September 22, 2014

Charles Rountree, Chairman  
COMPASS Board of Directors  
700 NE 2nd St., Ste. 200  
Meridian, ID 83642

Dear Chairman Rountree:

Thank you for your letter of September 16. The Transportation Board members appreciate receiving comments from our partners.

The District 3 staff made changes to the draft FY15-19 Idaho Transportation Investment Program to include more safety projects. With our emphasis on safety, we were pleased that additional safety projects could be funded; however, we apologize for the inconvenience this caused. Staff should have consulted with you and followed the proper procedures. We believe that has been addressed. New steps are being developed in an effort to improve coordination and communication with the COMPASS staff.

The board respectfully declines your offer to meet with the COMPASS Executive Committee on a regular basis. The board members believe the proposed training from FHWA on the MPO’s and state department’s roles would be beneficial for staff. We encouraged Chief Operating Officer Jim Carpenter and appropriate staff to attend that training. Please work with District 3 Engineer Amy Revis on scheduling FHWA’s presentation.

Hopefully the steps staff identified and your proposed training will improve the coordination and cooperation between the two agencies. We value your partnership and want to improve and enhance our relationship.

Sincerely,

Jerry Whitehead  
Chairman  
Idaho Transportation Board

Julie DeLorenzo  
District 3  
Idaho Transportation Board
September 16, 2014

Mr. Brian Ness, Director
Idaho Transportation Department
PO Box 7129
Boise, Idaho 83701

Re: IT Board Policy 4011 and Administrative Policy 5011

Dear Director Ness:

The Idaho Transportation Board (IT Board) packet for September 18, 2014, includes several IT Board and Administrative Policies with draft language for revisions.

Policies 4011 and 5011, regarding the State Investment Program and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs, were also on the Board’s agenda on May 22, 2014. At that time, I sent a letter to you dated May 20, 2014, with concerns and suggestions about the policies; a copy is attached for your review.

I appreciate that some of the suggestions were addressed in the September 18, 2014, IT Board packet. However, there are still several areas of serious concern:

Coordination between Transportation Investment Programs
United States code and regulations (23 USC §134, 23 USC §135, and 23 CFR Part 450) require that the Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) mirror each other. The attached letter included suggestions to cooperate with MPOs, where appropriate, in selecting projects for the ITIP and TIP.

Federal regulations direct that “the STIP shall be developed in cooperation with the MPO designated for the metropolitan area” and “in consultation with affected non-metropolitan local officials” (23 CFR § 450.216(b) and (c)).

It has become increasingly difficult to maintain correlation between the ITIP and regional TIP. Coordination efforts should occur between ITD and MPOs through all stages of the ITIP development, including mid-year, end-of-year and redistribution.

For additional clarification, the Legal Authority to Board Policy 4011 and Administrative Policy 5011 should reference 23 USC § 135 – Statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning.

Redistribution of Obligational Authority
As written, the redistribution policies on lines 79-84 of draft Board Policy 4011 and lines 163-168 of draft Administrative Policy 5011 only address projects for advancement. It should be made clear that Redistribution of Obligational Authority may also be used on an existing local project.
Project Delivery
The hard annual deadline (August 1) to submit local projects for obligation will help ensure local projects are completed in a timely manner. However, the deadline also spurs the need for local projects to have priority standing equal to state projects under various review processes. Past practices held local projects hostage to the time constraints imposed by ITD Headquarters and District staff, causing unavoidable delays in moving projects forward. State/local agreements, environmental reviews, and final reviews need to be completed by ITD staff in an expedited manner.

If you have questions about our concerns, please contact me. I appreciate your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Stoll
Executive Director

Enclosure

pc:  Mr. Jerry Whitehead, IT Board Chairman
    Ms. Julie DeLorenzo, IT Board Member, District 3
    IT Board Members
    COMPASS Board Members
    MPO Directors

DM/TT/nb  T:\Permanent\Resources\ITDPolicy\140918Ltr8dPolicies-4011-5011.docx
May 20, 2014

Mr. Brian Ness, Director
Idaho Transportation Department
P O Box 7129
Boise, ID 83701

Topic: Draft Board and Administrative Policies 4011, 4069, 5011, and 5069

Dear Director Ness:

The Idaho Transportation Board (IT Board) packet for May 22, 2014, includes several IT Board and Administrative Policies with draft language for revisions. In reviewing the policies several concerns were identified, resulting in the following suggestions.

**State Investment Program and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs**

Board Policy 4011 states the IT Board shall select the projects to be included in the State Investment Program. Because United States Code requires that the Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) mirror each other, COMPASS offers the following suggestions:

Draft Board Policy 4011

- **Lines 61-62** – “The Idaho Transportation Board shall select the projects to be included in the Program based on realistic plans and estimates of funding and other resources, and in cooperation with metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), as appropriate.”

- **Lines 75-77** – “Otherwise, mid-year changes...major scope change to an existing project requires Board consent and cooperation with MPOs, as appropriate.”

