Utah’s Transportation Principles - Federal Transportation Reauthorization

1. Long-term and timely reauthorization
2. Sustainable funding mechanisms
3. Utilize existing formula-based programs with enhanced flexibility and multimodal funding
4. Streamline processes
5. Support and ensure state, regional, and local transportation agencies have the ability to harness innovation, data, and technology
Legislative Preview / Tax Reform Update

★ 45-day session starts on January 27, 2020
★ 800+ bill files already
  ○ ~30 transportation specific bills
★ Each Legislator has ability to pick 3 “priority” bills
  ○ 1st by Dec 5   |  2nd by Jan 2   |  3rd by Jan 30
★ What to expect from WFRC staff during the session
  ○ bill tracker; email updates; weekly breakfast meeting
★ Key legislative items
  ○ Statewide transportation bond bill
  ○ UTA Transit Oriented Development (TOD) sites bill
  ○ Transportation catch-all bill
  ○ Commission on Housing Affordability bill
  ○ Tax reform (Tax Restructuring and Equalization Task Force)
Implementation Update
WFRC Council Meeting | October 24, 2019
Utah is growing, and we have a plan

WASATCH CHOICE

2050

Partners of the Vision

The Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision is built on community values and public input, shaping the desired future for the region. The following organizations facilitated this process:

- Wasatch Front Regional Council
- Mountainland Association of Governments
- Chambers of Commerce
- Envision Utah
- Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute
- Metropolitan Research Center at The University of Utah
- Utah Association of Counties
- Utah Department of Transportation
- Utah League of Cities and Towns
- Utah Transit Authority
Wasatch Choice Vision Key Strategies

1. Provide transportation choices
2. Support housing options
3. Preserve open space
4. Link economic development with transportation and housing decisions
AGENDA

1. Wasatch Choice detailed in the area
   • Southern Weber
   • Northern Weber

2. Discuss implementation challenges
   • Southern Box Elder
   • Northern Salt Lake
   • Southwest Salt Lake

3. Analysis of opportunities
   • Northern Davis
   • Southeast Salt Lake 10/28/19
   • Southern Davis 10/30/19

4. Key implementation tools
   • Tooele Valley RPO 11/18/19
   • Morgan County RPO TBD
# Your Challenges in Implementing the Vision

## North Salt Lake County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Funding for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education / NIMBY resistance</td>
<td>Open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer interest</td>
<td>Regional transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land availability</td>
<td>Local transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff capacity</td>
<td>Land development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA agency cooperation</td>
<td>UDOT agency cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Affordability</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Redevelopment funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges to Implementing the Vision: Options

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures
Key Implementation Challenges: Southern Weber

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures
Key Implementation Challenges: Northern Weber

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures

Water resources concerns
Key Implementation Challenges: Southern Box Elder

1. NIMBY resistance*
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures

Having a common local vision
Key Implementation Challenges: Northern Salt Lake County

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures
Key Implementation Challenges: Southwest Salt Lake County

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures

East/west traffic flow
Key Implementation Challenges: Northern Davis County

1. NIMBY resistance*
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures

* Community Education
Aggregated top 3

1. NIMBY resistance
2. Staff capacity
3. Transportation agency cooperation
4. Funding for open space
5. Funding for regional roads
6. Funding for transit
7. Funding for local transportation
8. Housing affordability
9. Lack of available land
10. Multi-family development pressures

/ Community Education
*Common community vision
### What is the #1 implementation challenge for local government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10%</th>
<th>1. NIMBY resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2. Staff capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3. Transportation agency cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4. Funding for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5. Funding for regional roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6. Funding for transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7. Funding for local transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8. Housing affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9. Lack of available land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10. Multi-family development pressures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the #2 implementation challenge for local government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NIMBY resistance</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff capacity</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transportation agency cooperation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Funding for open space</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Funding for regional roads</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Funding for transit</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Funding for local transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Housing affordability</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of available land</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Multi-family development pressures</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the #3 implementation challenge for local government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>挑战</th>
<th>百分比</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1. NIMBY resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2. Staff capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3. Transportation agency cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4. Funding for open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5. Funding for regional roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6. Funding for transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7. Funding for local transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8. Housing affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9. Lack of available land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10. Multi-family development pressures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Compile input on challenges and successes

• Put local status report data on the WFRC website

• Draft approaches to help our members address challenges
Transportation Improvement Program
TIP
20-25
Transportation Improvement Program is . . .

