



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

## **KCATT MEETING AGENDA**

April 23rd, 2024 - 8:00 AM

Idaho Transportation Department District One Headquarters  
600 W. Prairie Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83815

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome/Introductions – Michael Lenz, Chair
3. Approval of February 27th, 2024, Meeting Minutes – **Action Item**
4. Public Comments (limited to 3 minutes per person)
5. Member Project, Transit & Utility Updates
6. Planning and Programming Updates
  - a. Federal Functional Classification Map - **Update**
  - b. 2025-2031 STBG Urban Call for Projects – **Discussion**
7. Idaho Transportation Board Update
8. Current Business
  - a. Future Transportation Project Funding Policy - **Discussion**

### Upcoming KMPO Board Items

9. Other Business
  - a. KCATT Member Items
10. Next Meeting – May 21st, 2024
11. Adjournment

**KCATT MEETING MINUTES**

**For**

**February 27, 2024**

Idaho Transportation Department District One Headquarters  
600 W. Prairie Avenue, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho 83815

**Call to Order:**

Chair Michael Lenz called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and welcomed attendees.

**Welcome / Introductions:**

Michael Lenz, Chair.....	Post Falls Highway District
Ben Weymouth.....	East Side Highway District
Kevin Howard.....	Worley Highway District
Rob Palus, Vice Chair.....	City of Post Falls
Chris Bosley.....	City of Coeur d’Alene
Kevin Jump.....	City of Rathdrum
Rob Beachler.....	Idaho Transportation Department
Marvin Fenn.....	Idaho Transportation Department

**Absent:**

Alan Soderling.....	City of Hayden
David Callahan.....	Kootenai County
Eric Shanley.....	Lakes Highway District

**KMPO Staff:**

Ali Marienau.....	Transportation Planner
Kate Williams.....	Administrator

**Alternates and Guests:**

Terry Werner.....	Citizen/LHTAC
Monty Montgomery.....	LHD
Donna Montgomery.....	Citizen
Chad Ingle.....	Kootenai County Public Transportation
Jason Stippich.....	AVISTA
Matt Harwood.....	Ruen-Yeager
Chad Riddle.....	Ruen-Yeager
Brian Klatt.....	JUB
Nick Hatch.....	GRI

**3. Approval of December 19, 2023 Meeting Minutes – Action Item**

Rob Palus motioned to approve the December 19, 2023 minutes as submitted. Kevin Howard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**4. Public Comments (limited to 3 minutes per person)**

There were no public comments provided.

**5. Member Project, Transit & Utility Updates**

Rob Beachler, Idaho Transportation Department, reported on current projects. The temporary bridges for the SH-41 interchange project will be completed next week, so traffic can be moved over; extensive utility work being done on Mullan and SH-41. SH-54 will be reconstructed from SH-41 to Greystone Lane (MP 6.7) with 12’ lanes and 6’ shoulders. This project is under development with plans to bid the project by the fall. He reported that the district is anticipating that Pleasant View/SH-53 interchange project will go out for bid by the end of the year. He also noted that ITD District 1 is hosting a value engineering session for the US-95 interchange all this week.

Kevin Jump, city of Rathdrum, reported that the city is putting together their paving rehabilitation program for this summer's road maintenance.

Chris Bosley, city of Coeur d'Alene, gave an update on the city's FTA sidewalk project, which is mostly complete; one section of sidewalk remains. He also reported the city is planning chip seals/overlays for Sherman Ave., Northwest Blvd./Ramsey Rd., Atlas Rd., and in Riverstone. The work will cause some traffic impacts; they hope to do the bulk of the work on Sherman Ave. early in the morning prior to businesses opening.

Robert Palus, city of Post Falls, reported that the city will need to correct some issues with the Prairie Ave./Zorros Rd. roundabout; there will be some closures. The Spokane Street rehabilitation project is out for bid. The design is wrapping up on the BNSF/Chase Rd. crossing; the city hopes to have it out to bid in May. The city will also be closing a section of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave., west of SH-41, this summer for a sewer main project. Mr. Palus also reported the city of Post Falls' transportation master plan update is ongoing; they currently have a public survey and map live for feedback.

