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue project at the same priority as the original application Ratio, neither moving the project up nor down on the funded list.

Attached is our supporting documentation for this request, including a revised ITD-1150, ITD-2435 and LHSIP application form for the Middleton Road & Flamingo Avenue project.

If you have any questions or concerns feel free to contact me to discuss them.

Sincerely,

Leonard Grady, P.E., City Engineer
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, Idaho 83651
(208) 468-5458

Enclosures: ITD-1150, Project Cost Summary Sheet & Associated Engineers Estimate
ITD-2435, Local Federal Aid Project Request
Local Highway Safety Improvement Program Application
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**Subject**

**Statewide Safety Program changes to FY2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 15 B</td>
<td>A012441</td>
<td>12441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Location**

Segment Code 001370 MP 2.94 in Bingham County

**Background Information**

This Board item requests changes to the Statewide Safety Program per Policies B-11-02 and 5011, and following Departmental procedures.

The district has requested removal of the **S Broadway Street & Walker Street, Blackfoot** project from the program. The project entered the program in FY 2010 and was slated for construction in FY 2015 for intersection safety improvements. In preliminary design the district determined that a maintenance action would provide the desired safety benefit and took that action without a need for project funds.

The District proposes shifting the funding to a new safety project scheduled in FY 2015. The new **District - Wide Turn Bay** project cost and schedule for development and construction is identical to that for the removed Blackfoot project.

This type of program adjustment would usually be handled during the draft program process. However, the district believes that waiting could hinder planned accelerated delivery.

**Recommendations**

Remove **S Broadway Street & Walker Street, Blackfoot** (Key No. 12441) at $1.1M and add **District - Wide Turn Bays** at $1.1M in the Statewide Safety program and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

**Board Action**

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Deferred
- [ ] Other
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date: April 9-10, 2013

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program -- Three Project Removals in FY 2013–2014

Route Number  Project Number  Key Number
Off System   A012(414), A012(988), A012(094)   12414, 12988, 13094

District        Location                       1st Avenue in Ketchum, Coeur D'Alene Indian Reservation, City of Kimberly

Background Information

This Board item requests changes to the Safe Routes to School Program per Policies B-11-02 and 5011, and following Departmental procedures.

The project sponsors contacted the Department's SR2S Coordinator to request that their projects be removed and/or modified from the SR2S program in FY 2013 and FY 2014. The three projects requested for changes are:

- Off System, 1st Avenue Lighting, Ketchum/MRTA SR2S
- Off System, CDA Tribe SR2S Education
- Off System, Main Street Sidewalk & SR2S Coordinator, Kimberly (partial)

The City of Ketchum completed their SR2S lighting improvements themselves with city funds. The Kimberly sponsors withdrew from the infrastructure i.e. construction portion of their project, but chose to retain the non-infrastructure project component which has been obligated in FY2013. The CDA Tribe withdrew because they had been unable to receive all the funding for their project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Routes to School Program Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost in Thousands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013       FY 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove KN 12414, Ketchum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove KN 12988, CDA Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change KN 13094, Kimberly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Adjustment Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Remove/change three Off System projects, 1st Avenue Lighting, Ketchum/MRTA SR2S (Key No. 12414) at $63,000, CDA Tribe SR2S Education (Key No. 12988) at $2,000, and Main Street Sidewalk & SR2S Coordinator, Kimberly infrastructure only (Key No. 13094) at $100,000 from FY 2013 and FY 2014 in the SR2S program. Amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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Jeanette Finch

From: Shauna DeMeritt
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 7:50 AM
To: Jason Miller
Cc: Ihrowitz@ketchumidaho.org; Jack Shambaugh; Rinda Mitchell
Subject: RE: KN 12414 Ketchum SR2S Grant

Jason,

Unfortunately, we are not able to change the scope and will not be able to award the funds. The Safe Routes to School projects are recommended for approval by the Idaho Transportation Board, after review and prioritization by the Safe Routes to School Committee. Any changes in scope of this magnitude, (different location, different project type) has to go back through the application process. We normally have an annual call for applications. However, ITD has not made any decisions on what changes will occur to the Safe Routes to School program due to the elimination of the dedicated Safe Routes to School program/funding in the new transportation bill. Therefore we are not sure when, if at all, we would initiate the call for applications. The funds previously set aside for this project will go back into the pot and will be used for cost overruns on other awarded projects. Funds may come available in the next few years either from leftover Safe Routes to School funds and/or other funding. We will make sure to let you know about this or other opportunities.

Shauna

From: Jason Miller [mailto:jason@mountainrides.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2012 11:00 AM
To: Shauna DeMeritt
Cc: Ihrowitz@ketchumidaho.org; Jack Shambaugh
Subject: RE: KN 12414 Ketchum SR2S Grant

Hi Shauna-

Thanks for the info and responses. With some research between Mountain Rides and the City of Ketchum, we have discovered that there was much miscommunication with this project. As a result, it turns out that the City of Ketchum had thought that they were not successful in this grant and went ahead and did this project on their own using some unexpected extra city funds in the years after the grant was submitted.

Given that this project is complete, is there any way for the City of Ketchum and Mountain Rides to revise the scope of the project to meet another Safe Routes to School infrastructure need at Hemingway Elementary School or Pioneer Montessori School? The funding amount would stay the same. We would just write a new scope of work for you to consider, approve and incorporate into a revision to KN12414.

Thanks,
Jason

From: Shauna DeMeritt [mailto:Shauna.DeMeritt@itd.idaho.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 8:10 AM
To: jason@mountainrides.org
Cc: Ihrowitz@ketchumidaho.org; Jack Shambaugh
Subject: KN 12414 Ketchum SR2S Grant
January 3, 2013

Shauna DeMeritt
Grants and Contracts Officer
Division of Transportation Performance
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, Idaho 83707-1129

RE: Coeur d' Alene Tribal School Safe Routes to School Project KN 12988

Dear Shauna:

This letter is written in response to your letter to me dated December 26, 2012 regarding the match for the above-referenced grant award. When the Tribe applied for this grant we were willing to undertake the non-infrastructure portion of the work if the funding for the infrastructure (sidewalks) was granted. However, as you know we did not receive the infrastructure funding. Previously, we had decided to proceed with the grant and undertake the educational efforts outlined in our application; however, given the repeal of SAFETEA-LU and the new match requirement contained in MAP-21, I believe it would be prudent for us to opt out of this grant award and not proceed with completing the education requirements or accept the grant funding.

If you have any questions related to this matter, please contact me at the above address or telephone number.

Sincerely,

Jim Kackman
Public Works Director

CC: Eric Kendra, Tribal School Superintendent
December 5, 2012

Jack Shambaugh
Idaho Department of Transportation
216 South Date Street
Shoshone, ID 83352

Dear Jack:

The Kimberly City Council met on Nov. 27th, 2012 to discuss the Safe Routes to School project funding and was informed by the City’s project consultant Ivan McCracken, Project Manager from JUB Engineers, about the recent changes in SR2S Federal funding regulations as administered by ITD.

At the meeting the following information and options to proceed were presented by Ivan to the council:

SR2S Project Background Information:
The City has a 3 Phase plan for addressing the needs along Main Street South: Center St to City Limits.

1. Phase 1 is planned to be a roadway construction to correct severe pavement and minor drainage deficiencies
2. Phase 2 is planned to provide for a pedestrian/multi-use connection on the west side of the right-of-way from the residential areas in the south part of town to the center portion of town
3. Phase 3 is planned to provide additional roadway construction and for a pedestrian/multi-use connection on the east side of the right-of-way

The City Council was given the following options to decide from:

1. Will it continue to keep the Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects together and work through the Davis-Bacon and biological clearances? (Potential estimated overall project costs to the City $676,560, not including grant funds)
2. Will it split the projects and separate them so Phase 1 is completed prior to Phase 2 starting so they can be kept clear of each other, but this is very challenging on the schedule? (Potential estimated overall project costs to the City $584,340, not including grant funds)
3. Will it drop out of the SR2S program and build Phase 2 improvements on its own, and on its own schedule to avoid the entanglements of the Federal funding requirements. (Potential estimated overall project costs to the City $615,310, not including grant funds)

The City Council members discussed at length the pros and cons of each of the three options presented to them. When asked by the Council, Mr. McCracken said his recommendation was to choose Option 2. The final result of the discussions was that the Council voted to withdraw from the SR2S program and build phase 2 improvements with the City’s own resources and on its own schedule to avoid the entanglements of the Federal funding requirements.

Please feel free to contact myself, Rob Wright, Kimberly City’s Public Works Director, or the City’s project consultant Ivan McCracken if you have any questions or concerns about the City Council’s recent decision to withdraw from the Safe Route’s to School funding for Phase 2 of the project.

Respectfully,

Tracy Armstrong, Mayor
City of Kimberly, Idaho

The City of Kimberly complies with the ADA and offers accommodations for disabilities.
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**Subject**

Transit Program Changes - Add two FY2012 Tribal Transit Discretionary Awards to FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>D20120TRTR-022 &amp; D20120TRTR-023</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Transit within and to/from Nez Perce and Fort Hall Reservations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Information**

This Board item requests addition of two new projects to the Transit Program per Policies B-11-02 and 5011 and following Departmental procedures. Additionally, 23 CFR 216(g) requires the STIP to include all surface transportation projects within the boundaries of the state.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) solicited nationally in 2012 for applications toward $15.5 million in FTA Section 5311(c) discretionary funds for Public Transportation on Indian Reservations. Nez Perce tribe was awarded $300,000 and the Shoshone-Bannock tribe was awarded $200,000 for additional operations.

Staff requests that these two projects be added to FY 2013 of the Transit Program and the STIP.

**Recommendations**

Add two new projects to the Transit Program, the Nez Perce Tribe – Operations at $300,000 and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe – Operations at $200,000 to FY 2013 and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

**Board Action**

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
Subject

TRANSIT PROGRAM CHANGES requested by Valley Regional Transit & COMPASS to FY 2013

Route Number | Project Number | Key Number
--- | --- | ---
Various | Various | Various

District Location

Various Various

Background Information

In accordance with Board Policy B-11-02 and Administrative Policy 5011, and following Departmental procedures, this Board item requests multiple changes to the FY 2013 Transit Program at the request of the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS).

The **Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act** merged and streamlined transit programs. The program changes included in this item take into consideration additional guidance on transit spending and adhere to Federal Transit Administrative (FTA) guidelines.

Working through COMPASS, transit provider Valley Regional Transit (VRT) has requested approximately twenty-four program changes, including the addition of six new projects funded through MAP-21 transit funding. The new projects will fund Capital, Operations, and Purchase of Services projects such as:

- Vehicle lease or purchase for the fixed line and demand response services, and support for equipment and maintenance, both in the Boise and Nampa Urbanized Area;
- Administration of programs to provide rides for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities in the Meridian and Eagle areas where other volunteer or senior center transportation is not accessible;
- Operating funds to provide services to the general public in the Meridian area;
- Additional services for Persons with Disabilities in Nampa, Caldwell and Middleton;
- Installations of technologies such as automatic passenger counters, fare collection, and upgrades; &
- Operations and administration of services in the Nampa Urbanized Area including to the YMCA.

VRT also requested changes to existing projects in the program, including removals, increases and decreases to project costs.

The COMPASS Regional Transportation Improvement Program has been amended to reflect changes.

Recommendations

Approve the addition of six new projects to the Transit Program and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to reflect all of the changes as presented on page 2 of the item.

Board Action

☐ Approved ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
## Valley Regional Transit Project Changes to FY 2013

**Cost in Thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Federal-Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5307/5339</td>
<td>Capital Lease or Purchase and Maintenance, Boise</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Capital Purchase of Service, Boise</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Operations Fixed Line and Demand Response</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5339</td>
<td>Technology Implementation, Valley Regional Transit</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Capital Lease or Purchase and Maintenance, Nampa</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Capital Purchase of Service, Nampa</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12753</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Capital, Safety and Security, Boise</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12766</td>
<td>5316</td>
<td>Job Access Reverse Commute Development, Boise</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12768</td>
<td>5316</td>
<td>New Freedom Initiative Development, Boise</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12769</td>
<td>5317</td>
<td>New Freedom Initiative Administration, Boise</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13229</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Replacement Vehicles, Boise</td>
<td>-373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum -607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12754</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Associated Capital Enhancements, Boise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12756</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Demand Response Operations, Boise</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12757</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Planning, Boise</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12760</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Associated Capital Improvement, Nampa</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12762</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Operations Fixed Line, Nampa</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12764</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Transit Planning, Nampa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12767</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Mobility Program, Boise</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13225</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Valley Regional Technology, Boise</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum 1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12755</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Capital Lease or Purchase and Maintenance, Boise</td>
<td>-317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12758</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Preventive Maintenance, Boise</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12761</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Capital Lease or Purchase and Maintenance, Nampa</td>
<td>-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12763</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Demand Response Operations, Nampa</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12765</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>Preventive Maintenance, Nampa</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5307 Urbanized Area Funds (18 projects)—additional funding from FY13 apportionment 14
- 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities (2 projects)—additional funding from FY13, new MAP-21 item 339
- 5310 Elderly Persons & Persons w/Disability (2 projects)—additional funding from FY13 357
- 5316 Job Access Reverse Commute (2 projects)—cancelled projects -199
- 5317 New Freedom (1 project)—cancelled projects -8

**Total by Funding Type** 503
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Subject
Scenic Byways Project Delay from FY 2013 to FY 2014

Route Number       Project Number       Key Number
Off System         ID12(004)             13518
District            Location
3                  Swan Falls Road, MP 0-3.0 in Kuna

Background Information
In January 2012, the Federal Highway Administration conducted their final solicitation of projects for discretionary funding through the National Scenic Byway Program (NSBP) under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

One of the NSBP awards for Idaho was $490,000 of federal aid (total project cost $613,000) to the Ada County Highway District for addition of pedestrian and bicycling facilities along the Western Heritage Byway located to the southwest of the Boise metropolitan area. The project will construct three miles of five foot wide path alongside the roadway to improve the safety for the traveling public including bicyclists and pedestrians.

This project was included in the Approved FY 2013 – FY 2017 Idaho Transportation Investment Program.

This Board item requests a delay to Swan Falls Road Shoulder Widening, Kuna per Policies B-11-02 and 5011 and following Departmental procedures. The Swan Falls Road is a portion of the Western Heritage Historic Byway and is the focus of the FY 2012 NSBP award.

Ada County Highway District made a request through the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho-COMPASS to delay this project to FY 2014 to reflect the planned delivery year of the project.

Recommendations
Delay Swan Falls Road Shoulder Widening, Kuna (Key No. 13518) at $613,000 in the Scenic Byway program and amend the FY 2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) accordingly.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
 ☐ Other
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<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>Gordon Wilmoth</td>
<td>Business &amp; Support Mgr, Acting</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>JMG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparer's Name  Gordon Wilmoth  Preparer's Title  Business & Support Mgr, Acting  Initials  GW

Subject
Service Contracts issued by Business and Support Management

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information
The purpose of this Board item is to comply with the reporting requirements established in Board Policy 4001 - 'reporting requirements for the award of ...non-construction professional service agreements'.

For the period February 25, 2013 thru March 25, 2013, the Business and Support Management section processed 3 new service contracts totaling $312,370 and 0 service contract modifications.

Recommendations
For information only

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  
☐ Other  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Modification Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMP Companies LLC</td>
<td>Project Management for Office of Transportation Investment System</td>
<td>Innovative Business Practices</td>
<td>$197,600</td>
<td>8/2/13</td>
<td>7/31/14</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Office of Transportation Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKS Associates</td>
<td>Data Inventory and Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Innovative Business Practices</td>
<td>$99,775</td>
<td>2/15/13</td>
<td>2/14/14</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td>D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDESK Software Inc</td>
<td>Train ETS staff on how to get the best performance from the new LANDESK software</td>
<td>Innovative Business Practices</td>
<td>$14,995</td>
<td>6/24/2013</td>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Enterprise Technology Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Board Agenda Item**

**Meeting Date**  
April 9 & 10, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter’s Name</th>
<th>Presenter’s Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cole, LS/PE</td>
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<td>TC/lt</td>
<td>It</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**Preparer’s Name**  
Fran Hood, P.E.

**Preparer’s Title**  
Design/Mtls/Construction Engineer

**Subject**  
Contract Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Background Information**

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

Justifications are attached for awarding or rejecting contracts when the bid exceeds the engineer’s estimate by more than ten percent (10%).

**Recommendations**

For Information Only.

**Board Action**

- □ Approved
- □ Deferred

- □ Other
- Timber Way to Big Wood River Bridge
- Salmon River Bridge Nr Carmen
- I-86 Salt Lake IC to Raft River IC, WB
- Cheyenne Overpass Ph 1A, Pocatello
- FY13 D5 Distwide Br Repair
- Newdale, East
## Monthly Contract Status Report to the Board

### CONTRACT ACTIONS BY STAFF SINCE LAST BOARD MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>CN + CE</th>
<th>PE + PEC</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>UTIL</th>
<th>Est CE</th>
<th>Engineer Estimate</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
<th>% of Est</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>% of Prog</th>
<th>Prog net +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CONTRACTS ACCEPTED**

### District 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12916</td>
<td>$13,272,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route: I-86</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 3/12/2013</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: WESTERN CONSTRUCTION, INC.</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BIDS: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09846</td>
<td>$17,244,000</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09846</td>
<td>SALT LAKE IC TO RAFT RIVER IC, WB</td>
<td>RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route: SH-75</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 3/12/2013</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: STAKER &amp; PARSON COMPANIES dba IDAHO SAND &amp; GRAVEL COMPANY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BIDS: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07836</td>
<td>$12,767,000</td>
<td>$1,949,200</td>
<td>$4,453,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07836</td>
<td>TIMBER WAY TO BIG WOOD RV BR, BLAINE CO</td>
<td>RECONST/REALIGN</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route: OFF SYS</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 3/5/2013</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: LEGRAND JOHNSON CONSTRUCTION CO.</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BIDS: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10735</td>
<td>$5,805,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10735</td>
<td>CHEYENNE OVERPASS PH 1A, POCATELLO</td>
<td>BR/APPRES</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route: SH-33</th>
<th>OPENING DATE: 3/12/2013</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: M. A. DEATLEY CONSTRUCTION, INC.</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BIDS: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09389</td>
<td>$7,872,000</td>
<td>$418,436</td>
<td>$136,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09389</td>
<td>NEWDALE, EAST</td>
<td>RESRF/RESTO&amp;REHAB</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09571</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09571</td>
<td>SALMON RV BR, NR CARMEN</td>
<td>BR/APPRES</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE OF BID OPENING - FEBRUARY 26, 2013 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A011(660)
FY13 D5 Distwide Br Repair
Bannock County, Key No. 11660

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of repairing four existing bridges using a Silica fume or epoxy overlay on the deck and spawl repair on substructure; FY13 D5 Distwide Br Repair, known as Idaho Federal Aid Project No. A011(660), in Bannock County, Key No. 11660.

ESTIMATED COMPLETION: September, 2013

BIDDERS:

- D. L. Beck, Inc. $2,390,211.91
  Rexburg, ID 83440

- Gerber Construction, Inc. $2,497,129.65
  Lehi, UT 84043

- Cannon Builders, Inc. $2,925,238.45
  Blackfoot, ID 83221

4 BIDS RECEIVED
1-Irregular (Failure to acknowledge Addenda)

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $1,941,039.34

LOW BID - 123 Percent of the Engineer's Estimate

(AWARD) (REJECT)

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. Roadway Design concurs with the District's recommendation.

Frances J. Hood, P.E.
Design/Materials/Construction Engineer

Date 3/5/13
DATE: MARCH 1, 2013

TO: FRAN HOOD, P.E.

FROM: ED BALA, P.E.

RE: BID JUSTIFICATION

District Five has reviewed the results of bids on the referenced project and offers the following justification:

The engineer’s estimate was derived from the estimator program. Bids ranged from 123 percent (%) to 151 percent (%) of our engineer’s estimate. We believe this is primarily because we have difficult staging for the construction, and a short construction time period.

The apparent low bidder was 23 percent (%) over our engineer’s estimate. There are some bid items that significantly contributed to this. Item Z629-05A (Mobilization) was estimated at a lump sum of $164,000 and bid at $388,678; a difference of $224,678. Item 405-325A (Superpave HMA pav) was estimated at a unit price of $90 per ton, resulting in an estimate of $315,000 and bid at a unit price of $109 per ton, giving a bid of $382,375; a difference of $67,375. There were several other bid items that came higher than our engineer’s estimate and some that came in significantly lower.

We called the apparent low bidder to inquire on the reasoning for the higher bids, and to verify that there was not a mistake with the significantly lower bid items. He offered that many of the bid items that were higher were his subcontractor bids, and generally it was because materials have increased in cost, and it is a long haul to the project. He additionally said some of the items that were significantly lower than our bid items were because he estimated multiple trips to the project for those items and he put the travel in Mobilization. This resulted in the mobilization being higher than the estimate.

The contractor was satisfied with his bid and District Five sees no reason to re-advertise the project for additional bidding opportunity, and recommends awarding the project to the low bidder.

EB/jb:gh

c: EM5
   PDE5
   rf
DATE OF BID OPENING - FEBRUARY 26, 2013 - FEDERAL & STATE FINANCED
PROJECT

Idaho Federal Aid Project No. NH-6350 (127)
Salmon River Bridge, Nr Carmen
Lemhi County, Key No. 09571

DESCRIPTION: The work on this project consists of placing a concrete overlay and placing a riprap at the piers of the Carmen Bridge on US-93, MP 309.03; Salmon River Bridge, Nr Carmen, known as Idaho Federal Aid Project No. NH-6350 (127), in Lemhi County, Key No. 09571.

ESTIMATED COMPLETION: November, 2013

BIDDERS:

- Braun-Jensen Inc
  Payette ID 83661
  $675,000.00

- RSCI
  Meridian ID 83642
  $685,503.46

- D L Beck Inc
  Rexburg ID 83440
  $726,556.50

- James W Fowler Co.
  Dallas OR 97338
  $914,426.00

- Cannon Builders Inc
  Blackfoot ID 83221
  $976,260.00

5 BIDS RECEIVED

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE - $451,554.20

LOW BID - 149 Percent of the Engineer's Estimate

(AWARD) (REJECT)
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. Roadway Design concurs with the District’s recommendation.

Frances J. Hood, P.E.
Design/Materials/Construction Engineer

3/22/13
Date
DATE: March 13, 2013  

Program Number(s) NH-6350(127)  

TO: FRANCES J. HOOD, P.E.  
Design/Material/Construction Engineer  

FROM: BLAKE RINSLISBACHER, P.E.  

Program ID, County, Etc. SALMON RIVER BRIDGE, CARMEN LEMHI COUNTY  

RE: JUSTIFICATION FOR ACCEPTING BID ABOVE 110% OF ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE  

On February 26, 2013, the District received five bids for construction of the above captioned project. The five bids were:

- $675,000.00 – Low Bid  
- $685,503.46  
- $726,556.50  
- $914,426.00  
- $976,260.00  

The Engineer's Estimate was $451,554.20, making the apparent low bid 150% of the estimate.

The increases are reflected in the following items of work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Overlay</td>
<td>$50,720.00</td>
<td>$126,800.00</td>
<td>$76,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conc. Bridge Deck Rem Cl A</td>
<td>$57,035.00</td>
<td>$96,959.00</td>
<td>$39,924.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Jacks Scour Protection</td>
<td>$161,868.00</td>
<td>$196,308.00</td>
<td>$34,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastomeric Conc. Header</td>
<td>$6,885.00</td>
<td>$13,284.00</td>
<td>$6,399.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Header</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$110,813.20</td>
<td>$70,813.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$227,656.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After review and analysis of the bids in comparison to the Engineer's Estimate we have determined the following points to justify the low bid:

1. Three of the five bids are within 10% of each other, suggesting that the prices given for the bid items are reasonable.
2. The Engineer's Estimate was primarily based on historical prices and low unit bid prices rather than being adjusted for the real conditions for:
   a. Standard Construction practice for the installation of the A-Jacks System and,
   b. Construction projects that are in remote areas, North of Salmon.
3. This construction project will be done in a remote area where we will have two phases of mobilization which could induce a probability of the contractor conducting their operations by either mobilizing to another project or having their equipment sit idle. This was not adequately accounted for in the Engineer's Estimate and should have been a higher estimate.
4. We will not be using Standard Construction practices for the installation of the A-Jack System due to the limited access to the bridge and the narrow width. The installation is typically conducted off the deck of the bridge but instead we will be working on the embankment of the river. This was not
adequately accounted for the Engineer’s Estimate and should have been a higher estimate to cover the atypical construction practice.

