



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

April 14, 2016 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 – Jim Mangan, Chair**
- 2. Changes to the Agenda and Declarations of Conflicts of Interest**
- 3. Approval of March 10, 2016 KMPO Board Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Public Comments** (limited to non-agenda items 3 minutes).
- 5. KCATT Recap & Recommendations – Sean Hoisington**
 - a. STP Urban Applications and Scoring Recommendations
- 6. Administrative Matters**
 - a. March 2016 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report
 - b. Draft Policy on Staff Annual Compensation Policy
 - c. Urban Balancing Meeting Update
- 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. Kootenai County Urban and Specialized Transit Monthly Report – Corey Clarke
 - b. Kootenai County Transit Project(s) Presentation – Jody Bieze and Corey Clarke
 - c. Coeur d Alene Tribe Rural Transit Report – Alan Eirls
- 8. Other Business**
 - A. Regional Public Transportation Authority
 - i. RPTA – What's an RPTA? – Short Primer
 - ii. RPTA White Paper Prepared by KMPO
 - iii. Kelli Fairless, Executive Director Valley Ride (RPTA) for Ada and Canyon Counties
 - iv. Direction of the Board
- 9. Director's Report** (written report included in Board packet)
- 10. Board Member Comments**
- 11. Next Meeting – May 12, 2016**
- 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.

MEETING MINUTES

Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
Regular Board Meeting
April 14, 2016
Post Falls City Council Chambers, City Hall, First Floor
Post Falls, Idaho

Board Members in Attendance:

James Mangan, Chair	Worley Highway District
Jim Kackman, Vice Chair	Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Terry Sverdsten	East Side Highway District
Marc Eberlein	Kootenai County
Kerri Thoreson	City of Post Falls
Dick Panabaker	City of Hayden
Fred Meckel	City of Rathdrum
Terry Werner	Post Falls Highway District
Rod Twete	Lakes Highway District
Damon Allen	Idaho Transportation Department Dist. 1
Dan Gookin	City of Coeur d'Alene

Board Members Absent:

Staff Present:

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

Attendees:

Donna Montgomery	KMPO Volunteer
Monty Montgomery	Lakes Highway District
Kevin Howard	Worley Highway District
Alan Eirls	Citylink, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Sean Hoisington	City of Hayden
Diane Fountain	Lakes Highway District
Heather Keen	Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Corey Clarke	Kootenai County
Jody Bieze	Kootenai County
Kimberly Hobson	Kootenai County
John Kelly	KCATT
Ken Hamm	Citizen
Kelli Fairless	Valley Ride, Director

1. Call to Order – James Mangan, Chair

The regular meeting of the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board was called to order by Chair James Mangan at 1:30 p.m.

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

Chair Mangan noted there were no request for changes to the agenda and no conflicts of interest declared.

3. Approval of March 10, 2016 KMPO Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Richard Panabaker moved to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2016 KMPO Board meeting. Ms. Kerri Thoreson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

There were no public comments offered.

5. KCATT Recap & Recommendations – Sean Hoisington

a. STP Urban Applications and Scoring Recommendations

Mr. Sean Hoisington, KCATT Chair, reported the committee held a scoring session to prioritize projects for KMPO's future Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). Based on the scoring results, the KCATT committee requested the KMPO Board accept their ranking recommendation as follows: 1) Ramsey Road – Wyoming to Lancaster, City of Hayden 2) Chase BNSF, City of Post Falls 3) 4th Street – Dalton to Prairie, Cities of Dalton Gardens, Hayden, and Coeur d'Alene and 4) Poleline/Chase Roundabout, City of Post Falls.

Mr. Rod Twete moved to approve the final ranking of the projects as presented by Mr. Hoisington. Mr. Terry Werner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Panabaker commented that Mr. Hoisington had been working for the City of Hayden for a number of years and had done an excellent job. Mr. Hoisington will be leaving the City in the next few weeks. He thanked Mr. Hoisington, wished him well and said he would be missed.

