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RTP And Amendment Process Overview

- RTP is updated every four years
  - Recently adopted May 2015
- Periodic adjustments are needed between adoption cycles
- WFRC’s RTP amendment process
  - Financial constraints
  - Public review and input
  - Modeling and Air quality conformity
- Proposed requests reviewed annually beginning in March
RTP And Amendment Process Overview

1. Notification to County COG
2. 30-day Public Comment Period
3. WFRC Staff Review of Comments and Recommendation
   - Are there Regionally Significant Changes from the Comment Period?
     - Yes: RGC Review Staff Recommendation for Modification and New Public Comment Period
     - No: RGC Review Staff Recommendation for WFRC Approval and Website Update
4. WFRC Review and Approval
Amendment #4 Overview

• 17 total requests for approximately $150 million

• Projects guided by State requirements
  – Ten seeking Corridor Preservation Funds. (~$33 million)
  – One seeking Weber County-administered sales tax revenue. (~$5 million)

• Major capacity projects
  – Three could utilize funding from the WFRC-administered Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. (~$24 million)
  – Three UDOT projects could be financed through the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). (~$88 million)

• For information only
  – Two additional UDOT projects may also be funded with the TIF. Neither requires amendment into the 2015-2040 RTP; both are included for information only.
Projects Guided by State Requirements for Inclusion in the RTP
Local funding

Corridor Preservation Requests
1. Operational Improvements on 6000 West – Herriman City
2. Operational Improvements on 6400 West – Herriman City
3. Operational Improvements on 7300 West – Herriman City
4. Widening of Riverfront Parkway – South Jordan
5. Operational Improvements on 2700 West – South Jordan
6. Operational Improvements on Bengal Blvd. – Cottonwood Heights
7. Widening of Fort Union Blvd. – Cottonwood Heights
8. Widening of Vine Street – Murray
9. New Construction of Depot Street – Clearfield
10. Operational Improvements on 8000 West - Salt Lake County

Weber County Sales Tax
11. Operational Improvements on 1200 West – Marriot-Slaterville
Major Capacity Projects
Lone Peak Parkway – Draper City

Request: Draper City

Scope:
• Widening of Lone Peak Parkway from 12300 South to 12650 South.
• From three to five lanes.
• Existing Project move from Phase 2 to Phase 1.

Benefits:
• Realignment and providing a consistent cross section to Bangerter Hwy.
• Provide better traffic flow along Lone Peak Parkway.
• Connection to the FrontRunner Station.

Total Cost: $6 Million

Funding Source: Surface Transportation Program Fund and Corridor Preservation Fund
I-215 Frontage Road – Taylorsville City

**Request:** Taylorsville City and the Utah Department of Transportation

**Scope:**
- New road construction from 4100 South to 4700 South.
- Move from Phase 2 to Phase 1.

**Benefits:**
- Provide congestion and safety improvements on 4700 South and 2700 West.
- Provide improved access to development between 2700 West and I-215.

**Total Cost:** $14.5 Million

**Funding Source:** Surface Transportation Program Fund and other funding sources
Main Street – Kaysville and Layton City

Request:  Kaysville City

Scope:
•  Widen from 300 West to Layton Parkway.
•  From three to five lanes.
•  New project into Phase 1.

Benefits:
•  Provides a consistent cross section from Main Street to Layton Parkway.
•  Provide better traffic flow and addresses increased traffic volumes along Main Street.

Cost:  $3.1 Million

Funding Source:  Surface Transportation Program Fund
Request: Utah Department of Transportation

Scope:
• Upgrade current intersection at Bangerter Highway and 4700 South to an interchange.

Benefits:
• Will provide a continuous freeway cross section from I-215 to 4700 South.
• Will help with East / West traffic flow.
• Improve Safety.

Cost: $44.3 Million

Funding Source: Transportation Investment Fund
Bangerter Hwy Interchange at 13400 S - UDOT

Request: Utah Department of Transportation

Scope:
• Upgrade current intersection at Bangerter Highway and 13400 South to an interchange.

Benefits:
• Will provide a continuous freeway cross section from I-215 to 4700 South.
• Will help with East / West traffic flow.
• Improve Safety.

Cost: $43.2 Million

Funding Source: Transportation Program Investment Fund
US Highway 89 - UDOT

Request: Utah Department of Transportation

Scope:
• Widening of US Highway 89 from Antelope Drive to I-84.
• From four to six lanes.
• Move from Unfunded to Phase 1.

Benefits:
• Improved traffic flow along this major arterial.
• Improved safety.
• Part of the overall plan to upgrade this facility to a north / south freeway.