Based on the above information, we recommend that the low bid be accepted.

cc: D6 PDE
Project File w/ att.
rf
**Board Agenda Item**

**Meeting Date**: April 9-10, 2013

**Amount of Time Needed for Presentation**

<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>Leo Hickman</td>
<td>CAU Project Manager</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>It</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparer's Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparer's Name</th>
<th>Preparer's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Reviewed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo Hickman</td>
<td>CAU Project Manager</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>TEC, LSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Subject**

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS AND TERM AGREEMENT WORK TASK REPORT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Background Information**

The Consultant Administration Unit processed $1,553,491.78 in new professional services agreements and work tasks (WT) issued from March 1, 2013 through March 22, 2013.

The table below shows the new agreements and work tasks for each District. Twenty two new agreements and work tasks were issued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Public Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Geotechnical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Surveying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources not Available: Roadway Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Expertise: Traffic Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Expertise: Surveying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Expertise: Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Expertise: Highway Needs Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Board Agenda Item

### District 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STC-5723, Burma Rd; Gotham Bay Rd to SH 97, Kootenai Co</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>Design Support Services during Construction</td>
<td>Local Public Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 90, Northwest Blvd Signal Upgrades, CDA</td>
<td>Parametrix</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Design</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Traffic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 90, Pleasant View &amp; Spokane St, Overpass Signal Upgrade</td>
<td>Parametrix</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Design</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Traffic Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 95, Thorn Creek Road to Moscow, Phase 1</td>
<td>Rosemary Brennan Curtin, Inc.</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>Public Involvement Services</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Public Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12 District 2 Rockfall Mitigation</td>
<td>Jacobs Associates</td>
<td>$4,586.78</td>
<td>Geotechnical Analysis</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Geotechnical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY12 ACHD Overlays (2)</td>
<td>HDR Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>$124,500.00</td>
<td>Construction Engineering &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>Local Public Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pedestrian Bridge, Garden City</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>$110,205.00</td>
<td>Concept through PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Local Public Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Cole Rd to Orchard St, Boise (GARVEE)</td>
<td>WHPacific</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td>Land Surveying</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Surveying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Board Agenda Item

**District 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offsystem, Northside Main Canal Bridge, Jerome Highway District</td>
<td>Horrocks Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>Design Support during Construction</td>
<td>Local Public Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75, Timber Way to Big Wood River Bridge, Blaine County</td>
<td>WHPacific</td>
<td>$97,100.00</td>
<td>Design Support during Construction</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75, Stanley to Clayton, Guardrail Study</td>
<td>DKS Associates</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>Guardrail Study</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Highway Needs Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Malad River Gorge Bridge</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>$13,500.00</td>
<td>Materials Testing</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75, Timber Way to Big Wood River Bridge, Blaine County</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>$149,000.00</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Construction Inspection</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 75, Shoshone North</td>
<td>Civil Science, Inc.</td>
<td>$26,500.00</td>
<td>Construction Schedule Analysis</td>
<td>Special Expertise: Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Junction I 84/US 93 Interchange, Stage 2</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>Construction Materials Testing</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Cotterell Rest Area Reconstruction</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>Construction Materials Testing</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84 Cotterell Rest Area Ramps</td>
<td>Materials Testing and Inspection</td>
<td>$44,000.00</td>
<td>Construction Materials Testing</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84, Juniper Rest Area to Utah/Idaho State Line, East Bound</td>
<td>Civil Science, Inc.</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>Surveying and Mapping</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Surveying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 93, 400 South Road, Jerome County</td>
<td>J-U-B Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>$26,500.00</td>
<td>Topographic Surveys</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Surveying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason Consultant Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 91, Tyhee Wasteway Canal Bridge, Bannock County</td>
<td>URS Energy &amp; Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>Roadway Design</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Roadway Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 89, Ovid Creek East Bridge, Bear Lake County</td>
<td>Keller Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
<td>Roadway Design</td>
<td>Resources not Available: Roadway Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Supplemental Agreements to existing agreements, two for District 1, and one for District 2, were processed during this period and is summarized below. Total dollar amount is **$237,300.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US 95, Sandpoint, North &amp; South</td>
<td>SWCA Environmental Consultants</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>Artifact Curation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STC-5750, West Fork Pine Creek Bridge, Shoshone County (LOCAL)</td>
<td>David Evans &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Construction Inspection Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STC-4782, Grangemont Road, Clearwater County (LOCAL)</td>
<td>H.W. Lochner, Inc.</td>
<td>$35,300.00</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Agenda Item

Recommendations
For Information Only

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

**Meeting Date**  April 10, 2013  
**Amount of Time Needed for Presentation**  Consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter's Name</th>
<th>Presenter's Title</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maranda Obray</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td>MCO</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>Maranda Obray</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td>MCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject**

IPLAN Project - Monthly Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A011(202)</td>
<td>11202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>FY12 Statewide Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Information**

Providing the Board with a Project Status Update Report to be placed on the consent agenda to substitute for the monthly presentations.

At this time the project is currently in the development/configuration stage; however, in the event of major milestones, the project manager will present to the Board.

The project manager will always be available should the item be pulled for questions by the Board.

**Recommendations**

For information only.

**Board Action**

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
### Reporting Period: March 1 – 31, 2013

#### Reporting Date: 3/27/2013
- On Schedule
- On Budget

#### Goals:
1. Finalize Solution Document with Architectural Assessment and the Gap Analysis document
2. Monthly Board presentation
3. Establish agenda, schedule and conduct the IPLAN Project and Functionality Meeting with the District Geographic Information System (GIS) Analysts and District Planners
4. Submit Eco-Logical Grant Application with Idaho Department of Fish & Game (IDFG)
5. Continue outreach with stakeholders
6. Continue outreach with GIS and Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) sections
7. Continue working on the Data Standards Document
8. Move from study portion to configuration/development of IPLAN

#### Deliverables Completed during Current Period:

- **Goals 1 & 2**  
  Provided and presented Solution Document with Architectural Assessment and Gap Analysis document to the Board Members.

- **Goal 3**  
  Conducted an Introduction to IPLAN Project and Functionality to Headquarters and District GIS and Planner sections.  
  - Determined draft workflows of data standards;  
  - Determined IPLAN user login permissions;  
  - Determined roles and responsibilities; and  
  - Determined what collective efforts needed to take place in order to work together statewide rather than individually within each District

- **Goal 4**  
  Submitted Eco-Logical Grant Application with Idaho Fish & Game.  
  - Conducted a number of meetings to work together to complete the application;  
  - Gained a better relationship between agencies; and  
  - Discussed how and when the ITD & IDFG Upper Management could meet for a presentation of the Crucial Habitat Assessment Tool (CHAT) and IPLAN.

- **Goal 5**  
  Coordinated and aligned with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Section to clarify their needs and wants for thematic maps created and utilized in IPLAN.

- **Goal 6**  
  Coordinated and aligned with the ETS Section for follow up of Enterprise Architectural (EA) Assessment provided as part of the Solution Document.
Planned Activities for Next Period:

- Continue working closely with GIS Section and ETS Section through the configuration and development portion of IPLAN.
- Work with the Districts to provide a number of logins and permissions under IPLAN.
  - Assist in any training or support with IPLAN functionality
- Present an IPLAN overview at the Project Development Conference on April 3, 2013
- Prepare for an IPLAN/UPLAN workshop and presentation at the GIS-T Conference in May 2013
- Schedule kickoff meeting of the IPLAN Data Team
  - Start discussions regarding standards of collected data, submittal process and roles and responsibilities
- Schedule meeting between ITD and IDFG for the CHAT and IPLAN presentation

Upcoming Major Milestones/Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Start</th>
<th>Planned Finish Date</th>
<th>Actual Start Date</th>
<th>Actual Finish Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2/2013</td>
<td>4/26/2013</td>
<td>1/2/2013</td>
<td>3/4/2013</td>
<td>Solution Document and Cost Options with Architectural Assessment derived from Gap Analysis</td>
<td>As part of the document the EA Assessment provided by ETS was an appendix item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2013</td>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement IPLAN in a Production Environment</td>
<td>BIO-WEST will provide system support through 10/25/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td>10/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIO-WEST System Support and Implementation Complete</td>
<td>Provide a “quiet” go-live of IPLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2013</td>
<td>10/25/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Complete</td>
<td>User Training Content Creation during testing period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td>10/28/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IPLAN Project – Phase I Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Background Information

The Idaho Pathways project is a collaborative effort of many parties to stimulate successful productivity and prosperity while positioning Idaho's economy to be more competitive and dynamic in today's global marketplace. The Idaho Department of Commerce and the six economic development districts of Idaho are key drivers of Idaho Pathways. The University of Idaho is supporting their efforts with financial support from Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, Idaho Department of Commerce, the districts, the Idaho National Laboratory, the University of Idaho, and others. A list of committed project participants is found at the Idaho Pathways website; www.blogs.uidaho.edu/idaho-Pathways.

The goals of the project are to update the comprehensive economic development strategies (CEDS) of the economic development districts and create a statewide CEDS. Regional and statewide economic development teams will utilize secondary research, recent governor's summits on economic development and related topics, expertise at Idaho's institutions of higher education, and the expertise of the team members (e.g., leaders from business and industry, governmental leaders, non-profit economic development organization leaders and other economic development stakeholders) to create an economic development vision. These teams will identify metrics and devise protocols for measuring the movement toward successful outputs and outcomes, which reflect the vision.

The regional and statewide teams will employ the asset mapping and the results of economic modeling in interactive workshop settings to explore alternatives as they update their regional CEDS and create a statewide CEDS. This data-driven process is expected to provide a structure and platform to encourage (1) the development of realistic regional economic development visions, (2) the creation of evidence-based and supported CEDS, (3) diverse and engaged economic development teams with new ways to stay networked, and (4) the potential to align economic development opportunities across the state, capitalizing on newfound supply and demand chain linkages. Another output of the project is a database, which will be available to the general public, containing the asset mapping data.

### Recommendations

For information only.

### Board Action

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Deferred
- [ ] Other
Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date: April 9-10, 2013
Amount of Time Needed for Presentation: 15 Minutes

Subject
PTAC Annual Update & I-way Leadership Award

Background Information
The Public Transportation Advisory Council member will provide an update of district accomplishments, challenges, and a look forward into the new year with respect to improving mobility options and public transportation.

Additionally, the Community Transportation Association of Idaho will present an annual update as well as the 2013 I-way Leadership Award.

Recommendations
No action required - Information only.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐ Other
Strategic Plan Goal: Provide a mobility focused transportation system that drives economic opportunity.

In April 2008, the IT Board through resolution (attached) supported the implementation of a new system, structure, and concept for the delivery of rural public transportation across Idaho. The foundation of this new rural system was built upon:

- Mobility occurs at the local level
- Local officials must lead mobility efforts and requires extensive local participation
- Conducted through a comprehensive statewide planning methodology
- Delivers affordable, flexible, and accessible mobility for all citizens
- Workforce development and quality of life issues are high priority
- Urban and Rural systems must be integrated and coordinated

Additionally, over the past two years considerable efforts have been focused on rebuilding partnerships between our Rural and Urban transit partners, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Community Transportation Association of Idaho, human service organizations, local governmental agencies, elected officials, and ITD.

The next step to realizing an integrated statewide system of public transportation is a comprehensive analysis of all Urban and Rural Mobility Management Systems across the state. Therefore, both Urban and Rural transportation partners have initiated such a project with the following project purpose.

"Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the mobility management system at the state, regional, and provider levels and to develop a plan for creating and sustainably funding a comprehensive statewide mobility management system that recognizes the importance of multimodal mobility coordination and meets the vision and goals of the state, regional/local decision-makers, public transportation providers and leads to improved transportation and mobility for all residents in Idaho."

Pursuit of this next step of systems integration, coordination, and partnership between the Rural and Urban transit programs is a bold step and demonstrates a commitment from our transportation partners.

Recommendations

For information.

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
Transit Passenger Trips (in millions)

Based on Annual One-Way Boardings

Why This Is Important
The Division of Transportation Performance (DTP) along with its many partners across the State strives to "enhance mobility for all people." By measuring the cumulative usage of all public transportation systems in Idaho, a better understanding can be gained of service provided to the public.

How We Measure It
The measure is calculated by summing the total number of passengers who board public transportation vehicles. Passengers are counted each time they board no matter how many vehicles they use to travel from their origin to destination.

What We’re Doing About It
The DTP partners with numerous governmental, public, and private organizations to encourage public transportation use. Grant programs administered by the Division provide funds for the operational costs of service providers, the purchase of capital assets including vehicles, as well as various education and outreach programs. Program development and performance management are other key elements performed by the Division to ensure that access and services are continually expanding and that public funds are being used in the most effective and efficient manner.

Statewide Passenger Trips
(in Millions)

Statewide Passenger Trips
(One-Way Boardings in Thousands)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Passenger Trips per Capita</th>
<th>Why This Is Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Idaho has seen a rapid increase in total population in recent years. This has certainly brought to the forefront the need to better understand and monitor public transportation within the state. By analyzing total passenger trips compared to the population, one can begin to account for trip increases caused by population growth vs. other key factors including increases in services or a shift to greater usage by those already residing in the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How We Measure It**

The measure is calculated by dividing the total statewide passenger trips by the current population estimate for the state of Idaho.

**What We're Doing About It**

The Division of Transportation Performance partners with numerous governmental, public, and private organizations to encourage public transportation use. The Division facilitates and promotes a number of programs to encourage usage of public transportation and expansion of pre-existing services.
Transit Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Mile
Annual One-Way Boardings / Vehicle Revenue Miles

Why This Is Important

The Division of Transportation Performance (DTP) and its partners seek to provide enhanced mobility options for all Idahoans. One of the methods to accomplish this goal is to work to increase public transportation usage and efficiency.

As more passengers use public transportation given a constant level of service or vehicle revenue miles (VRMs) delivered, the ratio of trips to VRMs will increase. VRMs are defined as the miles that vehicles travel while in active, revenue generating service and capable of providing potential boardings. By comparing passenger trips to VRMs, we can track the trend in the ratio to ensure any additional service miles added to the statewide system correspondingly increase passenger trips.

How We Measure It

This measure is calculated by taking the total passenger trips and dividing it by the total vehicle revenue miles driven by the service providers in Idaho.

What We're Doing About It

The DTP is continuing to work with its partners to find new and innovative ways to expand service and increase usage to better serve the citizens of Idaho. This is done through monthly monitoring of the statewide system and encouraging local decisions by the District Coordinating Councils (DCC) and the Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC).
It is important to monitor the efficiency of public transportation operations within the state of Idaho as government funds continue to shrink due to the economic recession and current federal budget deficits. By monitoring the total operating cost per passenger trip among all service modes throughout the entire state, the Division of Transportation Performance (DTP) and its partners can recognize trends and work to assist public transportation providers in delivering the most efficient trip possible.

This measure is calculated by taking the total operating cost--inclusive of administrative and preventive maintenance costs--of public transportation providers in Idaho and dividing it by the total annual number of statewide passenger trips.

The DTP actively monitors the total operating cost per trip by each mode and individual public transportation provider. The Division provides this information to the local District Coordinating Councils (DCC). The DCCs use this information to help make funding allocations for each of their Local Mobility Management Networks.
FTA Operating $ Subsidy per Transit Passenger Trip

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Operating Dollars / One-Way Boardings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA Operating $ Subsidy per Transit Passenger Trip</th>
<th>Why This Is Important</th>
<th>How We Measure It</th>
<th>What We're Doing About It</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 -</td>
<td>Public transportation providers in Idaho currently receive grant dollars from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to assist them in purchasing capital assets such as vehicles as well as supporting the operation, maintenance and administration of the services needed for a functioning multi-modal system. An equitable distribution of these funds allows for everyone to have access to public transportation and ensure that taxpayer funds are being used in the most efficient manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This measure is calculated by totaling the FTA operating dollars received by the public transportation providers in Idaho and dividing them by the total number of one-way passenger boardings. This measure excludes capital dollars, i.e., those used for the purchase of vehicles or construction of facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Division of Transportation Performance actively monitors the amount of FTA operating funds received by Idaho’s public transportation providers. The Division provides this information to the local District Coordinating Councils (DCCs). The DCCs use this information to help them make funding allocations throughout their District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Federal Operating Subsidy per Passenger Trip

- 2010: 2.05
- 2011: 2.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The image of Idaho's public transportation system, I-80, is shown, with the text on the image indicating the number of fatalities and fatalities per 100,000,000 miles.
Transit Fatality Rate
Number of Fatalities / Million Vehicle Revenue Miles

Transit Fatality Rate
-- Federal Fiscal Year 2012 --

Why This Is Important

Even one death on Idaho's roadways is one death too many. It is the goal of the Division of Transportation Performance (DTP) and its partners to promote the safest public transportation system possible. The recent MAP-21 legislation has put further emphasis on state DOTs to develop safety plans, to monitor safety and provide training to public transportation providers.

How We Measure It

This measure is calculated by taking the total annual number of fatalities on Idaho's public transportation systems and dividing them by the number of vehicle revenue miles (VRM). The reported fatality rate is per 1,000,000 VRMs traveled. The fatalities tracked in this measure include only those reported by the DTP to the Rural National Transit Database on behalf of sub-recipients receiving Federal Transit Administration grant funds under the Section 5311 program. VRMs are defined as the miles that vehicles travel while in active, revenue generating service and capable of providing potential boardings.

What We're Doing About It

The DTP and its partners manage a number of programs that promote safety training as well as maintenance on public transportation vehicles. The continuing development of the I-TRIPS tracking system will further help to ensure the safe operation of public transportation in Idaho. DTP will also work under MAP-21 to develop a statewide safety plan, oversee the safety plans of the providers while monitoring safety in accordance with federal statutes.

Annual Number of Transit Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data is based on Federal Transit Administration hearing requests for Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 funds.
### Transit Incident Rate

Number of Incidents / Million Vehicle Revenue Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Incident Rate</th>
<th>Why This Is Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2012</td>
<td>The 2011 Strategic Plan for the Idaho Transportation Department commits the Department to provide the safest transportation system possible as one of our three primary goals. The Division of Transportation Performance (DTP) and its partners monitor safety efforts within the state’s public transportation system and promote a safe trip for all citizens. The recent MAP-21 legislation has put further emphasis on state DOTs to develop safety plans, to monitor safety and provide training to public transportation providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How We Measure It

This measure is calculated by taking the total annual number of incidents on Idaho’s public transportation systems and dividing them by the number of vehicle revenue miles (VRM). The reported incident rate is per 1,000,000 VRM's traveled. An incident is defined as a fatality, and/or an injury requiring immediate medical attention away from the scene, and/or property damage exceeding $25,000. The incidents tracked in this measure include only those reported by the DTP to the Rural National Transit Database on behalf of sub-recipients receiving Federal Transit Administration grants funds under the Section 5311 program. VRMs are defined as the miles that vehicles travel while in active, revenue generating service and capable of providing potential boardings.

### What We’re Doing About It

The DTP and its partners manage a number of programs that promote safety trainings as well as maintenance on public transportation vehicles. The continuing development of the I-TRIPS tracking system will further help to ensure the safe operation of public transportation in Idaho. DTP will also work under MAP-21 to develop a statewide safety plan, oversee the safety plans of the providers while monitoring safety in accordance with federal statutes.

### Annual Number of Incidents

Fatalities and/or injuries requiring immediate medical attention away from the scene and/or property damage exceeding $25,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2011</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2012</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, the Public Transportation Advisory Council, Interagency Working Group, Statewide Mobility Stakeholders, and the Division of Public Transportation collaborated to define the future of mobility and multi-modal transportation within the State of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, more than 600 individuals statewide participated in this process; and

WHEREAS, this effort illuminated many key findings, including:
- Regardless of the stakeholder, the primary customer for all is the user and potential user of transportation and mobility services,
- It is imperative that local stakeholders establish and support local mobility networks,
- Effective mobility networks start at the local level and are led by local leadership,
- Aggregating local mobility networks generate opportunities for coordination and connectivity,
- Recognition that public transportation and mobility services are relevant in Idaho,
- Idaho’s rural nature does not make mobility any less necessary; however it does make it more challenging,
- Idaho’s mobility networks, and stakeholders, should develop and support “Mobility Management” partnerships and systems that encourage moving people instead of focusing on the mode of transportation; and

WHEREAS, the collaboration produced the “Idaho’s Mobility and Access Pathway” (IMAP) document which presents Idaho’s comprehensive mobility management vision and scope within a new paradigm for working and furthering mobility management in Idaho; and

WHEREAS, IMAP describes the way in which the state and its many stakeholders will restructure and refocus themselves so that a most meaningful Statewide Mobility Management Plan, guided by customer needs being met through the efforts of local leadership, can be generated and pursued; and

WHEREAS, while many goals and objectives within IMAP rely on the Division of Public Transportation to lead and implement, it is clearly a plan that makes engagement and leadership of those at the local level its fundamental element of success; and

WHEREAS, the Division supports the development and coordination of locally designed mobility management networks—the foundation of Idaho’s mobility management system and services—and integrates and develops those into a comprehensive and coordinated Mobility Network articulated in the Statewide Mobility Management (Public Transportation) Plan; and

Continued
WHEREAS, the Division shall provide leadership and support by helping to coordinate and maximize all mobility management resources to provide accessibility and mobility, and by developing and supporting the availability of technical, informational, and educational resources that generate system efficiencies and viability; and

WHEREAS, Idaho’s Mobility and Access Pathway fully supports “Idaho’s Transportation Vision 2004-2034” including the following principles:

- Mobility of the future must be planned, preserved, developed, operated, and maintained in a fully integrated manner,
- Mobility of the future will support the citizen’s desired quality of life and be endorsed by stakeholders and citizens who own and use the system,
- Mobility of the future will be provided through adequate funding that allows multi-modal flexibility, with state and local commitment to integrated transportation and land use planning,
- Mobility of the future will support transportation choices for all individuals and clearly address the needs of all populations, including those with low incomes, people with disabilities, and the aging population.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board commends all those who have participated in this visioning process and authorizes staff to continue the Division’s efforts in building a statewide coalition of mobility management stakeholders with the intent to further define and pursue statewide multi-modal coordinated transportation based on a system of true mobility management; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Division of Public Transportation report back to the Board when draft local network plans are completed, and also as significant milestones are achieved and it becomes appropriate for the Board to consider further action.

Approved: April 17, 2008
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Presenter's Name
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Presenter's Title
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Reviewed By

Subject
Lower Payette River Heritage Byway Project

Route Number
SH 52

Project Number
N/A

Key Number
N/A

District
3

Location
Payette County, Gem County, Boise County

Background Information
The City of Emmett is proposing to designate a 52-mile scenic byway along Highway 52 from the City of Payette to the City of Horseshoe Bend. This byway will be known as the Lower Payette River Heritage Byway. The Lower Payette River Heritage Byway route will start at the Centennial Park in Payette County at milepost 0 and proceed East on Highway 52 through the City of Payette into Payette County on through Gem County, the City of Emmett, Boise County and terminating at the City of Horseshoe Bend. Attached is the proposal that was submitted to the Scenic Byways Advisory Committee and endorsed at the May 21, 2012 meeting.

Recommendations
Approve attached resolution, page 86.

Board Action
☐ Approved ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
APPLICATION FOR SCENIC BYWAY DESIGNATION FOR THE Lower Payette River Heritage Byway

Submitted by: City of Emmett

December 2011
An Application
For
Scenic Byway Designation
Of

Lower Payette River Heritage Byway
"52 on Highway 52"

The Lower Payette River Heritage Byway route will start at the Centennial Park in Payette County at Milepost 0 and proceed East on Highway 52 through the City of Payette into Payette County on through Gem County, the City of Emmett, Boise County and terminating at the City of Horseshoe Bend.

Presented to:
Idaho Scenic Byways Advisory Committee
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707

Proposed by:
Gem County, City of Emmett, Boise County, City of Horseshoe Bend, Payette County, City of Payette
December 20, 2011

Idaho Scenic Byways Advisory Committee
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707

Dear Idaho Scenic Byways Advisory Committee:

The City of Emmett on behalf of the Lower Payette River Heritage Byway Committee submits this application for consideration of a Scenic Byway designation for a 52 mile route along Highway 52 from the City of Payette to the City of Horseshoe Bend. The proposed byway would connect to the Payette River Scenic Byway and will offer travelers the opportunity to see and experience some of the finest historical sites in Southwest Idaho.

The Lower Payette River Heritage Byway Committee has worked with numerous Federal, State, and County agencies, and several city governments. Many community members have expressed support for the creation of a Scenic Byway along the proposed route.

