



City of Coeur d' Alene
City of Post Falls
City of Hayden
City of Rathdrum
Coeur d' Alene Tribe
East Side Highway District
Idaho Transportation Department
Kootenai County, Idaho
Lakes Highway District
Post Falls Highway District
Worley Highway District

Cooperatively Developing a Transportation System for all of Kootenai County, Idaho

**KMPO Board Meeting
October 9, 2014 1:30 pm**

Post Falls City Council Chambers, Post Falls City Hall, 1st Floor
408 N. Spokane Street, Post Falls, Idaho

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order – Mayor Vic Holmes, Chair**
- 2. Changes to the Agenda and Declarations of Conflicts of Interest**
- 3. Approval of September 11, 2014 KMPO Board Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Public Comments** (limited to non-agenda items 3 minutes).
- 5. KCATT Recap & Recommendations – No Recommendations this Month**
- 6. Administrative Matters**
 - a. September 2014 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report
- 7. Public Transportation (Informational Items Provided to KMPO)**

KMPO is not the Designated Recipient of FTA Funding for the provision of transit Service in Kootenai County. These informational items are provided as a service to the public and to local jurisdictions. Questions related to service, schedules, or concerns should be directed to Kootenai County.

 - a. Citylink Status Report – Alan Eirls
 - b. KMC Status Report – Toby Ruhs
 - c. Kootenai County Report – Jody Bieze
 - d. Rural Mobility Manager's Report – Susan Kiebert
- 8. Other Business**
 - a. 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #1
 - i. ITD US-95 Worley North Stage 2 TIGER Grant Award.
 - b. Transportation Facilitation Process Options for Consideration
 - c. Upcoming LHRIP and STP Urban/Rural/Bridge – LHTAC Applications Deadlines
- 9. Director's Report** (written report included in Board packet)
- 10. Board Member Comments**
- 11. Next Meeting – November 13, 2014**
- 12. Adjournment**

For special accommodation/translation services, call 1.208-930-4164, 48 hours in advance. KMPO assures nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.O. 100.259) and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

KOOTENAI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
250 Northwest Blvd, Suite 209 Coeur d' Alene, ID 83814
1-208-930-4164 website: www.kmpo.net

MEETING MINUTES

Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
Regular Board Meeting
October 9, 2014
Post Falls City Council Chambers, City Hall, First Floor
Post Falls, Idaho

Board Members in Attendance:

Vic Holmes, Chair	City of Rathdrum
James Mangan, Vice Chair	Worley Highway District
Terry Sverdsten	East Side Highway District
Todd Tondee	Kootenai County
Linda Wilhelm	City of Post Falls
Richard Panabaker	City of Hayden
Jim Kackman	Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Lynn Humphreys	Post Falls Highway District
Rod Twete	Lakes Highway District
Marvin Fenn, Alternate	Idaho Transportation Department, Dist. 1
Dan Gookin	City of Coeur d'Alene

Board Members Absent:

Damon Allen	Idaho Transportation Department Dist. 1
-------------	---

Staff Present:

Glenn Miles	Executive Director
Bonnie Gow	Senior Transportation Planner
Kelly Lund	Administrative Secretary

Attendees:

Donna Montgomery	Citizen, KMPO Public Trans Roundtable
Monty Montgomery	Lakes Highway District
John Pankratz	East Side Highway District
Rod Mitchell	Citylink
Sean Hoisington	City of Hayden
Christopher DeLorto	HDR
Connie Krueger	City of Hayden
Toby Ruhs	Kootenai Health
Jody Bieze	Kootenai County

1. Call to Order – Vic Holmes, Chair

The regular meeting of the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board was called to order by Chairman Vic Holmes at 1:30 p.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda and Declarations of Conflicts of Interest

Chair Holmes noted there were no changes to the Agenda or Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.

3. Approval of September 11, 2014 KMPO Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Lynn Humphreys made a motion to approve the September 11, 2014 KMPO Board meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Wilhelm seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments (limited to non-agenda items 3 minutes)

There were no public comments.