Cost: Funded

Funding Source: Transportation Investment Funds
For Information Only
I-15 Braided Ramp - UDOT

Request: Utah Department of Transportation

Scope:
• Not being amended in the WFRC RTP, but will be amended in the Statewide LRP.
• New Construction of a northbound braided ramp on I-15 between I-215 and 9000 South.

Benefits:
• Provide better traffic flow and addresses increased northbound traffic volumes along I-15.
• Relieves congestion at 7200 South and 9000 South interchanges.

Cost: $130 Million

Funding Source: Transportation Investment Fund
Request: Utah Department of Transportation

Scope:
• Not being amended into the WFRC RTP, but will be amended in the Statewide LRP.
• New Construction extending SR-201 from the SR-201/I-80 connection and SR-36.

Benefits:
• Parallel facility to I-80, allowing for emergency bypass.
• Provide better traffic flow and addresses increased traffic volumes on I-80.

Cost: $100 Million

Funding Source: Transportation Investment Fund
The Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision and RTP

WASATCH CHOICE
2050
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Wasatch Choice 2050 Process

Explore
- Establish Goals
- Develop Scenarios
- Evaluate Scenarios

Choose
- Draft & Evaluate Preferred Scenario
- Adopt Preferred Scenario

Prioritize
- Assess Financial Considerations
- Phase Projects
- Plan Impacts & Benefits

We Are Here
Stakeholder Input

WASATCH CHOICE 2050
&
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
2019-2050
Outreach

• Scenario Workshops

• Stakeholders
  – Special interest groups
  – Resource agencies
  – Community organizations
  – Public

• Online visualization tool: wasatchchoice.com/scenarios

• Webinar
10 Scenario Workshops
Feedback gathered

• Responses to 3 scenarios
  – Land use and centers
  – Transportation systems

• Keypad polling on preferences
  – Transit service
  – Active transportation networks
  – Driving patterns
Active Transportation: Regarding bicycle and pedestrian networks, where should the funding resources be spent?

1. Multi-use paths or trails separated from traffic.
2. On-street bicycle routes with greater separation from traffic.
3. On-street bicycle lanes adjacent to traffic.
4. Bicycle connections to transit stops and stations.
5. Wider, multi-use sidewalks.
6. Complete missing sidewalk connections.
Active Transportation: Regarding bicycle and pedestrian networks, where should the funding resources be spent?

1. Multi-use paths or trails separated from traffic.
2. On-street bicycle routes with greater separation from traffic.
3. On-street bicycle lanes adjacent to traffic.
4. Bicycle connections to transit stops and stations.
5. Wider, multi-use sidewalks.
6. Complete missing sidewalk connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>1 and 2 (tie)</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Roads:** Regarding driving patterns, what approach do you favor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Widen many roads</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Add lanes on the freeway</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Widen a few roads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>1 (tie) and 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Improve road network connectivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Reduce necessary travel distances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Roads: Regarding driving patterns, what approach do you favor?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Widen many roads</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Add lanes on the freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Widen a few roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve road network connectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (tie) and 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce necessary travel distances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (tie) and 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>1 (tie)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Transit Service:** If transit service is improved in your part of the county, which of the following do you favor?

1. Additional bus routes
2. More frequent bus service on existing routes
3. Additional fixed-route transit service (TRAX, BRT)
4. More frequent service on existing fixed-routes
5. Amenities like shelters, information kiosks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last (tie)</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Service: If transit service is improved in your part of the county, which of the following do you favor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which scenario do you prefer for active transportation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 3</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation</th>
<th>Priority bicycle routes</th>
<th>Centers-based, local bicycle connectivity</th>
<th>Separated regional bicycle facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Which scenario do you prefer for roads?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>2015-2040 RTP projects</th>
<th>Connectivity and management</th>
<th>Capacity-focused investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which scenario do you prefer for transit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>2015-2040 RTP projects</th>
<th>Capital-intensive projects</th>
<th>Service-intensive projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Which scenario do you prefer for new growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>General plans, extrapolated trends</th>
<th>Regional centers</th>
<th>Dispersed village/town centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which scenario do you prefer overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake SE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NE</th>
<th>Salt Lake NW</th>
<th>Salt Lake SW</th>
<th>Davis South</th>
<th>Davis North</th>
<th>Davis/Weber</th>
<th>Weber East</th>
<th>Weber North</th>
<th>Box Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scenario Results by mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>1st Phase Information</th>
<th>2nd Phase Information</th>
<th>3rd Phase Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>General plans, extrapolated trends</td>
<td>Regional centers</td>
<td>Dispersed village/town centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>2015-2040 RTP projects</td>
<td>Capital-intensive projects</td>
<td>Service-intensive projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway</strong></td>
<td>2015-2040 RTP projects</td>
<td>Connectivity and management</td>
<td>Capacity-focused investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Priority bicycle routes</td>
<td>Centers-based, local bicycle connectivity</td>
<td>Separated regional bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting to the Preferred Scenario

