



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

May 19, 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 April 14, 2016 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. April 2016 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report
 - b. Draft Policy on Staff Annual Compensation Policy - Comparisons
- 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 Project(s) Transit and Facility Updates – Jody Bieze
 - b. Kootenai County Urban and Specialized Transit Monthly Report – Jody Bieze
 - c. Coeur d Alene Tribe Rural Transit Report – Alan Eirls
- 8. Other Business**
 - a. Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) – Board Decision and Direction
- 9. Director's Report** (written report included in Board packet)
- 10. Board Member Comments**
- 11. Next Meeting – June 9, 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
May 19, 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
Dick Panabaker	City of Hayden
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:

Kerri Thoreson	City of Post Falls
Fred Meckel	City of Rathdrum

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
Jody Bieze	Kootenai County
Kimberly Hobson	Kootenai County
Ken Geibel	David Evans and Associates
Dwight Schock	David Evans and Associates
Steve Wilson	Coeur d'Alene Chamber
Alan Eirls	Citylink, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Diane Fountain	Lakes Highway District
Christopher DeLorto	HDR
Brian Walker	Coeur d'Alene Press

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 conflicts of interest declared.

Mr. Rod Twete moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Terry Werner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

3. Approval of April 14, 2016 KMPO Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Marc Eberlein moved to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2016 KMPO Board meeting. Mr. Dick Panabaker seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Chair Mangan concurred.

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

There were no public comments.

5. KCATT Recap & Recommendations – No Recommendations This Month

6. Administrative Matters

a. April 2016 KMPO Expenditures & Financial Report

Mr. Miles noted the office lease was through Global Realty Advisors; they had changed their name to Castle Properties, Inc. The “Total Cash less Liabilities” amount on the second page of the May Director’s Report was corrected to \$42,321.25.

Mr. Marc Eberlein moved to approve the expenditures for April 2016. Mr. Dick Panabaker seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. Draft Policy on Staff Annual Compensation Policy – Comparisons

Based on the discussion last month, Mr. Miles reached out to the Cities of Coeur d’Alene, Hayden, and Post Falls. He reviewed their responses which were incorporated in the memo included in the Board packet. The draft policy looks at what local jurisdictions have done.

Chair Mangan noted Mr. Gookin had originally raised the compensation policy issued.

Mr. Gookin wanted to ensure there was justification. Mr. Miles concurred.

Mr. Dan Gookin moved to adopt the draft Policy. Mr. Rod 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. Kootenai County Project(s) Transit and Facility Updates – Jody Bieze

Ms. Bieze provided an update on the Service and Fare Equity Analysis. To date, the transit center concept, data collection, ridership surveys, and existing service evaluation have been completed. Potential service alternatives and a fare feasibility analysis have begun. Fare recommendations are expected in July with implementation of the proposed fare expected March/April of 2017. The Intelligent Transit System (ITS) implementation is slated to begin in July/August.

The remaining updates were provided by Dwight Schock, David Evans and Associates, who has been involved with the Service and Fare Equity Analysis since its beginning last year.

Mr. Dwight Schock, David Evans and Associates, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Service and Fare Equity Analysis (SAFEA). Topics included service planning/concepts, fare collection concept, fares and fare roll-out, transit center and finalizing service concepts. Mr. Schock said, to date, they have been collecting data. He noted the existing service is consistent

with desired origins/destinations; however, the routes are difficult to understand, unpredictable, and too long. Existing routes and three service options were covered. Currently, there are 14 hours of service. Option A reduces operating hours significantly, but keeps costs at the current level; Option B maintains the hours per day, but increases operating costs more than 50%; and Option C increases the number of buses/operators, but increases operating costs more than 100%. Mr. Schock said are still analyzing the number of riders; the options are subject to adjustment as they analyze current/potential riders. Although it cannot be verified, ridership is estimated to be 160,000 per year and will be used as a baseline; the ITS will provide a better count of existing ridership. Mr. Schock said the County does plan to impose a fare. He reviewed the “low tech” and “higher tech” fare collection options. All options assume the fare recommendation, cashless system, and flat fare would be adopted. The fare amount will be part of the analysis and is to be determined. If the fare is imposed as planned, it will produce revenue they currently do not receive; however, it will not be enough to cover the operating system.

Chair Mangan questioned Mr. Schock about the distribution/accounting of paper fares and noted it would require service to distribution centers, auditing of the paper fares and proceeds from sales. If there were not strict controls, they would see a loss as fare tickets are a cash substitute and could be sold on the street. Chair Mangan stated it was a significant shift to go from a non-fare to a fare system. He asked Mr. Schock if the fare system was a basic concept or a proposed concept that had been approved by the County and accepted as the new system.