If additional information is needed for this application, please feel free to contact Shawn Charters at (208) 741-1113 or via e-mail at chartersconsulting@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

William Butticci, Mayor
# Lower Payette River Scenic Byway

"52 on Highway 52"
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Byway Map
Lower Payette River Scenic Byway
“52 on Highway 52”

Points of Interest

The Lower Payette River Heritage Byway route will start at the Centennial Park in Payette County at Milepost 0 and proceed East on Highway 52 through the City of Payette into Payette County on through Gem County, the City of Emmett, Boise County and terminating at the City of Horseshoe Bend.

Payette County
- Centennial Park – Mile Post 0
- Greenway Park – Mile Post 1
- Downtown – Mile Post 1.5
- Clay Peak Cycle Park – Mile Post 4
- Fort Wilson – East of Mile Post 7
- Blacks Bridge & Birding Island – Mile Post 11
- Falks Store – Mile Post 18

Gem County
- Downtown – Mile Post 31
- Plaza Bridge / Pickets Corral – Mile Post 36.9
- Big Butte & Look out – Mile Post 38
- Historic Canal Walls – Mile Posts 39 - 44
- Black Canyon Dam, Reservoir and Surrounding Parks – Mile Post 39.1
- Triangle/Roy Stone Hot Springs – Mile Post 41

Boise County
- Osborne Mine – Mile Post 52
- Thunder Mountain Train Depot/Old Depot – Mile Post 55
- Powerhouse/Old Dam – Mile Post 55
- Boise Cascade – Mile Post 55
Payette County

Milepost 0 - Centennial Park  Centennial Park is located on the Idaho side of the Snake River Bridge on Hwy 52. Its entry is marked by a large carved rock. The park contains fishing docks, a boat launch area, picnic tables, trees for resting in the shade and a large grassy area for playing games. It is also the trailhead for the nature path along the confluence of the Payette and Snake Rivers which is one of the stops on the Oregon Snake River Water Trail.

The Idaho-Oregon Snake River Water Trail is a 205-mile float or powerboat experience through the Great Rift section of the Snake River Plain in Southwestern Idaho and Eastern Oregon. The water trail begins at Three Island Crossing State Park in Glenns Ferry, Idaho, and the site of the historic river crossing by Oregon Trail emigrants. The trail ends at Farewell Bend State Park in Huntington, Oregon, where the Brownlee Dam impacts the Snake River.

Water trails are boat routes suitable for canoes, rafts and kayaks, as well as, recreational motorized watercraft. Water trail amenities include access areas, boat launches, day-use sites, fishing accesses, and camping areas. The trail serves as educational venues regarding the geology, pre-history, history, ecology and commerce of the areas.

Milepost 1 - Payette River Greenway - The Greenway contains a portion of nature path and a paved 1/2 mile pathway. It has a handicapped accessible fishing dock, parking lot, picnic benches, and beautiful sights to see. Many species of wildlife can be spotted on your walk. It is a great place to exercise, walk the dog, fish, practice photography, or just meditate.
Milepost 1.5- Historic Downtown Payette-- Downtown Payette has approximately 17 historic brick buildings on its Main St. (8th St.). The city fathers built most of them around the 1890 to 1920's. At the north end of the street are Freedom Park in which stands the WWI "Doughboy" statue, and a large American Flag. Highlights include the Old City Hall, the Woodward Building and the Jacobsen Building. The Coughanour Elk Statue stands in front of the Payette Police Department. At 90 S. 9th St. is the Payette County Museum. It boasts a large collection of local history, photos; and artifacts. One of its highlights is a one-of-a-kind 1861 A.M. Paxton Confederate Civil War cannon barrel. The Museum is open Wednesday through Saturday from noon to 4 p.m.

Milepost 4.5-- Clay Peak Motorcycle Park - Work began on the Clay Peak Motorcycle Park in the mid 1970's. It contains a wide variety of trails for the beginner as well as the advanced rider. The park sports bathrooms and loading ramps. Various events are hosted at the park throughout the year. It's a great place to come and ride.

Milepost 7.5-- Fort Wilson Park- Fort Wilson Park is small but a popular spot for weary travelers. Historically about 1877 residents used the area as refuge during the Nez Perce Indian Wars. There is a monument on the site to commemorate the spot. An additional attraction is "ruts" made by wagon wheel as travelers made their way on the 'Goodill Cutoff'. This roadway took people to the northern areas of Idaho. Looking northeast ruts can be spotted along the bluff.

Another monument is dedicated to the 1958 C-123 airplane crash of the 'Thunderbird maintenance crew were 19 servicemen and Civilians' lives were
lost. The park has a restroom, a covered picnic area, large trees and a great view of the surrounding area.

**Milepost 9.5 Birding Is. North.** Birding Island North is on Hwy 52 travelers will see Sportsman Access signs to the right if coming from Payette. There is a great view of the river and non-motorized boats can be launched. Duck/Geese and fisherman can enjoy this area. Blacks Bridge leads the visitor across the Payette River. Just on the south side of the bridge is a parking area for fisherman, floaters and others seeking the solitude of the river. As a side-trip follow the road on to the stop sign then turn right following Holly Ave. to the end. Follow the signs leading you to Birding Island South.

**Milepost 11.2- Blacks Bridge/Birding Island South.** In 1963 the Kennedy Family donated this beautiful area to Idaho Department of Fish and Game. The Birding Island complete site is 1,200 acres of wild terrain. It is a photographer's dream, paint ball enthusiasts delight, great for walkers and wildlife watchers. The area hosts waterfowl, beaver, deer, rabbits and all kinds of animals, big and small. It also has 5 fishing ponds.

**Milepost 18-- Falk’s Store (Falk)**
Falk’s Store is located near the Payette River at the Payette and Gem County Line on Falk Bridge Road. The original fort was a haven for residents in the area during the Nez Perce Indian Wars. Falk was also once known as "Fort Jefferson." It started as the Umatilla/Boise Stage line and the only Post Office between Umatilla, Oregon and Boise. In 1862 the company, giving access across the Payette River, built a ferry. Thousands of travelers went through this community heading to Oregon and beyond during the 1860s. It later became a busy commercial area. There were saloons, creameries, a school and a store owned by Nathan Falk. (Later Falk became to owner of the chain store Falk’s ID). At the present time there is little left of the one time bustling community.

Sidetrips from Payette County include several cemeteries and the communities of New Plymouth and Fruitland.

*Lower Payette River Heritage Byway*
Gem County

Mile Post 31, Downtown Emmett, Downtown Emmett - Our wonderful downtown Emmett was primarily built between 1900 and 1909 and has survived with many of its original building facades left intact. Several of the earlier wooden structures were destroyed by fire and replaced with brick construction over the years. In 1902 the Idaho Northern Railroad came to town. In 1912 the INR was sold to The Oregon Shortline and extended to McCall. During those years the settlers felt Emmett was a boom town. All types of fruit, livestock, lumber & logs were shipped out as store merchandise, express and the mail were shipped in. Ghost art from past businesses can still be found on building walls and many of the businessmen love to tell stories about their property. The town has a very active Farmers Market 1 block off Main Street and the Emmett Bridge and Downtown Walking Tours begins in the downtown area.

Mile Post 36.9, Plaza Bridge/Pickets Corral, - In the Spring of 1863, the Boise Basin gold discovery exploded on the world. Placerville, Centerville, Pioneerville, Quartzburg, and Idaho City were located in the center of the gold rush. Wherever there is gold there are also thieves trying to reap the rewards of someone else’s hard labor. Thieves robbed, murdered, passed bogus gold, and stole horses, mules, and cows. After bringing the miners west, thousands of mules and horses had been turned loose near Horseshoe Bend to feed on the lush grass. The thieves would round up a herd of animals at night and drive them to Oregon, Nevada or

Lower Payette River Heritage Byway
California, and sell them for a very profitable sum. For the return trip they would rob and plunder that area and return with horses and mules to sell to the Idaho people who had their horses robbed. These men headquartered in the Emmett alley near the entrance to the canyon leading to Horseshoe Bend. They called their headquarters Picket’s Corral and they built a log house and a corral strong enough to act as a fort. It was built in front of a natural cave of rocks in the canyon wall. The cabin was built out of driftwood and was a stopping place for travelers and freighters on their way to Horseshoe Bend. It was the last watering place until you came out of the canyon at the Marsh-Ireton Ranch, also a stopover inn near Montour. The Picket’s Corral Gang became the most notorious outlaws in southern Idaho.

Mile Post 39, Black Canyon Reservoir:  
 Constructed in 1924, this $1.5 million concrete gravity dam has a 1,039 foot crest and a 183 foot structural height. A 29-mile canal, along with lesser ditches, serves 58,250 acres of valley farms. A power plant at Black Canyon Dam generates electricity for commercial use as well as for irrigation pumping. Several day use parks are available for day use in the summer including Wild Rose Park, Black Canyon Park, and Triangle Park.

Mile Post 39 – 44 – Historic Black Canyon Canal  
The Carey Grant of 1894 allowed private companies in the United States to erect irrigation systems in the western semi-arid states, and profit from the sale of the water. Through advertising, these companies attracted farmers to the states which successfully utilized the act – notably Idaho and Wyoming.

Canyon Canal Co. Ltd entered into a contract with the State of Idaho on Dec. 18, 1903 with completion date, under the Carey Grant, of Dec. 16, 1908. The main canal would run 32 miles from a diversion dam on the Payette River to the lower valley. The system would include the dam, canals, tunnels and laterals at the cost of $300,000 with water rights selling for $30 per acre. Farmers were given the option to work off their assessment with their own man-hours and with their teams and equipment. The Black Canyon Canal would supply 25,500 acres of farmland with precious water.
The dam was constructed above the present Montour Wildlife Refuge near the Gem and Boise County line. The canal system wound around hillsides and nineteen wooden flumes crossed gullies and lowlands to the farmland on the Emmett Bench. Three tunnels were dug, and a siphon crossed the river below the present Black Canyon Dam to deliver water to the Slopes. The system proved ineffectual. The dam collapsed, crops were ruined and the deadline for completion was not met. In January 1910 the Water Users Association, parent of Emmett Irrigation District, set to work. A camp was set up for about 200 workers. They repaired flumes and lined them with concrete and Malthoid, repaired siphons and timbered tunnels. Thirty men rip rapped the river banks below the head gates of the dam to prevent further cutting. Water was turned into the canal by May 1, 1910 amid great fanfare - including Governor Gooding.

Black Canyon Dam, erected sixteen miles below the old diversion dam in 1924, made the Black Canyon Canal obsolete. Between 1934 and 1938 Hwy 52 was built on the north side of the Payette River, taking out the remains of the canal construction. These concrete walls of those old flumes are a reminder of the determination of our early settlers to get water to their fertile semi-arid land and make it bloom into the Valley of Plenty.

**Mile Post 44, Roystone, Hot Springs.** - The Roystone Hot Springs area has been a very important over-wintering site for the Native Americans from a very early time. Evidence is that it was also an important salmon fishing spot for them. George Coats (Croat) from Hanover Germany appears to be the first white man to farm the fertile land around the mineral hot springs. He used the warm water to irrigate a fine vegetable and fruit farm. One lone pear tree remains today.

The next owners (Neilson & Dr. Skippen) dug several cisterns to control the hot springs and bring the water down the hill to a large catch basin and swimming pool. That pool is still enjoyed today – over a hundred years later. By the early 1900’s people would go up to the hot springs to swim and do laundry. West of the pool were barrels set up to wash and clothes lines to dry. A house was build close to where the house is today. Just south of the pool was a screened summer house.

Neilson and Skippen sold the hot springs to the Roy Stones of Portland thinking it would be good for Stones health. He passed away before they could move. Eva Stone, a nurse and message therapist, came to Idaho and settled in. When the old house burned down she build the present house-hotel she called the Sweet Sanitarium. People would come to the sanitarium to swim in the warm mineral water and have therapeutic messages. It also served as the social center for the Sweet area.

After Eva Stones death in 1933, Roystone Hot Springs was owned or managed by various parties. Local people remember going to pool to swim. They loved the place but it soon closed down grow old and neglected.

*Lower Payette River Heritage Byway*
Mr. & Mrs. Johns bought the property in 1985. They have been fine stewards of this historic site, restoring it where possible and improving it where necessary. Roystone Hot Springs is now open for swimming and gatherings.

Mile Post 45, Triangle Area. Heading up the valley we find ourselves stepping further back in time. The communities of Sweet, Ola and Montour all access from the road house intersection. Montour was a big Railroad town in it's day and Sweet and Ola were the main supply areas for the local ranchers and farmers. Well worth wandering up the road to visit these small communities and don't forget to drink the Sweet Water.

Notable sidetrips from Highway 52 in Gem County are the community's of Sweet, Ola and Montour, Pearl, Freezeout Hill, Gem Cycle Park, Sage Hen Reservoir and numerous cemeteries.
Boise County

Mile Post 52, Osborne Mine. The Osborne Mine is a former gold and silver mine located in Boise County, Idaho, approximately 2 miles southwest of Horseshoe Bend, Idaho. The mine exists on BLM property at the northeast end of a gold belt that stretches from Pearl, Idaho to Horseshoe Bend, Idaho. The mine is located approximately 1500 feet southeast from the Payette River at an elevation of approximately 2800 feet above sea level. The mine was developed to access gold-bearing lodes which developed from gold-bearing ore solutions filling fissures caused by recurring movements along zones of weakness during and after dike intrusion.

Mile Post 52- Power Plant: In 1902 the Boise-Payette Electric Co. completed a water wheel on the Payette River in Horseshoe Bend. The waterwheel powered two 500 watt generators and a 22,000 volt transmission line sent the power to Boise and the mining camp at Pearl. “The Horseshoe Bend Power plant in 1919 was diverted from the Payette River into a canal, discharged through the power plant and back to the river.”

Mile Post 55, Horse Shoe Bend. The City of Horseshoe Bend is named for its location at the horseshoe-shaped U-turn of the Payette River, whose flow direction changes from south to north before heading west to the Black Canyon Reservoir. The area was originally settled as a gold miners’ staging area, as prospectors waited along the river for snows to thaw at the higher elevations. Gold had been discovered in 1862 in the Boise Basin Mountains to the east, near Idaho City. The settlement became known as Warrinerville, after a local sawmill operator. The name was changed to Horseshoe Bend in 1867, and after the gold rush quieted, the city became a prosperous ranching and logging community. The Boise Basin gold rush began in 1862 just over the ridge from Horse Shoe Bend. Traffic came by steamer up the Columbia to Umatilla and then overland. At first there were only pack and saddle trains, but in 1864, John Hailey, a famous Idaho pioneer, ran stages this way. A toll road up Harris Creek was soon open and freighters passed through Horse Shoe Bend for many years.
Mile Post 55, Thunder Mountain Line/Depot.
The history of the Thunder Mountain Line dates back to more than a century ago. The prospects for the railroad were originally to serve the Thunder Mountain Mining District, which was full of gold and ore. The current roads could not handle the incoming freight for these areas. Prospectors were filling the Long Valley area as mining districts and camps were forming. Gold fever soon spread and an entrepreneur named Colonel W. Dewey formed a railroad syndicate due to the suspected wealth in the areas.

Railroad tycoons were at war for a route to the Pacific Northwest and West Coast to gain control of the region for their railroads. The three tycoons at war were James Jerome Hill (who just completed the Great Northern, had control of the Northern Pacific, the Chicago and Northwestern, and the Burlington), Edward Harriman (who controlled the Union Pacific), and Jay Gould (who had control of the Rio Grande and Missouri). The Idaho Northern was incorporated on December 18, 1897 by Colonel Dewey and presumed later to be in the camp of the Union Pacific.

The chartered railroad was expected to reach as far south as Paradise Valley, Nevada, as far north as Spokane, Washington, as far east as Butte, Montana, and as far west as Williamette Valley in Oregon. The railroad surveyed and completed tracks into Emmett on March 29, 1902. The Idaho Northern’s claims north of Emmett had expired in 1906 and the Chicago Northwestern jumped in and filed claims down the Salmon, Boise and South Fork of the Payette Rivers. Control of the Chicago Northwestern had swung from Hill to Harriman and back to Hill. Harriman passed away and when the C&NW’s claims ran out in 1910, a new war began between Frederick Weyerhauser (a close friend of Harriman) and Hill. Weyerhauser owned huge tracts of land along the Payette and Boise River and it became obvious railroads were needed due to the costs of driving logs down the river. The Union Pacific counter claimed everything the C&NW had claimed in 1906. Surveying began in 1910 to an area outside of McCall and grading was finished to Banks by April 1912. The railroad had hired 2,500 men to assist in the grading and building of the railroad.

The railroad was built to Smiths Ferry on July 10, 1913 and an inaugural run was made in August 1913 and regular service began later that month from Nampa. The railroad was completed on July 1914 with regular service beginning to McCall on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. The trains were mixed with freight, mail, and passengers. Many people were excited to have access to the mountain lakes and rivers for their vacations.

Small towns and depots were established along the railroad tracks to support the local timber industry. Smaller logging railroads reached into the rich timber valleys and connected with Idaho Northern’s main line. The Union Pacific operated this branch line as part of their Oregon Short Line Division until the Idaho Northern and Pacific Railroad purchased the railroad in 1993. Until recently, the railroad had continued to be supported by the timber industry.
Mile Post 55, Boise Cascade. Boise Cascade Corporation was established in 1957 as the result of the merger between Boise-Payette Lumber Company of Boise and the Cascade Lumber Company of Yakima, Washington. Boise-Payette was established in 1913 from a merger of the Payette Lumber & Manufacturing Company and Barber Lumber, a Wisconsin company with operations in the Boise Basin. Payette Lumber, a Minnesota firm, acquired 33,000 acres (130 km²) of state timber in Idaho's Long Valley near present-day Cascade in 1902. To control the passage of logs downstream, the company built a large splash dam below Smith's Ferry on the North Fork of the Payette River. Logs were sent downstream to sawmills in the town of Payette.

In the 1960s, Boise Cascade acquired a majority interest in the Cuban Electric Co., the primary electric utility in pre-Castro Cuba. In November 2004, the corporation completed its sale of its paper, building products, and timberland assets to Madison Dearborn, a private equity investment firm. Boise Cascade Corporation then renamed itself OfficeMax, which it had acquired in 2003. In February 2008, the company spun off OfficeMax and its paper operations to a new company, Boise Inc., with Boise Cascade resuming use of its old name. In 1998 the City of Horseshoe Bend's primary employer, Boise Cascade, closed its sawmill on September 30th.

Suggested Sidetrips in Boise County off of Highway 52 are the Old Emmett Highway, Horseshoe Bend Cemetery, Zip Line, Placerville, Centerville, the Lady's Improvement Club and Mill Pond in Horseshoe Bend.
WHEREAS, the Board established the Scenic Byways Advisory Committee (SBAC) on June 21, 1996; and

WHEREAS, among its purposes the SBAC is to provide advice and recommendations concerning the Scenic Byway Program to the Idaho Transportation Board; and

WHEREAS, all local requests for Scenic Byway designation are to be submitted to the SBAC for review and consideration; and

WHEREAS, the City of Emmett submitted a request to designate a 52-mile scenic byway along Highway 52 from the City of Payette to the City of Horseshoe Bend; and

WHEREAS, District 3 is in full support of this designation; and

WHEREAS, the SBAC has found the request for this designation to comply with its established criteria and recommends Idaho Transportation Board approval.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board approves the Lower Payette River Heritage byway along the aforementioned route description.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Lower Payette River Heritage byway shall be so designated on the Idaho Official State Highway Map and signed as such.
Meeting Date: April 9-10, 2013
Amount of Time Needed for Presentation: 30 Minutes
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Subject
Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) & Strategic Implementation Program

Route Number | Project Number | Key Number
---|---|---
|               |               |          |

District | Location
---|---
|      |          |

Background Information
At the March 2013 IT Board meeting staff requested approval to provide funding and obligation authority for the full Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) as well as to establish a strategic implementation program to manage TAP funding through the Division of Transportation Performance.

The Idaho Transportation Board requested staff to move forward to form a start-up committee and bring the following back to the April ITB meeting:
- Develop preliminary TAP and SIP program guidance, and
- Clarify TAP and SIP resolution wording

Recommendations
Approval to establish a complete TA program to be administered through a strategic implementation program. Also approve two resolutions to establish a TA program and a strategic implementation program. Resolutions on pages 92 and 93.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other

Page 1 of 1
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM REQUEST

- Approve Strategic Implementation Program
  - Establish “Community Choices for Idaho” Program
  - Direct TAP as program’s first funding source (Commencing FY14)
  - Release “Draft” program guidance for public comment

- Approve TAP funding and Obligation Authority
  - See next slide...
TAP FUNDING
FY14 "OBLIGATION AUTHORITY"

Full Apportionment
~$5.20M

- Recreational Trails
  ~$1.71M
- TMA
  ~$420K
- Urban
  ~$765K
- Rural
  ~$581K
- Statewide
  ~$1.73M
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, it is the Idaho Transportation Board’s desire to support and authorize funding for the Transportation Alternatives program as established through Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21); and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Alternatives program supports a variety of local transportation projects by repackaging elements of the Safe Routes to School program, Transportation Enhancements program, Scenic Byways program, and the Recreational Trails program, and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department created the Community Choices for Idaho management tool to assist local communities in applying for funds and to competitively select projects that will be submitted to the board for approval.

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board supports fully funding the Transportation Alternatives Program, as outlined in MAP-21 and including the following allocations:

- Recreational Trails Allocation
- Population based Allocations
  - TMA Allocation
  - Urban Population Sub-Allocation
  - Rural Population Sub-Allocation
- Statewide Allocation

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Board authorizes funding and obligation authority for the Transportation Alternatives program that complies with MAP-21 and uses the Community Choices for Idaho management tool.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, it is the Idaho Transportation Board’s desire to continually improve both external and internal customer service, collaboration, and communications; and

WHEREAS, a strategic implementation program is established titled “Community Choices for Idaho” to act as a single customer touch point for local transportation funding programs providing a less administratively burdensome process for our external and internal partners, and

WHEREAS, the “Community Choices for Idaho” program will become a constant transportation implementation program adjusting to transportation funding authorizations thus making application process changes more transparent to our customer, and

WHEREAS, the consolidated “Community Choices for Idaho” program will support better coordination, collaboration, and communications with our transportation partners, and

WHEREAS, “Community Choices for Idaho” program will focus on supporting system preservation, economic opportunity, safety, and mobility, and

WHEREAS, “Community Choices for Idaho” is managed through an open and competitive process supporting both rural and urban projects, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Transportation Board directs staff to establish the “Community Choices for Idaho” program including required policies and direct the Transportation Alternatives program to be the first funding mechanism managed through “Community Choices for Idaho”.
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Board Agenda Item

Meeting Date: April 10, 2013
Amount of Time Needed for Presentation: 15 minutes

Presenter's Name: John Krause
Presenter's Title: TIM
Initials: JK
Reviewed By: JMG

Preparer's Name: Jeanette Finch/Amy Schroeder
Preparer's Title: SRA/GPM
Initials: JF/AS

Subject
Expansion Project Delay/GARVEE Program Adjustments to FY 2013 - 2014

Route Number: US 2
Project Number: A012(284)
Key Number: 12284

District: 1
Segment Code: 001590
Location: MP 28.273 – 28.725 Bonner County

Background Information
This Board Item requests a delay to US 2, Lake St to Cedar St, Sandpoint (Key No. 12284) in the Expansion Program, and change from Federal-funded in FY 2013 to State-funded in FY 2014 per Policies B-11-02 and 5011 and Departmental procedures. Due to revisiting the design alternatives the project is currently scheduled to deliver early in Federal FY 14. By delaying the project to FY 14 and converting the funding to ST, the project delivery will be expedited and provide Federal Aid in FY 14 to assist in the GARVEE program needs.

The District, GARVEE office, and headquarters are recommending utilizing the $7.2M in Federal formula funds made available by the delay to the US 2, Lake St to Cedar St, Sandpoint project for immediate needs in the GARVEE program as described on the following page.

The cost impact to FY 2014 from this delay will be addressed during the FY 2014 program update cycle. Since this project will be State funded it can also be placed in FY 2015 as needed for balancing purposes and still be delivered in FY 2014.

Additional details related to these two requested transactions are contained on following sheets.

Recommendations
Approve Resolution on Page 98.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred  ☐
☐ Other  ☐

Page 1 of 3
This Board item requests applying the Formula funds from the US 2, Lake St to Cedar St project to the GARVEE projects as described herein and identified in the table below.

In April 2012, the GARVEE office informed the Board that there was $80 million savings resulting from efficient program and project management and a competitive bidding environment.