1. Review scenario workshop and stakeholder feedback

2. Technical evaluation

3. Incorporate relevant planning efforts

4. Future RGC and TAC meetings
   - June 21: TACs refine the preferred scenario
   - August: RGC review
   - October: RGC review
   - Spring 2018: Local workshops to refine the scenario
Resilient Aging in Utah
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KEY FINDINGS: UTAHNS AND HEALTH
Avoiding chronic disease is the most important reason to eat well and exercise; having greater physical ability and feeling better are also top reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Absolutely Essential</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better able to physically do the things I want/need to do</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel healthier/sick less often</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a better mood/mental outlook</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid chronic disease such as diabetes or heart disease</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more energy/less sluggish</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep better/get more rest</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can focus better/sharper mind</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me maintain/lose weight</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better appearance</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Respondents (n=1012)

Q600. There are different benefits or consequences that are connected to eating right and being physically active. Thinking about your own personal situation, for each of the following, please rate how important it is to you personally using the five response options:

Q601. You rated each of the items below as ...'. Please select the one item that you think is most important for you personally.
DOES AIR POLLUTION CAUSE DEMENTIA?

Scientists now suspect that a major cause of Alzheimer's and Parkinson's could be the air we breathe.

BY AARON REUBEN

PHOTOGRAPHS BY MACIEK JASIK

July/August 2015 Issue
The most impactful initiatives **increase opportunity** for exercise and healthy eating

### Most Influential Health Strategies (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Influence:</th>
<th>One of most impactful/influential:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require daily physical activity during school for all students</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the availability of affordable or free recreational opportunities for physical activity</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote safe walking and biking in neighborhoods and communities</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage school districts to promote physical activity programs before and after school</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the availability of fresh fruits and vegetables through things like farmers markets</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage employers to promote physical activity for employees (exercise release policies; walking at work; walking, biking, public transit to work)</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support land use development policies that preserve and promote open spaces for recreation, physical activity, and community gardens</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BASE: n=1012
Q1005 – Q1025. Thinking about some of the things that can be done in the <strategy>, how important and influential do you think each of the following strategies is?*
SALT LAKE COUNTY
INITIATIVE ON AGING

Partnership for a Greater Salt Lake

November 2016
Services

Housing

Mobility
Outcome 1 - Salt Lake County older adults better utilize existing services.

Outcome 2 - Salt Lake County older adults, currently in their homes, are able to age in place.

Outcome 3 - Low income and future older adults, have access to affordable, age-friendly housing options.

Outcome 4 - Older adults have sufficient access to a variety of transportation options.
Services (Access)

• Aging-Friendly Community Initiatives (AFCI’s)
  – Access: Service “Concierge” services (fragmentation)
  – Ground-up Community Responses

• Food + Service Deserts
  – Mixed-use, mixed-income and Density (“Centers?”)
Food deserts

MORE THAN 1 MILE FROM THE NEAREST GROCERY STORE.

$16.33

$10.38
Housing (Belonging)

• Visitability
  – At least 1 no-step entrance
  – Accessible doors and hallways
  – Accessible 1st floor half-bath and a room that could serve as a bedroom
  – Reinforcement in bathroom walls for future grab bar installation

• Housing Diversity
  – Affordability and Fixed Income
Mobility *(Connection)*

- Environmental Convoy
  - individuals go through life embedded in a personal network of places from whom they give and receive psycho-social and functional support
Connectivity

10 minute walk (grocery, pharmacy, bank, restaurant/café, health service, park)
Roxborough Pocket Park | Programmatic Axon
Planning for the Lifespan

- Services (Access)
- Housing (Belonging)
- Mobility (Connection)
College of Architecture + Planning

Thank you!
Utah Health Values Map

Personal Focus (39%)
- More productive/get more of what I want/need done
- Feel more energy
- Improve physical abilities
- Feel healthier/sick less often

Family/Friend Focus (28%)
- Take care of children/family/friends better
- Spend/enjoy more time with family/friends

Personal Physical Capacity (36%)
- Feel more energy
- Improve physical abilities
- Feel healthier/sick less often

Personal Mental Capacity (30%)
- Better mood/mental outlook
- Sharper mind/focus
- Better more rest