5. KCATT Recap & Recommendations – No Recommendations this Month

Chair Holmes noted KCATT had no recommendations this month.

6. Administrative Matters

a. September 2014 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report

Mr. Miles stated most of the expenses were routine; a video projector had been acquired for use in public presentations. He noted the payment to Bracke & Associates was for the facilitation effort on September 3 and said the ICRMP insurance did not increase as much as expected.

Mr. Mangan moved to approve payment of the expenses for September 2014. Mr. Twete seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

7. Public Transportation (Informational Items Provided to KMPO)

KMPO is not the Designated Recipient of FTA Funding for the provision of transit Service in Kootenai County. These informational items are provided as a service to the public and to local jurisdictions. Questions related to service, schedules, or concerns should be directed to Kootenai County.

a. Citylink Status Report – Alan Eirls

In Mr. Eirls absence, Mr. Rod Mitchell reported September as a routine month noting the B and C routes were quiet.

b. KMC Status Report – Toby Ruhs

Mr. Ruhs provided his report and noted it was a quiet month. He has hired a new driver; they will be fully staffed by the end of the month. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Kackman, Mr. Ruhs stated the RouteMatch software worked well and noted they were running on an older software system.

c. Kootenai County Report – Jody Bieze

Ms. Bieze was not present. Mr. Tondee reported they were still answering some of the Triennial Review issues. Ms. Bieze is also on the RouteMatch software; however, she is looking into getting the software the State uses to incorporate all transportation and will be bringing it to the other entities for discussion; Mr. Kackman noted a meeting was held today. The County is working on putting the Paratransit service out to bid; an RFP should be coming out in the next month. Mr. Tondee stated he believed ridership had remained consistent.

d. Rural Mobility Manager's Report – Susan Kiebert

Ms. Kiebert was not present. Mr. Miles stated the Public Transportation Advisory Committee which is advisory to the Idaho Transportation Department will be meeting next Wednesday, October 15, 2014 in Boise; there is a full agenda. Mr. Miles noted the budget over the next couple of years had a significant revenue deficit which the rural areas would have to deal with. There will be ongoing discussions about mobility management and how it takes place in Idaho. During their October 15th meeting, they will receive recommendations from the consultant firm that conducted a process review of mobility management in Idaho. In an effort to implement the recommendations, a mobility management task force is expected to be created. Mr. Miles noted the advisory committee did not currently have a representative from the Lewiston/Moscow

area; discussions on how to fill these seats when more than one qualified person has applied are expected.

8. Other Business

a. 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #1

i. ITD US-95 Worley North Sate 2 TIGER Grant Award

Mr. Miles noted the recommendation to approve the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement (TIP) Amendment #1. The project has been in the TIP repeatedly; the scope and price of the project have not changed. As the project has received national recognition, Federal Highways has asked that the KMPO Board approve it during their regularly scheduled Board meeting. Mr. Miles noted this was a \$7.4M project through Worley.

Mr. Kackman moved to approve Amendment #1 to the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Wilhelm seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. Transportation Facilitation Process Options for Consideration

Mr. Miles noted the Board had asked him to put together a background and options for consideration in moving forward with the facilitation process. He drew from discussions, views, and responses from various stakeholders who had attended the facilitation meetings. In order for him to move forward with the request from the County Commissioners, the Board will need to discuss what they would like in their response. Mr. Miles reviewed the options and concerns he outlined for the Board and provided a copy of a letter he received after the Board packet had gone out. Kootenai County is proceeding with a land acquisition process of approximately 160 acres on the southwest end of the main runway. Mr. Miles noted that the land acquisition had a material effect on the Huetter Corridor's future. The letter included an exhibit which was a map of the area. Mr. Miles noted the map did not depict any future airport expansion plans, the Huetter Corridor, or the bowing of the Huetter Road as shown in the Airport Layout Plan which would have an adverse effect on the Corridor and would require a public taking of private property where houses are located. Option 3 would state that the Board was interested in making a comment as part of the NEPA process to identify those issues. Mr. Miles said in order for the stakeholders to fully understand the impacts to them and make a representation that is equal in nature to the expertise the County has through engineering and consulting firms, option 4 would provide the stakeholders with expertise that could assist them in understanding the circumstances, identify potential problems and adequately express their concerns to the County.