In May 2012, the Board approved Resolution ITB12-16 to include the US 95, Garwood to Sagle Granite Frontage Roads into the GARVEE program with a total budget of $4.469 million of GARVEE funds. The project has been in design since that time and the right of way acquisition phase is just beginning.

The timeframe for delivery of this project is impacting the cash flow and drawdown of GARVEE bonds that have already been bonded. Use of $4.469 million of Formula funds for the Granite Frontage Roads project allows the GARVEE funds to cover other imminent and immediate needs in current GARVEE projects and reestablishes the budget with Formula funds.

In July 2012, the Board approved the inclusion of additional projects in the Draft ITIP to fully utilize the savings and bond for the entire authorized amount. All unfunded projects in approved GARVEE corridors were rated and ranked against the same selection criteria. The projects selected for inclusion into the program were the Meridian, Broadway, and Gowen Interchanges.

Since the total cost of these improvements was more than the GARVEE savings, it was determined that these projects would be dually-funded with GARVEE and Formula funds. The plan presented to the Board was to utilize Formula funds for the design services and right of way acquisition in order to optimize cash flow of the next bond sale; and the construction would use the $80 million GARVEE bonds and the remainder of the budgeted Formula-funds.

These additional projects have expedited delivery schedules in order to advertise the projects as quickly as possible and take advantage of current low interest rates on the next and final bond sale later this year. The aggressive delivery schedules resulted in higher design costs than originally anticipated.

The original Formula funded right of way budgets were redistributed to cover the higher cost of design services. The right of way impacts on all three projects have been minimized by examining various options to avoid property impacts and through the use of design features such as geometric analysis and retaining walls.

### GARVEE/Expansion Program Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10939</td>
<td>I 84, MERIDIAN INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9821</td>
<td>I 84, BROADWAY INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9822</td>
<td>I 84, GOWEN RD INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,824</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>19,423</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,423</td>
<td>2,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11894</td>
<td>US 95, GARWOOD TO SAGLE, GRANITE FRONTAGE RDS</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>19,423</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,423</td>
<td>2,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional need for Interchange projects 2,731
Additional need for Granite project 4,469
Total additional needs 7,200

**Available from Delay to FY14** 7,200
RESOLUTION

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

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

WHEREAS, the US 2, Lake St to Cedar St, Sandpoint project (KN 12284) cannot be delivered this fiscal year as planned; and

WHEREAS, the Board has previously approved the use of Formula funds on GARVEE projects; and

WHEREAS, the US-95, Garwood to Sagle Granite Frontage Roads project is behind its original schedule; and

WHEREAS, the timely expenditure of current bond proceeds could be negatively impacted by delays on US 95, Garwood to Sagle Granite Frontage Roads project; and

WHEREAS, the design services budgets for the Meridian, Broadway, and Gowen Interchange projects are higher than originally estimated because of accelerated delivery; and

WHEREAS, the right of way impacts of the Meridian, Broadway, and Gowen Interchange projects have been minimized due to detailed engineering analysis and various design features; and

WHEREAS, a Formula funded offset has been identified to come from the US 2, Lake St to Cedar St project (KN 12284).

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to utilize $7.2 million in Federal Formula funds from delaying the US 2, Lake St to Cedar St, Sandpoint project to FY 2014 to cover right of way costs on the Meridian and Gowen Interchanges ($2.7 million) and right of way and construction costs on the US 95, Garwood to Sagle Granite Frontage Road project ($4.5 million).

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that staff is authorized to make any appropriate changes to the federal approved FY 2013-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
Subject
Highway Program Policy Discussion and Update – Policies B-11-04 and A-11-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

In October and November of last year, the Office of Transportation Investments presented information regarding the MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century) transportation funding act, and its apportionments of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds among the TMA, urban and rural areas of Idaho based on portions of total population.

In this item, OTI will expand on the history behind and purpose of the B-11-04 Board Policy (and the accompanying Administrative policy).

The discussion will also provide a better understanding of the purpose and intent behind MAP-21's population-driven STP sub-allocations and the relationship between this and the programming of transportation projects across the state.

The goal of this conversation is to provide additional information to the Board that might assist them in their evaluation of Board Policy B-11-04 and local public agency funding levels.

Recommendations

Information

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
ALLOCATION OF
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM APPORTIONMENTS
TO LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES
The director shall administer federal formula apportionments that are allotted to Idaho under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The director is further authorized to annually allocate formula apportionments received under SAFETEA-LU for use by Local Public Agencies (LPAs) having jurisdiction over federal-aid highways by applying the deductions and calculation methodology, identified as “Option B” (see attachment), as adopted by the Idaho Transportation Board on August 17, 2006. Option B becomes effective on October 1, 2007.

LPAs will receive an amount of Surface Transportation Program (STP) apportionments equal to 12.6% of the total SAFETEA-LU annual federal formula apportionments after deductions for:

- State Planning and Research,
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality,
- STP-Enhancement, and
- Recreational Trails.

Local SAFETEA-LU High Priority Projects are then deducted from the 12.6% LPAs share and any adjustment for obligation limitation is applied before it is divided equally between urban and rural LPAs.

Distribution between Local Urban and Rural LPAs
Available STP apportionments, as adjusted for obligation limitation, that are allocated to LPAs shall be divided equally between urban LPAs having jurisdiction over federal-aid highways within urban areas with a population of 5,000 or greater, and rural LPAs having jurisdiction over federal-aid highways outside urban areas having populations of 5,000 or greater.

The funds available to urban LPAs shall be those remaining after the deduction of:

- federal funding for statewide ride-sharing coordination,
- the matching costs for the Local Technical Assistance Program Transportation Technology Transfer Center, and
- any federally required distribution of funding to a Transportation Management Area (TMA).
The funds available to rural LPAs shall be those remaining after the deduction of:

- the matching costs for the Local Technical Assistance Program Transportation Technology Transfer Center, and
- apportionments for the Surface Transportation Program Rural (STPR) Exchange Program (Board Policy B-11-06).

The remaining funds available to rural LPAs shall be used for rural project selection under the Local Federal-Aid Incentive Program.

**Project Selection**

The director, or a delegate, shall work cooperatively with locally elected public officials, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council to formulate local jurisdiction project identification and funding recommendation procedures under the Local Federal-Aid Incentive Program which must be consistent with SAFETEA-LU and federal project funding regulations and guidelines.

All projects recommended for funding as a result of such procedures are subject to final approval by the Idaho Transportation Board for inclusion in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Costs for any LPA project, or any phase of the project, incurred prior to inclusion of the project in the federally approved STIP are not eligible for federal reimbursement.

**“Full Use” Policy**

By August 1 of each year, STP Urban and Rural apportionments that have not been obligated to an LPA project shall be made available to other LPAs or the department for use on other federally funded projects. Such apportionments obligated to other federal programs will no longer be available to the STP Urban and Rural Program for use in future years. This “full use” policy prevents loss of federal funds in Idaho.

The total annual federal costs for LPA projects shall remain within the applicable total annual available urban or rural apportionments provided under this policy. LPA projects, which have not qualified for federal funds because the projects were not obligated by August 1 of each year, may be deferred to another year in the STIP, but must be funded within the urban or rural apportionments made available under this policy in the year to which the project is deferred.

The continuation of this policy is contingent upon the continued availability of federal funding. This policy is subject to review by the Idaho Transportation Board in the event of changes in state or federal funding or related funding requirements.

Approved by the Board on:

Signed

FRANK C. BRUNEEL
Board Chairman
This policy based on:
- Section 40-103, 105, 310 (8), 312 (2) and 317, Idaho Code
- Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)
- “Option B” (see attachment), as adopted by the Idaho Transportation Board on August 17, 2006
- Distribution of Formula Apportioned Funds for Local Road Jurisdictions, May 1992
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

Implemented by Administrative Policy:
- A-11-04, ALLOCATION OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM APPORTIONMENTS TO LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES

Former date of B-11-04:
12/16/99, 10/9/98 (replaced B-19-05, Federal-Aid Urban Funds and B-19-10, Local Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds in conjunction with TEA-21 federal funding.)

Cross-reference to related Board policies:
- B-09-13, CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) PROGRAM
- B-11-01, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
- B-11-03, TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
- B-11-06, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM RURAL (STPR) EXCHANGE PROGRAM
- B-19-01, FINANCING CONSTRUCTION OF STATE HIGHWAYS IN CITIES
- F STATE HIGHWAYS IN CITIES
ALLOCATION OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM APPORTIONMENTS TO LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES

The passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century in 1998 (TEA-21); the Idaho Transportation Planning Task Force Report in 1997; and the Idaho Transportation Board’s adoption of B-11-04, Allocation of Surface Transportation Program Apportionments to Local Public Agencies, established the need for the department to work cooperatively with locally-elected public officials, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) to develop local jurisdiction project identification and recommendation procedures for the Federal-Aid Local Urban and Rural Highway Development Programs. Effective January 1, 2000, this Administrative Policy establishes policy for the continuation of the STP Local Urban and Rural Programs under the Local Federal-Aid Incentive Program adopted by the LHTAC on June 11, 1999, via resolutions number 1999-1 and 1999-2.

Use of Federal Local Urban and Rural Funds

Federal Local Urban and Rural funds may be used for any project or costs eligible under the Surface Transportation Program in TEA-21. A State/Local agreement shall be prepared by the District Engineer for all Local Public Agency projects after the projects have been added to the Highway Development Program. Project costs of any kind are not reimbursable until the State/Local agreement is signed and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program is approved by federal agencies.

Local Public Agency Project Programming and Development

All projects and project revisions proposed for inclusion in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) shall be submitted in conformance with the procedures in this policy, Board Policy B-11-04, and the public involvement, planning, and project selection requirements under TEA-21. The Idaho Transportation Board shall approve all project additions, deletions, or changes in scheduled fiscal year under the STIP. Annual costs for requested projects, or project revisions, shall not exceed the total annual available apportionments to the Urban or Rural Programs.

Projects recommended to the Idaho Transportation Board for use of the STP Urban apportionments under B-11-04 shall be recommended with the concurrence of the LHTAC and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Identification of, and requests for, new urban projects or urban project revisions shall be submitted through the MPO or the LHTAC as appropriate in coordination with the applicable ITD District to the Highway Programming Manager.

Projects recommended to the Idaho Transportation Board for the use of the STP Rural apportionments under B-11-04 shall be recommended by the LHTAC. Identification of, and requests for, new rural projects or rural project revisions shall be submitted through the LHTAC in coordination with the applicable ITD District to the Highway Programming Manager.

Local Public Agencies in rural areas that choose to participate in the “Surface Transportation Program Rural (STPR) Exchange Program” (Board Policy B-11-06), may not participate in the Local Federal-Aid Incentive Program portion of the STP Rural Program.
New projects should be placed in the Preliminary Development schedule of the Highway Development Program if project costs and scope cannot be adequately identified to determine the fiscal year of construction. The Highway Programming Manager will review the requests for projects to determine eligibility and incorporate the requested projects into the annual update of the Highway Development Program in conformance with Administrative Policy A-11-02, Highway Development Program.

In the event that the engineer's estimate for an approved Local Public Agency project exceeds the annual Federal STP Urban or Rural Program allocations, the sponsoring Local Public Agency must work with the LHTAC or the MPO to:

- Make up the difference with local funds;
- Defer the project to a later year when there are sufficient available apportionments in the appropriate Urban or Rural Program to cover the federal share of the project costs;
- Reduce the scope of the project by eliminating bid items, or phasing the project; or
- Identify other unused Urban or Rural apportionments.

Signed
DWIGHT M. BOWER
Director

This policy based on:
- Section 40-103, 105, 310 (8), 312 (2) and 317, Idaho Code
- Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century of 1998 (TEA-21)
- "Option D" (see attachment), as adopted by the Idaho Transportation Board on June 30, 1998
- Distribution of Formula Apportioned Funds for Local Road Jurisdictions, May 1992
- B-11-04, ALLOCATION OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM APPORTIONMENTS TO LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES
- Decision by the Director

Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
Chief Engineer

Direction for activity and results assigned to:
Highway Programming Manager and District Engineers

Former date of A-11-04:
-0- (converted Director's Memorandum No. 28, Interim Guidance for Federal Local Urban and Rural Programs)

Cross-reference to related Administrative policies:
- A-11-01, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
- A-11-02, HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
- A-11-06, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM RURAL (STPR) EXCHANGE PROGRAM
- A-19-01, FINANCING CONSTRUCTION OF STATE HIGHWAYS IN CITIES
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Funding for FY2014 – FY2018 Highway Investment Program Update

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

The Transportation Investments Manager will lead a presentation on federal and state capital funding assumptions for FY2014 to FY2018 and resulting proposed investment decisions for funding the state highway system performance programs, local programs, and other specific statewide programs in the highways capital investment program during the upcoming program update cycle.

Key funding assumptions at the federal and state levels will be presented. Board discussion will focus on how these funding assumptions affect the guidelines and targets presented in the FY2014 – 2018 Idaho Transportation Investment Program Update.

Recommendations

Information Item

Board Action

☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
Net obligations during March total $10.7 million, resulting in total Net Cumulative Obligations through March 22nd of $175.6 million.

Of these Net Obligations, $184.5 million are for current year projects included in the FY13-FY17 Board Approved Program. The remaining obligations are for adjustments for prior year projects coupled with advances of future year projects to FY13.

The original budget amount for obligated FY13 projects from the FY13-FY17 Board Approved Program is $179.8 million.

Net cumulative obligations for March are well above the historical trend of $151.8 million.

**FY2014 Budget Request Status**
No change since March 20, 2013 Board meeting.

**July 01, 2012 thru February 28, 2013 FY 2013 Year to Date Financial Statements**
**Fund 0260 – State Highway Fund**

**Revenues**
- **17,055,000** FHWA Indirect Cost Allocation YTD actual
- **17,019,000** FHWA Indirect Cost Allocation YTD projected
  - **36,000** .2% positive YTD variance
- **23,394,000** Miscellaneous State Funded Revenue YTD actual
- **21,302,000** Miscellaneous State Funded Revenue YTD projected
  - **2,092,000** 9.8% positive YTD variance
- **123,868,000** HDA Revenue (excluding ethanol exemption elimination) YTD actual
- **122,245,000** HDA Revenue (excluding ethanol exemption elimination) YTD projected
  - **1,623,000** 1.3% positive YTD variance
- **10,653,000** HDA ethanol exemption elimination YTD actual
- **10,741,000** HDA ethanol exemption elimination YTD projected
  - **(88,000)** .8% negative YTD Variance
Fund 0221 – State Aeronautics Fund

Aviation Fuels Revenues
1,331,000 Aviation Fuels revenue YTD actual
1,130,000 Aviation Fuels revenue YTD projected
201,000 18% positive YTD variance

Miscellaneous Revenues
252,000 Miscellaneous Revenues YTD Actual
220,000 Miscellaneous Revenues YTD projected
32,000 14% positive YTD variance

Fund 0260 46 - ARRA Title XII

Expenditures
161,230,000 ARRA - Highways Appropriation to Date expenditures
14,567,000 ARRA - Highways FICR Recovery
175,797,000 ARRA - Highways FHWA recovery including FICR - of $178.8M September 2015 expiration
8,944,000 ARRA - PT Appropriation to Date expenditures - of $9.2M September 2015 expiration

Recommendations

For Information.

Board Action

☐ Approved ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
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Cumulative Monthly Obligations - FFY13
Programmed vs. Actual Obligation Amounts for Highways Programs
Includes Federal Formula Obligation Authority, Match, High Priority, ST
As of 3/22/2013 (Dollars in millions)
State Highway Fund 0260
Fiscal Year 2013
State Revenue Sources Forecast vs Actual
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Includes Equipment Buy Back Program
Misc. Revenue (RTA $1,295,698) and Transfers - In
State Highway Fund 0260
Fiscal Year 2013
Federal & State Revenue (Excludes ARRA Title XII)
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Includes Revenue and Transfers - In
State Highway Fund 0260
Fiscal Year 2013
Expenditures (Excludes ARRA Title XII)
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
State Highway Fund 0260-46
Fiscal Year 2013
ARRA (Title XII) Funds Expenditures
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
GARVEE Capital Project Fund 0374
Fiscal Year 2013
Expenditures
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
Forecast modified November 30th, 2012
Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2013
State Revenue Sources Forecast vs Actual
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Includes Misc. Revenue and Transfers - In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY11 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY12 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY13 Current</th>
<th>FY13 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2013
Federal & State Revenue
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Includes Revenue and Transfers - In
Aeronautics Fund 0221
Fiscal Year 2013
Expenditures
February - For Period Ending 2/28/2013

Current = Actual Payments and Encumbrances
## Idaho Transportation Department

### Operating Fund Balance Sheet

28 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund 0221</th>
<th>Fund 0260</th>
<th>State Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vouchers Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Tax Payable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred Revenue (Local Projects Match)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounts Receivable Overpayment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor Retained % (In Lieu Of Performance Bond)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>Reserve for Encumbrance</td>
<td>81,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>1,492,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,573,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,573,759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Idaho Transportation Department

**STATE HIGHWAY FUND**

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund: 0260 State Highway Fund</th>
<th>Fiscal Year: 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Allotment</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Current 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>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E = A - B - D)</td>
<td>(F = E / A)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H = G - B - D)</td>
<td>(I = H / G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES**

**Federal Aid**

- **Highway - FHWA**
  - Allotment: 187,144,200
  - Actual: 174,524,853
  - Variance: 12,619,347
  - Percent: -6.74%
  - Appropriation: 331,059,200
  - Balance: 156,534,347
  - Remaining: 47.28%

- **FHWA - Indirect Cost Allocation**
  - Allotment: 17,019,000
  - Actual: 17,054,634
  - Variance: 45,634
  - Percent: 0.21%
  - Appropriation: 25,000,000
  - Balance: 7,945,366
  - Remaining: 31.78%

- **Transportation Performance**
  - Allotment: 5,194,000
  - Actual: 5,080,722
  - Variance: 113,278
  - Percent: -2.18%
  - Appropriation: 7,953,900
  - Balance: 2,873,178
  - Remaining: 36.12%

- **Highway Safety**
  - Allotment: 2,485,600
  - Actual: 2,344,300
  - Variance: 141,300
  - Percent: -5.68%
  - Appropriation: 3,963,500
  - Balance: 1,619,200
  - Remaining: 40.85%

- **Other Federal Aid**
  - Allotment: 55,000
  - Actual: 1,625,705
  - Variance: 1,570,705
  - Percent: 2855.83%
  - Appropriation: 3,100,000
  - Balance: 1,474,295
  - Remaining: 47.56%

**Total Federal Aid:**

- Allotment: 211,897,800
- Actual: 200,630,215
- Variance: 11,267,585
- Percent: -5.32%
- Appropriation: 371,076,600
- Balance: 170,446,385
- Remaining: 45.93%

**Match From Local Sources**

- For Projects
  - Allotment: 2,807,600
  - Actual: 1,824,740
  - Variance: 982,860
  - Percent: -35.01%
  - Appropriation: 5,514,280
  - Balance: 3,689,540
  - Remaining: 66.91%

- Other Local Sources
  - Allotment: 27,428
  - Actual: 1,807
  - Variance: 25,621
  - Percent: -93.41%
  - Appropriation: 100,000
  - Balance: 79,379
  - Remaining: 98.19%

**Total Match From Local Sources:**

- Allotment: 2,835,028
- Actual: 1,826,547
- Variance: 1,008,481
- Percent: -35.57%
- Appropriation: 5,614,280
- Balance: 3,787,733
- Remaining: 67.47%

**Equipment Buy Back Program**

- Allotment: 889,680
- Actual: 889,680
- Variance: 0
- Percent: 0.00%
- Appropriation: 12,535,900
- Balance: 11,646,220
- Remaining: 92.90%

**Miscellaneous Revenues**

- Allotment: 21,301,811
- Actual: 23,393,747
- Variance: 2,091,936
- Percent: 9.82%
- Appropriation: 32,513,698
- Balance: 9,119,519
- Remaining: 28.05%

**Total Equipment Buy Back and Miscellaneous Rev:**

- Allotment: 22,191,491
- Actual: 24,283,427
- Variance: 2,091,936
- Percent: 9.43%
- Appropriation: 45,049,598
- Balance: 20,766,171
- Remaining: 46.10%

**TOTAL REVENUES:**

- Allotment: 236,924,319
- Actual: 226,740,189
- Variance: 10,184,130
- Percent: -4.30%
- Appropriation: 421,740,478
- Balance: 195,000,289
- Remaining: 46.24%

**TRANSFERS-IN**

- Statutory - HDA
  - Allotment: 122,245,200
  - Actual: 123,867,794
  - Variance: 1,622,594
  - Percent: 1.33%
  - Appropriation: 179,200,000
  - Balance: 55,332,206
  - Remaining: 30.88%

- Operating
  - Allotment: 10,741,300
  - Actual: 10,653,350
  - Variance: 87,950
  - Percent: -0.82%
  - Appropriation: 15,500,000
  - Balance: 4,846,650
  - Remaining: 31.27%

**TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:**

- Allotment: 132,986,500
- Actual: 134,521,145
- Variance: 15,536,658
- Percent: 1.15%
- Appropriation: 194,700,000
- Balance: 60,178,855
- Remaining: 30.91%
# Idaho Transportation Department

## STATE HIGHWAY FUND

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

**Fund:** 0260  
**State Highway Fund**

**Fiscal Year:** 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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 (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>369,910,819</td>
<td>361,261,334</td>
<td>24,953,885</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8,649,485)</td>
<td>-2.34%</td>
<td>616,440,478</td>
<td>255,179,144</td>
<td>41.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENDITURES

### Permanent Staff Salaries
- 49,493,449
- 46,949,639
- 5,508,683
- 0
- 2,543,810
- 5.14%
- 75,700,241
- 28,750,602
- 37.98%

### Board, Hourly, Overtime, Shift Differential
- 182,121
- 878,261
- 219,768
- 0
- (696,140)
- -382.24%
- 510,468
- (367,793)
- -72.05%

### Fringe Benefits
- 21,621,846
- 20,086,492
- 2,468,380
- 0
- 1,535,354
- 7.10%
- 32,780,531
- 12,694,039
- 38.72%

### Internal Holdback-Personnel
- 901,684
- 645,393
- 58,478
- 0
- 256,291
- 28.42%
- 1,506,082
- 860,689
- 57.15%

### In State Travel Expense
- 132,829
- 97,956
- 6,967
- 0
- 34,873
- 26.25%
- 233,500
- 135,544
- 58.05%

### Out of State Travel Expense
- 44,744,248
- 35,185,763
- 4,282,929
- 5,620,835
- 3,937,650
- 8.80%
- 76,990,748
- 36,184,150
- 47.00%

### Capital Equipment Expense
- 12,937,969
- 14,220,828
- 1,082,362
- 3,319,668
- (4,602,528)
- -35.57%
- 26,406,799
- 8,866,302
- 33.58%

### Capital Facilities Expense
- 1,866,664
- 546,382
- 98,874
- 527,177
- 793,106
- 42.49%
- 2,800,000
- 1,726,442
- 61.66%

### Trustee & Benefit Payments
- 8,200,308
- 7,240,416
- 587,779
- 0
- 959,892
- 11.71%
- 12,849,500
- 5,609,084
- 43.65%

### GAAP Expenses
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0
- (0)
- 0.00%
- 0
- (0)
- 0.00%

## Contract Construction

### In State Travel Expense
- 0
- 77
- 0
- 0
- (77)
- 0.00%
- 0
- (77)
- 0.00%

### Operating Expenditures
- 9,384,100
- 3,578,222
- 586,317
- 945,538
- 4,860,340
- 51.79%
- 18,453,356
- 13,929,596
- 75.49%

### Capital Equipment Expense
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0.00%
- 0
- 0
- 0.00%

### Capital Projects
- 184,980,929
- 216,597,999
- 8,080,430
- 895,425
- (32,512,495)
- -17.58%
- 417,757,282
- 200,263,858
- 47.94%

### Trustee & Benefit Payments
- 3,381,738
- 4,432,607
- 437,357
- 0
- (1,050,869)
- -31.07%
- 7,205,660
- 2,773,053
- 38.48%

### Total Contract Construction
- 197,746,767
- 224,608,904
- 9,104,103
- 1,840,964
- (28,703,101)
- -14.52%
- 443,416,298
- 216,966,430
- 48.93%
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## STATE HIGHWAY FUND