Mr. Schock spoke to Mr. Mangan’s concern noting distribution/accounting was an important part of the service. Verification would be an additional cost. Although part of service could be handled through a third party source, there would still need to be an audit/verification function to ensure cash flow matched fare media. Mr. Schock said the fare system had not been approved, but was under consideration; these are recommendations they, as consultants, are making to the County.

Mr. Eberlein stated the matter had not been brought before the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Panabaker stated the cost was a concern to the City of Hayden, questioned the purpose, and wondered what was currently not being done that would be better with the new system. He wondered if there was a demand and asked if citizens had been forced to walk because they could not get the service.

Mr. Schock replied “Yes,” and noted part of the work they had not yet done was a broader survey of the population to determine the number of people who might take the bus if the system was improved. The new system would provide a greater level of predictability and be easier for riders/potential riders to take advantage of; people may not be choosing to take the bus because of the wait and/or length of the ride.

Ms. Bieze stated the current investment for the ITS had been paid for; they have that capital cost. She said the ITS system is speaking to the capital increase – grant funds that have already been identified for the funding of those types of capital expenditures.

Mr. Schock explained the reasons for presenting the low and high tech approaches. He noted the low tech option ties most of its cost in with the ticket vending machines. To some extent, those are optional, but they need a way to allow people to purchase tickets relatively easy.

Mr. Schock stated the County owned property at Riverstone for the transit center; the center would act as a hub where all routes come together. He discussed staged and ultimate build out options. Initial operation would require only part of the site; the ultimate build out includes more parking, bus lanes, and shelters. The design includes connection into trail and pedestrian access systems.

Mr. Ken Geibel, David Evans and Associates, further explained the reasoning behind the ultimate build out design which is more than is currently needed; the staged build out allows for expansion.

Mr. Schock concluded by saying their first step was to go through the service plan alternatives and come up with recommendations. They will also go through the fare implementation process and low/high tech fare collection concepts to determine if it should be phased, automated early on, or if the fare should be implemented at a lower tech alternative and assessed at a later time. Once the service plan and fare implementation concepts are in place, they will do a fare equity analysis as required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Mr. Schock said they need to ensure they are serving those who need to be served and provide them an opportunity to take advantage of the service. Results from different analyzes and information from the automated passenger count through the ITS purchase will provide the number of riders and the anticipated revenue from the system; this will be rolled into an implementation plan for the service and fare collection.

In response to Mr. Eberlein's question about the cost of the higher tech system, Mr. Schock stated they had not looked at it yet. They have looked at the low tech option which would include five machines at a cost of up to \$12,000 each – approximately \$60,000. Depending on the number of ticket vending machines, the purchase of media, negotiating various sales and distribution systems he expects the investment to be less than \$100,000. He recommended a joint purchase arrangement with other or multiple agencies to reduce equipment cost. Though not recommended, Mr. Schock noted the cost of the high tech system could be substantially more as vending machines can cost upwards of \$100,000 each. Bus fare boxes cost \$8,000 - \$10,000, but require significant maintenance and added operational expense.

Mr. Eberlein asked Mr. Schock if they had done any analyses “of keeping less than desirable people off of there...” If people have to purchase a bus ticket, they would more than likely be those who ride the bus on a regular basis. There have been issues with people riding the bus all day in order to stay warm.

Mr. Schock said they had not done that analysis, but were aware of the issue and the reason they were looking at the enforcement/evasion aspect. Having a fare will help the issue at the simplest level. They are looking at a fare policy that will include enforcement capabilities.

Chair Mangan referred to the timeline given in the presentation. The graph showed the Fare Equity Analysis/recommendations complete in October and the ITS implementation beginning late June/early July. He questioned if implementation could begin prior to the recommendation.

Mr. Schock said ITS could begin prior to recommendations; implementation of the fares could not.

Mr. Panabaker had a number of questions. He understood they had a timeline in order for the matter to be on the November ballot. Some of the answers were in the presentation. The City Council wanted more information prior to voting.

Ms. Bieze noted they had been working on the Service and Fare Equity Analysis for nearly nine months. This was to address the service as well as the fare; that is something they were required to do. Ms. Bieze clarified Kootenai County and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe own the transit center property.

b. Kootenai County Urban and Specialized Transit Monthly Report – Jody Bieze

Ms. Kimberly Hobson reported the cost of the fixed route was \$3.40 per rider in March; there were 13,034 riders in April. Paratransit (MV) had a cost of \$24.80 per rider in February; there were 1,339 riders in April. Kootenai Health had 2,018 riders in April. The contract for the Paratransit buses had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners; the buses are expected to

arrive in September. They have been talking with the cities regarding the Service and Fare Equity Analysis; public meetings will be held. Ms. Hobson said there was a positive outlook on what was going on especially in regard to the fare; she expected people to be against it. Data collection on the route and system analysis is nearly complete. Route alternatives are going to be formalized. RFPs on the Intelligent Transit System (ITS) are due next week.

c. Coeur d'Alene Tribe Rural Transit Report – Alan Eirls

Mr. Alan Eirls reported ridership was approximately 1,000 less in the rural area than last month; this is consistent with having one less day in the month. Although there were no accidents, there was a deer strike on US 95; the incident is expected to cost approximately \$10,000. They are in the process of issuing an RFP to purchase two full size buses and a smaller bus to be used within the system. It has been a quiet month.