Avoid chronic disease 23%
- Sleep better/get more rest
- Feel more energy
- Improve physical abilities

Based on Most Important Issues
Health Values Map: Personal Focus (39%)

- Self-esteem 16%
- Peace of mind 15%
- Joy and Happiness 18%
- Enjoy high quality of life 25%
- Provide for those that depend on me 13%
- Love for family 16%
- Close bond 7%
- Personal Focus (39%)
  - More productive/get more of what I want/need done 21%
  - Take care of myself better 18%
  - Feel healthier/sick less often 11%
  - Feel more energy 7%
  - Improve physical abilities 18%
- Personal Physical Capacity (36%)
  - Feel more energy 7%
  - Improve physical abilities 18%
  - Sleep better/get more rest 9%
- Personal Mental Capacity (30%)
  - Better mood/mental outlook 16%
  - Sharper mind/focus 5%
- Based on Most Important Issues
Based on Most Important Issues

Health Values Map: Family/Friend (Social) Focus (28%)

Self-esteem 16%
Confidence 14%

Avoid chronic disease 23%
Live longer 14%
Provide for those that depend on me 13%
Better live life to the fullest 16%
Enjoy high quality of life 25%

Love for family 16%
Closer bond 7%

Joy and Happiness 18%
Spend/enjoy more time with family/friends 13%

Personal Focus (39%)
More productive/get more of what I want/need done 21%
Take care of myself better 18%

Better mood/better/get more mental outlook 16%
Sleep better/get more rest 9%

Personal Physical Capacity (36%)
Feel healthier/sicker less often 11%
Feel more energy 7%
Improve physical abilities 18%

Personal Mental Capacity (30%)
Better mood/mental outlook 16%
Sharper mind/focus 5%
Universal (Inclusive) Design

...is a process that enables and empowers a diverse population by improving human performance, health and wellness, and social participation
Universal (Inclusive) Design

...is a process that enables and empowers a diverse population by improving human performance, health and wellness, and social participation.
PROGRAM GOALS

• Coordinate land use and regional transportation
• Support local governments
• Support Wasatch Choice growth principles, e.g.
  • Reduce travel demand
  • Improve access to opportunity
2014-2016 SUMMARY

Average annual demand $1.37M

Total Investment $2.74M

- Small Area Plans: 24
- Form-Based Codes/Zoning: 8
- Active Transportation/Transportation Master Plans: 4
- Complete Streets Policies: 4
- Market Analyses: 6
- General Plan Updates: 3

72% of communities across the region submitted applications

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL
2017 AWARDS

• $938,000 TLC Funds
• $326,500 Local Match
• Nearly $1.3 Million in Total Project Funding

• 16 projects
  • 4 projects implementing past TLC efforts
## 2017 AWARDS

### Ogden/Layton Urbanized Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>Land Use Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td>Form-based Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>Envisioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td>Town Center Form-based Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry City</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse City</td>
<td>Town Center Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>2100 South Corridor Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tooele County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tooele County</td>
<td>Active Transportation Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Salt Lake Urbanized Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>Wasatch Blvd. Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>City Station Area Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek</td>
<td>General Plan and Zoning Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Central Station Area Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>12600 South Small Area Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Central Station Area Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Salt Lake</td>
<td>Strategic Mobility Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>New Bingham Highway Connector Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY WIDEPROJECTS

• Millcreek General Plan and Zoning Implementation
  • $95,000 budget

• South Salt Lake Strategic Mobility Plan
  • $120,000 budget

• Brigham City Land Use Code
  • $80,000

• Perry City General Plan
  • WFRC In-House Project, $5,000 Local Match
FORM-BASED CODES

• Clearfield City Downtown Form-Based Code
  • $70,000 Budget

• North Salt Lake Town Center Form-Based Code
  • WFRC In-House Project, $6,000 Local Match
STATION AREA PLANS

• Midvale City Station Area Plans
  • $75,000 Budget

• Murray Central Station Area Plan
  • $85,000 Budget

• Salt Lake City Central Station Area Plan
  • 150,000 Budget
Station Areas
SPECIFIC AREA PLANS

• Cottonwood Heights Wasatch Blvd. Master Plan
  • $95,000 Budget

• Riverton 12600 South Area Plan
  • $72,000 Budget

• Layton Envisioned
  • $97,500 Budget

• Syracuse Town Center Plan
  • $80,000 Budget

• West Haven 2100 South Master Plan
  • $30,000 Budget
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

• West Jordan New Bingham Highway Connector Study
  • $120,000 Budget

• Tooele County Active Transportation Plan
  • $35,000 Budget