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

**Fund:** 0260  
**Fiscal Year:** 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337,827,885</td>
<td>350,460,034</td>
<td>23,418,323</td>
<td>11,308,643</td>
<td>(23,940,792)</td>
<td>-7.09%</td>
<td>676,514,167</td>
<td>314,745,490</td>
<td>46.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFERS OUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>15,563,189</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15,563,189)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS OUT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,588,189</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15,588,189)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15,588,189)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(39,528,981)</td>
<td>-11.70%</td>
<td>676,514,167</td>
<td>299,157,301</td>
<td>44.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net for Fiscal Year 2013:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,082,934</td>
<td>(4,786,889)</td>
<td>(48,178,466)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Idaho Transportation Department

### STATE HIGHWAY FUND

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

**Fund:** 0260  State Highway Fund

**Fiscal Year:** 2013

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

### Contract Construction

#### In State Travel Expense

- **Dedicated:**
  - In State Travel Expense: 0
  - Year to Date Allotment: 8
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0
  - Percent Variance: 0.00%
  - Annual Appropriation: 0
  - Appropriation Balance: 0
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00%

- **Federal:**
  - In State Travel Expense: 69
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0
  - Percent Variance: 0.00%
  - Annual Appropriation: 0
  - Appropriation Balance: 0
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00%

**Total In State Travel Expense:**
- Year to Date Allotment: 77
- Year to Date Actual: 0
- Current Month Activity: 0
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
- Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0
- Percent Variance: 0.00%
- Annual Appropriation: 0
- Appropriation Balance: 0
- Percent Remaining: 0.00%

### Operating Expenditures

#### Dedicated

- Operating Expenditures: 2,210,500
  - Year to Date Allotment: 223,106
  - Year to Date Actual: 43,368
  - Current Month Activity: 73,035
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 1,914,359
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 86.60%
  - Percent Variance: 4,483,123
  - Annual Appropriation: 4,186,982
  - Appropriation Balance: 93.39%

- Operating Expenditures: 6,723,000
  - Year to Date Allotment: 3,351,718
  - Year to Date Actual: 542,949
  - Current Month Activity: 872,504
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 2,498,778
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 37.17%
  - Percent Variance: 13,213,050
  - Annual Appropriation: 8,988,828
  - Appropriation Balance: 68.03%

- Operating Expenditures: 450,600
  - Year to Date Allotment: 3,998
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 447,202
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 99.55%
  - Percent Variance: 757,183
  - Annual Appropriation: 753,785
  - Appropriation Balance: 99.55%

**Total Operating Expenditures:**
- Year to Date Allotment: 9,384,100
- Year to Date Actual: 3,578,222
- Current Month Activity: 586,317
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 945,538
- Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 51.79%
- Percent Variance: 18,453,356
- Annual Appropriation: 13,929,596
- Appropriation Balance: 75.49%

### Capital Equipment Expense

- **Dedicated:**
  - Capital Equipment Expense: 0
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0.00%
  - Percent Variance: 0
  - Annual Appropriation: 0
  - Appropriation Balance: 0
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00%

- **Federal:**
  - Capital Equipment Expense: 0
  - Year to Date Allotment: 0
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0.00%
  - Percent Variance: 0
  - Annual Appropriation: 0
  - Appropriation Balance: 0
  - Percent Remaining: 0.00%

**Total Capital Equipment Expense:**
- Year to Date Allotment: 0
- Year to Date Actual: 0
- Current Month Activity: 0
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 0
- Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0.00%
- Percent Variance: 0
- Annual Appropriation: 0
- Appropriation Balance: 0
- Percent Remaining: 0.00%

### Capital Outlay

- **Dedicated:**
  - Capital Outlay: 42,366,469
  - Year to Date Allotment: 41,635,934
  - Year to Date Actual: 2,696,940
  - Current Month Activity: 66,008
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 664,527
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 1.57%
  - Percent Variance: 108,503,394
  - Annual Appropriation: 66,801,452
  - Appropriation Balance: 61.57%

- **Federal:**
  - Capital Outlay: 123,156,860
  - Year to Date Allotment: 142,776,354
  - Year to Date Actual: 3,817,991
  - Current Month Activity: 800,103
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: (20,419,596)
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: -16.58%
  - Percent Variance: 249,611,910
  - Annual Appropriation: 106,035,454
  - Appropriation Balance: 42.48%

- **FICR:**
  - Capital Outlay: 17,743,500
  - Year to Date Allotment: 30,080,258
  - Year to Date Actual: 1,429,612
  - Current Month Activity: 25,000
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: (12,361,758)
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: -69.67%
  - Percent Variance: 55,725,981
  - Annual Appropriation: 25,620,723
  - Appropriation Balance: 45.98%

- **Local:**
  - Capital Outlay: 1,714,100
  - Year to Date Allotment: 2,105,453
  - Year to Date Actual: 135,887
  - Current Month Activity: 4,315
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: (395,668)
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: -23.08%
  - Percent Variance: 3,915,997
  - Annual Appropriation: 1,806,229
  - Appropriation Balance: 46.12%

**Total Capital Outlay:**
- Year to Date Allotment: 184,980,929
- Year to Date Actual: 216,597,999
- Current Month Activity: 8,080,430
- Year to Date Encumbrance: 895,425
- Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: -17.58%
- Percent Variance: 417,757,282
- Annual Appropriation: 200,263,858
- Appropriation Balance: 47.94%

### Trustee & Benefit Payments

- **Dedicated:**
  - Trustee & Benefit Payments: 1,203,200
  - Year to Date Allotment: 3,328,290
  - Year to Date Actual: 404,850
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: (2,125,090)
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: -176.62%
  - Percent Variance: 3,750,660
  - Annual Appropriation: 422,370
  - Appropriation Balance: 11.26%

- **Federal:**
  - Trustee & Benefit Payments: 1,833,038
  - Year to Date Allotment: 991,264
  - Year to Date Actual: 32,507
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 841,774
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 45.92%
  - Percent Variance: 2,914,000
  - Annual Appropriation: 1,922,736
  - Appropriation Balance: 65.98%

- **FICR:**
  - Trustee & Benefit Payments: 0
  - Year to Date Allotment: 100,000
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: (100,000)
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 0%
  - Percent Variance: 0
  - Annual Appropriation: 0
  - Appropriation Balance: 0%

- **Local:**
  - Trustee & Benefit Payments: 345,500
  - Year to Date Allotment: 13,053
  - Year to Date Actual: 0
  - Current Month Activity: 0
  - Year to Date Encumbrance: 332,447
  - Variance Favorable/Unfavorable: 96.22%
  - Percent Variance: 541,000
  - Annual Appropriation: 527,947
  - Appropriation Balance: 97.59%
# Idaho Transportation Department

STATE HIGHWAY FUND

CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
BUDGET TO ACTUAL

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013

| Fund: 0260 State Highway Fund | Fiscal Year: 2013 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</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></td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E = A - B - D)</td>
<td>(F = E / A)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H = G - B - D)</td>
<td>(I = H / G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>3,381,738</td>
<td>4,432,607</td>
<td>437,357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,050,869)</td>
<td>-31.07%</td>
<td>7,205,660</td>
<td>2,773,053</td>
<td>38.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract Construction:</td>
<td>197,746,767</td>
<td>224,608,904</td>
<td>9,104,103</td>
<td>1,840,964</td>
<td>(28,703,101)</td>
<td>-14.52%</td>
<td>443,416,298</td>
<td>216,966,430</td>
<td>48.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User ID: gwalter
Report ID: F-GL-007L
Run Date: 06 Mar 2013
% of Time Remaining: 33.3

Fiscal Year: 2013
### Idaho Transportation Department

**STATE HIGHWAY FUND**

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

**Fund:** 0260  
State Highway Fund

**Sub Fund:** 46  
ARRA Title XII

**Fiscal Year:** 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</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>Federal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway - FHWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,222,163</td>
<td>60,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,222,163</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>8,933,395</td>
<td>6,711,232</td>
<td>75.13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371,565</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371,565</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>649,375</td>
<td>277,810</td>
<td>42.78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Aid:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>60,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>9,582,770</td>
<td>6,989,042</td>
<td>72.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>60,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>9,582,770</td>
<td>6,989,042</td>
<td>72.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>60,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,593,728</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>9,582,770</td>
<td>6,989,042</td>
<td>72.93 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Staff Salaries</td>
<td>35,029</td>
<td>35,022</td>
<td>10,641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02 %</td>
<td>1,378,100</td>
<td>1,343,078</td>
<td>97.46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, Hourly, Overtime, Shift Differential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>14,432</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01 %</td>
<td>590,562</td>
<td>576,131</td>
<td>97.56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>(49,104)</td>
<td>123,775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(172,879)</td>
<td>352.07 %</td>
<td>451,617</td>
<td>327,842</td>
<td>72.59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>49,104</td>
<td>227,540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(178,436)</td>
<td>-363.38%</td>
<td>248,426</td>
<td>20,886</td>
<td>8.41 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAAP Expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contract Construction |                  |                     |                        |                          |                                  |                  |                      |                      |                    |
| Operating Expenditures | 0                  | 98,023              | 43,992                 | 0                        | (98,023)                         | 0.00 %           | 171,081             | 73,058              | 42.70 %            |
| Capital Projects    | 0                      | 2,053,510           | (3,370)                | 7,935                    | (2,061,445)                      | 0.00 %           | 6,742,984           | 4,681,539           | 69.43 %            |
| Total Contract      | 0                      | 2,151,534           | 40,622                 | 7,935                    | (2,159,469)                      | 0.00 %           | 6,914,065           | 4,754,597           | 68.77 %            |

| TOTAL EXPENDITURES: | 49,461                | 2,552,307           | 55,853                 | 7,935                    | (2,510,780)                      | -5076.28%        | 9,582,770           | 7,022,528           | 73.28 %            |
**Idaho Transportation Department**

STATE HIGHWAY FUND

CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

BUDGET TO ACTUAL

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund:</th>
<th>Sub Fund:</th>
<th>Fiscal Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Fund</td>
<td>ARRA Title XII</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:</td>
<td>49,461</td>
<td>2,552,307</td>
<td>55,853</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>(2,510,780)</td>
<td>-5076.28%</td>
<td>9,582,770</td>
<td>7,022,528</td>
<td>73.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net for Fiscal Year 2013:</td>
<td>(49,461)</td>
<td>41,421</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>82,948</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(33,487)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Idaho Transportation Department

**GARVEE CAPITAL PROJECT FUND**

CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

BUDGET TO ACTUAL

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund:</th>
<th>0374 GARVEE Capital Project Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year:</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>1,523,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equipment Buy Back and Miscellaneous Rev:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>1,523,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(35,905,848)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>1,523,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(35,905,848)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>1,523,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,905,848</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(35,905,848)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDITURES         |                          |                     |                        |                          |                                  |                  |                      |                      |                    |
| In State Travel Expense | 0                     | 15,799              | 930                    | 0                        | (15,799)                        | 0.00%            |                      | 0                    | 0.00%               |
| Out of State Travel Expense | 0                    | 2,307               | 0                      | 0                        | (2,307)                         | 0.00%            |                      | 0                    | 0.00%               |
| Operating Expenditures | 0                     | 2,645,118           | 206,517                | 0                        | (2,645,118)                     | 0.00%            |                      | 0                    | 0.00%               |
| **Contract Construction** |                      |                     |                        |                          |                                  |                  |                      |                      |                    |
| Capital Projects     | 0                     | 35,128,500          | 1,821,501              | 5,208                    | (35,133,708)                    | 0.00%            | 0                    | (35,133,708)         | 0.00%               |
| **Total Contract Construction:** | 0 | 35,128,500 | 1,821,501 | 5,208 | (35,133,708) | 0.00% | 0 | (35,133,708) | 0.00% |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES:** | 0 | 37,791,725 | 2,028,947 | 5,208 | (37,796,933) | 0.00% | 0 | (37,796,933) | 0.00% |
| **TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:** | 0 | 37,791,725 | 2,028,947 | 5,208 | (37,796,933) | 0.00% | 0 | (37,796,933) | 0.00% |

Net for Fiscal Year 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Variance Favorable</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>Appropriation Balance</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Encumbr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                   | 0            | (1,885,877)  | (505,887)| (1,891,085)  | 0                    |         | 1,891,085   |                       |         |
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# Idaho Transportation Department

**GARVEE DEBT SERVICE FUND**

**CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**

**BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

| Fund: 0375 GARVEE Debt Service Fund | Fiscal Year: 2013 |

<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>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E = A - B - D)</td>
<td>(F = E / A)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H = G - B - D)</td>
<td>(I = H / G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equipment Buy Back</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Miscellaneous Rev:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</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>Operating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,563,189</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,570,560</td>
<td>344,438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,570,560</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,570,560</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Principal / Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,786,413</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,786,413</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPD AND TRANSFERS OUT:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,786,413</td>
<td>344,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,786,413)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net for Fiscal Year 2013:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(33,215,852)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>(33,215,852)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,215,852</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,215,852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STATE AERONAUTICS FUND

#### CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

**Budget to Actual**

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund: 0221 State Aeronautics Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year: 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E = A - B - D)</td>
<td>(F = E / A)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H = G - B - D)</td>
<td>(I = H / G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES**

**Federal Aid**

- Other Federal Aid: 291,996 116,920 6,407 0 (175,076) -59.96% 362,600 245,680 67.76%
- Total Federal Aid: 291,996 116,920 6,407 0 (175,076) -59.96% 362,600 245,680 67.76%

**Miscellaneous Revenues**

- 220,205 251,829 10,381 0 31,624 14.36% 338,000 86,171 25.49%
- Total Equipment Buy Back and Miscellaneous Rev: 220,205 251,829 10,381 0 31,624 14.36% 338,000 86,171 25.49%

**TOTAL REVENUES:** 512,201 368,749 16,788 0 (143,452) -28.01% 700,600 331,851 47.37%

**TRANSFERS-IN**

- Operating: 1,129,675 1,331,050 132,890 0 201,375 17.83% 1,600,000 268,950 16.81%
- Total Transfers-In: 1,129,675 1,331,050 132,890 0 201,375 17.83% 1,600,000 268,950 16.81%

**TOTAL REV AND TRANSFERS-IN:** 1,641,876 1,699,799 149,678 0 57,923 3.53% 2,300,600 600,801 26.11%

#### EXPENDITURES

- Permanent Staff Salaries: 400,602 363,536 40,146 0 37,066 9.25% 612,684 249,148 40.67%
- Board, Hourly, Overtime, Shift Differential: 79,508 68,404 1,859 0 11,104 13.97% 121,600 53,196 43.75%
- Fringe Benefits: 182,232 154,679 18,016 0 27,553 15.12% 277,016 122,337 44.16%
- In State Travel Expense: 60,495 26,601 873 0 33,894 56.03% 99,154 72,553 73.17%
- Out of State Travel Expense: 11,717 12,424 593 0 (707) -6.04% 17,800 5,376 30.20%
- Operating Expenditures: 589,774 233,847 18,187 7,342 348,585 59.10% 790,846 549,657 69.50%
- Capital Equipment Expense: 25,270 0 0 0 25,270 100.00% 34,800 34,800 100.00%
Idaho Transportation Department

STATE AERONAUTICS FUND
CURRENT STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
BUDGET TO ACTUAL
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO DATE - FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 2/28/2013

Fund: 0221  State Aeronautics Fund
Fiscal Year: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Capital Facilities Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3,409)</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>46,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee &amp; Benefit Payments</td>
<td>644,882</td>
<td>343,823</td>
<td>55,177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301,059</td>
<td>46.68 %</td>
<td>1,631,610</td>
<td>1,287,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract Construction
Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Contract Construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXPENDITURES:

| 1,994,480 | 1,206,723 | 134,850 | 7,342 | 780,415 | 39.13 % | 3,635,510 | 2,421,445 | 66.61 % |

TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS OUT:

| 1,994,480 | 1,206,723 | 134,850 | 7,342 | 780,415 | 39.13 % | 3,635,510 | 2,421,445 | 66.61 % |

Net for Fiscal Year 2013:

| (352,604) | 493,076 | 14,828 | 838,338 | (1,334,910) | (1,820,644) |
PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING MAINTENANCE OF STATE HIGHWAYS

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to delegate the responsibility for closing or restricting state highway use, to clarify the intent of the Board regarding state highway maintenance, and to clarify the intent of the Board regarding eradicating and controlling noxious weeds.

Legal Authority

Idaho Code 40-310(4). Authority to locate, design, extend, repair and maintain state highway system.

Idaho Code 40-310(5). Board authority to establish standards and maintenance and repair schedule for state highways.

Idaho Code 40-310(6). Board duty to establish and cause to be kept surveys, studies, maps, plans and specifications for alteration, extension, repair and maintenance of state highways.

Idaho Code 40-312(3). Board authority to make rules and regulations for maintenance and repair.

Idaho Code 40-314(3). Board authority to improve and maintain areas adjacent to highway for highway preservation.


The Department Director or director’s delegate Chief Engineer is responsible for closing or restricting the use of state highways when such action is necessary to protect the public or to prevent damage to the roadway. The Department Director is also responsible for maintaining the State Highway System by performing the following:

- Establishing guidelines for maintenance activities and responsibilities related to the State Highway System including bridges, connections and approaches. These guidelines shall be used as the basis for internal maintenance procedures and in assigning responsibilities to local jurisdictions with cooperative maintenance agreements.

- Developing maintenance levels of service for the State Highway System. Each route, or portion thereof, shall be assigned a level of maintenance service commensurate with the applicable corridor of significance, economic importance, traffic volume, crash experience, potential safety hazard areas, or other factors as determined necessary and subject to availability of funds.
• Instituting a Roadside Vegetation Program for the eradication and control of noxious
weeds and the establishment, growth, and maintenance of appropriate vegetation within
the right-of-way of the State Highway System. The Roadside Vegetation Program shall
promote the use of noxious weed free materials, the reclamation of materials sources on
highway construction projects, and a comprehensive and integrated management program
of native and other adaptable vegetation. The Director may delegate the authority to sign
contracts or agreements with public or private entities to provide for noxious weed
eradication or control.

Approved by the Board on:

Date January 18, 2012

Darrell V.-Manning-Jerry Whitehead
Board Chairman

This policy based on:
- Section 40-210(4)(5), Idaho Code
- IDAPA 39 C 42.3(a)
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board
- Implemented by Administrative Policy:
- 05-16, MAINTENANCE OF STATE HIGHWAYS
Former dates of 09-16:
- 05-65, 06-82, 08-89, 2/19/93, and 3/19/03
Cross-reference to related Board Policies:
- B 00-09, AUTHORITY TO SIGN CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS AND THEIR REGISTRATION
- B 05-06, WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS
- B 05-25, SNOWPLOWING OUTSIDE OF STATE-HIGHWAY BOUNDARIES
- B 05-34, CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE-HIGHWAYS
- B 09-08, BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES
PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING STATE HIGHWAYS

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to delegate the responsibility for closing or restricting state highway use, to clarify the intent of the Board regarding state highway maintenance, and to clarify the intent of the Board regarding eradicating and controlling noxious weeds.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code 40-310(4) - Authority to locate, design, extend, repair and maintain state highway system.

Idaho Code 40-310(5) - Board authority to establish standards and maintenance and repair schedule for state highways

Idaho Code 40-310(6) - Board duty to establish and cause to be kept surveys, studies, maps, plans and specifications for alteration, extension, repair and maintenance of state highways.

Idaho Code 40-312(3) - Board authority to make rules and regulations for maintenance and Repair

Idaho Code 40-314(3) - Board authority to improve and maintain areas adjacent to highway for highway preservation,

Idaho Code 40-502 - Department responsibility for maintaining state highways, including rights-of-way.

The Department Director or director’s delegate is responsible for closing or restricting the use of state highways when such action is necessary to protect the public or to prevent damage to the roadway. The Department Director is also responsible for maintaining the State Highway System by performing the following:

- Establishing guidelines for maintenance activities related to the State Highway System including bridges, connections and approaches. These guidelines shall be used as the basis for internal maintenance procedures and in assigning responsibilities to local jurisdictions with cooperative maintenance agreements.

- Developing maintenance levels of service for the State Highway System. Each route, or portion thereof, shall be assigned a level of maintenance service commensurate with the applicable corridor of significance, economic importance, traffic volume, crash experience, potential safety hazard areas, or other factors as determined necessary and subject to availability of funds.
• Instituting a Roadside Vegetation Program for the eradication and control of noxious weeds and the establishment, growth, and maintenance of appropriate vegetation within the right-of-way of the State Highway System. The Roadside Vegetation Program shall promote the use of noxious weed free materials, the reclamation of materials sources on highway construction projects, and a comprehensive and integrated management program of native and other adaptable vegetation. The Director may delegate the authority to sign contracts or agreements with public or private entities to provide for noxious weed eradication or control.

Approved by the Board on:

Date ______________________

Jerry Whitehead
Board Chairman
The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) has a long-term commitment for the eradication and control of noxious weeds, and the establishment, growth, and maintenance of appropriate vegetation within the right-of-way of the State Highway System. Permanent and well-established vegetation is the key component in roadside soil stabilization, water and wind erosion control, sediment containment, healthy and sustainable vegetation, beautification, and valuable ground cover. The Roadside Vegetation Program shall reduce the spread of noxious weeds, and promote the use of noxious weed-free materials, the reclamation of materials sources on highway construction projects, and a comprehensive and integrated management program of native and other adaptable vegetation.

The Director may delegate the authority to sign contracts or agreements with public or private entities to provide for noxious weed eradication or control and other maintenance or construction activities to complement department vegetation efforts. ITD contracts and agreements shall conform to the provisions of Board and Administrative Policies B and A-01-09, Authority to Sign Contracts, Agreements, or Grants and their Registration.

Approved by the Board on:

_________________________  _______________________
Darrell V. Manning       Date  April 16, 2009
Board Chairman

This policy based on:
- Sections 22-2471 and 40-502, Idaho Code
- Title 22, Chapter 4, Idaho Pure Seed Law, Idaho Code
- Title 22, Chapter 24, Idaho Noxious Weed Law, Idaho Code
- Title 06, Chapter 22, Idaho Noxious Weed Rules
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board

Implemented by Administrative Policy:
- A-05-08, ROADSIDE VEGETATION PROGRAM

Former dates of B-05-05:
2/19/93 and 5/18/2000

Cross-reference to related Board policies:
- B-01-09, AUTHORITY TO SIGN CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS AND THEIR REGISTRATION
- B-08-14, SAFETY REST AREAS
- B-08-27, VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
- B-06-06, PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS
- B-05-27, TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
- B-14-07, LANDSCAPING
WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS ON STATE HIGHWAYS

The Director shall develop appropriate levels of winter maintenance service for the State Highway System. Each route, or portion thereof, shall be assigned a level of winter maintenance commensurate with traffic volume, winter crash experience, potential safety hazard areas, or other factors as determined necessary. Interstate routes shall be assigned the highest maintenance service level. Exceptions can be made for particularly low traffic volume Interstate routes.

All maintenance activities are subject to availability of funds.

The Winter Maintenance Standards map, identifying the levels of winter maintenance service on all State highways, shall be prepared and presented to the Board for review prior to publication whenever changes are made.

Approved by the Board on:

__________________________                      Date: ___April 20, 2011______
Darrell V. Manning
Board Chairman

This policy is based on:
- Section 40-310(3) and (10), 40-312(3) and 40-314(3), Idaho Code
- Decision by the Board

Implemented by Administrative Policy:
- B-05-06, WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

Former dates of B-05-06:
3/10/80, 8/18/89, 3/25/93, 4/7/95, 3/27/95, and 8/16/07

Cross-reference to related Board Policies:
- B-05-16, MAINTENANCE OF STATE HIGHWAYS
- B-05-25, SNOWPLOWING OUTSIDE OF STATE HIGHWAY BOUNDARIES
- B-05-34, CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAY
CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAYS

The Department Director or the Chief Engineer is responsible for closing or restricting the use of state highways when such action is necessary to protect the public or to prevent damage to the roadway.

Approved by the Board on:

_________ Signed ___________ Date: __4-19-07________

Darrell V. Manning
Board Chairman

This policy is based on:

- Section 10-310 (10), Idaho Code
- Decision by the Board

Implemented by Administrative Policy:

A-05-34: CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAYS

Former dates of A-05-34:
- 1-19-73, 1-10-74, 9-3-74, 11-1-74, 6-16-81, 8-18-89, and 5-20-93

Cross-reference related Board policies:

- B-05-02, ROUTE DESIGNATION FOR SPECIAL TRUCK OPERATIONS
- B-05-06, WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS
ROADSIDE VEGETATION PROGRAM

The Idaho Transportation Department has a long-term commitment for the eradication and control of noxious weeds, and the establishment, growth, and maintenance of appropriate vegetation within the right-of-way of the State Highway System. This commitment is even more paramount as stricter regulations and increasing public awareness mandates serious consideration of the roadside vegetation component of a highway project.