Mr. Humphreys remarked that the map exhibit reflecting the acquisition of the properties the County was in negotiation on appeared to show Huetter Road going through the middle of that acquisition. If there was going to be a realignment of the Huetter Corridor, it would be significant compared to what he understood from the first meeting. Mr. Humphreys noted the Huetter Corridor had already been approved for protection and said the acquisition would impact it tremendously. It was not clear how they would realign Huetter to accommodate the Huetter Bypass with that much land acquisition.

Mr. Miles commented that without the exhibit depicting the Airport Layout Plan with the realignment of Huetter, it would be difficult to know where the realignment would occur. The challenge is presented in the letter to stakeholders; a response has been requested by October 17. They do not know the relationship between the land acquisitions and the Airport Layout Plan as it has been approved by the FAA. Mr. Miles commented that a letter from TO Engineers addresses trying to maintain the approach to the existing runway; however, the

Airport Master Plan and the Airport Layout Plan clearly show extensions. Discussions during the facilitation meeting on September 3rd included land acquisitions to accommodate the future runway extensions. Mr. Miles said without understanding the context completely, it would be premature to try to reach a conclusion.

Mr. Miles understood other stakeholders had sought out experts in land use. They had discussed with Marsha Bracke the idea of bringing in expertise during the facilitation process as part of the vetting. It was estimated that the entire facilitation effort would cost approximately \$40,000; to date, they have spent approximately \$21,000. As the matter does not materially affect the regional transportation plan, Mr. Miles did not feel KMPO should bear the burden of cost. As both the Ramsey Road extension and the Huetter Corridor are important projects to the regional transportation system, he felt KMPO's financial liability should be \$10,000. He estimated the entire cost of the expert at \$20,000 and suggested those with a stakeholder interest, Lakes Highway District, Post Falls Highway District, City of Hayden, and potentially City of Rathdrum share the balance of the estimated cost.

Chair Holmes felt finding someone who had land use expertise in relationship to the airport was very important at this time. In speaking for the City of Rathdrum, he favored option #4.

Mr. Humphreys said he discussed the matter with his Board; Post Falls Highway District is not interested in handling the matter individually and wished to remain a group when having any kind of dialogue. As one of the major stakeholders, the District is willing to financially contribute. Post Falls Highway District is also in favor of option #4.

Mr. Twete stated Lakes Highway District would also go along with Mr. Humphreys' comments and said he felt they had to find a different solution. Although Huetter and Ramsey Roads are important to Post Falls and Lakes Highway Districts, the City of Hayden is the stakeholder who is most affected. Mr. Twete said the stakeholders need to stay together as too much would be lost in holding separate meetings.

Mr. Panabaker stated the City of Hayden would like the stakeholders to stay together in dealing with the matter and could use the expertise of others in finding a solution to the problem.

Mr. Miles remarked that he did not know what issues the consultant's scope would include, but said to date, the two primary factors he has heard is the impact on land use and the justification for the runway extension; he noted the issues were related. Mr. Miles has recommended to the stakeholders that KMPO not hold the contract, but has suggested the contract be held by the City of Hayden who would be impacted the greatest.

Mr. Panabaker commented that he was concerned about the amount of time and money that had been spent in attempting to resolve the matter. He noted they all have budget constraints and are spending extra time and money to fix something that there was no excuse for ever happening to begin with.

Mr. Tondee commented that he agreed and said the jurisdictions were represented. He said he would agree with that (Mr. Panabaker's) statement.

