
A CHRONOLOGY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS IN IDAHO

By Jim Brooks

INTRODUCTION

Who am I and what is my connection with public transportation?

What this presentation will cover:

- **Public Transportation - A different playing field**
- **“Public” vs. “Client” transportation**
- **Federal, state and local roles in public transportation**
- **Legislative efforts**

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN IDAHO PRIOR TO 1991

- **Little federal funding and no state funding**
- **Two urbanized areas - Boise & Pocatello**
- **Two metropolitan planning agencies - APA & BPA**
- **No state “office” of public transportation**
- **Small “rural” program**

1991 – AN INTERIM COMMITTEE

WHY

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the 1990 U.S. Census

Why it was formed - Idaho Collaboration Project

Who was on the committee?

What occurred at the hearings?

THE FINAL REPORT - FINDINGS

There is a need for:

- Public transportation **services** for all state residents
- **Coordination** of services
- A **lead agency**
- A statewide **policy**
- Identifying **stable funding** for public transportation
- Training and technical **assistance**

THE FINAL REPORT - RECOMMENDATIONS

Submit legislative proposals to:

- Form a state-level Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC)
- Form PT advisory committees in each region
- Form an **Interagency Working Group (IWG)**
- Designate the Idaho Transportation Department as the “lead” agency
- Develop a **public transportation plan** for the state
- Maintain a state commitment to improve PT
- Provide assistance to local PT systems

1992 - LEGISLATION

(SECTION 40- 514 IDAHO CODE)

The legislation provided for all recommendations, plus:

- Called for a comprehensive data gathering effort
- Required the Idaho Transportation Department to coordinate “planning” of all public transportation funds
- Required a **“state commitment”** to improve public transportation.

1992 LEGISLATION

(SECTION 40-514 IDAHO CODE)

What it **did not do**:

- Define what a “state commitment” is
- Set a statewide public transportation policy
- Provide any funding mechanism for mandates
- Give ITD authority outside its own agency

1994 - REGIONAL PT AUTHORITIES

Why the need – **public transportation is regional**

What the 1994 legislation does:

- Requires a public vote to form
- Governed by existing local elected officials
- Powers same as other municipal corporations
- Has jurisdiction over all publicly funded PT services
- Provide general PT policy for RPTAs

The law does not include a **provision for funding!**

1994 - REGIONAL PT AUTHORITIES

The first RPTA, formed in 1995, had *problems*

The 1996 amendment

The Treasure Valley RPTA – 1998

1995 AN INTERIM COMMITTEE

In its final report, the committee urged lawmakers to “**consider** funding methods that would allow ITD to participate in funding public transportation.”

COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF IDAHO STUDY

1. Study centered on funding support for public transportation in other states
2. Developed options for state and local funding in Idaho

1996 – LEGISLATION

Title transfer fee proposal:

Would have added a \$2 fee for each title transfer

Would have raised \$870,000 a year

Failed in the House Transportation Committee

1997 – LEGISLATION

(Funding/Policy – State)

The tire tax proposal:

Added \$1 to the purchase price of each new tire

Would have raised \$1.2 million a year statewide

There also was “policy” in the same proposal that confirmed the state’s “support” role

The proposed legislation failed in the House Transportation Committee

1997 – LEGISLATION

(Funding/Policy – State)

Independent proposal:

A fee of **up to \$5** on each vehicle that would be earmarked for public transportation services

The money raised could only be used by regional public transportation authorities

Passage of the fee would require a vote of the people

The proposed legislation passed the House but failed to get a hearing in the Senate

1998 – LEGISLATION

(Funding/Policy – State)

A return to the title transfer fee. Redesignated from a fee to a **surcharge**.

The amount of the surcharge increased to \$2.50 from \$2.00

Would have raised \$1.2 million a year

Failed on the House floor

Same policy proposal as 1997 was included in a separate bill. It passed the House, but legislators adjourned before it could be heard in the Senate.

1999 – LEGISLATION

(State Policy)

This bill was the same as the 1997 bill, but was introduced in the Senate. It did not receive a hearing.

Also in 1999, there was a serious conflict between Medicaid and PT providers.

The providers claimed that the IWG was not doing its job. As a result, there was a misperception that ITD was at fault.

The solution: strengthen the IWG through legislation.

2000 – LEGISLATION

(Amendment of 40-514)

The amendment:

1. Expanded the Interagency Working Group
2. Required the reporting of more detailed performance data. Also required reporting this data to the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee.
3. Eliminated regional advisory committees
4. Required the involvement of PTAC in **planning**
5. The amendment passed with no objection by ITD

THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF THE 21ST CENTURY

- **Idaho's population gains**
- **Increased need for public transportation and concern about air quality (due to this growth)**
- **Increased local match requirements for increases in federal funding**
- **New federal authorization act provides new programs and more funding**

THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF THE 21ST CENTURY

These factors help lead to the formation of the Idaho Task Force on Public Transportation in 2003 and,

The Legislative Interim Committee on Public Transportation and Air Quality in 2004.

2004 - THE INTERIM COMMITTEE

(Public Transportation and Air Quality)

- Comprised of 14 legislators (eight from the Treasure Valley)
- Held three meetings – all in Boise
- **Did not** address funding – only policy
- Recommended adoption of public transportation policy legislation

2005 - LEGISLATION

(State Policy)

Bill introduced in Senate and passed unanimously

Bill did not receive a hearing in the House

SUMMARY

The state (ITD) **does not**:

- Own any PT buses, vans or facilities
- Provide or fund any PT services
- “Regulate” service providers
- Have a statewide PT system
- Have authority over IWG or client services

SUMMARY

The state (ITD) **does**:

- Administer federal public transportation funding except for urban areas
- Provide technical and training support to providers
- Provide some funding support for vehicle purchases
- Have responsibility for improving coordination
- Have a state **plan**

SUMMARY

- **Local private/public entities provide all public transportation services**
- **The regional nature of public transportation is recognized**
- **Three regional public transportation authorities have been formed**

SUMMARY

In the past 14 years, we have seen:

- **Public transportation needs/options studied to death**
- **Three interim legislative committees**
- **Four attempts to establish PT policy**
- **Four attempts to address funding needs**
- **Elimination of local citizen input on PT**
- **Changing conditions caused by growth**
- **A marked increase in federal funding**

QUESTIONS?