Permanent and well-established vegetation is the key component in roadside soil stabilization, water and wind erosion control, sediment containment, healthy and sustainable vegetation, beautification, wildlife habitat, and valuable ground cover. The Roadside Vegetation Program shall promote a comprehensive and integrated management program of native and other adaptable vegetation that:

- Promotes noxious weed-free materials on highway projects.
- Reduces the spread of noxious weeds, and complies with the state noxious weed law.
- Is compatible with safe highway use.
- Salvages and reuses topsoil as much as possible on projects and activities where seeding and planting will take place.
- Uses sound and proven soil agronomic and reclamation practices in all projects and activities which require vegetation establishment, protection, or re-estabishment.
- Has constructively appearance with a minimum of maintenance and holds maintenance costs at the lowest possible level.

Office of Highway Operations and Safety Responsibilities

The Highway Operations and Safety Engineer shall develop practices and procedures for all planting, seeding, and vegetation establishment and management for the department. The Roadside Program Coordinator shall:

- Maintain current vegetation practices and procedures in the Maintenance Manual, and ensure compatibility and consistency of all department vegetation policies, practices, and procedures.
- Provide assistance, training, and technical resources to the Districts, roadway design, construction, right of way, environmental, materials, and other department sections/divisions on department vegetation and revegetation practices and procedures.
- Assist in planning and reviewing all department sponsored or assisted vegetation management plans, roadside beautification, and landscape projects.
- Recommend purchasing and distributing primary and wildflower seed for department vegetation and revegetation projects through the department’s Business and Support Management Section.

District Responsibilities

District Engineers shall ensure that all construction projects and maintenance activities that disturb soil and/or vegetation shall incorporate a plan to control the spread of noxious weeds, as well as...
reseed and revegetate those disturbed areas. The Districts shall follow the Department's seeding guidelines and specifications. Whenever deviations in plant varieties and seeding rates are required, the Project Development Engineer, District Environmental Planner, or Roadside Vegetation Foreman shall obtain the concurrence of the Roadside Program Coordinator as early as possible in the design process.

The Project Development Engineer, Resident/Regional Engineers, Maintenance Engineers, Materials Engineers, Environmental Planner, and the Right-of-Way Encroachment administrators shall be responsible for reducing the spread of noxious weeds, and for all planting-and-seeding projects in their areas of responsibility and jurisdiction. Additionally, cooperation and coordination with landowners, local public agencies, and other Department staff shall be required for roadside maintenance activities such as: (1) herbicide applications; (2) blading; (3) mowing; (4) plant growth regulation; (5) brush control; (6) reseeding; (7) planting; and (8) fertilization.

The District Engineer may develop and sign contracts with public or private entities to provide for noxious weed eradication or control, and other maintenance or construction activities, to complement Department efforts, when such action is more economical or beneficial for the Department. TTD contracts and agreements shall conform to the provisions of Board and Administrative Policies, B and A-01-09, Authority to Sign-Contracts, Agreements, or Grants and their Registration.

__________________________
Signed
__________________________
Date: May 05, 2009

Pamela K. Lowe, P.E.
Director

This policy-based on:
- Title 67, Chapters 2471 and 40-502, Idaho Code
- Title 25, Chapter 4, Idaho-Pure-Seed Law, Idaho Code
- Title 37, Chapter 24, Idaho-Noxious-Weed Law, Idaho Code
- Title 06, Chapter 22, Idaho-Noxious-Weed Rules
- B-04-05, ROADSIDE VEGETATION PROGRAM
- B-01-09, AUTHORITY TO SIGN CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, OR GRANTS AND THEIR REGISTRATION

Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
- Assistant Chief Engineer (Operations) (Development)

Direction for activity and results delegated to:
- Roadway Design Engineer, Highway Operations and Safety Engineer, Construction Engineer, Right-of-Way Manager, Environmental Manager, District Engineers

Department procedures contained in:
- Maintenance Manual
- Design Manual
- Construction Manual
- TTD Standard Specifications for Highway Construction
- Adopted Storm Water Best Practices for Highway Construction and Maintenance

Former dates on:
4/15/95, 6/21/97, 12/14/98, 2/21/2002 (formerly DH-13-05, 1/21/95, and B-22/8006)

Cross-reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-01-09, AUTHORITY TO SIGN CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, OR GRANTS AND THEIR REGISTRATION
- A-08-14, SAFETY REST AREAS
- A-09-27, VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
- A-06-08, PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS
- A-10-07, LANDSCAPING
WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS ON STATE HIGHWAYS

The Winter Maintenance Standards map, found in the Maintenance Manual, identifies the level of winter maintenance service for State Highway System routes not covered by separate city or county maintenance agreements. The standards of winter maintenance service are determined by using winter crash experience, potential safety hazard areas, or other factors as determined necessary.

Snow plowing, and the application of sanding materials and chemicals, shall be accomplished according to the Winter Maintenance Standards map. The approved maintenance levels are the minimum requirements when general area-wide weather conditions are of such duration and intensity as to demand full deployment of Department winter maintenance resources. District Engineers have the authority to maintain State highways at levels greater than the minimum requirements provided that the increased maintenance activity can be accomplished within budget constraints.

The District Engineers shall determine the milepost limits on the State highway routes within their respective Districts for each level of the Winter Maintenance Standards map. The milepost limits shall be maintained in the respective District offices.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: May 13, 2011

Brian W. Ness
Director

This policy is based on:
- Section 40-310 (3) and (4), 40-312 (3) and (4), 311 (3), Idaho Code
- Board Policy 05-330, WINTER MAINTENANCE STANDARDS
- Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
  - Chief Engineer
  - Maintenance Manual, 05-220 and 334

Department procedures contained in:
- Maintenance Manual, 05-220 and 334

Former dates of A-05-06:
- 4/30/80, 9/18/81, 4/9/89, 11/12/91, 2/8/93, 4/11/95, 4/11/95, and 8/17/07

Cross-reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-05-16, MAINTENANCE OF STATE HIGHWAYS
- A-05-25, SNOWPLowing outside of state highway boundaries
- A-05-34, CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAYS
- A-05-37, ALLOCATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS (STM, STKP, AND MATERIALS)
MAINTENANCE-OF-STATE-HIGHWAYS

The Idaho Transportation Department will maintain the roads, bridges, connections, and approaches within the right-of-way boundaries of the State Highway System except:

- Local road surfaces and related drainage features crossing over or under State Highways will be maintained by the local jurisdiction; bridge structures will be maintained by the Department;
- Interchange ramps will be maintained by the Department only to the point of connection with local roads;
- Snow and ice control activities will be accomplished on private and public approaches only after the main road is cleared and equipment and manpower are available in accordance with 331.2 of the Maintenance Manual.

Frontage roads will be maintained by the local jurisdiction responsible for the roads connected with or collected by the frontage road.

When a State Highway is located within an incorporated city or a widened urban section, the State will enter into a cooperative agreement with the local agency which reflects shared maintenance costs based on a practical assignment of tasks.

Right-of-Way Use Permits may be issued to utilities or others to perform repairs on their non-highway facilities in accordance with A-14-08, Movement of Utilities. Maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be in accordance with A-09-08, Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities.

---

Date: 3/25/03

Jimmy D. Ross
Acting-Director

This policy is based on:
- Sections 40-310(4), (5), and (6) and 40-503, Idaho Code
- IDAPA 39 C. 42 3-a
- B-05-16, MAINTENANCE-OF-STATE-HIGHWAYS
- Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
  - Chief Engineer
- Direction for activity and results delegated to:
  - Maintenance Engineer and District Engineers
- Department procedures contained in:
  - Maintenance Manual
  - Design Manual
Forms associated with this policy:

Cross reference to related Administrative Policies:

- A-05-05: ROADSIDE-VEGETATION MAINTENANCE
- A-05-06: WINTER-MAINTENANCE-STANDARDS-ON-STATE-HIGHWAYS
- A-05-14: ROADSIDE TURNOUTS-AND-REST-AREAS
- A-09-08: BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN-FACILITIES
- A-14-08: MOVEMENT-OF-UTILITIES
CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAYS

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to delegate the responsibility for closing or restricting state highway use and for notifying the media of closures or restrictions.

Authority
Idaho Code Section 40-310 (10)
Board Policy 4012, PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING STATE HIGHWAYS

Decision by the Department Director

The Chief Engineer or the District Engineer is responsible for closing or restricting the use of state highways when such action is necessary to protect the public or to prevent damage to the roadway. The Idaho State Police, local law enforcement officers, and other responsible agencies shall be advised of the closure and when necessary, their assistance may be requested.

Law enforcement personnel are empowered at their discretion, to enforce temporary delays, inform the news media of road and weather conditions, and issue traveler's warnings whenever conditions warrant such action.

During regular business hours the Office of Communications, in coordination with the appropriate District Engineers or a designee, shall notify the media of roadway closures, openings, etc. During non-business hours the State EMS Communications Center, in coordination with the Public Affairs Office of Communications and the appropriate District Engineer or a designee, shall make the necessary notifications.

Procedures for implementing this policy are in the Maintenance Manual, Section 05-322, 330 and 340.

Signed: Pamela K. Lowe, P.E. Brian Ness
Date: January 05, 2009
Director

This policy is based on:
- Sections 40-310 (10), Idaho Code
- Board Policy 4012, CLOSURES OR RESTRICTED USE OF STATE HIGHWAYS

Decision by the Department Director: Chief Engineer

Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
- Highway Operations and Safety Engineer and District Engineers

Department procedures contained in:
- Maintenance Manual, Section 05-322, 330 and 340

Former dates on A-05-34:
- 6-14-74, 11-12-74, 6-17-81, 5-5-93, and 5-5-931-05-09

Cross-reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-05-15, SPECIAL PERMIT OPERATIONS
- A-20-01, RELEASE OF DEPARTMENT INFORMATION TO THE MEDIA
PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING STATE HIGHWAYS

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to delegate the responsibility for closing or restricting state highway use and for notifying the media of closures or restrictions.

Authority
Idaho Code Section 40-310 (10)
Board Policy 4012, PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING STATE HIGHWAYS
Decision by the Department Director

The Chief Engineer or the District Engineer is responsible for closing or restricting the use of state highways when such action is necessary to protect the public or to prevent damage to the roadway. The Idaho State Police, local law enforcement officers, and other responsible agencies shall be advised of the closure and when necessary, their assistance may be requested.

Law enforcement personnel are empowered at their discretion, to enforce temporary delays, inform the news media of road and weather conditions, and issue travelers warnings whenever conditions warrant such action.

During regular business hours the Office of Communications, in coordination with the appropriate District Engineers or a designee, shall notify the media of roadway closures, openings, etc. During non-business hours the State EMS Communications Center, in coordination with the Office of Communications and the appropriate District Engineer or a designee, shall make the necessary notifications.

Procedures for implementing this policy are in the Maintenance Manual, Section 05-322, 330 and 340.

_________________________________________ Date: ___________________
Brian W. Ness
Director
March 28, 2013

BOARD POLICY B-12-034016
Page 1 of 1

TRAFFIC REGULATION MINUTE ENTRIES

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to require the Department to adopt a Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways and to install, operate, and maintain traffic control devices in conformance with the manual; record the final determination of any traffic regulations; and to establish cooperative agreements with local jurisdictions regarding the same.

Legal Authority

Idaho Code 40-313(1) - The Board shall erect and maintain for public safety suitable signs and devices.

Idaho Code 40-317 - The Board may enter into cooperative agreements with the federal government and with local governments.

Idaho Code 49-201(3) - The Board shall adopt a manual and specifications for traffic control devices on state highways.

Idaho Code 49-202(20) - The Department shall maintain traffic control devices on state highways.

Idaho Code 49-202(28) - The Department shall place traffic control devices in cooperation with local highway authorities.

Idaho Code 49-661 - Regulations in regard to parking on state highways.

Traffic control devices within the state of Idaho shall be installed, operated, and maintained in conformance with the "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" as adopted by the state.

Traffic signal installation costs shall be proportioned as determined by the Department, with installation, maintenance, and operation requirements covered by cooperative agreement with the local jurisdiction. The Department shall also establish Cooperative Agreements with local jurisdictions relative to installation and maintenance of traffic control devices on joint-use facilities.

The Department shall establish traffic regulations such as speed zones, parking restrictions, the use of traffic signals, railroad grade crossings, and selective vehicle exclusions on the State Highway System.
constraint that a specific determination of the regulation is required. Each change in a regulation shall be documented and final determination shall be recorded in an official Traffic Minute Entry. Whenever possible, local government agencies and law enforcement officials shall be consulted about the proposed changes.

Establishment and administration of a program for Traffic Minute Entries is assigned to the Director or a delegate.

Signing shall not be altered until approved by the appropriate authority.

Unresolved differences between Department personnel, local officials, and/or the public shall be presented to the Idaho Transportation Board for resolution.

Approved by the Board on:

Date October 15, 2009

Signed

Darrell V Manning
Jerry Whitehead
Board Chairman

This Policy based on:

- Sections 40-313(1) and 49-201, 202, and 661, Idaho Code
- IDAPA-39.03.65, Rules Governing Traffic Minute Entries
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board

Implemented by Administrative Policy:

- A 12-03, TRAFFIC MINUTE ENTRIES

Former date of B 12-03:

11/17/53, 1/1/74, 8/5/74, 9/20/77, 12/18/98, and 9/21/00

Cross reference to related Board Policies:

- B-12-01, RIGHT OF WAY USE PERMITS
- B-12-07, STATE HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS WITHIN CITY JURISDICTIONS
- B-12-11, HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
- B-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
- B-14-01, DAMAGED OR OBSOLETE RAILROAD CROSSING GATES AND/OR SIGNALS
PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to require the Department to establish a technical document that identifies and addresses impacts from access changes to the highway system.

LEGAL AUTHORITY

Idaho Code 40-310(6). The Board shall cause to be made and kept surveys, studies, maps, plans, specifications and estimates for state highways:

Idaho Code 49-202(18). The Department shall compile accident statistics:

Idaho Code 49-202(23). The Department shall regulate use of a controlled-access highway for any kind of traffic found to be incompatible with the normal and safe flow of traffic.

Idaho Code 49-202(28). The Department shall place traffic control devices in cooperation with local highway authorities.

Idaho Code 67-6519. Planning and zoning permits to consider traffic volumes and effects of land use.

TRANSPORTATION IMPACT STUDIES

The Board of the Idaho Transportation Department recognizes the need to manage access to the state highway system to preserve safety and operation of the system. Each point of access to the state highway system has potential impacts on the system that must be identified so necessary mitigation measures can be implemented.

The Board hereby assigns the Director the authority to identify and address impacts to the state highway system associated with changes in access to the highway system, and to establish a technical document detailing requirements for Transportation Impact Studies to be recognized as ITD's standards and procedures for addressing the impacts of land development on the safety and operation of the state highway system.

Approved by the Board on:

Date: June 19, 2008

Darrell V. Manning/Jerry Whitehead
This Policy is based on:

- Sections 40-310, 42-202, and 67-619, IDAHO CODE
- IDAPA Rule 34.03.42, RULES GOVERNING USE OF STATE RIGHT-OF-WAY
- "Requirements for Transportation Impact Studies" (contact the District Traffic Engineer for copies or Transportation Planning for corrections or changes)
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board

Former dates of B-12-06:
3/19/08

Cross-reference to related Board Policies:
- B-12-01, RIGHT OF WAY USE PERMITS
- B-13-01, HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
SAMPLE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Idaho-Transportation-Department
And
Local-Public-Agency
For
Transportation-Impact-Studies

Statement of Purpose

New land-developments, and the expansion of existing developments, can have a significant impact on the surrounding transportation system, particularly if adequate planning and transportation system improvements are not addressed. The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and cities, counties, and highway districts having jurisdiction over land use and transportation systems, (Local Public Agencies—LPA) shall cooperatively use a consistent approach for determining the need for transportation impact studies and the conduct and review of such studies prior to any changes in the transportation system.

Participants

The participants in this Memorandum of Understanding are the Idaho Transportation Department, P.O. Box 7129, Boise, Idaho 83707-1129 and the ____________________________

Effective Date

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective on ________________ and in force until canceled in writing by one or both of the parties.

Agreements

Both parties agree:

1. That Transportation Impact Studies (TIS) are necessary to determine which changes to the transportation system are needed to accommodate new developments or the expansion of existing developments.

2. That both parties retain full access authority, ITD over requirements for access to State Highways and LPA over requirements for access to city, county, and highway district roads.

3. That the document “Requirements for Transportation Impact Studies,” that was jointly prepared by ITD and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council and reviewed and accepted by the Association of Idaho Cities, Idaho Association of Counties, and the Idaho Association of Highway Districts, shall be used as the reference document detailing what a TIS should include.
4. That (Local Public Agency):

- is the local point of contact to determine the need for a TIS for roadways in its jurisdiction, based on the criteria in "Requirements for Transportation Impact Studies;"
- will distribute information to the developer about requirements for a TIS; and
- will communicate to the developer the decision about transportation system improvements that are determined to be required.

5. That an appeals process is provided for decisions about transportation system improvements resulting from a TIS.

Issues

- Either party may choose to waive the need for a TIS if an agreement is reached with the developer regarding road improvements.
- The cost of review of a TIS by a professional consulting engineer will be borne by the developer.
- Impact fees may be assessed if required by local ordinances, when approved through proper administrative procedures.

Executed By

Idaho Transportation Department

________________________________________
Chief Engineer or delegate

________________________________________
(Name of Local Public Agency) (City, County, Highway District)

________________________________________
(Official's signature and title)
PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to require the Department to establish guidelines to determine reasonable and safe speed limits from engineering and traffic investigations.

LEGAL AUTHORITY

Idaho Code 49-201(4). The Board shall determine on the basis of engineering and traffic investigation the maximum speed on any part of state highways.

Idaho Code 49-202(22). The Department shall determine on the basis of engineering and traffic investigation the minimum speed for state highways.

STATE-HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS WITHIN CITY JURISDICTIONS

Sections 49-201(3) and 49-207(2), Idaho Code, assign the Idaho Transportation Board (for the State Highway System, including Interstate highways) and the local authorities (for local highways within their jurisdiction) the responsibility to determine speed limits that are reasonable and safe based on engineering and traffic investigations. The Director shall establish guidelines to implement the requirements of Sections 49-201, 49-202, 49-207, 49-208, and 49-654, Idaho Code, regarding the responsibilities of the Department to determine appropriate speed limits that are reasonable and safe and the authority of incorporated cities to further adjust speed limits on sections of the State Highway System that are within their jurisdictions. The speed limit guidelines shall be used as the basis for responding to city requests for speed limit adjustments.

Whenever the State Highway System traverses an incorporated city, and is neither an Interstate highway nor a controlled-access highway (Type IV or greater), the local authorities may request speed limit adjustments within urban, residential, and business districts of their jurisdiction that differ from the department’s established speed limits.

Any proposed speed limit adjustment shall not be effective until the incorporated city notifies the department in writing and new speed limit signs are placed on the highway. Notification shall be in the form of a minute entry, resolution, ordinance, or other official written method established by the city to document official actions.

In areas where the speed limit is established by city action and varies from the Department’s recommendation, the District shall perform annual follow-up engineering and traffic investigations to monitor the effects of the change in speed limit. These investigations shall be compiled and held by the Division of Highways and reported upon the Board’s request.

Approved by the Board on:

165
This policy is based on:
- Sections 49-201, 202, 207, 304, and 614, Idaho Code
- Decision by the Board

Implemented by Administrative Policy:
- A 12-07, STATE HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS WITHIN CITY JURISDICTIONS
- Former dates of B-12-07:
  - 6/5/97, 9/24/00, and 11/16/01

Cross-reference to related Board Policies:
- B-12-01, STATE HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
- B-12-03, TRAFFIC MINUTE ENTRIES
- B-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to require the Department to install, operate and maintain traffic control devices in conformance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways; and to establish cooperative agreements with local jurisdictions regarding same.

LEGAL AUTHORITY

Idaho Code 40-313(1). The Board shall erect and maintain for public safety suitable signs and devices.

Idaho Code 40-317. The Board may enter into cooperative agreements with the federal government and with local governments.

Idaho Code 49-201(3). The Board shall adopt a manual and specifications for traffic control devices on state highways.

Idaho Code 49-202(29). The Department shall maintain traffic control devices on state highways.

Idaho Code 49-202(28). The Department shall place traffic control devices in cooperation with local highway authorities.

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Traffic control devices within the state of Idaho shall be installed, operated and maintained in conformance with the "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" published by the Federal Highway Administration and as adopted by the state. For school crossing traffic signals to be installed on the State Highway System, the signals must meet warrant requirements regardless of who installs or maintains the school crossing signals. Any exceptions to the aforementioned requirements must be approved by the Board.

Traffic signal installation costs shall be proportioned on the basis of intersection approach lanes on the State Highway System, with installation, maintenance and operation requirements covered by a cooperative agreement with the local jurisdiction.

The Director or a delegate shall establish cooperative agreements with local jurisdictions relative to installation and maintenance of traffic control devices on joint-use facilities.
This policy is based on:

- Sections 49-201 and 49-202, Idaho Code
- Decision by the Idaho Transportation Board
- Implemented by Administrative Policy
- A-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
- Former dates of B-12-16:
  - 1/20/54, 4/22/63, 7/12/70, 3/9/78, 12/9/88, 1/1/95, and 4/12/03
- Cross-reference to related Board Policies:
  - B-12-01, STATE HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
  - B-19-01, FINANCING CONSTRUCTION OF STATE HIGHWAYS IN OTHER
TRAFFIC REGULATION CONTROL DEVICES

Authority
Board Policy 4016, TRAFFIC REGULATION

Traffic control devices on the State Highway System are approved at the discretion of the Department.

When installation, operation, and maintenance costs of traffic control devices and lighting on the State Highway System costs are shared, participants shall execute a cooperative project agreement specifying each participant's share of the costs, requirements and responsibilities. Additional installation costs for variances from standard traffic control devices and lighting designs shall be paid by the entity requesting the variance. The following criteria shall be considered as a guide in assigning costs of control devices and illumination fixtures.

Traffic Control Devices

- If new signalization is required at a public road approach that is not a state highway, the installation, operation, and maintenance costs shall be shared by the Department and the local jurisdiction in proportion to the number of approach lanes from the local jurisdiction and the number of new lanes on the state system.

- If new development necessitates installation of additional traffic control devices and/or roadway improvements, the developers or special use groups (industry, factory, warehouse, shopping center, etc.) shall pay all design and installation costs, including construction inspection. Signal installation shall not commence until approved by the Department.

- The cooperative agreement shall include a requirement that the developer dedicate to the local jurisdiction a minimum of 15 meters (50 feet) of right of way beyond the state right of way, within the driveway or the future public road approach. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval.

- School crossing signals may be installed and maintained by local jurisdictions at their expense, provided the signals meet signal warrants. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval.

- Costs for intersection control beacons (flashing beacons) at public road approaches and major private approaches are apportioned among the participants on the same basis as traffic signal costs. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval.

Lighting

- The AASHTO publication, "An Informational Guide for Roadway Lighting" shall be used to determine where and when lighting devices are located. Proposed lighting installations require the District Engineer's approval.
Many rural interchanges with light traffic volumes are sufficiently delineated so as to not require roadway lighting at night. However, in some circumstances, partial interchange lighting or complete interchange lighting is the preferred treatment. All lighting costs at rural interchanges are paid by the Department.

All costs for interstate highway lighting are paid by the Department.

If a local jurisdiction requests additional lighting, all associated costs are paid by the local jurisdiction.

If other governmental agencies or private entities request special signal and/or lighting devices, all arrangements for installation, operation, and maintenance shall be specified in the written agreement and the Right of Way Use Permit.

**Appeals**

Appeals regarding the decisions of the Department shall follow the process described in IDAPA 39.03.42 Section 003 Administrative Appeal.

