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Executive Board Meeting Agenda - AMENDED
Monday, February 03, 2020
11:00 AM
VRT Board Room – 700 NE 2nd Street – Meridian, Idaho

I. CALLING OF THE ROLL

II. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Comments will be limited to no more than three (3) minutes.)

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are Action Items and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless an Executive Board Member requests the item be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed under Action Items.

A. Minutes of the January 6, 2020 Executive Board Meeting Θ Pages 4-10
   The Executive Board is asked to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2020 meeting.

V. FINANCE COMMITTEE

A. ACTION: Local Cost Allocation Θ Pages 11-21 Jill Reyes
   The Executive Board is asked to review and consider approval of Resolution VEB20-002 Local Cost Allocation Methodology outlining the new methodology for use in discussions with funding partners, and in preparation of funding requests for the FY21 budget.

VI. EXECUTIVE BOARD - ACTION ITEMS

A. ACTION: Children's Walking and Biking Infrastructure Program Θ Pages 22-24 Kelli Badesheim
   The Executive Board will consider supporting legislation being introduced this session by the Idaho Walk Bike Alliance to create a permanent Children's Walking and Biking Infrastructure Program, and establish a fund for future monies to be deposited.

VII. EXECUTIVE BOARD – INFORMATION ITEMS

A. INFORMATION: Building Accessible Capacity Draft Specialized Transportation Technical Analysis Θ Pages 25-43 David Pederson
   Staff will present a draft of the Specialized Transportation Analysis for Executive Board questions and input.

B. INFORMATION: Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Draft Policy Θ Pages 44-48 Dave Meredith
The Executive Board will have the opportunity to review and comment on the Public Transportation Agency Safety Program (PTASP) draft policy.

C. **INFORMATION: Procurement Calendar**  
The most current procurement calendar has been included in the packet for your information.

D. **INFORMATION: Staff/Department Reports**  
The most current staff/department reports have been included in the packet for your information.

VIII. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**  
The Executive Board may convene into Executive Session at this time Pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206, identifying one or more of the specific paragraphs a) Personnel Hiring, b) Personnel Issues, c) Land Acquisition, d) Records Exempt from Public Disclosure, e) Trade Negotiations, f) Pending/Probable Litigation, i) Insurance Claims, j) Labor Contract, I.C. 74-206(1).  

An action by the Executive Board may follow the Executive Session.

IX. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Θ = Attachment**  
Agenda order is subject to change.

**NEXT VRT EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING:**  
**March 2, 2020**  
VRT Boardroom  
700 NE 2nd Street  
Meridian, ID 83642

**Mission Statement:** Valley Regional Transit’s mission is to leverage, develop, provide, and manage transportation resources and to coordinate the effective and efficient delivery of comprehensive transportation choices to the region’s citizens. (ValleyConnect 2.0 Plan approved 04/02/18)

Arrangements for auxiliary aids and services necessary for effective communication for qualified persons with disabilities or language assistance requests need to be made as soon as possible, but no later than three working days before the scheduled meeting. Please contact Mark Carnopis, Community Relations Manager at 258-2702 if an auxiliary aid is needed.
Executive Board Meeting Minutes  
Monday, January 06, 2020  
11:00 AM  
VRT Board Room – 700 NE 2nd Street – Meridian, Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS ATTENDING</th>
<th>MEMBERS ABSENT</th>
<th>OTHERS PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke Cavener, City of Meridian</td>
<td>Dave Bieter, City of Boise</td>
<td>Kelli Badesheim, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Clegg, City of Boise</td>
<td>Darin Taylor, City of Middleton</td>
<td>Mark Carnopis, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dale, Canyon County Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paula Cromie, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evans, City of Garden City, phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregg Eisenberg, First Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Goldthorpe, ACHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Fotsch, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hill, Boise State</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maureen Gresham, Commuteride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Kling, City of Nampa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Haukkala, COMPASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lincoln, ACCHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Hansen, Dist. #1 ACHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Nancolas, City of Caldwell, phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Hassard, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Head, ACHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Hernandez, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Hunt, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Jakovac, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Jedry, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaite Justice, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaytlyn Marcotte, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Meredith, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Moran, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Beth Nutting, RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Pedrosa, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Pidjeon, Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Schick, VRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Steed, RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Stoll, COMPASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrie Washington, First Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALLING OF THE ROLL – Elaine Clegg called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. with a quorum present, by phone and in person.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES - David Lincoln moved to change the agenda to move item VI-B before item IV-A. Debbie Kling seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION: Electric Bus and Infrastructure Procurement
Todd Lakey, legal counsel, updated the Executive Board on Idaho Code for procurement. (Transcript attached) Following discussion, Debbie Kling made a motion to recommend for approval to the Board the contract with Proterra for the procurement of electric bus and infrastructure, with the stipulation the contract be available to the Board prior to the final decision; Greg Hill seconded. The motion passed.
PUBLIC COMMENTS – Ken Pidjeon spoke regarding the electric bus procurement.

At this time the meeting was turned over to Chairman Tom Dale.

CONSENT AGENDA
Items on the consent agenda consisted of the following:

- Approve Minutes of the December 2, 2019 Executive Board Meeting
- Main Street Station Janitorial Services

Elaine Clegg moved to approve all items on the consent agenda; Greg Hill seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

FINANCE COMMITTEE - None

EXECUTIVE BOARD - ACTION ITEMS
ACTION: Review Officer Succession and 2020 Nominations Kelli Badesheim
Kelli Badesheim discussed officer succession and open positions for 2020. Elaine Clegg moved to recommend to the Board, David Lincoln as vice-chair and Luke Cavener as the secretary treasurer for the Executive Board open position; Debbie Kling seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair/Canyon: Tom Dale Canyon County Commission
Chair-Elect/Ada: Elaine Clegg City of Boise
Vice-Chair/Canyon: David Lincoln ACCHD
Sec-Treas/Ada: Luke Cavener City of Meridian

INFORMATION: Innovative Bike Share Project
Dave Fotsch provided a status report on the Innovative Bike Share procurement.

INFORMATION: Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Policy
A memo was included in the packet for information.

INFORMATION: Procurement Calendar
The most current procurement calendar was included in the packet for information.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 11:52

NEXT VRT EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING:
February 3, 2020
VRT Boardroom
700 NE 2nd Street
Meridian, ID 83642
Transcript of Discussion with Todd Lakey, Legal Counsel on Electric Bus and Infrastructure

Todd Lakey: Okay great, thanks Kelli and Madam Chair and Executive Board. I appreciate the adjustment in your schedule to accommodate mine a little bit. Can everybody hear me okay?

(Audience replied yes.)

Elaine Clegg: Thanks for being here, Todd.

Todd Lakey: Okay, sure, sure, happy to. So, this is...Kelli asked that I look into the competitive grant request and selection process regarding the electric buses and particularly how it may comply with Idaho Code.

I want to start out last year the Legislature passed Senate Bill N-47 which was a change to the type of procurement statutes. It took the old language from Idaho Code 67-2807 and pulled it out and replaced it with new language. The new language allows local government entities to meet the Idaho Code procurement requirements by doing so by cooperative agreements with other governmental entities. The intent was to broaden the ability of local government entities to participate in purchasing processes that other governmental entities have either completed already or doing so cooperatively with them.

The previous language limited, before it was changed, limited it to Idaho political subdivisions in the State of Idaho or to certain nonprofit associations. The new language changed that and added that other governmental entities, not specifically limited to Idaho, and then also associations, thereof and cooperative purchasing programs.

The matter we have before us, as far as the grant for electric buses, this involves a competitive federal grant application for the purchase of these electric buses and the cooperative grant was issued by the Department of Transportation and the Federal Transit Administration. It specifically talks about partner or joint applications, which is the type of application we have with VRT entering into a partnership or joint cooperative application with Proterra, and both partner applications for the grant are evaluated in the competitive process by the FTA and that evaluation of both of them results in the selection decisions regarding the applications.

This particular grant was issued under a Federal Title Code 49-USC, Chapter 53 and 49-USC 5325 specifically states that a partner application process be competitive and open and that it would be conducted in a manner Secretary of Transportation. The Notice of Funding Opportunity, “NOFO,” for lack of a better acronym, was issued by the Department of Transportation and the FTA. And in that...so, that involved the Secretary of Transportation and that partnership and that application in the competitive application process satisfies the procurement requirements of 49-USC, Chapter 53, specifically in 49-USC 5325. That specifically states that in the notice of grant provided by the DOT and FTA.

The end result of that competitive process, VRT and Proterra were selected and any result of that selection is a cooperative agreement with the FTA where federal funds and VRT funds are used to purchase the electric buses. As I said, both VRT and Proterra were evaluated, federal codes states that
partnership application in competitive evaluation process with federal procurement requirements, and both VRT and Proterra are noted as being selected in the cooperative agreement we’ll have with the FTA. In my opinion, this satisfies the language in Idaho Code as far as the State side allows for purchasing by cooperative agreement. Again, this is new language from last year with other governmental entities and FTA and DOT being another governmental entity.

So, those are my thoughts. Madam Chair, I would be happy to answer any other questions you have.

Elaine Clegg: Questions? Mr. Goldthorpe.

Kent Goldthorpe: What protections do we have equal to a non-appropriation clause under this process?

Todd Lakey: Madam Chair and I’m not sure who I am talking to Board member wise, but...

Kent Goldthorpe: Goldthorpe

Elaine Clegg: Kent Goldthorpe

Todd Lakey: Commissioner Goldthorpe, the actual agreement itself, I haven’t seen that draft, we can evaluate whether that needs to be included or if it’s already in their standard form. I would...

Kent Goldthorpe: It’s not in the Virginia form.

(There was talking over the top of one another and not decipherable content)

Todd Lakey: failing to enter into the agreement, not the specific term, itself.

Kent Goldthorpe: Under the agreements that I’ve read, there is absolutely no clause that says that there’s ever a struggle who be litigated anywhere other than Virginia. I think that needs to be changed as well.