Mr. Humphreys stated that there were a lot of unanswered questions on both sides. He was not sure the airport or County had provided them with all the information. According to the articles and the correspondence he had read, the FAA was not totally on board with this program; in fact, according to what he had read, there was no justification for an extension of runway at this time. Mr. Humphreys said he understood preservation of a corridor as that is what they are doing with Huetter Road, but said they did not have answers to whether or not this is or would ever be justifiable; or if they were just preserving a corridor that may never be of any use. Mr.

Humphreys questioned how they determine the answer to these questions and asked Mr. Tondee if he had an answer to whether or not an extension on the runway at the airport is justified noting Mr. Tondee had been involved in this more than the rest of them.

Mr. Tondee responded that he believed this was a planning process. He said the answer to Mr. Humphreys' question was, "No, they do not need an extension today, but it is to protect the corridor for an extension and economic viability of the airport and surrounding jurisdictions. So, having the economic and aspect of getting that done prior to having this is not the normal planning procedure process...it is not done in the master plan process, so to expect it to be done through this process that's false expectation from what is normal practices." Mr. Tondee continued by saying the FAA had signed off on both the Master Plan and the Airport Layout Plan so they are in agreement with it. He commented that there was a lot of discussion that needed to happen to move forward. Mr. Tondee remarked that they had another Airport Master Plan organization come forward; they are considering hiring them to true some of the questions that have come up through the facilitation process. When the County sent out the letters to the individual stakeholders, the idea was not to split everything, but to be more productive and get the issues so the County could understand all of the issues. They then planned on holding a joint meeting to state the issues and solutions before moving forward with an outcome. As the jurisdictions are not interested in doing that, he is not sure what the Board is going to do.

Chair Holmes commented that he did not mean to be contentious, but said the City of Rathdrum did not feel they were involved in any of the planning process until the Airport Master Plan was approved. He said they certainly would like to have been involved. In good faith, they have had discussions with elected officials from every jurisdiction attending. Although they have talked and talked, in the end, there did not seem to be a willingness by the County to actually open up the Master Plan and take a good look at it. Chair Holmes said the City of Rathdrum has run out of energy, time and money for this. He again stated the City favored option #4 in hopes of finding a logical conclusion. Chair Holmes said again, in good faith, they had these discussions, but it appears the County went ahead with a plan to purchase property while these good faith discussions were being held. He felt the Board and stakeholders should be represented by someone with expertise.

Mr. Tondee said the property acquisitions had been in the process for a year. He believed there was only one of the parcels they had been having discussions on, the others were just proposals "to get the big picture out there." Mr. Tondee said before the Master Plan discussion, they were only going to move forward with the EIA on one parcel, but due to the discussions, they wanted a bigger picture and said the other parcels are in the Master Plan for future land acquisitions.

Chair Holmes stated what he said earlier still stands. It was news to him that a year ago the County was trying to acquire property. He said again, it would have been nice to be involved.

Mr. Tondee noted that it was in their last Master Plan.

Mr. Miles stated the subject land still interfered with the Huetter Corridor as it was currently proposed. Mr. Miles explained if the County acquired the property and if the environmental assessment is approved, it would give the County environmental clearance. They could then apply to FAA for grants for any one of the parcels that are already cleared through the environmental process. Mr. Miles stated they would not have another opportunity for providing comments on those land acquisitions as they would have already been environmentally cleared. Under NEPA, you are required to fully disclose the intent, purpose, and need for the project. Mr. Miles questioned the airport director during the September 3rd facilitation meeting asking whether or not this was for the current approach to the runway. The airport director said no, it

included the approach to the runway extension in the future runway. However, the presentation in the paper, does not state that so there is a material difference between what the airport director is stating publicly and what has been stated in this assessment. Mr. Miles said the property acquisition in question has been under discussion since September 2013 and takes 250' of the east side of the Huetter right-of-way preservation plan. This would cause the displacement of Huetter as well as the displacement of property owners of existing homes. In response to a question from Mr. Tondee, Mr. Miles explained that the County's intent to move the Huetter Corridor from its existing approved location to the west would cause displacement and said when it comes to that point, the County would have to pay for the moving of it as it would be their project that created...