**Traffic Minute Entries**

Regulation of traffic on the State Highway System (see following table) is authorized by Idaho Code with the constraint that specific determination of the regulation is required. Adoption of these regulations shall be made by official entries in department records or “Traffic Minute Entries.” These Traffic Minute Entries must be approved before the regulation is enforceable. Approval authority is delegated as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Regulations</th>
<th>Code Reference</th>
<th>Area Of Application (*1) (TME = Traffic Minute Entry)</th>
<th>Approval Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speed Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Permanent limits</td>
<td>49-201 and 49-202</td>
<td>Entire State Highway System – TME</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Temporary limits</td>
<td>49-201</td>
<td>Construction, maintenance speed zones and emergency situations</td>
<td>District Engineer (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bridge limits</td>
<td>49-202 (21)</td>
<td>Entire State Highway System – TME</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Restriction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rural Prohibition</td>
<td>49-202 (28) and 49-661(3)</td>
<td>Entire State Highway System – TME</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Urban Angle Parking</td>
<td>49-202 (28) and 49-661 (3)</td>
<td>Urban highways – TME</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Control Signals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Signals/Intersection Flashing Beacons</td>
<td>49-202 (20)</td>
<td>TME required for locations where there is no cooperative agreement between the Idaho Transportation Department and local officials</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Flashing Beacon with Warning Sign (school zones, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railroad Grade Crossings</th>
<th>49-202 (20)</th>
<th>Entire State Highway System</th>
<th>District Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TME required for non-signaled railroad crossings (to validate the reasons for not having a stop sign or signal).</td>
<td>District Chief Engineer or a delegate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selective Vehicle Exclusion | 49-202 (23) | Fully Controlled Access Highways – TME | District Chief Engineer or a delegate |

---

*1 The regulation of traffic within an incorporated community is the concurrence of municipal officials and is covered by a local ordinance rather than Traffic Minute Entry. (See Administrative Policy, 1207, State Highway Speed Limit within City Jurisdictions.)

*2 Traffic Minute Entries that have been approved shall be submitted each month to the Board as information in the Consent Calendar.

*3 Regulation of temporary speeds shall be established and deleted by written approval of the appropriate District Engineer or a delegate.

In consultation with local government agencies and law enforcement officials, the District Traffic Engineers shall monitor, prepare supporting documentation, and initiate requests for Traffic Minute Entries. Each request for a Traffic Minute Entry shall include an engineering study and traffic investigation in accordance with Section 103 of the Traffic Manual. This documentation shall be prepared and stamped with the seal of a professional engineer licensed in Idaho.

Each Traffic Minute Entry shall have a Public Outreach Plan, and if issues are identified the unresolved differences and plan of action shall be formalized and provided to the Office of Communications. The Office of Communications shall further identify affected parties and statewide impact. Districts shall update and implement the plan of action.

A copy of the approved Traffic Minute Entries shall be provided to the Office of Highway Operations and Safety for review. The Office of Highway Operations and Safety shall manage Traffic Minute Entries to make monthly reports to Board on the Consent Calendar of changes in speed zoning.

Highway signing shall not be altered until approved by the appropriate authority.

Unresolved differences between Department personnel, local officials and/or the public shall be documented by the District Traffic Engineer and reviewed by the Director. The Director shall take action and provide a resolution to the Director, Idaho Transportation Board.

Signed: Brian W. Ness
Director
L. Scott Stokes, P.E.
Acting-Director

Date: November 02, 2009
This policy-based on:
- Sections 40.313(1), 40.201, 202, and 661, IDAHO CODE
- IDAPA 39.03.65, Rules Governing Traffic-Minute-Entries
- Board Policy B-12-03, TRAFFIC-MINUTE-ENTRIES

Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
- Chief Engineer

Direction for activity and results delegated to:
- Assistant Chief Engineer—Operations, Highway Operations, and Safety Engineer, District Engineers

Department procedures contained in:
- Traffic manual

Former dates of A-12-01:
- 9/12/74, 9/26/77, 10/24/89, 12/22/98, and 9/27/00

Cross-reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-12-01, RIGHT-OF-WAY USE PERMITS
- A-12-04, TRAFFIC CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION OR MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS ON HIGH VOLUME HIGHWAYS
- A-12-07, STATE HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS WITHIN CITY JURISDICTIONS
- A-12-15, HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
- A-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
- A-14-01, DAMAGED OR OBSOLETE RAILROAD CROSSING GATES AND/OR SIGNALS
STATE-HIGHWAY-SPEED LIMITS-WITHIN-CITY-JURISDICTIONS

The Idaho Transportation Department shall determine reasonable and safe speed limits on the State Highway System, which are based on engineering and traffic investigations (Idaho Code, 49-201 and 49-202). Effective July 1, 1997, incorporated cities may, by official action for the purpose of enhancing motorist and pedestrian safety, request speed limit adjustments within their jurisdiction for those sections of the State Highway System that are not classified as an interstate or a controlled-access highway (Type IV or greater).

To ensure statewide uniformity, fairness, and timeliness in addressing state highway speed limit adjustments within city jurisdictions, the following procedures shall be adopted:

Upon receiving a request from a city for consideration of a speed limit adjustment within their jurisdiction, the appropriate District Traffic Engineer shall:

1) Acknowledge the request in writing. The Department shall perform an engineering and traffic investigation whenever requested to look at the feasibility of adjusting the speed limit. However, a city must be incorporated and the section of highway to be reviewed cannot be classified as an interstate or a controlled-access highway (Type IV or greater) for the city to have authority to adjust the Department's established speed limit.

• If the city is not an incorporated city and/or the route is classified as an interstate or a controlled-access highway (Type IV or greater), the engineering and traffic investigation shall only review the appropriateness of the Department's established speed limit.

• If the city is an incorporated city and/or the route is not classified as an interstate or a controlled-access highway (Type IV or greater), the engineering and traffic investigation shall review all speed limit variables. The anticipated time frame to complete the investigation should be noted in the reply.

2) Complete the engineering and traffic investigation to determine the appropriate speed limit in accordance with Section 103 of the Traffic Manual. The Highway Operations and Safety Engineer must approve the engineering and traffic investigation report, and any changes in the Department's established speed limit, before the report is released to the requesting city.

3) Send a letter (signed by the District Engineer) to the city authorities documenting the city's request for speed limit adjustment, the Department's findings based on the engineering and traffic investigation, and a copy of the investigation report. Suggested letters for speed limit adjustment requests are included in this policy. Exhibit A should be used when the Department recommends retaining the established speed limit. Exhibit B should be used when the Department finds the appropriate speed limit is different from the established speed limit.

The incorporated city shall notify the District of any proposed speed limit adjustment. Notification shall be in the form of a minute entry, resolution, ordinance, or other method established by the city to document official actions.
If a change in the established speed limit is required, the District shall post the new speed limit within thirty (30) days of either, adopting a new established speed limit, or of receiving written notification of the City's official action for speed limit adjustment.

In areas where the speed limit is established by City action and varies from the Department's recommendation, the District shall perform annual follow-up engineering and traffic investigations to monitor the effect of the change in speed limit. These investigations shall be compiled and held by the Division of Highways and reported upon the Board's request.

Signed

Brian W. Ness, P.E.
Director

This policy is based on:
- Sections 49-201, 49-202, 49-207, 49-208 and 49-654, Idaho Code
- Board policy, B-12-07, STATE HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS WITHIN CITY JURISDICTIONS
- Highway Safety and Operations Engineer
- Traffic Manual, Section 103
- District Engineers, District Traffic Engineers, and Traffic Engineer
- Department procedures contained in:
- Traffic Manual, Section 103
- Former dates of A-12-07: 6/16/97, 9/27/00, and 11/20/01

Cross reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-12-01, STATE HIGHWAY ACCESS CONTROL
- A-12-03, TRAFFIC MINUTE ENTRIES
- A-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
The Honorable Mayor Allan Muller  
City of McCall  
216 E Park Street  
McCall, ID 83763

RE: Speed Limit on State Highway 55 within McCall City Limits

Dear Mayor Muller:

As you requested, the Idaho Transportation Department has completed an engineering and traffic investigation on State Highway 55 (McCall), milepost 142.536, from the South city limits to milepost 143.031, intersection of 3rd St. and Deinhard Lane, to determine the appropriate speed limit for this section of state highway. A copy of the investigation report is enclosed for your reference. Based on our consideration of the 85th percentile speed, accident records, roadside development and other factors noted in the report, the Idaho Transportation Department recommends that the speed limit be retained at the established limit of 35 mph. This speed limit is considered to be reasonable, convenient, safe, and will usually be voluntarily observed by most motorists.

If the city of McCall chooses to set the speed limit at a limit other than the department’s recommended speed limit and establishes by official action a lesser speed limit in accordance with Idaho Code sections 49-201, 49-202, 49-207, 49-208 and 49-654, the city must notify the department in writing of the city’s official minute entry, resolution, ordinance, or other method established by the city to document official actions.

The Idaho Transportation Department will post the new speed limit set by the city not later than thirty (30) days after receipt of your written notification.

Please note that a posted speed limit below the department’s established speed limit may require extra enforcement to obtain motorist compliance. The department will notify you if we receive significant public complaints regarding what may be perceived as a “speed trap” and may refer the complaints to the city for resolution if the complaints are numerous or require justification.

Sincerely,

<District Engineer’s name>  
District <number> Engineer  
Enclosure
EXHIBIT B: Speed Limit Adjustment  

The Honorable Mayor Allan Muller  
City of McCall  
216 E Park Street  
McCall, ID 83638  

RE: Speed Limit on State Highway 55 within McCall City Limits  

Dear Mayor Muller:  

As you requested, the Idaho Transportation Department has completed an engineering and traffic investigation on State Highway 55 (McCall), milepost 142.536, from the South city limits to milepost 143.031, intersection of 3rd St. and Deinhard Lane, to determine the appropriate speed limit for this section of state highway. A copy of the investigation report is enclosed for your reference. Based on our consideration of the 85th percentile speed, accident records, roadside development and other factors noted in the report, the Idaho Transportation Department recommends that the speed limit be changed from the current limit of 35 mph to 25 mph. This speed limit is considered to be reasonable, convenient, safe, and will usually be voluntarily observed by most motorists.  

If the city of McCall agrees with the new speed limit of 25 mph, the department will post the new speed limit not more than thirty (30) days after official approval.  

If the city of McCall chooses to set the speed limit at a limit other than the department's recommended speed limit and establishes by official action a lesser speed limit in accordance with Idaho Code sections 49-201, 49-202, 49-207, 49-208 and 49-654, the city must notify the department in writing of the city's official minute entry, resolution, ordinance, or other method established by the city to document official actions.  

The Idaho Transportation Department will post the new speed limit set by the city not later than thirty (30) days after receipt of your official written notification.  

Please note that a posted speed limit below the department's established speed limit may require extra enforcement to obtain motorist compliance. The department will notify you if we receive significant public complaints regarding what may be perceived as a "speed trap," and may refer the complaints to the city for resolution if the complaints are numerous or require justification.  

Sincerely,  

<District Engineer's name>  
District <number>-Engineer  
Enclosure  

EXAMPLE ONLY
TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

The installation, operation and maintenance of traffic control devices shall conform to the standards established in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as adopted by the State. Traffic control devices on the State Highway System are approved at the discretion of the Department.

Installation, operation and maintenance costs of traffic control devices and lighting on the State Highway System shall be distributed among local jurisdictions, developers, and the Department as appropriate. When costs are shared, participants shall execute cooperative project agreements specifying each participant’s share of the costs, requirements and responsibilities. Additional installation costs for variances from standard traffic control devices and lighting designs must be paid by the entity requesting the variance. The following criteria shall be used as a guide in assigning costs of control devices and illumination fixtures.

Traffic-Control Devices

- The Department pays all costs of traffic control devices on the State Highway System that are not specifically covered by cooperative project agreements, installation agreements, and/or cooperative maintenance agreements between the Department and the local jurisdiction or other entity.

- If signalization is required at a public road approach that is not a state highway, the installation, operation and maintenance costs are paid by the Department and the local jurisdiction in proportion to the number of approach lanes under the jurisdiction of each entity. Approach lanes are defined as through lanes, exclusive of turn lanes.

- When signalization at an existing public road approach is necessitated by new development, the developer or special-use groups must submit an impact study. If the development will be a significant traffic generator, developers or special-use groups shall pay fifty percent (50%) of the installation costs, unless otherwise agreed upon. The Department's participation for installation costs is limited to the Department's proportional share of the remaining fifty percent (50%). The Department and the local jurisdiction shall pay operation and maintenance costs in proportion to the number of approach lanes in their jurisdiction. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval. Disapprovals may be appealed to higher management levels.

- If new development necessitates installation of additional traffic control devices at private driveways or future public road approaches, the developers or special-use groups (industry, factory, warehouse, shopping center, etc.) shall pay all design and installation costs, including construction inspection of the signal installation. The signal design shall be reviewed by the Traffic Engineer to ensure it conforms to the Department’s standards. Signal installation shall not commence until approved by the Department.
Operation and maintenance costs are shared by the local jurisdiction and the Department. The cooperative project agreement must include a requirement that the developer dedicate to the local jurisdiction a minimum of 15 meters (50 feet) of right-of-way beyond the state right-of-way, within the driveway or the future public road approach. The Department shall negotiate with the local entity for future revisions or replacements of signal equipment. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval.

School crossing signals may be installed and maintained by local jurisdictions at their expense, provided the signals meet signal warrants. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval. Disapprovals may be appealed to higher management levels.

Intersection control beacons (flashing beacons) may be installed and maintained at public road approaches and major private approaches when justified by an engineering study. Costs are apportioned among the participants on the same basis as traffic signal costs. Proposed installations require the District Engineer's approval, regardless of the study results.

Lighting

The AASHTO publication, "An Informational Guide for Roadway Lighting" shall be used to determine where and when lighting devices are located. Proposed lighting installations require the District Engineer's approval.

Many rural interchanges with light traffic volumes are sufficiently delineated so as to not require roadway lighting at night. However, in some circumstances, partial interchange lighting or complete interchange lighting is the preferred treatment. All lighting costs at rural interchanges are paid by the Department.

On the State Highway System, except for rural interchanges, the design and installation costs are paid by the Department and the operation and maintenance costs are paid by the local jurisdiction as described in the construction/installation and maintenance agreement.

All costs for interstate highway lighting are paid by the Department.

If a local jurisdiction requests additional lighting, all associated costs are paid by the local jurisdiction.

If other governmental agencies or private entities request special signal and/or lighting devices, all arrangements for installation, operation and maintenance must be specified in the written agreement and the Right-of-Way Use Permit.

Appeals

Appeals regarding the decisions of the Department shall follow the process described in IDAPA 39.05.42-Section-003 Administrative Appeal.
JIMMY D. ROSS
Acting-Director

Date: 4/21/03

Traffic Control Devices:
- Sections 49-312.11 and 49-203, Idaho Code
- Board Policy A-12-16, TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Department-supervision and coordination assigned to:
- Traffic Engineer

Director for survey and studies delegated to:
- District Engineer

Department procedures contained in:
- Traffic Manual
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
- Vehicular Management Standards and Procedures for Highway Rights of Way Encroachments

Former Codes:
A-12-16:
10/23/78, 10/30/81, 11/12/88, and 11/83

Cross-references:
- Administrative Rules:
  - A-12-41, STATE HIGHWAY ACCESS encroachments
  - A-19-41, FINANCING CONSTRUCTION OF STATE HIGHWAYS REVERSIONS
Idaho Transportation Board

Subcommittee on Audits

Audit Committee Charter

Pursuant to the decision of the Idaho Transportation Board at its meeting of January 15, 2003, an Audit Committee, later known as an Audit Committee on Audits, was established and charged with interacting with internal and external auditors and performing specific financially related assignments as the Committee and Board deem appropriate, and with providing periodic reports to the Board.

Member John McCugh was appointed to the Subcommittee for a two-year term. In 2005, Member McCugh was re-appointed to the Subcommittee for a three-year term.

In 2012, Member Jim Kempton was appointed to the Subcommittee.

1. The Audit Committee, later the Subcommittee on Audits, is a standing committee composed of not less than one or two Board Members, serving at the pleasure of appointed by the Chairman of the FTD Board, to serve for such term as agreed to by the Chairman and the member(s) of the Audit Subcommittee.

2. The Audit Subcommittee on Audits shall be responsible in accomplishing for the following:

   a. External Legislative Audits: Draft Legislative Audit Reports will be reviewed with the ITD management in accordance with Administrative Procedure A-01-05 prior to presentation of preliminary draft responses to the Audit Committee Subcommittee on Audits. Final Preliminary drafts with management responses will be presented to the Audit Committee-Subcommittee by the Auditors Office of Internal Review with management (Director, AEA Chief Administrative Officer and Controller) with the Office of Internal Review Manager present. [Board Agenda, January 15, Page 110, FTD Board Audit Committee, Background Information.] 2) The Subcommittee on Audits will meet with the Legislative Auditor to review the results of the independent audit, including the auditor’s recommendations for improvements and management’s preliminary responses. Management should be included in these meetings if deemed appropriate. 3) Final draft Legislative Audit Reports responses will be presented to the full Board by the Audit Committee-Subcommittee for acceptance. [ibid]

   b. Internal and other External Reviews/Audits: Periodically meet with the ITD Office of Internal Review Manager to review the results of internal audits and other external reviews/audits performed by entities other than the Legislative Auditors,
including management’s responses. Management should be included in these meetings if deemed appropriate.

c. Meet at least annually, or more often as the SubcCommittee desires, with the Chief Administrative Officer and Controller for a briefing and analysis of the department’s financial statements, system of internal controls and briefing of financial policies and issues.

d. Report the results of Audit SubcCommittee on Audits’ meetings to the Board.

e. Review peer reviews reported on the Office of Internal Review.

f. Perform other duties as appropriate.
Idaho Transportation Board

Subcommittee on Audits

Charter

Pursuant to the decision of the Idaho Transportation Board at its meeting of January 15, 2003, an Audit Committee, later known as a Subcommittee on Audits, was established and charged with interacting with internal and external auditors and performing specific financially related assignments as the Committee and Board deem appropriate, and with providing periodic reports to the Board.

1. The Subcommittee on Audits is a standing committee composed of one or two Board Members, serving at the pleasure of the Chairman of the Board, to serve for such term as agreed to by the Chairman and the member(s) of the Subcommittee.

2. The Subcommittee on Audits shall be responsible in accomplishing the following:
   a. **External Legislative Audits:** 1) Legislative Audit Reports will be reviewed by ITD management in accordance with Administrative Policy A-01-05 prior to presentation of preliminary draft responses to the Subcommittee on Audits. Preliminary draft responses will be presented to the Subcommittee by management (Director, Chief Administrative Officer and Controller) with the Office of Internal Review Manager present. 2) The Subcommittee on Audits may meet with the Legislative Auditor to review the results of the independent audit, including the auditor’s recommendations for improvements and management’s preliminary responses. Management should be included in these meetings if deemed appropriate. 3) Final draft Legislative Audit Report responses will be presented to the full Board by the Subcommittee for acceptance. **Internal and other External Reviews/Audits:** Periodically meet with the ITD Office of Internal Review Manager to review the results of internal audits and other external reviews/audits performed by entities other than the Legislative Auditors, including management’s responses. Management should be included in these meetings if deemed appropriate.
   b. Meet at least annually, or more often as the Subcommittee desires, with the Chief Administrative Officer and Controller for a briefing and analysis of the department’s financial statements, system of internal controls and briefing of financial polices and issues.
   c. Report the results of Subcommittee on Audits’ meetings to the Board.
   d. Review peer reviews reported on the Office of Internal Review.
   e. Perform other duties as appropriate.
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVIEW

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to establish an Office of Internal Review.

Legal Authority
Idaho Code section 40-314 (1) - Powers and Duties of the Idaho Transportation Board to establish internal structures deemed necessary for the full and efficient administration.

The Director of the Idaho Transportation Department will establish an Office of Internal Review. This office will provide independent evaluations of Department operations, internal controls and financial management. The Manager of the Office of Internal Review will periodically meet with member(s) of the Idaho Transportation Board and will present an Annual Report on Audits to the full Board.

Approved by the Board on:

______________________________  __________________________
Jerry Whitehead                Date ________________
Board Chairman

Cross reference to Administrative Policies: A-01-05, Office of Internal Review
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVIEW

The Office of Internal Review shall assist Division Administrators, District Engineers, and Section Managers in the effective performance of their responsibilities by reviewing and furnishing objective analyses, appraisals, recommendations, and pertinent comments concerning Department activities. The standalone Office of Internal Review reports directly to the Director and maintains a strong working relationship with the Idaho Transportation Board.

Reviews and audits shall be performed in accordance with appropriate professional standards and shall determine and promote:

- The adequacy of accounting, financial, information technology, and operational controls.
- The fairness and reliability of financial recordings, applications, and presentations.
- The extent of compliance with established Department policies and State and Federal laws and regulations.
- The quality and efficiency of Department operations.
- The extent that Department assets are accounted for and safeguarded.
- The attainment of program results that is consistent with management goals and objectives.

Reviews and audits shall be scheduled and conducted in coordination with the personnel involved so that full access to all relevant records, properties, and personnel can be provided. Review emphasis is on assistance and prevention, with improvement and cost savings as objectives. An annual risk assessment for prioritization of audit segments shall be performed as part of the work plan. Certain internal audits may be considered for a 90-120 day follow-up by Internal Review.

The cost versus benefit of recommended changes shall be identified wherever feasible. Recommendations, as approved by the Director, shall be implemented within a reasonable time period. The involved Section Manager, District Engineer, or higher authority shall submit a written response specifying the action(s) to be taken on the reported recommendations. The Section Manager, District Engineer, or higher authority shall provide a quarterly update on the resolution to the Administrator, Division of Administration (ADA), with copies to the Deputy Director and the Internal Review Manager, until the recommendations are resolved. The respective Division Administrator is responsible for recommendation resolution.

The Office of Internal Review shall also coordinate, conduct, and/or review all external audits. The Internal Review Manager shall examine and analyze fiscal and other records maintained by those making claims or cost representations to the Department, depending on an assessment of the risk involved.

The Internal Review Manager shall present an annual report on audits to the Idaho Transportation Board.
This Policy is based on:
- Section 40-314, Idaho Code
- 23 CFR Part 172
- Office of Management and Budget Grants Management Circulars: 2 CFR Parts 220, 225 and 230; A-102 Common Rule, A-110; and A-133
- AASHTO Subcommitteee on Internal and External Audit publications

Department-wide supervision and coordination assigned to:
- Internal Review Manager

Direction for activity and results delegated to:
- Division Administrators, District Engineers, Section Managers, and Administrator, Division of Administration

Department procedures contained in:
- Internal Review Desk Manual
- Roadway Design Professional Service Agreement Procedures Manual

Former dates of A-01-05:
- 6/1/84, 4/7/86, 4/27/95, and 2/6/02

Cross-reference to related Administrative Policies:
- A-01-09, AUTHORITY TO SIGN CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, OR GRANTS AND THEIR REGISTRATION
- A-06-08, PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS
Cooperatively Developing a Transportation System for all of Kootenai County, Idaho

March 1, 2013

Mr. John Krause, Manager
Office of Transportation Investments
Idaho Transportation Department
Post Office Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707

Subject: LPA Funding Distribution Recommendation

Dear Mr. Krause,

In November, 2012 the Urban Balancing Committee was provided an opportunity by the Idaho Transportation Department to recommend amendments to the ITD Board’s B 1104 Policy based on the new apportionment language contained in the new Federal transportation bill referred to as MAP-21 that is related to the distribution of FHWA Surface Transportation Program (Funding). The Urban Balancing Committee, representing the six federally designated metropolitan areas and LHTAC, which represents towns with populations between 5,000 and 49,000 in the State of Idaho, appreciated the opportunity to collaboratively work with ITD in this effort.

ITD staff provided three preliminary options to consider, as well as encouraged us to consider other options that would be consistent with the provisions of MAP-21. Based on ITD’s request for a recommendation, a subcommittee comprised of a representative from LHTAC, COMPASS and KPMO held multiple meetings between November and February to look at various options, and their overall potential impact to local transportation investments throughout Idaho. The results from the subcommittee were presented to the Urban Balancing Committee on February 7, 2013.

After significant discussion among the Urban Balancing Committee members on the various alternatives, the committee voted 5-1 in support of following MAP-21 in the use of federal apportionments outlined in Statute; whereby,

1. 50% of the FHWA STP Funds are allocated for use anywhere in Idaho at the discretion of ITD
2. 50% of the FHWA STP Funds are allocated for use in designated area defined by Congress
   a. Transportation Management Areas (TMA’s) geographic areas over 200,000 people
   b. Geographic areas/jurisdictions with populations between 5,000 and 199,999 people
   c. Geographic areas under 5,000 people and rural areas

Since the item 2.a. is established by Congress in MAP-21 as a direct allocation to TMA’s with a designated annual apportionment, and items 2.b. and 2.c. are also geographic allocations based on population, ITD Board Policy B-1104 would be amended to be consistent with and conform to Federal statute.
Since the Urban Balancing Committee’s role is limited in scope to managing the use of Federal funds designated for geographic areas/jurisdictions with populations between 5,000 and 199,999 people, our recommendation would implement the Federal Statute and revised ITD Board Policy B-1104 by providing population based STP Funding allocations to the five (5) eligible Metropolitan areas and LHTAC to serve those communities and areas within their geographic area of responsibility. This approach would also be consistent with the current Highway Distribution Account under Idaho Code 40-709, where funds to cities are based on population.