Todd Lakey: Sure. Madam Chair and Commissioner Goldthorpe I always prefer to have agreements being subject to the laws of the State of Idaho. That may depend on the willingness of the FTA and DOT to enter in.

Kent Goldthorpe: Well, this is just in regards to the fact that we are piggy-backing, or proposing to piggy-back off of Virginia’s purchasing agreement like we used to here in Idaho with WISKA and stuff like that. And, we have no choice if we do that, at least if that’s how I read the agreement where their bid package and I think that is absolutely crazy.

Elaine Clegg: Thank you, Commissioner Goldthorpe. I think Kelli would to comment.

Kelli Badesheim: So the procurement for the eight busses, we’re not proposing those would be under the Virginia agreement, so that would be because we don’t have to go under a cooperative agreement, we already have an agreement with FTA to partner with Proterra and procure the eight bases and that’s why they are separated out in the memo. We haven’t executed a contract yet, and that’s part of what we’re doing, is our diligence and will certainly look at anything in the Virginia agreement that we need to
and that’s part of why we’ve engaged legal counsel to make sure that we have all of our ducks in a row when it comes to the procurement process.

**Kent Goldthorpe:** Well, I would think the amount appropriation portion is like Procurement 101 stuff. I’ve never seen an agreement that doesn’t include it until now.

**Elaine Clegg:** Thank you Commissioner Goldthorpe. I guess I, Todd I will comment at this point. The City of Boise does this quite often and we regularly accept the conditions that are already in the agreement. I can certainly check with our legal counsel. I don’t think we have had any issue with that. As I understand it, in the terms of non-appropriation, correct me if I’m wrong, that proposing to do something still requires the final vote of the Board and that meets the non-appropriation clause if I’m not mistaken.

**Kent Goldthorpe:** I don’t believe they would have that in existence without it.

**Elaine Clegg:** Could we. Todd, could you comment on that?

**Todd Lakey:** Sure, Madam Chair, I haven’t reviewed this specific agreement, but we can look at including that language in it. I would think with this being a cooperative agreement with Virginia, its essentially discretionary on VRT’s part whether you’re going to purchase those busses. Virginia wouldn’t care one or the other and you would make sure prior to purchasing those buses and entering a contract you would have sufficient funds. But, that said, it’s probably no harm, no foul, to include that non-procurement, non-appropriation language in the agreement. I don’t think Virginia would have any concerns about that and it just provides that extra protection.

**Garret Nancolas:** Madam Chair?

**Elaine Clegg:** Yes. Is this Garret or John? Would you identify yourself, sorry.

**Garret Nancolas:** I’m sorry, Madam Chair, this is Garret.

**Elaine Clegg:** Okay.

**Garret Nancolas:** I’m not sure that the discussion regarding a purchase and non-appropriation clause is even relevant. The non-appropriation clause has to do with, for instance, a trash contract with the city for ten years with Republic Services, then of course we include the non-appropriation clause that if the Council does not approve funding the contract for trash service for the next year then the contract is void. We’ve never put that in a contract for purchasing anything. And, we’re a City. So, I’m not sure why that…the non-appropriation comes into extended contracts when services that extend beyond the existing year that you are in. And, that’s the way I have always understood it, that is the way our attorneys have advised us. I don’t know why a non-appropriations clause, because a contract is a contract for purchase, with specific terms. The Board approves that, authorize it, it’s in the budget. The budget is approved by the Board, so me, I don’t even know why that discussion is relevant where you’re purchasing something. If it’s an extended contract over a period of year, maybe, but not in an outright purchase.

**Todd Lakey:** Madam Chair, if I might add on to Mayor Nancolas’s comment. He’s correct, a non-appropriation clause typically deals with things that stretch over more than one budget year. As I’ve said, I haven’t reviewed this contract but if we are purchasing vehicles within this budget year and the
funds have already been appropriated for that purchase, then we wouldn’t need a non-appropriation clause.

**Elaine Clegg:** So if I could...I think Mayor Nancolas I believe, what the issue will be is if we enter into this cooperative agreement it would be over a period of years that we would actually purchase the bus...

**Kelli Badesheim:** The bus leases, it would be the bus leases for the batteries

**Elaine Clegg:** Battery leases would be over a period of years.

**Kelli Badesheim:** So, we would need to incorporate that which we have in all of our agreements.

**Elaine Clegg:** So in that part of it, where it would be over a period of years, it does make sense that we would do that. I certainly agree.

**Kent Goldthorpe:** That’s all I want to get in there.

**Garret Nancolas:** I thought it was just about the initial purchase so forget what I just said.

**Elaine Clegg:** No, no, that’s okay. This is a big contract. Other questions? I actually do have one, Todd. My questions is this, does contacting every vendor directly as we did before we entered into the partnership with the FTA NOFO, does that meet the requirement in the Idaho State Statute to publically notice.

**Todd Lakey:** Madam Chair, I would say that is kind of looking at it from a little bit more of a full course type of approach. I think the notice requirement would be met by the competitive federal grant process.

**Elaine Clegg:** Okay

**Todd Lakey:** They met the federal requirements for publication. They put it in the federal register and the other places that meet the federal requirements. If you’re meeting the federal competitive requirements and you have a cooperative agreement with the federal government that meets their requirements, then I think 57-2807 says you meet all those procurement requirements in Idaho Code. I think it is useful and helpful and just shows that we went through a particularly transparent process where every single electric bus manufacturer that exists was notified of the opportunity to enter into a partnership application with VRT. The fact that Proterra was the only responsive electric bus provider just provides some additional I guess transparency and openness and meets the requirement for full source, but I don’t think you have to go down that road to do what the federal cooperative agreement covers.

**Elaine Clegg:** Okay, thank you. I appreciate that. Any other questions. Hearing none, then will the action on this needs just to forward it to the full Board.

**Kelli Badesheim:** Yes to consider recommending to the Board of Directors approve the procurement of the buses, electric buses, and if there are any questions from the staff report, we’d be happy to answer those.
Elaine Clegg: Any questions from the staff report? Hearing none, I’d entertain a motion to recommend this to the full Board for approval.

Debbie Kling: So moved.
Elaine Clegg: So moved by Mayor Kling.

Greg Hill: Second


Kent Goldthorpe: Are we going to ask that before a final approval be given that the contracts be available to be examined?

Elaine Clegg: Sure

Kelli Badesheim: That can just be a part of the motion.

Elaine Clegg: We can just make that part of the motion if the maker agrees.

Debbie Kling: I agree and that it should obviously be reviewed by legal, but I think that is a standard process.

Elaine Clegg: Yes

Kelli Badesheim: Yes

Debbie Kling: You would have legal review the contract and it would be made available.

Kent Goldthorpe: That includes the maintenance as well.

Kelli Badesheim: Yes.

Elaine Clegg: Full agreement. Okay, so the motion is to recommend approval of the contract of the electric bus and infrastructure procurement to the full Board with the stipulation that the full contract be available for review prior to signing. All right any other questions. Hearing none, all those if favor.

Multiple Aye’s, one Nay
TOPIC: Local Cost Allocation Methodology

DATE: February 3, 2020

Summary:
In October of 2018, Valley Regional Transit (VRT) identified the need to update the local cost allocation methodology. VRT staff introduced an approach that would have three categories:

1. **General Assessment**: All overhead that cannot be directly associated with service levels or special projects.
2. **Service and Capital Allocation**: All general/base public transportation services and their associated capital costs.
3. **Special Allocation**: Any specific projects (capital or service) outside the base budget and their associated overhead.

This approach allocated those needs in a three step process:

1. Identify the local share: The costs for services or capital after accounting for directly generated and federal funds.
2. Categorize costs: Local costs are categorized into general assessment, special allocation or service and capital allocations.
3. Distribute costs: Categorized local costs are distributed among funding partners accordingly.

In subsequent presentations, the VRT Executive Board requested VRT staff to explore the impacts of the proposed allocation model, including finding an equitable and transparent way to fund the transit system today and provide for growth with the expectation that this process might produce a template for a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Resolution between VRT and its funding partners.

To assess the methodology and identify potential impacts, the FY 2020 Budget costs were allocated using the new methodology and resulting funding requests reviewed:

- **Impacts Overview (Tables 1a, 1b)**
  - An increase in requested contributions for a majority of members.
  - A decrease in requested contributions for the City of Boise.
  - A shift in costs from Ada County members to Canyon County members.

- **Impacts by Category (Tables 2a, 2b, 3)**
  - **General Assessment** contributions increased for all members. This is due to the updated categorization method which shifts some costs from service to general assessments.
  - **Service Contribution** changes varied. The costs of local routes are allocated to those members’ jurisdiction. Intercity or regional route costs are allocated by a share of revenue miles.
o **Capital Contributions** increased for Ada County and Garden City. The local share of capital costs were distributed among members with active service in the county (Ada, Garden City, and Boise). There are currently no capital costs distributed for Canyon County members.

o **Special Assessments** and **Enhancements** are not affected and continue to be assessed per project needs.

**Staff Recommendation/Request:**
Staff recommends the Board adopt Resolution VEB 20-002, outlining the new methodology for use in discussions with funding partners, and in preparation of funding requests for the FY21 budget.

**Implication (policy and/or financial):**
The updated local allocation methodology provides a transparent process to allocate overhead, capital, and maintenance costs across all jurisdictions. This will help the VRT Board and local governments understand the actual costs of services and support informed decision-making. Covering the full costs of services, including capital and maintenance, will lead to a more sustainable system and lower future operating costs if equipment is replaced and maintained more proactively.