6. Administrative Matters

a. March 2016 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report

Mr. Terry Werner moved to approve the expenditures for March 2016. Mr. Dick Panabaker seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. Draft Policy on Staff Annual Compensation Policy

Mr. Miles noted budget discussions last year included how the cost of living adjustment was calculated in draft budgets; the Board was provided a memo recapping the discussion. He was asked to document methodology and provide a policy statement. In addition to what local jurisdictions have done, the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) survey is referenced. The survey includes a broader range of employer/employee groups and actual cost of living raises from the previous year; this is used to help determine a proposed cost of living increase for KMPO employees in the upcoming year. Although many organizations give step increases and/or performance/merit raises, increases given to KMPO employees are based on cost of living. The Board questioned Mr. Miles and discussed practices used by their jurisdictions. The cost of living adjustment is presented to the Board as a proposal based on historical fact; the decision is up to the Board. This was an exercise to provide the current practice. Mr. Miles will present the Board with alternative options.

c. Urban Balancing Meeting Update

Mr. Miles reported the Urban Balancing Committee met in Boise April 6 and 7. Due to timing, the committee was presented KCATT's proposed list of prioritized projects prior to the Board's acceptance and agreed to allow adjustments in the event the Board made changes. The Urban Balancing meeting went well; projects moved forward and into the program.

The City of Hayden's \$4.6 million Ramsey Road Extension project was moved out of preliminary development into the 2021 program year for construction; the City will receive \$750,000 in 2024 for right-of-way acquisition. The committee approved the increase to urban funds; the project will move forward with the full amount of money requested. With the Ramsey Road Extension project being moved out of preliminary development, the first three projects on the prioritized list were able to be moved into the program.

The Government Way project from Hanley to Prairie Avenue is a group project between Lakes Highway District and the Cities of Coeur d'Alene and Hayden. The project is scheduled for 2017 and, based on the engineer's estimate, is \$1.3 million over budget; Mr. Miles was able to obtain \$1.1 million for the projects construction next year.

The 4th Avenue - Hanley to Prairie Avenue project, a group project between the Cities of Coeur d'Alene, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden, was put into project development for just over \$4.2 million. The project did not propose sidewalks or effective bike lanes creating a lot of discussion for the KCATT committee. Based on that discussion, Mr. Miles met with the mayor of Dalton Gardens and representatives from the Cities of Coeur d'Alene and Hayden. The City of Dalton Gardens has modified the project to include sidewalks/bike lanes at the 4th Avenue cross-section. Once the design concept is complete they will look for a slot to move it to the program for construction.

Also put into preliminary development, was the City of Post Falls' \$462,000 Chase BNSF project.

Mr. Miles noted MPO Directors received training regarding Title VI, environmental rights, environmental justice, and ADA responsibilities for Federal grantees. ITD and the Federal Highway Administration provided the training. Mr. Miles is going to request the FHWA presentation be made to KCATT.

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. Kootenai County Urban and Specialized Transit Monthly Report – Corey Clarke
- b. Kootenai County Transit Project(s) Presentation – Jody Bieze and Corey Clarke

Ms. Jody Bieze stated she would speak prior to Mr. Clarke. She outlined their approach to creating a framework for evaluating the transit service. Information collected will be presented to local officials, boards, the Tribe, jurisdictions and agencies. The goal was to make the transit system the best it could be using the limited resources.

Mr. Corey Clarke reported the Service and Fare Equity Analysis was near completion; there were three major parts, the fare, the transit center concept which is at 20% design, and the analysis of the route/stop structure as it exists today. They are currently gathering data for the Regional Transit Plan. Six Paratransit buses had been purchased and are expected by September. The County has just completed an RFP for the Intelligent Transit System. Mr. Clarke noted public meetings were scheduled; input on the transit and fare system will be sought from the public.

Chair Mangan asked Mr. Clarke when the route structure would be defined, the logic used to determine the best route structure, and if the cost of the fare had been determined.

Mr. Clarke said the amount of the fare had not yet been determined. Public meetings wrap up the end of May. Route alternatives will be considered once they pull together data from public

meetings, surveys, data retrieved from other sources, projections, etc. An optimistic timeline for route alternatives is late summer/early fall.

In response to a question from Mr. Meckel asking if they were getting public buy-in from Kootenai Health, Heritage Health, social services, retirement homes, etc., Mr. Clarke noted Kootenai Health was a major partner and provided a number of their medical Paratransit services. He has had discussions with nonprofit and community organizations, social services including Panhandle Health and Area Council on Aging. They have also reached out to bike/trail groups as public transit is aligned with that community.

Ms. Thoreson stated they were all stakeholders; she asked who would determine cost of the fare.

Ms. Bieze stated it would be a “multiple-prong” process. Their job was to provide the information/recommendation to the appropriate jurisdictions and the County. “The boss” for the transit system was the Board of County Commissioners, with buy-in from the Tribe.