Mr. Miles was interrupted by a person sitting in the audience.

Mr. Miles stated that he preferred not to get into a discussion during the Board meeting.

Chair Holmes noted this was a public meeting, but not a public hearing.

Mr. Miles continued his response to Mr. Tondee saying he believed the environmental document needs to address the potential impacts associated with those land acquisitions both now and into the future since it is a part of their record, in their Master Plan and the Airport Layout Plan.

Mr. Gookin questioned if the Master Plan was passed in 2010 and asked if these efforts were to implement the Plan.

Mr. Miles responded to the question from Mr. Gookin saying the Master Plan was passed in 2012 and the Airport Layout Plan was approved in 2013. Mr. Miles confirmed the action by the County had taken place without coordination between the various entities and that they (the County) were moving forward during the facilitation process.

In response to a question from Ms. Wilhelm asking why they would be bringing in an expert after the Master Plan had been approved, Mr. Miles explained there were organizations/stakeholders that were not involved in the Master Plan process, like KMPO. He noted there were statements in the Master Plan representing things that were going on that were not and said they need to be corrected. Additionally, the Master Plan, at public meetings and at the time it was approved, showed regional transportation facilities inside runway protection zones; it was not until after the Master Plan was approved that the Airport Layout Plan came out and showed them being moved – without any comment or discussion with local jurisdictions. Mr. Miles noted KMPO and the City of Hayden met with Commissioner Tondee and the FAA in March of 2013 before the FAA gave limited approval of the Airport Layout Plan; there was not a full approval of the Airport Layout Plan. He expressed concerns about the Ramsey Road Extension and the Huetter Road movement and their plans when they were talking; it was approved by the County and then subsequently, submitted to the FAA for approval.

In response to an additional question from Ms. Wilhelm about the County stating, at a prior meeting, that they would be open to amending the Master Plan, Mr. Miles said he believed the County Commissioners met on September 10 regarding the matter; the Minutes from that meeting were included in the Board packet. Mr. Miles noted the County was not interested in opening the Master Plan, but did want to have individual discussions with local jurisdictions and stakeholders to see if they could reach a resolution.

Mr. Tondee said, for clarification, they were not interested in "wiping out" and restarting the Master Plan. In that discussion, they were okay with amendments to the Master Plan.

Mr. Miles noted that question was specifically asked during the last meeting and the response was, no, they were not interested in opening the Master Plan. Mr. Miles remarked that they may be talking about semantics, but said there have been a lot of statements made and there are questions about their validity.

He noted the disadvantage of not having an expert representing the stakeholders. He referred to Chapter 5 of the Financial Feasibility of the Airport Master Plan. It contains a program of what they are going to do over the course of the life of the Master Plan in terms of programming projects. The acquisition of property which they are currently discussing, was scheduled for 2031 and yet, it is being done in 2014. Mr. Miles said if you listen to what was done in the Master Plan discussions and the programming of the document, which was approved, you would anticipate that this discussion would be taking place in the future rather than while these facilitation meetings were taking place. In terms of environmental assessment, Mr. Miles questioned the program for runway extensions and decoupling of the runways which is scheduled for 2019. He noted the program adopted in 2012, is not being implemented in the sequence in which it is being presented.

Mr. Humphreys requested clarification and asked if the dialogue for acquisition of one of the parcels of land that is currently under review, started a year ago. He understood the acquisition of property actually began in 2013 as opposed to 2031 and has been ongoing for a year.

Mr. Tondee stated that it has been going on for a year and said the property that is in acquisition was in the previously adopted Master Plan from 2001. The land they are talking about, A-16, was in future land acquisition in the previous Airport Master Plan. Mr. Tondee noted there had not been any discussions in the negotiations about imminent domain.