**Highlights:**
- July 2018 – A financial analysis was presented to the Board and a recommendation to update the local allocation model was adopted.
- June 2018 – ValleyConnect 2.0 allocation methodology was presented to the Board.
- October 2018 – Executive Board released the proposed local allocation methodology to the local governments for comment.
- January 2019 – The VRT Board reviewed the implications of the new funding allocation.
- December 2019 – The new local allocation methodology was applied to the FY2020 budget. A summary of findings and issues was provided to the Executive Board. VRT reviewed the findings and continued to refine the methodology.
- February 2020 – VRT staff will propose a methodology and process that:
  1. identifies local funding needs;
  2. is responsive to the budgets and priorities of local jurisdictions;
  3. meets the needs of local jurisdiction budgetary process;
  4. provides opportunity for the public to comment on transit needs in their community; and
  5. equitably shares costs among funding partners

**More Information:**
*Local Cost Allocation Methodology*
*Comparison Summary Tables*

For detailed information contact: Jill Reyes, Planning Programmer, (208)-258-2707 jreyes@valleyregionaltransit.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>FY20 Requested ($)</th>
<th>FY20 Requested – New methodology applied ($)</th>
<th>Δ ($)</th>
<th>Δ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>62,693</td>
<td>149,557</td>
<td>86,864</td>
<td>138.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHD</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>39,984</td>
<td>51,537</td>
<td>11,553</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>66,605</td>
<td>82,042</td>
<td>15,437</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City Development Corp.</td>
<td>128,507</td>
<td>130,789</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boise</td>
<td>9,000,649</td>
<td>8,532,879</td>
<td>-467,770</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Eagle</td>
<td>128,419</td>
<td>131,570</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kuna</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
<td>736,857</td>
<td>750,825</td>
<td>13,968</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Star</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Garden City</td>
<td>135,806</td>
<td>186,043</td>
<td>50,236</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Development Coro.</td>
<td>68,654</td>
<td>70,132</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ada County</strong></td>
<td>10,385,827</td>
<td>10,108,459</td>
<td>-277,368</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>39,299</td>
<td>74,759</td>
<td>35,460</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County Highway District #4</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Caldwell</td>
<td>192,133</td>
<td>234,426</td>
<td>42,293</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Greenleaf</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melba</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>383,385</td>
<td>454,394</td>
<td>71,009</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Notus</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Parma</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilder</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Highway District #3</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Highway District #1</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus/Parma Highway District</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canyon County Total</strong></td>
<td>624,876</td>
<td>777,019</td>
<td>152,143</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td>11,010,703</td>
<td>10,885,478</td>
<td>-125,225</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1b: Comparison of FY20 Requested Contributions (only general and service/capital requests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>FY20 Requested ($)</th>
<th>FY20 Requested – New methodology applied ($)</th>
<th>Δ ($)</th>
<th>Δ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>47,693</td>
<td>134,557</td>
<td>86,864</td>
<td>182.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHD</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>39,984</td>
<td>51,537</td>
<td>11,553</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>66,605</td>
<td>82,042</td>
<td>15,437</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City Development Corp.</td>
<td>28,507</td>
<td>30,789</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boise</td>
<td>8,500,649</td>
<td>8,032,879</td>
<td>-467,770</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Eagle</td>
<td>13,449</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kuna</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
<td>148,673</td>
<td>162,641</td>
<td>13,968</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Star</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Garden City</td>
<td>135,806</td>
<td>186,043</td>
<td>50,236</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Development Coro.</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ada County</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,002,673</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,725,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>-277,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>39,299</td>
<td>74,759</td>
<td>35,460</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County Highway District #4</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Caldwell</td>
<td>192,133</td>
<td>234,426</td>
<td>42,293</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Greenleaf</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melba</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>383,385</td>
<td>454,394</td>
<td>71,009</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Notus</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Parma</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilder</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Highway District #3</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Highway District #1</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus/Parma Highway District</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canyon County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>624,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>777,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>152,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,627,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,502,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 $125,255 variance is due to an unallocated $130,542 requested service contribution and unallocated $5,320 of special assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>FY20 Requested ($)</th>
<th>FY20 Requested – New methodology applied ($)</th>
<th>Δ ($)</th>
<th>Δ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>329,682</td>
<td>408,867</td>
<td>79,185</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7,973,892</td>
<td>7,769,482</td>
<td>-204,410</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1,208,055</td>
<td>1,208,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>378,684</td>
<td>378,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements</td>
<td>1,004,470</td>
<td>1,004,470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Requested</td>
<td>10,894,783</td>
<td>10,769,558</td>
<td>-125,225</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$125,255 variance is due to an unallocated $130,542 requested service contribution and unallocated $5,320 of special assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>General ($)</th>
<th>Service ($)</th>
<th>Capital ($)</th>
<th>Special ($)</th>
<th>Enh. ($)</th>
<th>Unall* ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>31,506</td>
<td>94,817</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHD</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>46,405</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>76,910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City Development Corp.</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boise</td>
<td>125,446</td>
<td>6,644,822</td>
<td>1,172,348</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>90,263</td>
<td>8,532,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Eagle</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>105,470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kuna</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
<td>60,878</td>
<td>101,763</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169,184</td>
<td>419,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Star</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Garden City</td>
<td>6,498</td>
<td>152,072</td>
<td>27,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Development Coro.</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ada County</td>
<td>284,542</td>
<td>7,116,788</td>
<td>1,208,055</td>
<td>378,684</td>
<td>1,004,470</td>
<td>115,920</td>
<td>10,108,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>49,267</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County Highway District #4</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Caldwell</td>
<td>31,230</td>
<td>203,196</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>234,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Greenleaf</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melba</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Middleton</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>54,163</td>
<td>400,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>454,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Notus</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Parma</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilder</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Highway District #3</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Highway District #1</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus/Parma Highway District</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County Total</td>
<td>124,352</td>
<td>652,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>777,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unallocated funds included to balanced original requests that at the time of this analysis had not been allocated in the budget.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHD</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City Development Corp.</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Development Coro.</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County Highway Districts Group</td>
<td>$5,132.23</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> Canyon County Highway District #4</td>
<td>$1,473.97</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> Golden Gate Highway District #3</td>
<td>$1,042.97</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> Nampa Highway District #1</td>
<td>$1,701.19</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> Notus/Parma Highway District</td>
<td>$914.10</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alt Member</td>
<td>$30,793.37</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Cost Allocation Methodology

The local cost allocation methodology creates three categories to ensure that all costs are appropriately allocated and requested. Those categories and definitions are as follows:

1. **General Assessment**: All overhead that cannot be directly associated with service levels or special projects.
2. **Special Assessments**: Any specific project (capital or service) outside the base budget and their associated overhead costs.
3. **Service and Capital Contributions**: General/Base public transportation services and associated capital costs.

Once the total need is identified there are three basic steps to the cost allocation methodology:

**Identify Local Share**

1. Aggregate budget by division and department
2. Subtract expected federal share by division and department
3. Subtract expected directly generated funds by division and department
4. Identify local share needed by division and department

**Categorize Costs**

1. Identify how much of the local share by division and department will need to be categorized as General Assessment, Special Allocation or Service and Capital Allocation.
2. Categorize costs into General Assessment, Special Assessment or Service and Capital Contribution.

**Distribute Costs**

1. **General Assessment** (*Annual VRT Assessment*) costs are distributed based on jurisdictions’ share of the regional population for those partners with populations.
2. **General Assessments** for partners without populations are calculated as a percent of the total General Assessment budget. The fixed percentage of 7.35% as determined by last year’s contributions, is to be used to calculate future contributions. Members in this category share the costs equally unless otherwise noted.
3. **Special Assessments** are negotiated for the individual projects and programs they are to fund and may be assessed of any partner.
4. **Service and Capital Contributions** costs are distributed by share of service within each jurisdictions’ boundaries. The costs of local routes are allocated to the local member. Intercity or regional route costs are distributed by the share of revenue miles.
5. **Service and Capital Contributions** would not apply to those partners without jurisdictional boundaries. Those partners must contribute to these categories via a Special Assessment.
6. **Identify each partner’s requested contribution categorized as General Assessment, Special Assessment, and/or Service and Capital Contribution and build the cooperative agreement.**
The diagram below illustrates how the proposed allocation of Valley Regional Transit’s costs will take place over the course of each fiscal year and inform the following actions: 1. Annual funding requests  2. Annual Revenue Projections  3. Annual Budget

**Quarter 1: Cost Allocation**

**Service Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTERLY</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>Δ%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Development Plan**

**Local Priorities**

- **1. Identify Local Share**
- **2. Categorize Costs**
- **3. Distribute Costs Across Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Districts</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Corporations</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funding Partners</td>
<td>XX%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quarter 2: Annual Funding Requests**

**Quarter 3: Annual Revenue Projections**

**Quarter 4: Finalize and Approve Annual Budget**
EXECUTIVE BOARD RESOLUTION

Local Cost Allocation Methodology
RESOLUTION VEB20-002

BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF VALLEY REGIONAL TRANSIT APPROVING A METHODOLOGY FOR ALLOCATION OF OPERATING AND CAPITAL COSTS TO LOCAL MEMBERS AND INFORMS ANNUAL FUNDING REQUESTS.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Idaho Code, Chapter 21, Title 40, and as a result of the approval of the voters of Ada and Canyon Counties on November 3, 1998, a regional public transportation authority (now known as “Valley Regional Transit”) was created to serve Ada and Canyon counties; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Code § 40-2109(1) confers to Valley Regional Transit, as a regional public transportation entity, exclusive jurisdiction over all publicly funded or publicly subsidized transportation services and programs except those transportation services and programs under the jurisdiction of public school districts and law enforcement agencies within Ada and Canyon Counties; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Code § 40-2108(2) and (5) provide that Valley Regional Transit, as a regional public transportation entity, has power to raise and expend funds as provided in Idaho Code Chapter 21, Title 40 and to make contracts as may be necessary or convenient for the purposes of the Regional Public Transportation Authority Act; and

WHEREAS, The Valley Regional Transit Board of Directors adopted ValleyConnect 2.0 in April 2018; and

WHEREAS, VRT has identified a need to update the methodology and process by which annual funding requests are made to identify the fair share of costs by jurisdiction for both current and growth scenarios; and

WHEREAS, the Valley Regional Transit staff conducted research and analyzed multiple methods for an equitable distribution of costs amongst members, and provides the necessary funding to grow our transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the methodology will be used to allocate costs in the FY21 budget; and

WHEREAS, the methodology does not bind any member to the resulting funding requests, and is used solely as the basis for funding discussions, and as a template for the creation of funding agreements; and

VEB20-002
WHEREAS, staff determined that the methodology outlined in Exhibit A meets the aforementioned needs; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Code § 40-2109(5) provides that the Board of Valley Regional Transit may adopt resolutions consistent with law, as necessary, for carrying out the purposes of Chapter 21, Title 40, Idaho Code and discharging all powers and duties conferred to Valley Regional Transit Pursuant to Chapter 21, Title 40; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Valley Regional Transit has created an Executive Board, conferring specific authority upon it to discharge its powers, pursuant to Resolution VBD11-011.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF VALLEY REGIONAL TRANSIT:

Section 1.  That the Executive Board approves the Local Cost Allocation Methodology for application in FY21 funding allocations and requests.