Kevin Howard, Worley Highway District, gave an update that construction on the Cougar Gulch Road project will start in June. The Kidd Island Road project team is set to meet to discuss the last rights-of-way to be obtained. He reported that the Greensferry Rd. guardrail project is in design; construction is anticipated for 2025. Mr. Howard also mentioned that WHD is working with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe Fisheries department on the details of the Lake Creek Project to allow fish passage beneath district roadways.

Ben Weymouth, East Side Highway District, reported they will be opening bids for asphalt overlays tomorrow (2/29) for French Gulch, Thompson Lake, and Bell Canyon Roads; the district is also projecting about 20 miles of chip sealing to be completed this year.

Michael Lenz, Post Falls Highway District, reported that work on the Spokane River bridge project is underway, and they are trying to coordinate traffic delays with the city of Post Falls' Spokane Street project. PFHD has received funds for the Prairie Trail underpass and is working with ITD to decide how to proceed. The Huetter Rd./Lancaster Rd. roundabout (a joint project with Lakes Highway District) is the process of acquiring right-of-way; construction will be bumped to next year, due to utility work and project cost increases. The Beck Rd. project will go out to bid this spring; the district is coordinating with ITD on the Pleasant View Rd/SH-53 interchange project, due to proximity of the projects.

Chad Ingle, Kootenai County, reported that transit is working of dispossession of out-of-service paratransit buses. He also spoke on the National Transit Database reporting they just completed, which is part of their annual reporting completed for FTA. He also stated that they have drug and alcohol reporting due March 15<sup>th</sup> and are working on getting all that documentation together. FTA will be visiting for Citylink's Triennial Review in April.

## **6. Planning and Programming Updates**

### **a. Federal Functional Classification Map Update**

Ali Marienau, KMPO, reported that, due to the 2020 census and update to the urban area boundary, KMPO needs to review and update the Federal Functional Classification Map for Kootenai County. With additional development and new facilities over the last 10 years, it is an opportunity to review how roads are functioning – if they are function well, as is, or if they need to be reclassified and/or added to the map. Rathdrum was designated as a small urban area after this census, so those will need to be reclassified. KMPO is ahead of the process but would like to get this process going to include in the MTP update; this update will also adjust some of the classifications of roadways within the model. KMPO will facilitate the collection of data and submit the change forms to ITD as one unit. Ms. Marienau will be setting up meetings to speak with each agency individually. Mr. Palus asked if they should review the 2014 map to collect their ideas prior to speaking with her, and she agreed that would be a great place to start.

b. 2024 Safety Performance Targets & Review

Ms. Marienau gave a review of ITD's updated safety target and she provided an overview of the serious and fatal crashes over the last year in comparison to the 2023 targets. The most harmful events present in fatal crashes were head on collisions. She also noted that, over the last three years, more people have complained about drivers running red lights; in the data, fatalities with 'failed to obey signal' as a contributing factor have surfaced over that same time period. There continue to be issues with pedestrian and bicyclist deaths and serious injuries occurring. Ms. Marienau also noted that the data used for this update came from ITD's license to Numetric's AASHTO Safetyware data; access is available to all local agencies, as well.

c. Strategic Initiatives – Local Government Transportation Program – **Update**

Ms. Marienau spoke on behalf of Mr. Glenn Miles, who wanted the committee to know that a routing slip had been introduced in the legislature, which would move the Strategic Initiatives funding program from ITD's management to LHTAC. Mr. Palus asked if this change will impact the timing on funding and putting things out to bid. Mr. Beachler spoke to the readiness to cut checks. There was discussion on the topic before the legislature – what it said and if it was available to read. Marvin Fenn, ITD, said a draft bill has been posted online to be reviewed.

**7. Idaho Transportation Board Update**

Mr. Beachler reported that the IT Board has a new member: Mitch Watkins for District 4. Mr. Watkins was on the broadband advisory board prior to ITD and was involved with fund distribution. He is on the 129K route subcommittee. \$15 million was available for this year's Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) grants; LTHAC received and funded all 35 applications that were submitted. The Coeur d'Alene River Bridge project came in higher than the engineer's estimate; the Board approved an additional \$4 million for the project. Construction has been moved to 2025. ITD is looking to have the Urban Boundary adjustments approved by June and presented to the board in July; the state will then move forward with updating the road classifications as needed.