Mr. Clarke reported the fixed route cost per rider was \$2.63 in February which was down from the previous month. The fixed route carried 13,627 riders in March which was up slightly. The general Paratransit (MV) trips ran at a cost of \$25.51 per rider and carried 1,371 passengers in March; Kootenai Health carried 1,948 passengers.

Mr. Eberlein referenced page 4 of the Kootenai County Transit System report noting there was a significant decrease from October to February – \$3.61 to \$2.63 per passenger. The price of fuel was down and reflected in the “Fuel” category [\$6,444 to \$3,756]. “Maintain & Ops” was down to \$32,000 [from \$46,168], a substantial amount; he asked Ms. Bieze what the decrease was attributed to, if she expected the trend to continue, and wondered if it was due to new buses.

Ms. Bieze explained they were initially paying 50.8% contribution for the portion of the fixed route; the amount has been reduced to 17% which attributed to one aspect of the decrease. They are doing a total analysis and looking at a new network design; funding and what they are proposing will be aligned with the service. She felt it would not be a fair assessment to expect the costs to remain the same. Ms. Bieze’s final answer to Mr. Eberlein’s question was the reduction was not due to new buses, “We are going to say it is because we are effective and efficient and able to have implemented something at this particular point in time with 2 buses and 4 drivers.”

Mr. Kackman explained to Mr. Eberlein that he was not seeing the Tribe’s costs. Ms. Bieze was showing costs from the County’s perspectives. Reimbursement rates to the Tribe had been reduced. If the Board saw the Tribe’s costs, they would see their costs have correspondingly increased as they are not being reimbursed at 50.8% for administrative costs as they were between 2005 and December of 2014; the Tribe is being reimbursed 17%. Major route changes a few years ago reduced the level of service and costs overall. Mr. Kackman’s response to Mr. Eberlein’s question is that the County’s reimbursement to the Tribe had been reduced. It is this trend that is of concern to the Tribe and the reason the Tribe is exploring other options.

Ms. Bieze stated the Federal Government requires a reimbursement by cost; the County was overpaying and under-matching. She questioned if the Tribe should be paying for fixed route service and be the major matchmaker. Ms. Bieze said it is not a surprise to them as they have been working hand in glove with the Tribe. She believed the discussion should be about funding, service, contribution, and how to equalize that so the Tribe is not paying more than they deem reasonable; she did not know what that amount was.

c. Rural Transit Report – Alan Eirls

Mr. Alan Eirls reported no accidents or major issues in March; minor issues related to bus/rider arrival/departure times happen occasionally. Ridership was higher than the previous month on nearly all routes and has made an impressive climb over the past six months. Mr. Eirls was surprised by the increase in ridership in light of the low fuel prices and better weather, but hopes the trend continues. ADA ridership has also increased. They are doing their quarterly reporting.

8. Other Business

A. Regional Public Transportation Authority

i. RPTA – What's an RPTA? – Short Primer

Mr. Miles gave a PowerPoint presentation on RPTAs under Idaho Code Title 40 Chapter 21 and provided a history on the establishment. It is created to establish a single governmental agency oriented for public transportation needs within a determined boundary. The agency is under the supervision of and directly responsible to local governments; it is a governing authority with no taxing authority. In order for an RPTA to be created, a resolution would have to be prepared by Kootenai County or a subset of local jurisdictions within Kootenai County and approved by the jurisdictions within the boundary. It could then be placed on a public ballot and established only by registered voters sixty days after the final resolution has been adopted. The authority will have exclusive jurisdiction over all publicly funded/subsidized transportation services.

ii. RPTA White Paper Prepared by KMPO

Mr. Miles noted the Board Chair requested the RPTA White Paper be included in the Board packet. It was prepared during the last discussion; existing State statutes were included.

iii. Kelli Fairless, Executive Director Valley Ride (RPTA) for Ada and Canyon Counties

Mr. Miles introduced Ms. Kelli Fairless and noted she agreed to attend the meeting at the request of KMPO Chair Mangan. Valley Regional Transit is one of two RPTAs in Idaho.

Ms. Fairless, Executive Director of Valley Regional Transit, gave a PowerPoint presentation on Valley Regional Transit, a two-county Regional Public Transportation Authority in the Boise metropolitan area. Prior to the formation of the RPTA there were a number of transit providers in the area under different governments/organizations. Ms. Fairless explained an RPTA simply means public transit is organized under one organization. The vote for their RPTA occurred in 1998; their Chamber organized the region around forming the RPTA. The committee had both public and private sector members and chaired by now Senator Chuck Winder and past Boise State University President Charles Ruch. The referendum passed with an average of 70% in favor (68% - 72%); the vote was even throughout the urban/rural communities in both counties.