Section 2.  That the Executive Board delegates authority to the Executive Director to finalize and execute the contract.

Section 3.  That this resolution shall be in full force and effective immediately upon its adoption by the Executive Board of Valley Regional Transit and its approval by the Executive Board Chair.

ADOPTED by the Executive Board of Valley Regional Transit, this 3rd day of February, 2020.

APPROVED by the Executive Board Chair this 3rd day of February, 2020.

ATTEST: __________________________  APPROVED: ______________________________

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT  CHAIR OF EXECUTIVE BOARD
RS#
Children’s Walking & Biking Infrastructure Program

Contact:
Lance Giles, 208-972-0972
Cynthia Gibson, 208-336-5821

Goal
Make it safer for Idaho’s children to walk and bike to schools, libraries and parks.

Issue
Too many crashes between motor vehicles and children that are walking or bicycling in Idaho.

What it does
Requires ITD to create and maintain a permanent Children’s Walking and Biking Infrastructure Program. In addition, the legislation would establish a fund for future monies to be deposited.

The Program would be a competitive grant program in which local communities could apply for funding to build walking and biking infrastructure projects like sidewalks and crosswalks to help children get to the places they need get to and from, especially schools, libraries and parks.

The Program will have the following four main criteria:

- Safety
- Mobility
- Project Readiness (Projects that are closer to the construction phase will have priority)
- Proximity to a School, Library or Park

The Program will be managed in a partnership with the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council, much like the highly successful and popular “Children Pedestrian Safety Program” that was funded by the now defunct “Surplus Eliminator.”

Who Supports the Legislation
The following organizations support the legislation:
- American Association of Retired People (AARP)
- American Council of Engineering Companies
- American Heart Association
- Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS)
- Idaho Association of Highway Districts
- Idaho Conservation League
- Idaho School Boards Association
- Idaho Smart Growth
- Idaho Walk Bike Alliance

Who We Worked With Developing the Legislation
We worked with the following organizations in developing the legislation and none of them have any objections:
- Idaho Transportation Department
- Local Highway Technical Assistance Council

Who is the Idaho Walk Bike Alliance?
The Idaho Walk Bike Alliance (IWBA) is a statewide organization that has been advocating for walking and biking safety and infrastructure for the past ten years. IWBA is based in Boise and has members throughout the entire state of Idaho. In recent years, IWBA has focused its efforts on improving the walking and biking infrastructure that used by children, such as sidewalks and crosswalks. IWBA believes these improvements will help children safely get to the places they need to go, like schools, libraries, and parks.
AN ACT

RELATING TO A CHILDREN'S WALKING AND BIKING INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM; AMENDING CHAPTER 5, TITLE 40, IDAHO CODE, BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SECTION 40-515, IDAHO CODE, TO ESTABLISH A CHILDREN'S WALKING AND BIKING INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 5, Title 40, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended by the addition thereto of a NEW SECTION, to be known and designated as Section 40-515, Idaho Code, and to read as follows:

40-515. CHILDREN'S WALKING AND BIKING INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM. (1) The Idaho Transportation Department shall establish and maintain a children's walking and biking infrastructure program. The purpose of the program is to fund pedestrian and bicycle projects that are proposed by the department's six (6) districts and local units of government. Proposed projects shall compete for children's walking and biking infrastructure program and selection and funding on a statewide basis based on the following categories:

(a) Safety;

(b) Mobility;

(c) Proximity to a school, library, or park; and

(d) Project Readiness.

(2) There is hereby created in the state treasury a fund to be known as the Idaho children's walking and biking infrastructure program fund, which shall consist of all funds made available to it from the state, private, and other sources. Interest earned on the investment of idle moneys in the Idaho children's walking and biking infrastructure program fund shall be paid to the Idaho children's walking and biking infrastructure program fund. Moneys in the fund shall be used for the purposes of this section as determined by the director or the director's designee. Sums from the fund may be used as necessary to offset an amount not to exceed five percent (5%) for the costs associated with administration of the children's walking and biking infrastructure program.

SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY. The provisions of this act are hereby declared to be severable and if any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is declared invalid for any reason, such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act.
TOPIC:  Building Capacity to Serve Accessible Rides
DATE:  January 27, 2020

Summary:
Valley Regional Transit (VRT) is working with a variety of partners and stakeholders to identify and address availability of accessible vehicles to meet the transportation needs of persons with disabilities. In addition, VRT is interested in building capacity to provide accessible same-day/on-demand rides through coordination of existing transportation services, including ACCESS, the ADA paratransit service required to be complementary to the ValleyRide fixed-route services in Ada and Canyon counties.

Over the last year, VRT has completed an internal review of accessible vehicles in the existing VRT shared vehicle pool. This has led to the procurement of five additional accessible vehicles for our partners to utilize. The objectives of the next phase include an evaluation of current conditions of the specialized transportation model; a determination on technology applications and operations approaches to support expanding accessible ride capacity in the region; and prioritization for future investments in services, capital and technology to achieve building capacity to serve passengers with disabilities more effectively.

VRT staff will establish a project team to support the next steps in the project. The RAC members participation is invaluable to consider the needs of riders as the final solutions are designed and moved forward in the process.

Staff Recommendation/Request:
Attached is a draft of the Specialized Transportation Analysis. The analysis includes findings and recommendation for consideration in this project. VRT staff seeks input from the RAC on the analysis including any insights they would offer on the next steps. The final draft will be provided to the RAC for an advisory recommendation to forward to the VRT Board in April 2020.

Implication (policy and/or financial):
The outcome of this project could potentially effect current services provided in the region. Current services include city of Boise taxi scrip program, VRT Late Night, Lyft Transit Connections, Rides to Wellness service in Ada County, as well as a planned expansion into Canyon County, services currently provided by senior centers in Parma, Kuna, Meridian, Star and Eagle, Harvest Church in Meridian, Metro Community Services in Caldwell, and Supportive Housing and Innovative Partnerships in Boise.

Highlights:
• Shared Vehicle Program review – 2019
• Analysis of existing specialized transportation services – In process
• Establish project team – February 2020
• Research technology designed to coordinate rides – March – May 2020
• Report findings and recommendations to increase capacity, which will include operational feasibility and costs – June 2020

More Information:
Leslie Pedrosa, Operations Director, 208-258-2713, lpedrosa@valleymetropolitantransit.org
Background/Summary: Valley Regional Transit (VRT) collaborates with senior centers, nonprofit agencies, various community organizations, and private transportation providers to offer rides to transportation dependent and some of our region's most vulnerable residents. VRT Specialized Transportation programs are either free or at a reduced fare making this very affordable for the riders.

The VRT Board of Directors adopted ValleyConnect 2.0 in 2018. The staff recognized at the time a need to develop more detail in the area of Specialized Transportation. The attached analysis serves as the “existing conditions” report for this work. The report will provide a foundation for building out projects in Specialized Transportation for the Transportation Development Plan (TDP), the five-year work program for VRT, demonstrating how VRT will invest in these important services. In addition, the analysis serves as background information for VRT’s current initiatives to expand Rides2Wellness in Canyon County, and build additional accessible transportation capacity in the region.

The attached analysis reviews the performance of three specialized transportation programs over the last three-year period, 2017, 2018 and 2019. The first half of the report is summary data on all the services. The last half of the report is the detailed data by program and service provider. VRT staff only included transportation provided in the region administered and coordinated through VRT. VRT is incorporating programs and services using federal funds to serve these populations (ie. job access transportation and beyond ADA services) in TDP.

Services analyzed in this report:
- Acquisition of Service (AOS) Transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities;
- Rides 2 Wellness for transportation dependent patients from St Luke's, St Al's and designated clinics; and
- Volunteer Driver program that serves as a transportation safety net when no fixed-line bus service or other specialized transportation programs are available.

Findings and Recommendations: The following are the overall findings and recommendations for the Specialized Transportation Program administered and coordinated by VRT.

Findings
• The analysis does not include any providers receiving federal funds that are not being coordinated directly by VRT.
• More demand for services than providers are able to meet, as noted by number of denials and lead-time required to book trips.
• Volunteer driver program ridership fluctuates based on other providers capacity to provide services
• Over the past three years, AOS transportation providers have experienced increases in rides and service.
• The largest percentage of AOS ridership growth occurred in Metro Community Services, SHIP, Harvest Transit, and Eagle Senior Center.
• Of the top four AOS providers, Eagle Senior Center is the only one associated with a senior center.
• All four top performing providers take advantage of all the technology and program supports provided by VRT.
• Rides per hour range from 2.14 to 3.87. The highest riders per hour come from services using the technology and program supports.
• Providers with lowest per cost ride are reliant on volunteers for staffing and program supports.
• Availability of volunteers can lead to fluctuations in levels of service available to riders.

Recommendations
• Complete an inventory of existing providers and services in the region for consideration to include in the Transportation Development Plan (TDP).
• Use the data from the analysis to support future recommendations on building accessible capacity in the region.
• Update performance reporting to ensure consistency of data collected, including denials and wait-lists.
• Research and implement sustainable funding mechanisms to meet the demand.
• Develop a plan for building on efficiencies that have been achieved and decrease overall cost-per-ride for the services.
• Develop more robust community engagement tactics to continue to grow the programs and pool of providers.