1. Six Year Program of Highway, Transit and Active Transportation Projects
   • Four Years Funded - Two Years Concept

2. In the Urban Areas
   • Salt Lake/ West Valley - Ogden/ Layton

3. Funded by
   • Federal, State, & Local Programs

4. For All Cities, Counties, UDOT & UTA
Transportation Improvement Program will . . .

1. Implement the Long Range Plans
   • Highway/ Transit & Active Transportation Projects for the Region

2. Help Meet the Short Range Needs
   • Of the Wasatch Front Area

3. Provide for the Maintenance
   • Of the Existing Transportation System
2020-2025 TIP
Board Modification

Regional Council
October 24, 2019

Ben Wuthrich
Wasatch Front Regional Council
After the Uintah Interchange project was approved and funding was programmed, Region One completed a study with plans that will replace the existing interchange with a future interchange configuration to accommodate the expected growth and needs of this location. To address the immediate needs on the Uintah Interchange, pothole patching and a polymer bridge deck overlay was applied this past summer to preserve them until the future project can be funded.

The funds being added to the US-89; Farmington to I-84 project will be used to rehabilitate the two bridges over the Weber River on US-89. The original project scope included only striping an additional lane across both structures.

---

### New Project

#### Salt Lake/ West Valley Urban Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Facility PIN</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Concept/ Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Currently Funded Amount</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>SR-210 17985</td>
<td>SR-210; Little Cottonwood Canyon</td>
<td>Construct a High Tee Intersection</td>
<td>Hot Spot Funding - TIF (Transportation Investment Funds)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>New Funding</strong></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the Cottonwood Canyons Recreation HotSpot Project, Region 2 has identified an early action operational improvement that will assist with traffic congestion exiting Little Cottonwood Canyon by extending the existing High Tee intersection at Entry 1 and adding new High Tee intersections at Entry 4 (Alta Bypass Road) and the Wildcat Access (Ft Trail).

While these types of intersections are not common, a review of the National Crash Modification Factors indicates that a reduction of 13% of current crashes is likely. Studies show that after a High Tee intersection was installed, a survey of local road users was conducted and it indicated that users felt the roadway was safer to have this protected turn and driving lane, as well as the average delay through the intersection was reduced. The requested funds are part of the overall Hot Spot Funding program.
Weber/Davis – Bridge Rehabilitation
Rehabilitate Two Bridges over the Weber River on US-89

- Immediate Interchange Improvements were done this past Summer with other Pavement Maintenance Funding
- Rehabilitate the two bridges over the Weber River

Additional funding is available from the Uintah Interchange Deck Rehab

Additional Funding $ 2,050,000

Total Project Cost Estimate $ 476,786,658
Salt Lake – SR-210; Little Cottonwood Canyon
Construct Two New High Tee Intersections

Funding Available from
the Hot Spot Funding – TIF
Cottonwood Canyons
Recreation Hot Spot Funds

New Funding
$ 2,000,000

Total Project Cost
Estimate $ 2,000,000

Project improvements include . . .

- Construction of an early action operational improvement that will assist with traffic congestion and improve safety for users exiting Little Cottonwood Canyon
As part of the Cottonwood Canyons Recreation HotSpot Project, Region 2 has identified an early action operational improvement project that will assist with traffic congestion entering Little Cottonwood Canyon by adding a merge lane at the intersection of SR-210 and SR-209.