Ms. Fairless went to the organization in November of 2000 and became Executive Director in 2001. Although their mission statement has changed over the years, they take very seriously the sense of being accountable to local governments and responsible for regional coordination. The mission statement is focused around managing transportation resources and ensuring they are coordinating effective/efficient delivery of transportation options. Their RPTA is accountable to local government by their Board which is composed of 29 members – ITD sits on the Board as an ex-officio member; the other 28 members are a combination of local government officials and special members that have been added to the Board. Their three goals are around demonstrating financial stewardship, building community partnership, and developing institutional and technical

capacity; coordination is at the nexus of those three things goals. State code has driven how they are organized and how they focus their attention.

Funding sources for Valley Regional Transit are believed to be similar to funding sources in our area for public transit. In addition to the federal funding, jurisdictions in their region provide a voluntary per capita contribution which assists with administration costs. Ms. Fairless said although there may be gaps, they plan for every community. The Transportation Development Plan includes a number of public opinion surveys and community meetings. It is viewed as a partnership between local jurisdictions, business employers and stakeholders. Coordinated funding has allowed them to expand stakeholder partnerships and build financial capacity.

Ms. Fairless said one of the lessons they learned was to embrace the idea of managing transportation assets and leveraging resources as effectively as possible; planning activities have been focused to bring about a unified vision. They have built a solid foundation for a coordinated regional public transportation system over the past 15 years.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Eberlein, Ms. Fairless explained how they made the transition to an RPTA and said it was a collaborative effort. Each year, she visits the 19 jurisdictions in their region, provides an annual report and makes a budget request. A provision in the code allows the Board structure to change by majority vote; special members may be added by this process. Their Board has added ITD as an ex-officio member, two urban renewal districts, Boise State University, and College of Western Idaho. In order for special members to be voting members, they provide funding which is negotiated every year. Local jurisdictions are not required to pay administrative support. Ms. Fairless advocates for all citizens whether or not their local jurisdictions contribute. She felt regional government was valuable. An RPTA is the citizen's vote.

Mr. Panabaker understood there would be no increase in costs; any major increases will greatly impact the City of Hayden. He felt they should be fair to the other jurisdictions involved, should consider the RPTA, and said he was not against putting it to a vote of the people.

Mr. Miles said under Federal statutes, there are the providers and planners and noted that they are to work collaboratively together. KMPO is responsible for the long range planning for roads (Title 23) and public transportation (Title 49) and responsible when jurisdictions/public transit agencies want to use federal dollars. KMPO's role is not expected to change if an RPTA is created; the two agencies will have to work collaboratively to ensure a good plan is created and executed in accordance with federal grant regulations.

Chair Mangan noted increased effectiveness is generally realized when there is unity of command and said it is easier to act upon opportunities when resources are under one organization. He concurred with Mr. Miles stating he did not expect KMPO to change, but believed some Board members may also serve on an RPTA Board.

Mr. Miles had, upon request, given presentations explaining an RPTA to Hayden Joint Policy Committee and Coeur d'Alene Public Policy Committee.

Chair Mangan said the creation of an RPTA would be a multi-stage process, include KMPO, local jurisdictions, and the County Commissioners. If approved, it would be placed on the November ballot. The public would have the ultimate decision of whether or not an RPTA would be formed.

Ms. Bieze currently administrates the transit plan. In response to a question from Mr. Gookin, she gave her opinion on an RPTA stating it was "neutral to say best" and not certain they were ready for it as it was a funding question. Although she knew governance was important, she believed they had made great progress toward "formalizing an otherwise unformal process" in the two years she had worked on the transit system. She spoke to the Tribe's generous contribution over

the years, but said she had not asked Mr. Kackman what the Tribe would consider a reasonable amount. Ms. Bieze believed they should look at the current cost of the system and would like the opportunity to present the findings they have and are working on. She stated she was not opposed to what the Board would decide. Ms. Bieze said she wanted to qualify Mr. Miles remark that KMPO was in charge of the funding by saying how it really worked was FTA looked to Kootenai County as the administration of the funders as they apply for 5307, 5310, and 5339 funds. She said the role of KMPO was to provide support and planning. As discussed by Ms. Fairless, Kootenai County Transit is working on coordination of partnerships, the difference is that they did not come before the KMPO Board and discuss it with them, they wanted to work closely with the Tribe to reach an understanding so they could then make a presentation. She stated she had not spoken to Mr. Kackman, the KMPO Board member representing the Tribe, about what the Tribe would deem fair. Ms. Bieze made arrangements to speak about funding at area city council meetings.