More Information:  David Pederson, VRT Mobility Coordinator, 208-258-2725, dpederson@valleynationaltransit.org.
Specialized Transportation Analysis

Background and Overview

Existing Services

Seniors and persons with disabilities: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) established the Section 5310 grant program in 1975 to serve the transportation needs of older adults and persons with disabilities. In 2015, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act brought significant changes to the program. Instead of apportioning funds directly to states, funds were apportioned to large urban, small urban and rural areas. The FAST Act made it possible for Valley Regional Transit (VRT) to work with existing Acquisition of Service (AOS) 5310 grant recipients and establish new non-profit AOS transportation providers. The objective was to facilitate more efficient use of available resources, reduce costs and fill gaps in service for Treasure Valley seniors and persons with disabilities. Program funds support transportation providers by reimbursing costs to deliver service on a per boarding basis. Transportation providers include senior centers and other non-profit agencies.

Transit dependent medical patients: In response to a 2015 federally sponsored initiative, VRT developed Rides 2 Wellness, a public/private collaborative with Boise area hospitals and clinics. Rides 2 Wellness improves community heath by enabling Treasure Valley residents who may otherwise not have transportation to get to follow-up medical appointments and receive treatment. Non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) service providers deliver the rides.

Volunteer Driver program: The Volunteer Driver program is one of the first Specialized Transportation programs. Funded in part by low, affordable fares, in-kind and federal funds the Volunteer Driver program functions as a safety net for those needing transportation outside the hours or service areas of other fixed line or Specialized Transportation services. Volunteer drivers are recruited, vetted and trained from all across the Treasure Valley.

Specialized Transportation ridership performance

By increasing the number of vehicles, drivers and hours of service, AOS ridership has increased. Demand for rides has disproportionately grown larger than capacity. SHIP Transportation, Harvest Transit, Metro Community Services and Eagle Senior Center have responded by moving excess ride requests to a will call or waiting list. This ultimately ends with trip denials each day. Even with a will-call list, there are not enough cancellations or no-shows to accommodate every ride request.

Specialized transportation programs, including AOS transportation, Rides 2 Wellness and VRT Volunteer Driver programs saw increases in ridership as an outcome of collaboration with VRT:
A total 87,502 rides were provided by VRT specialized transportation programs during FY2019. Rides-per-hour increased from 1.56 rides-per-hour in 2017 to 2.81 rides-per-hour in 2019.

**Specialized Transportation Program Supports**

**Shared Vehicle program:** VRT makes available to AOS service providers and other qualified non-profit organizations accessible and non-accessible vehicles at a reduced fee. VRT maintains and insures the vehicles as part of the Specialized Transportation pool. Annual state of good repair evaluations track the condition of pool vehicles and plan for vehicle replacements. The table at right on the following page shows the current 2019 rating for all vehicles in the Specialized Transportation vehicle pool. Note that the vehicle replacement plan is in effect and replacement vehicles have been added since the last rating on vehicles that is shown here was completed.
RouteMatch dispatch and scheduling software: AOS providers are able to optimize schedules and routes, increase passengers per hour, reduce no-shows and minimize driver idle time by collaborating with VRT using RouteMatch scheduling software.

Customer service support: VRT is here to help. Whether it is answering customer inquiries or helping our partners with RouteMatch scheduling related questions, VRT Customer Service department assists all Specialized Transportation service providers.

Training: VRT provides continuous RouteMatch training and on-going driver education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation provider</th>
<th>Customer service support</th>
<th>RouteMatch technical support</th>
<th>Number of shared vehicles in use</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Community Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Community and Senior Center Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing &amp; Innovative Partnerships (SHIP) Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Senior Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma Senior Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Senior Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna Senior Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows how AOS providers utilize VRT supports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Number</th>
<th>Type of Vehicle</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>TAM Score 0 to 5 (5 is new condition; 0 is not safe for service)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S001</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S002</td>
<td>CARAVAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S003</td>
<td>CARAVAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S004</td>
<td>CARAVAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S007</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S008</td>
<td>TRANSIT VAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S009</td>
<td>TRANSIT VAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1501</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1502</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1512</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1514</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1515</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2302</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2305</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2311</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2601</td>
<td>CUTAWAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S407</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S408</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S409</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S410</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S414</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S415</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S416</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S417</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S418</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S701</td>
<td>TRANSIT VAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V102</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V103</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V104</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V105</td>
<td>FLEET VAN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost comparison to deliver service

From the individual volunteer drivers using their own vehicle to the full service AOS provider with multiple vehicles, the cost to deliver service varies.

The following table shows the cost-per-ride by provider or service:

Costs per ride vary from $5.52 at Kuna Senior Center to $25.80 at SHIP. Variances are due to a range of factors including the number of volunteers working both as drivers and as supports staff, manual scheduling vs. automated software, and the number of vehicles in service.

Future potential for existing services

Future AOS expansion of service:

- Funding – Service providers must generate the local match requirement to receive federal funds. As AOS provider services continue to grow, more emphasis must be placed on shifting funding sources from 5310 program funds (80 percent federal, 20 percent local match) to 5307 program funds (50 percent federal, 50 percent local match).

- Service providers – Future AOS expansion is dependent on providers that have a vision for serving their customers and communities. Data compiled over the past three years shows that demand for rides increases to meet available service.

- To meet current and future demand - service providers must be willing to grow their service. This includes expanding service to include technology for scheduling and dispatching rides and more cost-effective shared vehicles.

  With vehicle seating of nine to 14 passengers most service providers have the capacity to deliver two to three times their current ridership.

Rides 2 Wellness future potential

- Ada County and Boise – NEMT provider RAMP IT UP contracted to provide service in Ada County into FY2020. Trinity Transportation may also become an Ada County NEMT provider for the program beginning in early FY2020.
• Canyon County – Ramp It Up and Trinity have expressed an interest in expanding business as Rides 2 Wellness moves into other Treasure Valley communities. Both companies indicated they may add drivers and vehicles to accommodate any new demand for service.

Volunteer driver future potential

• Uber, Lyft and other transportation services has proven the viability of volunteer transportation. New emphasis will be placed on building a large pool of volunteer drivers.
Detailed Specialized Transportation by Program and Provider

**Rides 2 Wellness**

Rides 2 Wellness serves Ada County patients with medical conditions that have the highest likelihood of developing debilitating and costly complications. Rides 2 Wellness improves community health by enabling Ada County residents who may otherwise have no other means of transportation to keep their follow-up appointments and receive treatment. Funding for both ambulatory and patients requiring accessible rides is provided by Ada County healthcare systems. The program supports quality healthcare in the region by reducing costs due to missed appointments and hospital readmissions.

Rides 2 Wellness is a public/private collaborative with non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) providers delivering the rides. Rides 2 Wellness provided 4,702 rides to Boise area patients in FY2017, 9,151 rides in FY2018, and 10,421 rides in FY2019. Efforts are under way to expand service to Canyon County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Friday, 7:30 AM – 6 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>VRT Customer Service and WellRyde scheduling software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>Varies (according to number of participating NEMT providers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of service</td>
<td>Trips originating in Meridian, Eagle, Star, Garden City and Boise with service to specific clinics in Boise, Meridian and Eagle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rides 2 Wellness</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17 Hours</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Hours</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 Hours</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>270.97</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>255.83</td>
<td>315.74</td>
<td>336.8</td>
<td>290.97</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>321.4</td>
<td>352.4</td>
<td>401.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volunteer Driver Program**

Valley Regional Transit Volunteer Driver Program operates in both Ada and Canyon counties. Ride requests from any person is accepted 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Filling a ride request is subject to driver availability. The Volunteer Driver program fills the gap when other transportation modes are not available.

| Transportation hours of service | 24 hours a day, seven days a week |
The VRT Volunteer Driver program functions as a safety net for those passengers who are seeking transportation outside the hours or service areas of other fixed line or specialized transportation services.

**Acquisition of Service Transportation for Older Adults and Persons with Disabilities**

The following is an analysis of program services providing transportation to seniors and persons with disabilities in Boise, Nampa, Caldwell, Kuna and the surrounding areas.

**Metro Community Services – Caldwell**

Metro Community Services (Metro) is a non-profit human services agency offering supportive and energy conservation services in Southwest Idaho. Metro provides assistance to seniors, people with disabilities, and financially limited individuals through a variety of human service programs. Metro offers transportation to seniors and/or disabled in Canyon County at no cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Friday, 6 AM – 5 PM (special trips outside normal business hours can be arranged using volunteer drivers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Full-time dispatcher using RouteMatch scheduling software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>Five (two accessible) plus three to four volunteer drivers using their own vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of VRT Shared Vehicles in service</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory passengers</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by accessible passengers</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per service hour of operation</td>
<td>$48.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VRT provided Metro with scheduling software in FY2017 to assist in coordinating trips. The following chart shows that rides-per-hour more than doubled with the implementation of scheduling software. Rides-per-hour increased from an average 1.43 rides-per-hour in FY2017 to 3.05 in FY2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO Community Services</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17 Hours</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Hours</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>823.6</td>
<td>730.35</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>635.73</td>
<td>704.2</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 Hours</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>641.73</td>
<td>554.22</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>714.55</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>514.43</td>
<td>583.23</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metro Community Services future potential

- Metro Community Services is well positioned to expand and extend services throughout Canyon County. With a knowledgeable support staff, experienced drivers and a solid financial base, Metro Community Services is one of VRT’s most viable transportation partners.
- Beyond AOS service – Metro Community Services is interested in expanding service beyond AOS.

Eagle Community & Senior Center Transportation

Eagle Community & Senior Center Transportation is committed to improving lives through caring support with opportunities for social interaction, recreation, and services for health and basic needs. Transportation is offered free of charge to seniors and persons with disabilities within the city boundaries of Eagle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Friday, 9 AM – 5 PM (special group trips are offered outside normal business hours to attend social and lifestyle activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Full-time dispatcher using RouteMatch software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>Four (three accessible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of VRT Shared Vehicles in service</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a 134 percent increase in ridership and nearly double the rides-per-hour since FY2017, Eagle Community & Senior Center Transportation is providing high-demand service to seniors and persons with disabilities.