There was also significant discussion during the committee meetings related to rural and unincorporated areas of the State, where there are a substantial number of rural road miles that highway districts and counties must operate and maintain as part of the State’s overall transportation system. These rural roads provide necessary and essential access to forestry, mining, agriculture, tourism, and outdoor recreational activities that support Idaho’s economy. While not within our area of scope or responsibility, the Urban Balancing Committee voted 6-0 to request the ITD Board’s consideration to supplement the FHWA STP allocation to rural communities and unincorporated areas under 5,000 people with funds from the FHWA STP 50% funding that can be used anywhere in Idaho under the discretion of the ITD Board. LHTAC would then incorporate any additional funding into their normal rural project selection and programming process.

Again, on behalf of the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s and LHTAC which make up the Urban Balancing Committee, we appreciate the close and collaborative working relationship we have with the Idaho Transportation Department and look forward to the ITD Board’s update to Board Policy B-1104

Sincerely,

Glenn F. Miles

Urban Balancing Committee Chair
Executive Director
Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
250 Northwest Blvd., Suite 209
Coeur d’ Alene, ID 83814
March 25, 2013

Jerry Whitehead, Chairman
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707-1129
Attn. Sue Higgins

RE: ITD Board Policy B-11-04

Chairman Whitehead;

The LHTAC Council reviewed Board Policy B-11-04 at their regularly scheduled meeting on March 15, 2013 and formally recommends that the Board retain the existing policy of splitting 12.6 percent of Federal STP funds on a 50/50 percent basis between the rural and urban areas.

The Council is concerned that rural local highway jurisdictions (LHJ's) are facing an array of revenue reductions including the loss of Craig-Wyden funds, personal property tax reductions, and a steady erosion of the funds in the state Highway Distribution Account.

In November, ITD decided to review Board Policy B-11-04 which establishes the distribution of Federal-aid Surface Transportation Program funds (STP) to LHJ's. ITD requested comment and specifically asked for consensus from an informal group called the Urban Committee which represents the 5 metropolitan planning organizations (MPO's). LHTAC participates on the Urban Committee representing 26 urban areas over 5,000 in population, but less than 50,000.

The MPO members of the Urban Committee recommended changes to B-11-04 in a letter to John Krause on March 1st that is based solely on population and have requested the entire population amount of the STP apportionment. LHTAC feels a vote from the Urban Committee does not represent the interests of the remaining 251 rural LHJ's nor take into account the substantial road miles they are required to maintain.

The Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) consists of 12 Council Members that represent Idaho Cities, Highway Districts and Counties of all sizes. Under Idaho Code 40-2403 (4) LHTAC is specifically authorized by the Legislature to make recommendations to the Idaho Transportation Board on distribution and prioritization of federal funds for local highway projects.

Sincerely,

Mayor Mac Pooler, Chairman
Background Information

The Forest Highways Program under SAFETEA-LU provided funding for planning, research, engineering, and construction activities for roads on the Forest Highway system. As you may recall, a report on Idaho’s participation in the Forest Highways Program is presented to you each year at this time.

In Idaho, there are approximately 63 designated Forest Highways totaling 1,716 miles. This program was primarily managed through a Tri-Agency Group consisting of representatives from the Idaho Transportation Department, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Western Federal Lands Highways Division (WFLHD) of FHWA.

In MAP-21, the Forest Highways program was deactivated and replaced with a new program: the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP). This program is very similar to the Forest Highways Program in scope and purpose, but with some significant differences.

ITD remains active in the management of the new FLAP program through participation in a Programming Decisions Committee (PDC) which includes representatives from ITD, Western Federal Lands Highways Division (WFLHD), and LHTAC.

This item will 1) provide a short overview of the Federal Lands Access Program with a comparison to the Forest Highways Program; and 2) introduce a list of proposed changes to the Approved FY2013-FY2017 ITIP to adjust the program to reflect the shift in the underlying programs.

Adjustments to the Approved FY2013 – FY2014 ITIP

Pre-MAP-21 projects Forest Highway projects are included in the FY2013 – FY2017 Idaho Transportation Investment Program which you approved last September. Because of new funding requirements under the MAP-21 Federal Lands Access Program – specifically a local match requirement – a decision was made at a September 26, 2012 meeting of the Tri-Agency Group and interested parties to make determinations of which projects could be carried forward under the new program and which would need to reapply and re-compete for funding. Minutes from this meeting are attached.

Recommendations

Approve attached resolution, page 111.

Board Action

☐ Approved   ☐ Deferred

☐ Other
## CURRENT ITIP CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key No</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost $000</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change of Fund Source Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>US Forest Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06656</td>
<td>ID PFH 26-1(1)</td>
<td>Ketchum-Challis Highway - Warm Spring Section – SH75</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>FLAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13547</td>
<td>ID PFH 26(3)</td>
<td>Ketchum-Challis Highway - Pebble Beach Segment – SH75</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>FLAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clearwater County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12944</td>
<td>ID PFH CDP 67(3)</td>
<td>Grangemont Road (Sponsor Clearwater County)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>PLHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Add to Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Idaho County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09806</td>
<td>ID PFH 60(2)</td>
<td>Manning Crevice Bridge</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>FLAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove – Project Sponsors will Reapply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>US Forest Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09993</td>
<td>ID PFH 24(14)</td>
<td>Banks Lowman Rockfall Mitigation, Phases 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13505</td>
<td>ID PFH 22(12)</td>
<td>Cascade-Warm Lake Chip Seal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13508</td>
<td>ID PFH 79(2)</td>
<td>Bogus Basin Chip Seal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13591</td>
<td>ID PFH 91(1)</td>
<td>Williams Creek Shoup Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13503</td>
<td>ID PFH 24(160)</td>
<td>Banks-Lowman Highway Chip Seal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13426</td>
<td>ID PFH 50(10)</td>
<td>St. Joe River Road Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13427</td>
<td>ID PFH 73(1)</td>
<td>Westside Road - Myrtle Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13504</td>
<td>ID PFH 98(1)</td>
<td>Goose Lake Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13506</td>
<td>ID PFH 48(1)</td>
<td>Lick Creek Road Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13592</td>
<td>ID PFH 99(1)</td>
<td>Redfish Lake Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13428</td>
<td>ID PFH 9(6)</td>
<td>Enaville-Thompson Pass Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13507</td>
<td>ID PFH 21(7)</td>
<td>Warren Wagon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,703</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13593</td>
<td>ID PFH 66(1)</td>
<td>Trail Creek Road Surface Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>PREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Highways Program</td>
<td>Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Goal</strong></td>
<td>Safety, Mobility, Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Safety, Mobility, Economic Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td>Forest Highway apportionments</td>
<td>FLAP apportionments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Participation</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Local Entity per ITD-2435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Allocation</strong></td>
<td>~$12 million</td>
<td>~$18.1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Management</strong></td>
<td>Tri-Agency i.e. ITD, Forest Service, Western Federal Lands Highways Division (WFLHD)</td>
<td>Programming Decisions Committee (PDC) i.e. ITD, Western Federal Lands Highways Division (WFLHD), and LHTAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Administration</strong></td>
<td>Tri-Agency: project applications are requested periodically from applicable federal agencies and Idaho counties, cities, and reservations by the Tri-Agency. Projects are prioritized, selected, costed, and scheduled by the Tri-Agency. Projects are managed by either an ITD District or the WFLHD as determined at project inception.</td>
<td>Programming Decisions Committee (PDC) - project applications have been solicited for construction FY2014 through FY2018. Review, selection, prioritization and scheduling of projects will be completed by the Project Selection Team with representation from WFL, ITD, LHTAC, National Park Service, and US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Army Corp of Engineers. Recommendations are expected by 9/2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Distribution</strong></td>
<td>Per project prioritization by the Tri-Agency</td>
<td>Per project prioritization by the PDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Eligibility**          | Eligible activities include planning (including tourism and recreational development), research, engineering, highway construction, highway reconstruction, adjacent parking areas, interpretive signs, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, roadside rest areas, and visitor centers per 23 USC 101 on designated forest highways, public lands highways, park roads, and reservation roads. | The focus of the program is to deliver projects that access National Parks, National Forests System lands, National Wildlife Refuges, BLM lands, US Corp of Engineers lands, and Tribal lands. Projects must be:  
  - Located on a public highway, road, bridge, trail or transit system;  
  - Located on, is adjacent to, or provides access to Federal Lands; and  
  - Title or maintenance responsibility is vested with the State, County, Local Government, or Tribe.  
Eligible activities include:  
  - Transportation planning, research, engineering, construction, preventive maintenance, & rehabilitation/restoration;  
  - Acquisition of necessary scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;  
  - Provisions for pedestrians and bicycles;  
  - Environmental mitigation in or adjacent to Federal Land to improve public safety and reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity;  
  - Roadside rest areas; and  
  - Transit facilities. |
IDAHO FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM MEETING
September 26, 2012
Idaho Department of Transportation
Division of Aeronautics
3483 Rickenbacker Street
(next to the Boise Airport)
Boise, ID 83705
Conference Room
1:00 – 4:00

Agenda

Telephone Conference Number: 1-866-859-0785
Passcode: 9115754

Objectives:

• Common understanding of the Access Program
• Understanding of roles and responsibilities
• Short and long term strategies for moving forward

1. Introductions

2. Review and adjust agenda

3. Overview of MAP-21 and Federal Lands Access Program

4. Roles and Responsibilities
   a. Role of Programming Decisions Committee
   b. Role of Federal Land Management Agencies
   c. Role of Western Federal Lands

5. Short Term Strategy for Moving Forward
   a. FY13 Program – decision needed
      i. Projects to fund
         1. Construction for FY 13 Programmed Projects
         2. Project Development for FY13 Programmed Projects

6. Long Term Strategy
   a. Call for projects – decision needed
      i. Which projects re-compete
      ii. Timing
      iii. Goal areas

7. Next Steps

8. Schedule next meeting
1) Introductions

Welcome to the first Idaho Programming Decisions Committee meeting for the new Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) that was established from the Transportation Bill Reauthorization (MAP-21). The objective of this program is to improve access to federal lands on Public Roads, Highways, Trails, and Transit systems on transportation facilities that are under non-federal jurisdiction or maintenance.

Objectives of the meeting:

- Develop a common understanding of the Access Program
- Understand roles and responsibilities of the parties involved
- Discuss short and long term strategies for moving forward

The meeting was attended by the PDC and representatives of the NPS, US Forest Service, US Army Corps of Engineers, and BLM. The Fish and Wild Service was contacted but could not attend. An Attendee List is attached.

On the Phone:

- Gary Hunter (BLM)
- Diane Croal (NPS)
- Heather Burke (USACE)

2) Review and Adjust Agenda

- Agenda was adopted as presented

3) Overview of MAP-21 and Federal Lands Access Program

Western Federal Lands (WFLHD) gave an overview presentation on the portions of MAP-21 that apply to the FLTP and FLAP programs.

Discussion:

- TRIP program (Paul Sarbanes) has not been reauthorized. Alternative Transportation projects are now eligible under the Access program.
4) Roles and Responsibilities

a) Programming Decisions Committee (PDC)
   • The PDC by statute is composed of representatives from the State DOT, FHWA and an appropriate local political subdivision of the state.
   • The PDC will be composed of the following representatives:
     o Tom Cole, Idaho Transportation Department (ITD)
     o Jerry Flatz, Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC)
     o Phyllis Chun, Western Federal Lands Highway Division, FHWA (WFLHD)
   • The PDC is responsible for decisions related to the programming of projects for the FLAP.

b) Federal Land Management Agencies
   • Purpose is to provide access to federal lands and thus the FLMAs need to be consulted. The PDC is required to consult with all appropriate Federal Land Management Agencies before programming decisions are made.
   • MAP-21 specifies that preference be given to High Use Recreation Sites and Federal Economic Generators. Each FLMA will need to define these terms as to how it applies to their agency. Most of the FLMAs are working on those definitions at a national level.
   • Work with the appropriate public road agencies for project application and development.

c) Western Federal Lands
   • Represent interests of all FLMAs
   • Lead the PDC, coordinate the meetings, and lead development of program of projects.
   • WFLHD has a full complement of expertise to deliver projects including planning, environmental, design and construction. WLFHD hopes to deliver much of the program.
   • Receives the funding allocation from the Federal Lands national office and provides stewardship and oversight of the funds.

d) Counties and DOT
   • You own and operate the routes that are eligible
   • Work with the FLMAs directly on project submittals and provide information needed for the call.

5) Short Term Strategy for Moving Forward FY 2013 Program
The group discussed that we need to keep the delivery of projects going through the transition to the full program.

Discussion:

   • Even though MAP-21 is only a two year bill for 2013 -2014, we expect it to continue. We need to plan for both the short term (2 years) and long term (4-5 years)
   • All funds after 10/1/2012 will need to be approved by the PDC
• It appears that Idaho will receive a small amount of additional funding compared to the Forest Highway allocation.
• There was an approved program of projects in the Forest Highway program. We want to be able to have the new players participate but it takes time to develop projects.
• We want to be able to include needs expressed by the new FLMAs (NPS, FWS, BLM, USACE).
• Need to deliver projects in 2013

What do we want to do in 2013 to allow the new FLMAs to participate?

• We should keep projects moving if there has been a significant investment in them already
• If a new call for projects is done this winter, additional projects could be considered both in the short and long term.
• We would like to continue the 2013 program which is focused on Ketchum/Challis Warm Springs section and Manning Crevice Bridge.
• Phyllis explained the existing Forest Highway program sheet as a possible place to start and went over what was on the program for delivery in 2013. Additional things to consider:
  o There will be some additional funds based on non-federal match (7.34%) which will free up some funds available for new projects
• County Match Ability
  o Boise County has no funding available for match. It will be very difficult to find funding in this county.

Projects Programmed:

The following projects were discussed with decisions as noted:

• FY 2013
  o Ketchum Challis Highway – Warm Spring Section (ID PFH 26-1(1))
    • Project was programmed for $16M CN ($8.67M of FH and $4.33M State funds in 2013 and $3.0M of FH funds in 2014). Match is provided through $4.33 M from ITD. ITD will need to ensure that their funds are non Title 23/49 funds. FH program has already spent $3.8M of PE on this project.
    • Can we combine all the pieces together for this road (Pebble beach and the ID PFH 26-1(1))?  
      • It’s possible from an environmental perspective as the entire route has been addressed under one NEPA doc.
      • Project was chunked up due to funding. We could reduce cost if we could combine all the projects together. Another alternative is to use options in the bid package.
    • We should consider the match from ITD as the match for all the projects (ID PFH 26-1(1), ID PFH 26(3) and CE for ID PFH 26(2)).
**Decisions:**

- Fund remaining PE and CN/CE/CMs from Access funds
- Consider all three projects discussed above as one project for the non-federal match. The $4.33M provided by the State will cover all necessary non-federal match.
- State funds will need to be non Title 23/49 funds.

- **Ketchum-Challis Rock Scaling (ID PFH 26(2))**
  
  **Discussion:**
  
  - Funds for CN have been obligated from Forest Highway funds in 2012
  - Need $133K for CE in 2013

- **Manning Crevice Bridge (ID PFH 60(2))**

  - **Background** – Very old bridge that is structurally deficient
  - Is a CMGC project
  - Approximately $5.9M of Forest Highway carry over funds are available to contribute to the project.
  - Remaining funding needed to cover PE, CN, CE, and contingency is approximately $3.2 M which will need to be funded from Access funds. The non-federal match required is approximately $236,000 as shown below:

    | Estimated CN       | $7,000,000 |
    |-------------------|------------|
    | Best Estimate Remaining PE and CE | $1,445,000 |
    | Construction Contingency (10%)   | $700,000   |
    | **Total Funds Needed:**           | **$9,145,000** |
    | Less FH Carryover Funds           | **$5,925,000** |
    | Balance subject to Match          | $3,220,000 |
    | Non-Federal Match Rate:           | 7.34%      |
    | **Estimated Non-Federal Match:**  | **$236,348** |
Decisions:

- Program Access funds to cover remaining PE/CN/CE needed after Forest Highway carry over funds are expended.
- Revise project agreement to cover non-federal match
- Discuss non-federal match with Idaho County (LHTAC) and USFS. USFS may be able to assist with meeting the match.

- Grangemont Road Earmark (ID PFH CDP 67(3))
  - Use Earmark funds for remaining work

- FY 2014
  - Ketchum Challis Rock Fall Mitigation, remaining funds (ID PFH 26-1(1))

Decision:

- Combine with the base portion of the project if funding is available.

- Banks Lowman Phase 2 (ID PFH 24(14))

Discussion:

- Can WFLHD get NEPA ready for a 2014 obligation?
  - Yes
- Should we continue to develop this project if the county can’t come up with match?
- Would IDT be willing to provide match?
  - No – route is not on the state system and thus the state can’t spend funds on it because of State Statute
- ITD intends to assume jurisdiction and maintenance ONLY after all the projects are completed on the route.
- Any interest in pursuing just the design?
  - Project is complex, estimate at 15% PE
- Need to get the county into the conversation. We could put project on hold and then have the county resubmit in the new call for projects. This would confirm if the County can find the match and if they want to continue to pursue the project.
Update since the Meeting – The USFS (R4) has notified WFLHD that they intend to provide the non-federal match for PE in 2013 from Federal Lands Transportation Program funds they expect to receive this spring. The purpose is so that design can continue.

Decisions:

- USFS/LHTAC will talk to Boise County about the needed match for the project.
- PDC agrees to fund the design with Access funds as there is a match secured for PE in 2013.
- Tentatively program in 2014 for CN but require the County resubmit the project in the new call for projects.
- ITD/LHTAC will investigate how the match will be met

- FY 2015+
  - All projects in 2015 and beyond on the old Forest Highway program need to re-compete in a new call for projects.

6) Long Term Strategy

a) Call for Projects

- George presented DRAFT timeline, criteria, call letter, and proposal and explained the contents. Very draft and needs work.
- Call will go out though ITD, LHTAC, FLMAs
- Proposals will be submitted and then project selection team will evaluate and develop recommendations for the PDC.
- Project selection team will look at some of the projects on the ground.
- After field review, may develop a Project Identification Report (PIR) to review scope and budget and schedule. Typically a PIR took about 3-4 months and $30K each to compete. WLFHD is investigating a shorter less intensive process for the PIR.
- Request some guidance on how In-Kind matches will work in the packet for the call for projects.
- Need to add verbiage for quick delivery in 2013 and 2014 in addition to the long term
- WFLHD staff is willing to talk to your staff about the program and the call for projects details. Contact George Fekaris at WFLHD. Consider holding webinars to get the word out.
- PDC can choose to focus on specific types of projects or leave it wide open for all eligible work.
- Staff Members for the Project Selection Team are:
  - George Fekaris (WFLHD)
  - Fred Bower/Kay Shurtz (USFS)
• Justin De Santis (NPS)
• Cynthia Kowalczyk or Other (BLM)
• Jeff Holm (FWS)
• Joyce Dunning or other (USACE)
• Loren Thomas (ITD)
• Jerry Flatz (LHTAC)
• ?,BOR

• Much more discussion needs to occur on the documents, handouts today are rough drafts
• The staff will use a VTC or conf call to work on revising the draft documents for the call. Probably will still meet in Boise and then bring others in.

Decision:
• A new call for projects is needed to fill out the 2014 and beyond program.

7) Next Steps
• Official program guidance from FHWA HQ in the next few weeks
• WFLHD will start working on projects for 2013/2014 that were approved today
• WFLHD will working on revising project agreements
• WFLHD will start working on a new PDC Charter and get out for review.
• WFLHD will notify parities that had projects selected in 2015 and beyond on status of their projects
• Need to figure out how to do Government to Government consultation with the Tribes. FLMAs have a list of tribes in each state. BIA may be able to provide advice on reaching out to the tribes.

8) Schedule Next Meeting
• Objective of the next meeting will be to discuss the call for projects documents and how the call will work. PDC will need to frame the objectives of the call and if there are certain types of projects that they want to emphasize. (i.e. size, type, scale, etc)
• Early November is the target time frame for the next meeting
WHEREAS, it is in the public's interest for the Department to publish and accomplish a current, realistic, and fiscally constrained five year Transportation Investment Program; and

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) requires that a priority list of projects covering a minimum four year period be provided in a federally approved statewide transportation improvement program; and

WHEREAS, MAP-21 provided for the replacement of the Forest Highways Program under the Safe, Accountable, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEALU) with a new program to be known as the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP);

WHEREAS, the Tri-Agency Group managing the Forest Highways Program under SAFETEALU met on September 26, 2012 to develop a plan for transitioning from Forest Highways Program to FLAP;

WHEREAS, the Programming Decisions Committee (PDC) on which ITD has representation will be actively involved in the process to solicit, review, prioritize, and recommend projects for award of FLAP funding;

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 attached minutes of the September 26, 2012 meeting reflects the program changes previously specified;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Idaho Transportation Board authorizes staff to add, change and remove projects from the lists entitled “Current ITIP Changes” to the current FY2013-2017 ITIP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that staff is authorized to make the appropriate changes to the federally approved FY 2013-2017 Idaho Transportation Improvement Program in accordance with the provisions of MAP-21.
The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) was initially created in 2006, and is a data-driven, comprehensive plan that includes a goal, emphasis areas, and strategies to reduce traffic deaths and serious injuries. It focuses resources on education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency response. It is being updated to revise emphasis areas, incorporate new goals, include emphasis area teams to work on the specific contributors to traffic deaths and serious injuries, develop actions and track work done, build and empower partnerships, and require evaluations.

On November 29, 2012 more than 100 highway safety partners were brought together in a facilitated workshop to develop goals and strategies for the eleven data-driven focus areas of highway safety. The outcome of this day-long event was generation of the updated SHSP for 2013.

The draft SHSP is attached for final Board acceptance.

Recommendations
Final acceptance by the ITD Board per the resolution on page 95

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
RES. NO. ITB- WHEREAS, Idaho experienced 117,834 traffic crashes that resulted in 1,086 traffic deaths and 59,573 injuries on Idaho’s roads from 2007 to 2011; and

WHEREAS, the economic cost of traffic crashes in Idaho for 2007 through 2011 was $12.6 billion; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Department’s goal is to eventually have zero traffic deaths on all roadways in Idaho; and

WHEREAS, the Department has selected performance measures and goals to reduce the five-year fatality rate to no more than 1.25 in 2015, to reduce the five-year average number of fatalities to less than 200 in 2015, and to reduce the five-year serious injury average to no more than 1,356 by 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Department has developed the Strategic Highway Safety Plan following an extensive process including involvement of over 100 highway safety partners from the engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services communities; and

WHEREAS, the highway safety partners met and conducted a Strategic Highway Safety Plan Workshop in November 2012, which utilized highway safety emphasis area teams and an executive oversight team; and

WHEREAS, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan was drafted as a result of the November 2012 workshop.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board adopts the Strategic Highway Safety Plan revision dated April, 2013.
Meeting Date  April 10, 2013  Amount of Time Needed for Presentation  10 minutes

Subject
Freight Advisory Committee Nominations

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

Background Information
Maureen Gresham will present nominations for the first Freight Advisory Committee for the board's approval.

Recommendations
Approve resolution, page 88.

Board Action
☐ Approved  ☐ Deferred
☐ Other
WHEREAS, it is in the public’s interest for the Transportation Department to facilitate the efficient and effective movement of freight; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Transportation Board to encourage partnerships between various transportation stakeholders that further safety, mobility and economic opportunity; and

WHEREAS, the Idaho Transportation Board has authority to establish internal structures deemed necessary for its duties; and

WHEREAS, the Freight Advisory Committee charter recognizes that key stakeholder interests will be represented on the committee; and

WHEREAS, the Freight Coordinator, in consultation with the freight industry, members of the Freight Study Steering Committee, the Idaho Trucking Advisory Committee, and the Idaho Aeronautics Board recommends the following persons as representatives of their respective industry to terms as members of the Freight Advisory Committee as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Doeringsfeld</td>
<td>Port/Barge Industry</td>
<td>March 2013 – December 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Air Freight Industry</td>
<td>March 2013 – December 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Manufacturing/Retail Industry</td>
<td>March 2013 – December 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Carrier Shipping Industry</td>
<td>March 2013 – December 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Whipple</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>March 2013 – December 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Board accepts the recommendations of the Freight Coordinator Administrator and appoints the recommended persons to positions and terms of service on the Freight Advisory Committee.