**8. Current Business**

a. March Meeting Quorum

Discussion was had over if there will be enough KCATT members present at the March meeting to meet quorum since it is the same week as local school districts' spring breaks. Kate Williams will send out the head count email again to the KCATT members. As of the time of the meeting, only five KCATT members had confirmed they will be able to attend. There was discussion about moving the meeting if there is a pressing business item that warrants a meeting, otherwise it may be cancelled.

**9. Upcoming KMPO Board Items**

Ms. Marienau noted that Mr. Miles had raised the question to the KMPO Board, in February, to think about a policy the Board might have for federal projects that exceed programmed funds and what that might mean for the local agency to assume some of the costs. Idaho has added a new MPO, so there will be less funding available through the Urban Balancing Committee moving forward. This item will be discussed at the March KMPO Board meeting; Board members may be interested in KCATT's perspective.

**10. Other Business**

a. KCATT Member Items

No KCATT member items were brought before the committee.

**11. Next Meeting – March 26, 2024**

**12. Adjournment**

**Without objection, Chair Michael Lenz adjourned the February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 a.m.

*Signature on File*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

## Surface Transportation Block Grant Program APPLICATION 2021-2027 URBAN Program Funds

**Project Key # and Name:**

**Federal Functional System Route #:**

**Jurisdiction:**

**Federal Funds Requested:** (maximum allowable is 93% of total project cost)

STP  Urban

**Funding is requested for the following (check all that apply):**

Engineering Study     PE     RW     CN

**Project Category (see descriptions on last page):**

New Construction     Reconstruction     Preservation     Planning

**Project Type:**

Reconstruction/Rehabilitation     Safety Improvements     Bridge     Railroad

**Crossing**  Planning     Other Describe

**Has your project been selected for prior STP/STBG federal funding?**

Yes     No    **If Yes, year?** \_\_\_\_\_

---

### Applicant

---

Contact Person:

Title

Address:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

**Project Location:**

**Attachments:**

Provide Vicinity Map, detailed scope of work and ITD Forms 1150 and 2435

---

---

**Cost Summary:**

		<i>Matching Funds Summary</i>	Is right-of-way needed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Federal:	\$	(maximum allowable is 93% of total project cost)	
State:	\$		Is property purchase needed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Local:	\$		
Private:	\$		Estimated # of parcels/relocations:
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>			<i>(local match required at obligation of each phase)</i>

**Structural Condition (15 points maximum):**

Is this a new facility?  Yes  No **5 points**

If not, please describe the current structural condition of the existing facility. Please indicate Overall Condition Index (OCI) or other rating and list year of last inspection:

- OCI: 0 – 4 (Other 0-3) **10 Points**
- OCI: 41 – 60 (Other 4-7) **7 Points**
- OCI: 61 – 80 (Other 8-10) **2 Points**

Other rating =

Notes: Gravel to Paved Road = Other (0) Zero  
Scale (i.e., 0 to 10 with 0=worst 10=best):

How will the project address any existing facility design deficiencies or improve overall system performance measures, e.g. safety, pavement condition, travel time reliability, state of good repair.

---

If so, please describe: **0 – 5 Points**

**Capacity Issues (20 points maximum):**

Provide the most current volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio. List the source for the projected V/C ratio (KMPO model, actual counts). If available, please provide a quantitative discussion of future forecast volumes and potential capacity issues that need to be addressed with the 20 year design life of the project:

Is this on a designated truck route?  **Yes**  **No** If yes, % trucks: **10 Points**

V/C Ratio	With Improvements		Without Improvements	
	LOS	Points	LOS	Points
<0.60	A	5	A	0
0.61 to 0.70	B	4	B	1
0.71 to 0.80	C	3	C	2
0.81 to 0.90	D	2	D	3
0.91 to 1.00	E	1	E	4
>1.00	F	0	F	5

**Current**  
V/C ratio **2018 Base Model:** <

**Projected 2040 No-Build Model (without improvements)** **0 – 5 Points**

V/C ratio: >

**Projected 2040 Build Model (with improvements)** **0 – 5 Points**

V/C ratio: <

Please describe how the proposed improvements address traffic volume capacity issues. If this is a new route, please provide evidence of how this will alleviate capacity issues for other facilities:

**0 – 5 Points**



---

**Ability to Advance (15 points maximum):**

---

Please describe your agency's ability to advance the project. Give status of PE, design, right-of-way, utilities and environmental permits.