Eagle Community & Senior Center Transportation future potential

- The Center is interested in expanding services in the future to include populations beyond AOS.

SHIP Transportation – Boise

Supportive Housing and Innovative Partnerships (SHIP) Transportation is a non-profit human services agency made up of cause-based staff and volunteers whose goal is to preserve and sustain our community. A significant part of SHIP’s mission is providing free transportation for Boise seniors, persons with disabilities and veterans. SHIP was one of the first specialized transportation providers to transition to technology-based ride scheduling.
The following chart illustrates how rides-per-hour increased 252% with the aid of scheduling software. Rides-per-hour increased from an average 1.27 per hour in FY17 to 2.20 in FY19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIP Transportation</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>501.41</td>
<td>445.45</td>
<td>413.95</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>394.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>346.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>375.13</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>409.42</td>
<td>363.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHIP Transportation future potential

- SHIP Transportation has expressed an interest in adding drivers and vehicles to meet the current unmet transportation needs of Boise seniors and persons with disabilities. Rides are fully booked two to three weeks in advance.
- SHIP Transportation is interested in exploring the possibility of expanding service beyond the current AOS.

Harvest Transit – Meridian
Harvest Transit is a free transportation service in Meridian providing rides to seniors and persons with disabilities. Harvest Transit uses three accessible transit vans providing curb-to-curb service Monday through Saturday. Harvest Transit is a fully integrated transportation service provider using the latest technology in scheduling and dispatching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Saturday, 9 AM – 3 PM (Special group trips and shuttle service offered outside normal business hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Fulltime dispatcher using RouteMatch software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of VRT vehicles in service</td>
<td>3 (three accessible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory passengers</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by accessible passengers</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per service hour of operation</td>
<td>$56.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per passenger trip</td>
<td>$15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of service</td>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The city of Meridian is one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States. The 65+ senior demographic makes up a significant portion of that population growth. The following graph shows how Harvest Transit has gone from providing 3,295 rides in 2017 to more than 15,381 rides in 2019:

Harvest Transit future potential

- Church of the Harvest has adopted community transportation through Harvest Transit as part of their church outreach. Harvest Transit is eager to expand service to include additional drivers and vehicles, expand the organizations geographic reach, and provide transportation services to additional populations and groups.

Parma Area Senior Center Transportation - Parma
Parma Area Senior Center Transportation is the only Specialized Transportation provider serving western Canyon County. The Center offers free rides for seniors and persons with disabilities in Parma, Notus, Wilder, Homedale and surrounding rural areas. Due to the remote regions served and the lack of transportation options, Parma Area Senior Center Transportation may be the only transportation service available to some for medical, pharmacy, nutrition and important lifestyle trips.

| Transportation hours of service | Monday-Friday 8 AM – 2 PM  
(No-charge after-hour ride appointments are based on van and driver availability) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Scheduler using a manual system to log trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>One (accessible plus occasional volunteers using their own vehicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory or accessible passengers</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per service hour of operation</td>
<td>$17.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per passenger trip</td>
<td>$8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of service</td>
<td>Parma and western Canyon County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past three years Parma Area Senior Center Transportation has worked to grow their transportation program. As a rural transportation provider, securing a sustainable source of funding has been challenging. The following graph provides ridership numbers:

[Graph showing ridership numbers for Parma Area Senior Center Transportation from FY17 to FY19]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parma Area Senior Center Transportation future potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• As one of very few transportation providers serving the rural areas of western Canyon County, Parma Area Senior Center Transportation is continuously seeking ways to meet the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. The program has demonstrated in the past that if transportation is available, seniors from Parma to Homedale and Wilder to Notus will use the service. Future transportation expansion is dependent on a secure, sustainable source of funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meridian Senior Center Transportation – Meridian

Meridian Senior Center provides members and others in the Meridian and Western Boise area with free transportation. Ride reservations for seniors and persons with disabilities are accepted for meals, medical appointments, nutrition and shopping. Special outside groups trips are occasionally offered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Friday, transportation schedule varies by day and event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Scheduler using a manual system to log trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>One (accessible) vehicle per provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory or accessible passengers</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per service hour of operation</td>
<td>$57.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per passenger trip</td>
<td>$15.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of service</td>
<td>Meridian and Western Boise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Star Senior Center Transportation - Star
Star Senior Center provides members and others in the Star and Eagle area with free transportation. Star is focused on providing their core customer base with exceptional service. Special outside group activities and trips are offered on a regular basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Tuesday-Friday, transportation schedule varies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Scheduler using a manual system to log trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>One (accessible) vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory or accessible passengers</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per service hour of operation</td>
<td>$12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per passenger trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of service</td>
<td>Star and Eagle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Star Senior Center Transportation future potential

Star Senior Center serves the seniors and persons with disabilities with safe, professional transportation. Many of the Star customers are also Eagle customers. Star is interested in expanding hours of service to better serve their customers.

Kuna Senior Center - Kuna

Kuna Senior Center provide members and others with free transportation. Rides to the Center are scheduled on a regular basis. Kuna Senior Center also schedules regular trips to Meridian and Boise for groceries, doctor appointments and shopping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation hours of service</th>
<th>Monday-Friday, transportation schedule varies by day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling process</td>
<td>Scheduler using a manual system to log trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles in service</td>
<td>One (accessible) vehicle per provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips by ambulatory or accessible passengers</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kuna Senior Center Transportation

#### Future Potential
- Kuna Senior Center is focused on providing exceptional service to their core customer base, and have expressed an interest in increasing current operations with additional hours of service.
TOPIC: Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and Policy

DATE: February 3, 2020

Summary:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) final rule (49 C.F.R. Part 673) that requires certain operators of public transportation systems that are recipients or sub-recipients of financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. § 5307 to develop a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP). The PTASP must include the processes and procedures necessary for implementing Safety Management Systems (SMS). Each transit operator is required to certify that it has a safety plan meeting the requirements of the rule by July 20, 2020.

Each safety plan must include an approval by the agency’s Accountable Executive and Board of Directors, designation of a Chief Safety Officer, documented processes of the agency’s SMS, an employee reporting program, performance targets, criteria to address all applicable requirements and standards, and a process and timeline for conducting an annual review and update of the safety plan.

Transit operators that operate 100 or fewer vehicles in peak service that do not operate rail transit systems, may have their state develop a safety plan on their behalf or may opt to develop their own.

The PTASP will meet FTA’s requirement for a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and will include all sub-recipients of the agency.

The PTASP Policy will include:
- Introduction which will include agency information, approvals and updates
- Safety information that will include performance targets, management practices, risk management, assurances and promotions
- The plan will be written by the Idaho Transportation Department’s Public Transportation (ITD-PT) Office in coordination with all of the state MPOs

Staff Recommendation/Request:
Information item. Staff will recommend an outline for the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and Policy. Staff requests input from the Executive Board on the outline of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and Policy.

Implication (policy and/or financial):
The policy will ensure that the plan produced by ITD-PT coincides with the business that all sub-recipients and contractors provide. The policy will also ensure goals and targets will be attainable.
Highlights:

January 2020
- Executive Board – Information Item – Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and Policy Outline (included in January’s information packet)

February 2020
- Executive Board – Information Item – Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan and Policy

March 2020
- Executive Board – Action Item - Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Policy

April 2020
- Board of Directors - Action Item – Approve Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Policy

More Information:
Dave Meredith, Compliance Officer, 208-258-2729 dmeredith@valleyregionaltransit.org
Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Policy

Statement of Policy
This policy recognizes the FTA’s final ruling on July 19, 2019 (PTASP regulation, 49 C.F.R. Part 673) requiring those Transit Agency’s receiving financial assistance under the Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C Section 5307 to have a safety plan in place no later than July 20, 2020. This regulation requires implementation of a risk-based Safety Management System (SMS) approach. Valley Regional Transit (VRT), as the local transit agency, has set safety as the highest priority and involves all employees of VRT and its contractors, and sub-recipients as determined appropriate by FTA regulations/findings.

Definitions
- **Accident** means an event that involves any of the following: a loss of life; a report of a serious injury to a person; a collision of public transportation vehicles; a runaway train; an evacuation for life safety reasons; or any derailment of a rail transit vehicle, at any location, at any time, whatever the cause.

- **Accountable Executive** - means a single, identifiable person who has the ultimate responsibility for carrying out the safety management system of a public transportation agency; responsibility for carrying out transit asset management practices; and control or direction over the human and capital resources needed to develop and maintain both the agency’s public transportation agency safety plan, in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), and the agency’s transit asset management plan in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5326.

- **Event** means any accident, incident, or occurrence.

- **Incident** means an event that involves any of the following: A personal injury that is not a serious injury; one or more injuries requiring medical transport; or damage to facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure that disrupts the operations of a transit agency.
**Occurrence** means an event without any personal injury in which any damage to facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure does not disrupt the operations of a transit agency.

**Performance target** means a quantifiable level of performance or condition, expressed as a value for the measure, to be achieved within a time period required by FTA.

**PTASP**- Acronym for **Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan**.

**Safety performance target** means a performance target related to safety management activities.

**Serious injury** means any injury which: (1) Requires hospitalization for more than 48 hours, commencing within seven days from the date the injury was received; (2) Results in a fracture of any bone (except simple fractures of fingers, toes, or noses); (3) Causes severe hemorrhages, nerve, muscle, or tendon damage; (4) Involves any internal organ; or (5) Involves second- or third-degree burns, or any burns affecting more than 5 percent of the body surface.

**SMS**- Safety Management System

**Policy**

1. **Statement**:
   a. The management of safety is one of our core business functions. Valley Regional Transit (VRT) is committed to developing, implementing, maintaining, and constantly improving processes to ensure that all our transit service delivery activities take place under a balanced allocation of organizational resources, aimed at achieving the highest level of safety performance and meeting established standards.
   b. All levels of management and all employees are accountable for the delivery of this highest level of safety performance, beginning with the Executive Director, with approval of said policy from the board of directors.