- **Lines 82-84** – As written, the redistribution policy will only be considered for advancement. We request consideration of additional funding for an existing project as well as advancement of construction: “Projects to be considered for additional funding or advancement on the local system shall be ready for advertisement, including with all agreements and local match...for prioritization and Board approval. Projects for advancement shall also be ready for advertisement.”

Draft Administrative Policy 5011

- **Lines 74-75** – Project Delivery. This section documents directive for ITD District Engineers to submit Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) packages one year prior to the start of the scheduled fiscal year. Currently, many state/local agreements are not drawn up until half-way into the fiscal year or later, creating a challenging timeline for local projects to deliver. We request language that local projects receive state/local agreements for design and construction in a timely manner to encourage the PS&E for local projects to also be submitted early.
• Lines 118-122 – Clarification is needed on how local projects with funding needs will be included in re-programming unused budget amounts.

• Lines 130-135 – This section states that the Engineering Services Division Administrator shall commit all unused annual OA to priority projects, but it does not define what constitutes a priority.

• Lines 139-141 – We request consideration of additional funding for an existing project as well as advancement of construction: “Projects to be considered for additional funding or advancement on the local system shall be ready for advertisement, including with all agreements and local match...for prioritization and Board approval. Projects for advancement shall also be ready for advertisement.”

• Lines 146-150 – The current end-of-year plan would be changed to a statement, with only reports of what happened after the fact. This section also removes language for prioritization of cost increases for projects already under construction. We request additional IT Board interaction in the process prior to action occurring, and that language regarding cost increases remain in the policy.

Corridor Planning for Idaho Transportation Systems
As described in lines 43-46 of draft Board Policy 4069, corridors are broad geographic areas served by multiple transportation modes within and between regions. MPOs play a unique role facilitating cooperation and collaboration in the most populous regions in the state, and should be actively involved in corridor planning processes within their respective planning areas. MPOs also reflect ITD project priorities in their respective transportation improvement programs. Suggested changes:

Draft Board Policy 4069:
• Lines 54-55 – “Involve local land use, highway jurisdictions, MPOs and other stakeholders...;”

• Lines 66-72 – “Corridor plans...state long-range transportation plans and district transportation plans, as well as regional long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs.”

Draft Administrative Policy 5069:
• Lines 30-31 – “Enlist close cooperation with all governmental agencies having road jurisdiction and/or land use authority to promote a community-based planning effort, including MPOs, where appropriate.”

• Lines 53-54 – “Ensure that all local and regional governmental agencies, the private sector, stakeholders, and the general public are involved...”

• Lines 68-69 – “Encourage local and regional governmental agencies to incorporate corridor plans into their comprehensive or long-range plans and future acquisitions maps.”

• Lines 100-101 – “Assist local and regional agencies in local corridor planning, with priority given to routes...;”

• Lines 108-111 – “...prioritize recommended improvements for placement in the Idaho Transportation Investment Program and appropriate regional transportation improvement programs.”

• Lines 130-131 – “The entity initiating the plan (consideration as to whether a local or regional agency, private sector party, Idaho Transportation Department, etc., initiates a study).”
If you have questions about our concerns, please contact me. I appreciate your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Stoll
Executive Director

pc: Mr. Jerry Whitehead, IT Board Chairman
   Ms. Julie DeLorenzo, IT Board Member, District 3
   IT Board Members
   COMPASS Board Members
   MPO Directors
September 16, 2014

Mr. Jerry Whitehead, Chair, Idaho Transportation Board
Idaho Transportation Department
PO Box 7129
Boise, Idaho 83704

Re: Joint COMPASS Executive Committee and Idaho Transportation Board Meetings

Dear Chairman Whitehead,

The Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) Board of Directors was unable to approve the FY2015-2019 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Ada and Canyon Counties at its September 15, 2014, meeting due to the recent disclosure by Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) staff that several significant federally funded projects were either removed, added, advanced, or delayed in the program by ITD staff. It appears ITD did not consult nor coordinate with COMPASS in these programmatic changes (see attachment). COMPASS solicited public comment on the draft TIP from August 11, 2014 – September 9, 2014. Since several of the proposed project changes are significant in nature, COMPASS must seek public comment again on the draft TIP per the COMPASS Public Involvement Policy and federal regulations. COMPASS staff will coordinate with ITD District 3 to provide explanation for each proposed project change within the draft TIP for the public comment process. The COMPASS Board of Directors will consider approval of the draft FY2015-2019 TIP for Ada and Canyon Counties at its October 20, 2014, meeting.

Over the past several years, there have been a number of instances of a lack of coordination/consultation between ITD and COMPASS in our shared planning and programming processes, which cause the COMPASS Board of Directors concern. It is our belief that improving communication between the two agencies and understanding of shared responsibilities can help minimize these conflicts.

To this end, the COMPASS Executive Committee requests semi-annual meetings between the COMPASS Executive Committee and Idaho Transportation Board. It would be best to schedule these joint meetings around the Idaho Transportation Board’s meetings in Boise to maximize participation of the local elected officials on the COMPASS Executive Committee and Idaho Transportation Board members. We recommend that the first meeting of the two groups be held in conjunction with the Idaho Transportation Board’s meeting in Boise on October 15, 2014. At that meeting, we request a presentation by the Federal Highway Administration – Idaho Office regarding “Metropolitan Planning Organizations and State Transportation Department Roles in the Programming Process.”
If the Idaho Transportation Board or ITD staff have any questions regarding this request, feel free to contact Matt Stoll, COMPASS Executive Director, at (208) 475-2266.