---

- Is environmental 100% complete?  **Yes**  **No** **5 Points**  
Is right-of-way 100% complete?  **Yes**  **No** **5 Points**  
Is PE 100% complete?  **Yes**  **No** **5 Points**  
Are utility agreements in place?  **Yes**  **No** **3 Points**
- 

The project shall either demonstrate how it fits into an approved system/route plan, or how it matches facilities adjacent and connected to the proposed project (system continuity).

Does this project complete a missing or significantly deficient segment on the regionally transportation system plan?  **Yes**  **No** **10 Points**

If Yes, please explain:

Is this proposal a multi-jurisdictional project?  **Yes**  **No** **5 Points**

If Yes, please explain how and to what extent each is involved:

---

Does this project have public support and the support of the sponsoring jurisdiction's Council/Commission?  **Yes**  **No** **15 Points**

Provide the documentation or website address where the documentation can be accessed

Is the proposal identified in the MTP, local transportation plan or jurisdictions comprehensive plans?

**Yes**  **No**

If Yes, cite the document and attach the relevant pages or website: **5 Points**

---

---

**Alternative Modes/Mobility – (10 points maximum):**

---

Projects may include connections, expansion, enhancement or construction of facilities which create modal interfaces. Indicate how this project facilitates alternative transportation modes and or improves the efficient movement of freight and goods.

**Pedestrian Facilities:**

**0 - 2 Points**

Does this project add or enhance pedestrian facilities (beyond ADA)?  
If Yes, please explain:

Yes  No

**Bicycle Facilities:**

**0 - 2 Points**

Does this project add or enhance bike facilities?

Yes  No

Is this project on a current or proposed bike route?

Yes  No

If Yes, please explain:

Does this project enhance connections to key destinations (i.e., schools, parks, retail, employment, transit)?

Yes  No

If Yes, please explain:

**Transit:**

**0 - 2 Points**

Is this project on a bus route?

Yes  No

If Yes, has this project has been coordinated with Citylink?  
*If yes, provide documentation supporting coordination*

Yes  No

**Freight and Goods Movement:**

**0 – 5 Points**

Does this project improve the safe and efficient movement of Freight and Goods?

Yes  No

---

If Yes, please explain how this will be accomplished within the project.

---

**Safety (20 points maximum):**

---

Accidents per million vehicles

---

Example:

Roadway Intersection	Year	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)	No. of PDOs	No. of Injuries	No. of Fatalities	Total Collisions
Example: Mullan/Cecil	2011	14,425	25	0	0	25
	2012	14,752	3	3	0	5
	2013	14,914	1	1	0	2
	Totals	14,697	29	4	0	32

Formula:

Avg. collisions / year: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total collisions: (Year 1 + Year 2 + Year 3) / 3)

Avg. collisions / million vehicles: (Avg. collisions per year / (365\*AADT/1,000,000))

Primary cause(s) of collisions from police report(s): \_

Specific design elements to be incorporated to address safety: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Rate of Collisions per million Vehicles:

Avg. collisions / year: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total collisions: (Year 1 + Year 2 + Year 3) / 3)

Avg. collisions / million vehicles: \_\_\_\_\_ (Avg. collisions per year / (365\*AADT/1,000,000))

**Rate of Collisions per million Vehicles = \_\_\_\_\_****Additional Requirements:**

- 1) Applying jurisdiction must provide collision history from the most recent, concurrent 3-years for each intersection within the project area that the applicant is seeking to get credit for.
- 2) The AADT only needs to be provided for 1 of the 3 years, within the 3-year period of collision history.
- 3) The applicant should provide additional sheets as necessary for each intersection that they are applying credit for those within the project area.