2. **Management Approach**
   a. Support the management of safety through the provision of appropriate resources, that will result in an organizational culture that fosters safe practices, encourages effective employee and contractor safety reporting and communication;
   b. Integrate the management of safety among the primary responsibilities of all managers, employees, and contractors;
   c. Clearly define for all staff, managers, employees, and contractors alike, their accountabilities and responsibilities for the delivery of the organization’s safety performance and the performance of VRT’s safety management system;
d. Establish and operate hazard identification and analysis, and safety risk evaluation activities, including an employee and contractor safety reporting program as a fundamental source for safety concerns and hazard identification, in order to eliminate or mitigate the safety risks of the consequences of hazards resulting from the operations or activities to a point which is consistent with acceptable level of safety performance;

e. Ensure that no action will be taken against any employee or VRT’s contractor who discloses a safety concern through the safety reporting program, unless disclosure indicates, beyond any reasonable doubt, an illegal act, gross negligence, or a deliberate or willful disregard of regulations or procedures;

f. Comply with, and wherever possible exceed, legislative and regulatory requirements and standards;

g. Ensure that sufficient skilled and trained human resources are available to implement safety management processes;

h. Ensure that all staff and contractors are provided with adequate and appropriate safety-related information and training, are competent in safety management matters, and are allocated only tasks commensurate with their skills;

i. Establish and measure VRT’s safety performance against realistic and data-driven safety performance indicators and safety performance targets;

j. Continually improve VRT’s safety performance through management processes that ensure that appropriate safety management action is taken and is effective; and

k. Ensure externally supplied systems and services to support VRT’s operations are delivered, meeting VRT’s safety performance standards.

3. Responsibilities and Accountabilities

a. VRT Board of Directors – Approves all policies and procedures related to the PTASP policy and plan.

b. PTASP Accountable Executive – a single identifiable position who has the ultimate responsibility for carrying out the PTASP policy and plan; who will also ensure an ongoing effort by VRT to make all aspects of safety a top priority of the transit authority and to ensure all employees are aware of and participate in all aspects of reporting any safety issues.

c. PTASP lead employee – a single identifiable person who will manage the day to day operation of the PTASP safety plan including the following key tasks;
   1. establish goals and targets
   2. ensure the plan is being followed by all employees
   3. report to key management progress of the plan
   4. make recommendations to improve the plan after implementation
   5. report to any government agency any reporting requirements associated with PTASP
### FY2020 PROCUREMENT CALENDAR

#### EXECUTIVE BOARD / VRT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods/Service</th>
<th>Total Procurement Amount</th>
<th>Potential Executive Board Action</th>
<th>Potential VRT Board of Directors Action</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Response Vehicles (approx. 10)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 6, 2020</td>
<td>VRT wishes to procure ten (10) demand response vehicles over a term of three years to replace vehicles that have reached their useful life. Term of the agreement would be April 2020 – April 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Upcoming/Active Procurements:

- Canyon County Innovative Transit On-Demand System Validators/Integrated Payment App

*Executive Board Approval Levels: $50,000 - $199,999

*VRT Board of Directors Approval Levels: $200,000 and over*
Finance and Budget
Valley Regional Transit’s audit closed late January with no findings. Eide Bailey will provide a review of the audit at the Executive Board’s March meeting. Staff began the process to close the first quarter after the audit was completed. Jason Jedry will present the information in the new report format at the March meeting.

VRT staff initiated the budget development process for FY2021. The staff responsible for expenditures are completing their budgets through February. Staff will bring revenue and expenditure trends to the Executive Board in March. We are planning to review some key issues influencing the FY2021 budget in April and May. The Executive Board receives the first draft of the preliminary budget in June.

Community Engagement, Committees and Projects
I continue to support a variety of community-based committees and projects this year. Rides 2 Wellness – Canyon County Expansion is entering the outreach phase of the project. Staff is conducting focus groups with clinics and reaching out to patients with a short survey to help the team better understand their needs for health care access.

We will be working this coming month with a subcommittee of the Regional Advisory Council to establish and expand our strategy around neighborhood mobility collaborations. The initiative will establish a “playbook” for how VRT can work with key agencies and stakeholders in neighborhoods to improve access and utilization to a variety of key activities through transit.

I am continuing to support City of Boise Strategic Team and the Canyon County Project Team. Staff works with staff on service development affecting their constituents. In addition, I have been meeting with a group of inter-city transportation providers to consider strategies for improving connections at the Boise airport and to the fixed-route transit system.

More information: Kelli Badesheim, Executive Director, 208-258-2712, kbadesheim@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC: Development Department Monthly Report
DATE: February 03, 2020

Summary: Update of Development Department activities for the month of January 2019

VRT Strategic Plan
Goal 1 - Demonstrate responsible stewardship of public resources

Performance Based Decision-making
• ValleyConnect 2.0 (VC2.0)
  VRT Staff is developing the FY2021-25 Transit Development Plan (TDP). Staff has
  begun collaboration with staff, stakeholders and partners to develop and program
  projects. This plan will build on ValleyConnect 2.0 and the efforts of local jurisdictions
  to enhance transit services in their community.

• Programming
  o Local and Federal Allocations – VRT staff has refined the local allocations
    methodology and will present it to the executive board at the February
    meeting.

Increase Ridership and Revenue
• Service to the Amazon Fulfillment Center
  VRT staff has been in discussion with Amazon regarding service during their shift
  changes at the fulfillment center being constructed at Franklin and Star Road.

• Fixed Route Service in Meridian
  VRT Staff has drafted and tested the route through Meridian from Ten Mile to Kleiner
  Park and is preparing to further discuss the proposed routing with the Meridian
  Transportation Commission, and is preparing to begin public outreach

• Transit Access to Ada County Facilities
  VRT staff has been in discussion with Ada County about expanding access to their
  facilities in Boise.

• On Demand Service in Canyon County
  VRT staff is looking into alternatives to fixed route service for Canyon County. This
  investigation began in response to the poor ridership on Route 55, and the desire of
  CWI to invest in higher ridership service.
Goal 3 - Build institutional and regional capacity

Regional Capital Enhancements

- Boise Operations Facility
  - Electric Bus Infrastructure
    Staff has coordinated initial changes required by Idaho Power and is expected to commence those improvements in the spring of 2020. Design of the charging infrastructure is being scoped now.
  - Fuel Island Work
    Based upon TAM scoring, staff is coordinating the replacement of the cathodic protection system, the gas dryer, the fluid dispensing building and the cooling system for the compressor building in 2020. Costs are being finalized and design completed for that work now.
  - Site Work
    The lowest ranking TAM item after the fuel island is the existing pavement at the site. Pavement evaluation and repair will occur throughout 2020.

- Happy Day Transit Center Upgrades
  The Executive Board approved initial design funding at the November 2018 Executive Board meeting. Cost estimates, material testing and mitigation studies have been completed as part of that effort. VRT is still waiting on grant funding in order to begin the construction side of this effort. Local Match may not be available for this small urban project due to the fact that the Compressed Natural Gas Rebate (CNG Rebate) has not been awarded this fiscal year, but the federal dollars are ready to be implemented as soon as local match can be identified.

- Regional Facilities and Infrastructure Plan / Facility Maintenance Plan
  Staff is drafting the Facilities and Infrastructure Plan currently and has engaged a technical writer to assist in the plan in 2020. The plan is currently posted on VRT’s website for review/comment. Once the Facilities and Infrastructure Plan has been reviewed by staff, the technical writer will assist in updating the current Facility Maintenance Plan to match the new Facilities and Infrastructure Plan for the region.

- Main Street Station
  No new items to report this month for the site but staff has finalized an additional facility maintenance engineer/facility master technician to assist in the maintenance of MSS and the technical equipment at the Boise Maintenance Facility such as the fuel island.

- Bus Stops
  The 2020 bus stop improvements projects have several phases and elements. Design for construction of 8 larger shelter sized bus stop pads (carried over from FY19) is 80% complete. Planning in preparation of the NEPA effort for any 2020 bus stop improvements will be complete soon and we expect the NEPA application to be submitted in early 2020. Bus stop improvements for Eagle are planned in early 2020 and the Meridian alignment will commence when that alignment is finalized.
• **State Street Corridor Projects**
  Working with the City of Boise, Compass and ACHD, VRT staff will kick off the approved transit alternatives analysis for State Street in January.

State Street Executive and Technical Teams have been working together to identify actions that would help member agencies continue making progress on the Transit and Traffic Operations Plan (TTOP). The technical team met to further refine performance metrics and develop a scope, schedule and budget for a transit operational analysis that would review several key assumptions in the current TTOP.

**Other Development Activities**

- **Title VI** – Next submittal will be October 2020.
- **Grant Opportunities** – VRT was awarded a competitive federal grant to purchase 8 electric transit vehicles and the supporting infrastructure. It is expected that the new vehicles will be in service by the first or second quarter of FY 2021.

**More Information:**
Stephen Hunt, Sr. Principal Planner, 208.258.2701, shunt@valleyregionaltransit.org
Jacob Hassard, Project Manager, 208.258.2705, jhassard@valleyregionaltransit.org
Alissa Taysom, Associate Planner, 208.258.2717, ataysom@valleyregionaltransit.org
Jill Reyes, Planning Programmer, 208.258.2707, jreyes@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC:       Operations Department Monthly Report - December
DATE:       January 22, 2020

Summary:    Status update of activities related to contracted transportation services, Specialized Transportation services, information technology and intelligent transportation systems, compliance, customer service support and regional operations.

Highlights:

Contracted Transportation
- Ada County operations participated in the Boise Holiday Parade
- Ada and Canyon County operations provided buses and staff for the annual Stuff the Bus event. Over 11,000 toys were collected during the event.