Mr. Miles confirmed the RPTA could only be placed on even year ballots and the reason they were focusing on this at this time.

Mr. Miles explained, without a plan approved by the MPO, a designated recipient is ineligible to receive 5307, 5310, or 5339 funding. As the designed recipient, Kootenai County is required to put together a Program of Projects (POP) which is included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It is the inclusion of the POP in the TIP and the approval of the TIP that makes Kootenai County eligible to even apply for federal funds. The KMPO Board has the authority to disallow any proposed project that is inconsistent with the Program regardless of the work; the disallowance would prevent the use of federal funds for the proposed activity. Mr. Miles remarked that both he and Ms. Bieze are correct in the respect that it has to be done collaboratively and said it is important matters continue to be done in a collaborative manner in the future.

Ms. Bieze stated Mr. Miles did not include her in the RPTA discussion, though, she would expect him to say something different. She felt collaboration was important.

Mr. Miles did not respond to Ms. Bieze's accusation.

Mr. Eberlein commented on a previous issue faced by the City of Hayden, Kootenai County, and KMPO and said it was important everyone continued to work together. Mr. Miles concurred.

Mr. Kackman addressed the KMPO Board members saying he was interested in knowing three main things, governance – how decisions get made, representation – are the cities fairly represented right now, and funding. These are the reasons why they would explore the option of the RPTA. Mr. Kackman and the Tribe are supportive of a ballot measure to see what the voters think about an RPTA, but would like to know if the decision making process was satisfactory and the cities were happy with their representation.

Mr. Panabaker believed it was satisfactory to the extent it was currently understood, but asked what would keep the system going if one of their partners, for instance the Tribe, did not feel they were being treated fairly and pulled out; their costs would go up substantially or the service would not exist. If everyone was working together, and with the Board, this would not normally happen.

Mr. Kackman noted the Tribe had not changed their commitment of funding the match for the urban service based on the availability of FTA funding. The system has had some growing pains and the Tribe has been shouldering more of the burden. It is not probable to believe the Tribe would continue paying "forever." At some point, benefiting jurisdictions should recognize what their proportionate share of service is and help shoulder the burden. The Tribe will continue to stay and be supportive, but is looking for help.

Mr. Panabaker asked if everyone was paying their share. Ms. Bieze provided the FY16:

Tribe	\$225,000
City of Coeur d'Alene	\$21,991.50 x 2
Dalton Gardens	\$2,904
Hayden	\$11,696 x 2
Huetter	\$165.00
Post Falls	\$10,975 (it was not known if this was half the amount or the total)

The approximate total for all contributions is \$80,000; Kootenai County has put in a \$36,000 match and a capital contribution of \$162,000. The Tribe has borne the weight of the contribution. Ms. Bieze stated she would be going to the city council meetings for the sole purpose of being able to ask for additional funding contributions. Financial calculations will be based on service. The calculation for the \$80,000 worth of contributions was done in 2005; the methodology is unknown. They are working with and wanting to establish partnerships; this may include additional financial contributions, a basket of contributions or voluntary contributions. Kootenai Health is a "great" partner; NIC has been approached.

Mr. Miles explained contributions to the RPTA would be sought based on the policy decisions set by the governing Board. The expectation would be those organizations who are currently contributing would continue until the governing board had completed an analysis for seeking additional funds. Under the code, contributions to an RPTA are strictly voluntary.

Mr. Panabaker commented that paying for the system should be fair for everyone.

Mr. Eberlein noted the RPTA was first mentioned in 2012; why was it not on the 2014 ballot?

At the time, Mr. Kackman did not feel the Commissioner sitting on the Board would support an RPTA.

Mr. Eberlein questioned how long they had to get this on the ballot and if they had time to postpone the vote for another month to gather information. He suggested taking time to get the support of the Chambers of Commerce and city councils prior to presenting the matter to the County Commissioners who have the final say in whether or not the resolution is placed on the ballot. He suggested Mr. Miles and Ms. Bieze work together to determine how the councils felt about an RPTA.