8. Other Business

a. Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) – Board Decision and Direction

Chair Mangan understood representatives from area Chambers of Commerce may be present to address the Board.

Mr. Steve Wilson, Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce, was present to report on their Public Policy Committee. They have had the opportunity to discuss the matter during their last two meetings. The RPTA concept has been met with a warm reception and believed to be worthy of good public debate which can happen through the election process. He urged the KMPO Board to move the matter through the debate process.

Chair Mangan noted the matter had been put off a month so each of the Board members could assess where their jurisdictions were on the issue. He opened the matter up for discussion and asked the discussion be kept relevant to the subject of the RPTA. There were no comments.

Chair Mangan said he would entertain a motion that would request the Kootenai County Commissioners to place a Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) ballot measure on the November 2016 general election ballot in order for the citizens of Kootenai County to decide whether a countywide RPTA should be formed and included in this motion, we would authorize staff to provide assistance in the collection, development, and implementation of public information materials to inform and educate the public about an RPTA.

Chair Mangan requested Board members' vote be on record.

Chair Mangan made the motion as stated above. Mr. Jim Kackman seconded the motion.

Mr. Kackman said it might be difficult to defend a position against allowing the voters to decide how they want public transit to operate in Kootenai County. This is simply a recommendation that the Commissioners take an action and the reason for his second of the motion.

Mr. Panabaker commented that they were not against the voters having the opportunity to vote on the matter as it was the proper way for it to be done; their concern was simply financial.

Mr. Eberlein stated he had heard concerns from Chambers of Commerce and City Councils about how an RPTA would be paid for. Kootenai County currently acts as the holder of the funds and various jurisdictions contribute. He believed the City Councils would have to embrace an RPTA because it will be a voluntary contribution. At this point, he had not heard of any City Councils making a commitment either way.

Chair Mangan echoed Mr. Eberlein’s comment noting the allocations from various jurisdictions were voluntary; he had not heard any news that the contributions would be made mandatory. He believed each jurisdiction, particularly the City Councils, should look at the service being provided to their residents and take that into account when making their decision. Chair Mangan would like to move the decision up to the County level. If they want a public transportation system in the years to come, it will have to be an organization dedicated to operating and planning that system.

Mr. Kackman said the jurisdictions may want to consider the issue of governance. Without an RPTA, a jurisdiction involved with public transit may have a grievance, but no seat on a policy board to get the policy decision addressed or resolved.

Mr. Panabaker said apart from it being voluntary, he found it hard to believe that anybody that is receiving the service, which the City of Hayden is, would quit; he felt that would be unreasonable. Mr. Panabaker said he was just asked to bring information back to the City before they make a decision; he is not the Council.

Mr. Gookin stated the City of Coeur d’Alene was reluctant to commit one way or the other. Just because it may be a no vote or may not go before the public now, does not preclude it from going to the public in the future when, in his opinion, the need or expense are greater. He commented that he was reminded of what Coeur d’Alene Councilman McEvers said during their meeting, “...you have a bus system that has two tiny routes and that is it.” Mr. Gookin said Councilman McEvers did not see the point, at this point in time, of creating a “new level of bureaucracy” to administer what is already being done. Although they can argue representation, one of the things he did not want to do when he became an elected official was grow government. Mr. Gookin said he was okay with the way it is and thought his Council would like him to vote against it.

Chair Mangan stated they would move to a vote and requested a roll call be taken.

East Side Highway District – No
Kootenai County – Recuse
City of Hayden – No
Coeur d’Alene Tribe – Yes
Post Falls Highway District – No

Lakes Highway District – Aye
ITD – Yes
City of Coeur d’Alene – No
Worley Highway District – Yes

Yes – 4
No – 4
Recuse – 1

Chair Managan stated the motion failed.

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

KCATT had been provided the draft Highway 41 Corridor Study Update; the committee is currently reviewing the document.

Mr. Miles has been assisting the City of Hayden with their City Impact Fee Ordinance which will be going to their City Council in the near future.

The KMPO draft budget and work program will be put together during June and July.

10. Board Member Comments

There were no Board member comments.

11. Next Meeting – June 9, 2016

12. Adjournment

There being nothing further before the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization Board, Chair Mangan adjourned the May 19, 2016 meeting without objection.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Recording Secretary