Mr. Mangan said although this is a Plan, a plan is an intention. He had heard nothing to indicate that the airport board would hold back on its intention to extend the runways. He said if they do nothing, by default, the Huetter Corridor and the Ramsey Road project will be adversely affected. He felt they had little choice than to hire their own expert so they can define what is partially known as well as what is unknown.

Chair Holmes noted the Board had the options as laid out by Mr. Miles or could come up with creative options as an alternative. As the KMPO Chairman and representative for the City of Rathdrum, he favored option #4 because he felt they had spent a lot of time and energy in this matter and have gotten nowhere.

In response to a question from Mr. Gookin, Mr. Miles said the current Master Plan and the Airport Layout Plan show the land that is being acquired in this discussion could preclude the Huetter Corridor in that location; they would be back to moving or abandoning it. Mr. Miles said deciding to protect the Corridor would be up to the Board.

Mr. Humphrey stated when they started this dialogue 20+ years ago, it was their intent to start the preservation of the Huetter Corridor as a bypass which would relieve congestion on Highway 95. He noted ITD had done their part to mitigate the congestion along Highway 95, but noted it is currently very congested. Mr. Humphreys said he believed the preservation of the Huetter Corridor began long before the airport expansion became an issue.

Mr. Miles noted the Huetter Corridor started in the 1990s. At that time, KCATT was an informal group of local jurisdictions created by ITD. KCATT and ITD did two corridor studies to create a way around US 95. When KMPO was created in 2003, the Board took two big items on, public transportation and creating the right-of-way needs map for the Huetter Corridor under Idaho Code. It was a 6+ year effort to define the corridor. There were a significant amount of

meetings and a formal public hearing where approximately 80 people attended. As a result, the KMPO Board approved the Huetter Corridor Study which included the Huetter Right-of-Way Needs Map which was subsequently adopted and has been recognized by the Post Falls Highway District and the City of Hayden. The City of Hayden subsequently adopted it as part of their Master Plan, their Comprehensive Land Use Plan and their Transportation Plan and have been doing right-of-way preservations as part of the condition of acquisition and development since that time. Mr. Miles confirmed that it was put together by a countywide public process for the purpose of land preservation.

Mr. Humphreys said in all fairness to the County's position, he recognized that they were trying to preserve a corridor for the airport. They are both after the same thing, preservation of land use into the future and said they are trying to make it so everyone can benefit. He believed there was a solution. Mr. Humphrey said, from Post Falls Highway District's perspective, they want to work as a group and felt they should have someone who has expertise. He noted the main stakeholders had been identified, Lakes Highway District, Post Falls, Highway District, City of Hayden, KMPO, and possibly, the City of Rathdrum. He noted the City of Hayden had the most to risk and, for that reason, should enter into the dialogue with the expert. He asked Mr. Panabaker to go back to the Hayden City Council to see if there would be any interest in the City being in charge of that.

Mr. Panabaker said going back 15 years ago when he was County Commissioner, they were well aware of the bypass when Scott Stokes of ITD was doing the long range plan and noted they were part of that process at that time. They did not acquire any property, but as he recalls, they required setbacks so buildings along Huetter Road would not interfere with the corridor. He stated the City of Hayden would be grossly affected by this immediately and said they cannot put this matter off. In speaking for the City of Hayden, he said they cannot take the matter lightly and will do anything they can to rectify the matter.

Chair Holmes said he anticipated the City of Hayden would take a lead role.

Mr. Humphreys moved to accept option #4 as presented earlier in the discussion. Mr. Twete seconded the motion.

Mr. Tondee asked if the motion included KMPO helping to pay for a consultant if the County hired one or if it was for an independent consultant for KMPO or the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Humphreys stated that it seemed to him that it would be in the best interest of the jurisdictions that they hire an individual consultant and not involve the County as they are actually in opposition to some of the presentations that were brought forth by the County and the airport board. He said they need someone with expertise to give them clarification on what they need to accomplish.