**Existing Conditions (0-5 points):****0 – 5 Points**

Based on average rate of collisions per million vehicles

Rate / million vehicles	points
<0.5	0 pts
0.5 -0.9	1 pts
1.0 - 1.9	2 pts
2.0 – 2.9	3 pts
3.0 – 3.9	4 pts
> 3.9	5 pts

**Safety Improvements (0-15 points) Maximum of 15 points:****0 – 15 Points**

Based on addressing identified safety needs:

2 points	Each “primary collision cause ” addressed by the project.
5 points	Design element improvement that addresses primary cause of collisions, with an avg. of 5 or more CPY.
5 points	Design element improvement that addresses primary cause of collisions, with an avg. annual injury occurrence of 2 or more IPY.
7 points	Design element improvement that addresses primary cause of collisions, with an avg. injury occurrence of 5 or more IPY.
10 points	Design element improvement that address primary cause of collisions, with an avg. collision occurrence of 15 or more CPY.
14 points	Design element improvement that address primary cause of collisions, with an avg. injury occurrence of 10 or more IPY.
15 points	Design element improvement that address primary cause of collisions, with an avg. annual fatality rate greater than 0.5 FPY.

Avg = Average  
 CPY = Collisions per year  
 IPY = Injuries per year  
 FPY = Fatalities per year

**Total for all sections = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Project Category Descriptions:**

New Construction projects will include elements such as constructing a new roadway or widening the roadway to place additional lanes or turn lane, placing new sidewalks, new bike facilities or replacing existing facilities, addressing any deteriorated curbs or sidewalks, placing concrete intersections, new signals or upgrades to existing signals. Full reconstruction of the roadway is eligible as well as the addition to the roadway width while preserving the existing roadway section.

Reconstruction projects are intended to rebuild the full depth roadway section. Project includes replacing deteriorated curb and sidewalks, ADA improvements, installing or updating bike facilities, replacing asphalt intersections with concrete, updating ITS at the intersections, communication conduit, existing signal system improvements, sight distance improvements.

Preservation projects are intended to improve/preserve structural integrity of the existing roadway with no significant geometric improvements. These would include projects such as grind and overlays. It is reasonable that alternative mode improvements/preservation can occur but should be minor and less than five percent of the total cost.

Planning projects encompass transportation studies relating to infrastructure improvements including alleviating safety problems, addressing capacity issues or other enhancements.

**Project Key # and Name:**

**Jurisdiction:**

<b>STRUCTURAL CONDITION (15 MAX)</b>		
Is this a new facility?	5 Points	
If not, please describe the current structural condition of the existing facility.	0-10 Points	
How will the project address any existing facility design deficiencies or improve overall system performance measures? If so, please describe:	0-5 Points	
<b>Total:</b>		
<b>CAPACITY ISSUES (20 POINTS MAX)</b>		
Is this on a designated truck route?	10 Points	
2040 No Build V/C Ratio	0-5 Points	
2040 Build V/C Ratio	0-5 Points	
Please describe how the proposed improvements address traffic volume capacity issues. If it is a new route, please provide evidence of how this will alleviate capacity issues for other facilities.	0-5 Points	
<b>Total:</b>		
<b>ABILITY TO ADVANCE (50 POINTS MAX)</b>		
Is environmental 100% complete?	5 points	
Is Right-of-Way 100% complete?	5 points	
Is PE 100% complete?	5 points	
Are utility agreements in place?	3 points	
Does the project complete a missing or significantly deficient segment on the regional transportation system plan?	10 points	
Is this proposal a multi-jurisdictional project?	5 points	
Does this project have public support and the support of the sponsoring jurisdiction's Council/commission?	15 points	
Is the proposal identified in the MTP, local transportation plan or jurisdictions comprehensive plans?	5 points	
<b>Total:</b>		
<b>ALTERNATIVE MODES/MOBILITY (10 POINTS MAX)</b>		
Does this project add or enhance pedestrian facilities (beyond ADA)?	0-2 Points	
Does this project add or enhance bike facilities? Is this project on a current or proposed bike route? Does this project enhance connections to key destinations?	0-2 Points	

**Project Key # and Name:**

**Jurisdiction:**

Is this project on a bus route? If yes, has this project been coordinated with Citylink?	0-2 Points	
Does this project improve the safe and efficient movement of Freight and Goods? If yes, please explain how this will be accomplished within the project.	0-5 Points	
<b>Total:</b>		
<b>SAFETY (20 POINTS MAX.)</b>		
Existing Conditions: Based on average rate of collisions per million vehicles	0-5 Points	
Safety Improvements: Based on addressing identified safety needs (15 Points Max.)	0-15 Points	
<b>Total:</b>		
<b>Total for all Sections:</b>		