Mr. Miles said he would not expect the Chambers of Commerce to take a position on the creation of an RPTA until such time there was interest on the part of elected officials. Mr. Miles noted the vote of the County Commissioners was not necessarily an endorsement of an RPTA, but whether or not they would affirm the resolution to put it on the ballot.

Mr. Eberlein asked Mr. Gookin and Mr. Panabaker if their councils would support an RPTA.

Mr. Gookin stated he did not know if the City Council would be supportive; the mayor and city administrator had declined to take a position. He explained why he was reluctant to vote today and said he would like to get as much information as possible, but believed the public would be supportive of an RPTA.

Mr. Panabaker stated he did not have authority to make a decision without input from the Council. He said they were not unreasonable and believed they would vote to let the people decide.

Mr. Eberlein said he believed there would be one, maybe two votes in favor of an RPTA from the County Commissioners and would like to increase the odds before presenting it to them.

Mr. Eberlein said though he did not know what his fellow Commissioners would decide, he personally, did not want the hassle of a transit system and would rather it be under an RPTA.

Mr. Miles felt Mr. Gookin had brought up a good point, with the upcoming meetings, it was possible to present the concept of a RPTA from a governance, financial, and routing perspective and get the councils' feedback. Mr. Miles said the County Commissioners would need to request the referendum be placed on the ballot 60 days before the election. If it does not make it on the ballot this year, they will have to wait two years; timing is the reason the matter was on the agenda.

Chair Mangan said, prior to the next Board meeting, Board members should discuss the matter with their respective boards and/or councils.

Mr. Sverdsten said, as a rural highway district, they currently do not benefit from the transit system and did not foresee a benefit in the future.

Mr. Miles said if an RPTA was created, the highway districts would have to designate someone from the four highway districts to sit on the Board. He noted the City of Harrison had expressed interest in transit service and said Ms. Fairless commented on the purpose of having countrywide RPTA was to plan for everyone. Mr. Miles remarked on the possibilities of service if rural funds were available through the 5311 program.

iv. Direction of the Board

Mr. Eberlein said in order to expedite the matter and avoid putting it off for another two years, he suggested the Board vote to support the RPTA, but put it off to the other entities in order to give them an opportunity to familiarize themselves with an RPTA.

Chair Mangan felt the consensus was to put off a vote until the next meeting, May 12.

Ms. Bieze said she would be presenting the matter to the City of Post Falls on April 19th, the City of Hayden on April 26th, the City of Coeur d'Alene on May 3rd, and the City of Dalton Gardens on May 5th. She would appreciate the opportunity to present the work they have been doing and would respectfully request the KMPO Board acknowledge they would be their best resource.

Mr. Eberlein and Mr. Miles discussed the timing of the meetings. Mr. Miles suggested the Board meeting be delayed until May 17th to ensure they were able to get through the meetings and Ms. Bieze and staff were able to put together what was said at the meetings and add it to the packets.

Mr. Marc Eberlein made a motion to delay the vote on the matter until the May 17th, KMPO meeting, or whichever meeting occurs first. Mr. Dan Gookin seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sverdsten noted May 17th was a Tuesday.

Mr. Miles corrected the date stating the Board meeting would be held Thursday, May 19th.

Mr. Marc Eberlein amended his motion to reflect Thursday, May 19th. Mr. Dan Gookin seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Miles noted KMPO received a copy of the Coeur d'Alene Airport's Environmental Assessment on the acquisition of the land; the matter is currently open for a 30 days public comment period. The closure date is May 13th. Those in that process should be receiving copies of the document.

Mr. Miles commented on a report prepared by United Way, the Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed (ALICE) which came out in January 2016. The report is a way of defining those who would be considered the working poor with income levels high enough they cannot receive public assistance, but low enough they cannot sustain themselves. Mr. Miles noted the report included every county and jurisdiction in Idaho. The ALICE population for Kootenai County is 33%; some jurisdictions are 40-50%. Mr. Miles said he believed the conversation about how ALICE fits in our community is a very important when discussing the provision of transportation.

ITIP should be out for public comment in June.

Mr. Marc Eberlein made a motion to close the meeting.

Chair Mangan stated he would put the motion up for a vote, but noted it would involve skipping Board Member Comments, Agenda item 10.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Board Member Comments

11. Next Meeting – May 12, 2016

12. Adjournment

The regular meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Recording Secretary