A traffic analysis of this merge lane at the intersection of SR 210/SR 209 has been completed and the results show a reduction of a 2 mile long queue to 200 yards during peak times for travelers going up Little Cottonwood Canyon. The requested funds are part of the overall Hot Spot Funding program.
Salt Lake – SR-210; Little Cottonwood Canyon
Construct A Lane Merge

New Funding
$6,000,000

Total Project Cost Estimate $6,000,000

Funding Available from
the Hot Spot Funding – TIF
Cottonwood Canyons
Recreation Hot Spot Funds

Project improvements include:
- Construction of an early action operational improvement that will assist with traffic congestion and improve safety for users entering Little Cottonwood Canyon
Porter Rockwell; 14600 South to Rising Star
Construct Section of Missing Bike/ Pedestrian Trail

Program Year 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>$ 49,886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP Funding</td>
<td>$ 32,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>$ 17,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cedar Street; 6100 South to 6200 South
Construct Sections of Missing Sidewalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$ 178,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TAP Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 115,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 62,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11400 South; 1300 East to 1700 East
Construct Bike Lanes along 11400 South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>TAP Funding</th>
<th>Local Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$ 274,940</td>
<td>$ 178,711</td>
<td>$ 96,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
730 E; Sego Lily Drive to Tulip Drive
Construct Section of Missing Sidewalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$134,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP Funding</td>
<td>$87,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>$47,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ozone Pollution

Three-Year Average 4th Highest 8-Hour Concentration

[Graph showing ozone pollution data from various locations over time, with lines representing different locations and years.]
PM2.5 Pollution

Three-Year Average 98th Percentile 24-Hour Concentration

The graph shows the PM2.5 pollution levels from various locations over a three-year period, with data points from 2000-2002 to 2015-2016. The concentrations are measured in micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³). The graph includes various sites such as Standard (65), Bountiful (BY/BV), Herriman, Tooele (T2/T3), Spanish Fork, and others.
PM2.5 Emissions by Source

Tons/day: PM2.5, NOx, VOC, NH3, SO2

2010
Total: 343.4 tons/day
- Area, 94, 28%
- Mobile, 173, 50%
- NonRoad, 35, 10%
- Point, 42, 12%

2017
Total: 218.2 tons/day
- Area, 80, 37%
- Mobile, 78, 36%
- NonRoad, 28, 13%
- Point, 32, 14%

2035
Total: 181.5 tons/day
- Area, 77, 42%
- Mobile, 41, 23%
- NonRoad, 24, 13%
- Point, 39, 22%

Source: Salt Lake PM2.5 Maintenance Plan 2019, Salt Lake PM2.5 SIP 2013.
WFRC Conformity analysis using MOVES model and Tier 3 fuel.
Air Quality: Potential Actions for Drivers

Buy a new car
  • MY2017, SMOG rating 8-10
Reduce the number of “cold starts”
  • Telecommute
  • Trip chain
  • Skip a trip
  • Walk to school/church
Use public transit
Walk / Bike
Reduce idling – Do NOT warm up your car!
Carpool (“round-up” vs “rendez-vous”)
Flextime
Cruise control
Air Quality: Potential Actions for Local Leaders

Provo Clean Air Toolkit
(Provocleanair.org)

Individuals | Business | City

• Local idling ordinance
• Convert city fleet to Tier3, CNG, or electric
• Transit oriented development
• Walkable communities
• many more....
Air Quality Report
Kip Billings, WFRC | October 2019
Ozone Pollution

Three-Year Average 4th Highest 8-Hour Concentration

Ozone 4th Highest 8-hr Concentration

- Bountiful
- Herriman
- Spanish Fork
- 2015 Standard (0.070)
- Hawthorne
- Erda
- N Ogden/Harrisville
- Tooele #3
- Rose Park
- North Provo
- Ogden #2
- 1997/2008 Standard (0.084/.075)
PM2.5 Pollution

Three-Year Average 98th Percentile 24-Hour Concentration

PM2.5 98th Percentile of 24-hr Concentration

- Standard (65)
- Standard (35)
- Brigham City
- Bountiful (BT/6V)
- Magna
- Hawthorne
- Rose Park
- Herriman
- Tooele (T2/T3)
- Erda
- Ogden #2

PM2.5 [μg/m³]

Year: 2000 to 2018
Vehicle Emissions Reductions: 2019-2050

Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, Tooele, Box Elder

Tons/day

50% Reduction