The motion passed with one nay.

c. Upcoming LRHIP and STP Urban/Rural/Bridge – LHTAC Applications Deadlines

Ms. Gow noted the Board packet included a memo which was also sent to KCATT. The LRHIP applications have changed. A jurisdiction can now put in an application even though they may have applied previously; however, it will affect them in the scoring of the projects. Ms. Gow said all applications should be received by KMPO no later than October 17th; if more than one application is received, non-biased members of KCATT will be scoring the projects with her assistance. The applications are due to LHTAC by December 1. The same process will take place for the STP application; these applications are due to KMPO by November 14th and to LHTAC by January 12th, 2015.

9. Director's Report (written report included in Board packet)

Mr. Miles noted the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) which was approved by KMPO last month, was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). At the request of the MPOS, FHWA and FTA will be meeting with ITD to put together a protocol for future amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Miles noted some ambiguity had occurred as a result of staff turnover between FHWA, FTA, and ITD.

The Seltice Way Congestion Mitigation project did not receive End of the Year funding.

The Seltice Way - Huetter Road to Northwest Boulevard project which is in preliminary development will receive preliminary engineering and design funds in 2015. Mr. Miles said he understood the City of Coeur d'Alene engineer, Mr. Gordon Dobler, would be working with LHTAC, ITD, and FHWA, to become partial certification acceptance which will enable them to manage their own federal aid projects. .

Mr. Miles noted he had given a presentation with a panel at the Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce's Legislative Summit. They were asked to talk about transportation funding and the fact that it has been a long time since they had a transportation funding increase in the State of Idaho. Mr. Miles noted the last gas tax occurred in 1996 and represented 20% of the cost of a gallon of fuel; today, it represents 7%. The event was fairly well attended.

10. Board Member Comments

On behalf of ITD, Mr. Fenn thanked KMPO and Mr. Miles for their support in applying for the TIGER grants saying he felt it helped bring success in the grant award.

Mr. Humphreys reported the Prairie Avenue widening project was winding down and ahead of schedule. He noted the Highway District Convention was scheduled during the time period the November KMPO Board meeting was scheduled. Mr. Humphreys thought they may want to reconsider the timeline as he was not certain how many Highway District Commissioners would be able to attend the November Board meeting.

Mr. Miles said he would see if there was enough on the Agenda to hold the November meeting.

Mr. Panabaker commented that he felt they were at a crossroads. Over the last 25-30 years that he has been in local government, they had never been adversarial and had always been able to sit down and work things out. He stated that when he was with the City previously, they worked to protect the airport, zoning and annexing around it in order to prevent growth from encroaching on and destroying it; he said the same thing was done when he was a county commissioner. Mr. Panabaker did not want to see all the years of good work and good will thrown out over the matter before them; they must get this resolved.

Mr. Tondee said he echoed Mr. Panabaker's comments and believed the area was known for their cooperation and working together (inaudible).

Chair Holmes proposed the time of the Board meetings be changed from 1:30 p.m. to 11:00 a.m. for the next year as his schedule had changed; he believed the meetings were originally scheduled at 11:00 a.m. or 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Miles confirmed that he would check the availability of the Post Falls Council Chambers.

Mr. Kackman commented that 1:30 p.m. was a good time for him to attend the KMPO Board meetings noting the Tribal Council met on Thursdays; there may be a rare occasion when he would not be able to attend the Board meeting

Chair Holmes noted the matter would be on the Agenda. Senator Crapo will hold a town hall meeting at the Rathdrum City Hall this Friday from 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.; Chair Holmes invited everyone to attend.

Mr. Panabaker noted Senator Crapo would also be at Hayden City Hall on Friday, but later in the day.

Mr. Tondee noted a possible conflict with the requested time change for the KMPO Board meetings noting, in the past, the County Commissioners held their land use meetings on Thursdays from 9:00 a.m. – noon.

11. Next Meeting – November 13, 2014

12. Adjournment

There being nothing further before the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization Board, and with no objection, the October 9, 2014 Board meeting was adjourned by Chair Vic Holmes.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

Recording Secretary