Sincerely,

Charles Rountree
Chair, COMPASS Board of Directors

Enclosure

pc: COMPASS Board of Directors
   Idaho Transportation Board
   Pete Hartman, FHWA
   Brian Ness, ITD
Late Major Changes List
Draft FY2015-2019 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

For the purposes of this report, “major changes” are defined as projects that are new, removed, advanced, or delayed, as compared to the Draft FY2015-2019 released for public comment.

### Removed Roadway Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*H306</td>
<td>I-84, US 20/26 (Franklin Road) in Caldwell to Franklin Boulevard in Nampa (includes design in FY2015)</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$13,350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Add Roadway Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H340</td>
<td>US 20/26 and Franklin Road, Canyon County</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H344</td>
<td>SH-55, Overhead Message Sign Near Avamore, Ada County</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advanced Roadway Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*H311</td>
<td>I-84, Sand Hollow Interchange, Canyon County</td>
<td>2019 to 2018</td>
<td>$8,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12364</td>
<td>Capital Vehicle Purchase, VRT, Nampa – FY2017 FY2016 (combined with KN 13957)</td>
<td>2017 to 2016</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13957</td>
<td>Capital Vehicle Purchase, VRT, Nampa – FY2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delayed Roadway Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C315</td>
<td>Cherry Lane, Linder Road to Meridian Road, Lighting Improvements, ACHD</td>
<td>2016 to 2017</td>
<td>$514,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Re-scope Roadway Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H324</td>
<td>US 20/26 and Farmway Road Intersection, Canyon County (Convert to major intersection improvements.)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13476</td>
<td>SH-55 (Eagle Road) and SH-44 Intersection, Eagle (Convert to major intersection improvements and delayed. Project in Early Development program.)</td>
<td>2017 &quot;PD&quot;</td>
<td>$988,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13941</td>
<td>US 20/26, Meridian Road-and Locust Grove Road Intersections, Meridian (Removed Meridian Road intersection and advance)</td>
<td>2018 2017</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects for Consideration in Statewide Competitive Program (Strategic Initiatives):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H310</td>
<td>I-84B, Curb Ramp Improvements, Canyon County</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H322</td>
<td>SH 44, SH 16 to Linder Road, Between Eagle and Star</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>$4,995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H323</td>
<td>SH-55 (Karcher Road) and Hoskins, Pride, and Riverside, Canyon County</td>
<td>PD 2019</td>
<td>$1,595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13921</td>
<td>US 20/26, Smeed Parkway to Middleton Road, Caldwell</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects submitted for competitive selection, and only those remaining are considered funded. KN 13921 remains in Early Development program with construction unfunded.
### New Transit Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**NEW1</td>
<td>Transit – Vehicle Replacement Parma, EOA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**NEW2</td>
<td>Transit – Vehicle Replacement, Kuna Senior Center</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**NEW3</td>
<td>Transit – Vehicle Replacement Melba, EOA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New project for FY2015-2019 TIP cycle, but removed before final.

**These rural FTA 5339 projects were selected for funding through statewide competitive process through ITD. Although they were supposed to coordinate through the MPO, ITD’s process did not include MPO coordination.
September 5, 2014

Matt Stoll, Executive Director
Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho
700 NE 2nd Street, Suite 200
Meridian, Idaho 83642

RE: Potential TIP changes due to Redistribution

Dear Mr. Stoll:

The Idaho Transportation Department would like to formally inform the COMPASS Board of potential changes to the FY2014-2017 TIP based on any Redistribution of Obligation Authority (OA) not used by Other States that Idaho may receive. Please note that a similar agenda item was presented and approved by the IT Board at their August meeting and included the below listed projects that are located in either Ada County or Canyon County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KeyNo</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Not Obligated ($1000's)</th>
<th>Fed Share ($1000's)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12347</td>
<td>STATE, FY15 D3 SIGN UPGRADES</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12343</td>
<td>I 84, FY15 D3 PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13022</td>
<td>STATE, FY15 D3 GUARDRAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13456</td>
<td>I 84, FY15 D3 RAMP PROJECTS</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12341</td>
<td>STATE, FY15 D3 BRIDGE DECK LIFE EXTENSION</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13030</td>
<td>SH 45, DEER FLAT TO I 84 B, NAMPA</td>
<td>10,732</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13035</td>
<td>I 84, BRIDGE REPAIR, BOISE</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>Advance from FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13057</td>
<td>I-84, MERIDIAN IC TO FIVE MILE RD</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2014 CN, Cost Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the amount of redistribution is known and ITD is able to make a determination as to which projects funding shall be applied to, the Division of Engineering Services shall contact COMPASS and inform them of the outcome of any projects affected within the Boise urbanized area.
Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to present this at the COMPASS Board meeting in September. If you have any additional concerns, please contact myself at 334-8301.

Sincerely,

Amy Revis, PE
District 3 District Engineer