Specialized Transportation
- Received three replacement Transit vans for fleet replacement
- Have begun to score vehicles for Transit Asset Management

Information Technology and Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Migrated Microsoft Exchange service from 2010 to 2013
- Work group is preparing update to the IT/ITS Prioritized List FY21 approval
- Transit Asset Management assets scored

Compliance
- Staff received notice that VRT has a compliant program following the Federal Transit Administration Drug and Alcohol audit.
- Finalized compliance procedures and checklists for audit inspections for contracted operators

Customer Service Support
- Staff still working to ensure changes implemented for ACCESS scheduling are compliant

Regional Operations
- Staff has been working on the following projects:
  - Canyon County Service Redesign
  - FTA Triennial and Drug and Alcohol audits
  - Treefort planning for March 2020
  - PTASP work with ITD
  - Working on MOU with Ada County Sheriff’s Office to provide emergency transportation at times of need
  - Electric Vehicle procurement
Updates:

Contracted Transportation
• Ada County and Canyon County operations is working with VRT staff to finalize service changes planned for spring 2020
• VRT staff is working with Ada County and Canyon County operations to find new solutions to improve service in Canyon County

Specialized Transportation
• Staff began completing vehicle inspection following new checklists that align with industry standards
• Staff started working on rebranding and renumbering fleet vehicles for consistency

Information Technology and Intelligent Transportation Systems
• Continued server migration for Microsoft Exchange and Barracuda firewalls
• Staff working to finalize compliance for automatic passenger counters
• Security protocols failover tests conducted successfully, but deficiencies with network infrastructure design may cause single points of failure. Equipment has been installed and in the process of being programmed
• Staff resolved 113 support requests from 120 submitted

Compliance
• Completed scoring of assets for Transit Asset Management
• Continued work on Public Transportation Agency Safety Policy and Plan (PTASP) that will go into effect in July 2020
• Compiled all Davis Bacon wage compliance data for audit

Customer Service Support
• Customer service agents handled 4,863 of 5,146 incoming calls, with 283 calls abandoned. The average call time was 4 minutes, 3 seconds and the average hold time was 13 seconds.
• December mobile ticket sales totaled $5,373.50
• Staff is working on solutions to address challenges found with the change in ACCESS scheduling

Regional Operations
• Staff is with working with Ada County, Canyon County, and VRT staff to finalize service changes planned for Spring of 2020.

More Information:
Leslie Pedrosa, Operations Director, 208-258-2713, lpedrosa@valleyregionaltransit.org
Susan Powell, Operations Manager, 208-258-2711, spowell@valleyregionaltransit.org
Nick Moran, IT Manager, 208-608-0584, nmoran@valleyregionaltransit.org
Dave Meredith, Compliance Manager, 208-258-2729, dmeredith@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC:   Finance and Administration Activity Report
DATE:   February 3, 2020

Summary
This memo provides an update on the accomplishments of the Finance Department

VRT Strategic Plan
Goal 1 – Demonstrate responsible stewardship of public resources

Highlights:

Budget/Finance

- Finance is working with Eide Bailly to finalize the annual independent audit
- Finance submitted required documentation for FTA triennial review
- Finance is preparing to submit the Authorities FY2019 National Transit Database information to the FTA
- Finance is assisting with FY2021 budget planning

Grant Management

- Grants and Compliance Administrator is working on the following:
  - Milestone reporting
  - STP TMA applications for TVYMCA and VRT
  - STP Transfers
  - Triennial two-day workshop
  - Grant / Project balancing

Procurement

- Staff has been working on several procurements:
  - Main Street Station Janitorial
  - Vinyl Graphics and Associated Services
  - On Call Engineering and Architecture and Associated Professional Services
  - Electric buses

For More Information: Contact Jason Jedry, Finance Controller, (208) 258-2709, or e-mail:  jedry@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC: Community Projects/Outreach Efforts Update
DATE: January 21, 2019

Summary: This memo provides updates on current and future community outreach efforts, including those related to VRT Strategic Plan goals.

VRT Strategic Plan
Goal 2 - Build community partnerships/build advocates for public transportation
  • Regional Outreach Toolkit and Speakers Bureau
Goal 3 – Build institutional and regional capacity
  • Secure stable funding sources
    o Public transportation ambassadors and outreach campaign
    o Coalitions and partnerships

Highlights
  • I have drafted a new VRT policy that addresses both public involvement and public notification concerning service changes. We currently only have a public involvement policy. This policy will be reviewed by staff, the RAC and Executive Board before going before the VRT Board for final approval in April.
  • We are getting ready to start collecting data on the medical transportation needs in Canyon County. The information from the interviews will be used to develop a first draft of a Rides2Wellness plan for Canyon County. This is one of three mobility enhancement initiatives in the county. We also will be doing outreach for a local fixed-route service redesign and building capacity to service accessible rides for persons with disabilities. All three projects are expected to be implemented beginning in October 2020,
  • I am continuing to work on a two-sided fact sheet that will provide high-level information about VRT and its services. The sheet will include a comparison of where we are now in terms of services with where we could be if Valleyconnect 2.0 is implemented.
  • I am researching best practices with the goal of updating our social media policy. We hope to have a policy available for review by March.
  • Staff and I are also developing a schedule for social media postings and blog story for our Valley Regional Transit home page. This is being done to ensure that we do not miss posting an important event, meeting, board action, etc.

More Information: Mark Carnopis, Community Relations Manager, 208 258-2702, or mcarnopis@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC: Bike Share Program

DATE: January 22, 2020

VRT Strategic Plan
Goal 3 - Build institutional and regional capacity
• Regional Capital Enhancements

Highlights:
Program Administration

• The Boise GreenBike system now has 103 active station and flex hubs with 127 bikes. Roughly 100 bikes are being kept active during the winter months.
• As of January 22, 2020, Boise GreenBike has 22,046 active members, who have made 120,546 overall trips since the beginning of the program, covering 296,032 miles and burning 11.8 million calories.
• Below is a table comparing system statistics for December in each of the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>New Sign-ups</th>
<th>Overall Trips</th>
<th>Miles Travelled</th>
<th>Calories Burned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>24,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>30,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>24,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>14,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Our current vendor, Social Bicycles (Uber/Jump), has been sold to a new company, Mobility Cloud. Mobility Cloud is honoring all terms of the Social Bicycles agreement and is willing to extend the contract on a month-to-month basis. VRT legal counsel is reviewing the contract Mobility Cloud provided. We hope to sign before the end of January.
• We have selected a preferred vendor to replace the existing system with a much larger, all-new, all-electric system in the spring of 2020. One of the vendors not selected is protesting the selection. While that process plays out we are continuing conversations and contract negotiations with the preferred vendor.
• We submitted a proposal asking for a substantial increase in sponsorship support SelectHealth and St. Luke’s, our title sponsors, on October 24, 2019. In a meeting with them on December 3, 2019 the proposal was rejected, though both said they would be
willing to continue at the current level of support. In the interim we have been exploring the possibility of bringing in multiple sponsors to support the program. We also are continuing conversations with SelectHealth and St. Luke’s. Resolution of the sponsorship issue will allow us to move forward with plans for the next phase of the bike share program.

**Sponsorship Plan**

- **Title Sponsorship**
  - SelectHealth & St. Luke’s (expires April 15, 2020)
  - Actively recruiting new sponsors

- **Station sponsors:**
  - Independence University (previously Stevens-Henager College)
  - Boise Co-op
  - Banner Bank
  - CCDC (two stations)
  - Treasure Valley Clean Cities Coalition
  - ACHD
  - Harris Ranch
  - HDR
  - The Watercooler (Local Construct)
  - Midas Gold
  - Idaho Central Credit Union
  - Parkway Station

- **Membership Card Sponsorship**
  - Key Bank

- We continue to schedule meetings with potential sponsors.

**More Information:** Dave Fotsch, Boise GreenBike Director, 208-331-9266 (cell), dfotsch@valleymetroroutetransit.org
Summary: Status update of activities related to the downtown mobility collaborative, City Go.

Highlights:

City Go
• City Go held their first event in the 2020 even series City Go Conversations. The event was on bike and pedestrian safety downtown and we had about 3 attendees. City Go Member TMN events hosted.
• City Go has their second event scheduled for February 27, 2020. The event will consist of a smart commuter panel. Boise State will host the event.
• City Go has 3 corporate members and 5 individual members.
• City Go sold $973 in passes in January.

Updates:

Technology and Service Integration
• Staff worked with Masabi, Boise State, and Clearwater to initiate a software development project for the Boise State Senior Design Class in Spring of 2020. The students will work to create a system-to-system interface for employer pass distribution through mobile ticketing. The project has started and Boise State have seven students working on the project.

Performance Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2020 Target</th>
<th>Launch to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of outreach events</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of website visits</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of business members</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual members</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new sustaining business members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue generated</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership revenue generated</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wallets sold</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of social media followers</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Insta – 158 Facebook - 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insta - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media average post reach</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of direct email subscribers</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenBike sign-ups</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals covered under membership</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of active individual members in MemberSpace</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed memberships</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Annual survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute behavior change</td>
<td>IPI annual survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown SOV Counts</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Website visits:

![Website visits graph](image)

Wallet Sales:
Wallet Sales:

Website popular content:

Active Member Space accounts:
More Information:
Kaite Justice, City Go Director, 208-258-2750, kjustice@valleyregionaltransit.org
TOPIC: Fleet Media Q1 FY2020 Revenue Updates
DATE: January 23, 2020

Summary:
This memo provides updates on current contracted revenues associated with the Fleet Media Division.

Highlights:
The Fleet Media Division is on track to meet and surpass its projections for FY 2020 of $500,000.00 gross revenue. As of the end of Q1 FY2020, revenues are as follows:

- Carryover of contracted revenue from FY2019 = $143,943.00
- Contracted revenue that will be invoiced FY2020 = $205,490.66
  Total = $349,433.66

There is an additional carryover over of $45,341.32 to invoice in Q1 FY2021 for contracts in FY2020 that run through December and will help us reach our projected goal of $750,000.00 gross revenue for FY2021. Our current total of $349,433.66 minus division costs of $125,000.00 and our commitment to Ada and Canyon Operations of $125,000.00 leaves a current net surplus of $99,433.66 with three quarters left in FY2020 to contract additional advertisers/clients.

More Information:
Ken Schick, Fleet Media Manager, 208 258-2718, or kschick@valleyregionaltransit.org