“As growth keeps coming, we have a plan”
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
#WhereMatters
Ten workshops between September and December

Conversation around implementation, funding, data
Understanding where you’re going before takeoff
City-specific Information

- Mode share
- Current housing mix
- Average housing + transportation costs
- Percent of households within a ten-minute walk of a park
- Land use mix
- Street connectivity
- Potential for walking to destination
- Access to opportunities
Wasatch Choice Goals

- Livable and healthy communities
- Access to economic and educational opportunities
- Manageable and reliable traffic conditions
- Quality transportation choices
- Safe, user friendly streets
- Clean air
- Housing choices and affordable living expenses
- Fiscally responsible communities and infrastructure
- Sustainable environment, including water, agricultural, and other natural resources
- Ample parks, open spaces, and recreational opportunities
Data on WFRC's website
Implementing the Vision

WASATCH CHOICE 2050
VISION FOR OUR FUTURE
Utah is growing... and we have a plan. Our future quality of life depends on the choices we make today. Wasatch Choice 2050 is our communities’ shared vision for transportation investments, development patterns, and economic opportunities. The Vision map and key strategies show how advancing the Vision can enhance quality of life even as we grow.

Key Strategies
The Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision is built on four key strategies:
1. Provide transportation choices
2. Support housing options
3. Preserve open space
4. Link economic development and housing decisions

Benefits of the Vision
Implementing the Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision promotes high quality of life now and for generations to come.
- Livable and healthy communities
- Access to economic and educational opportunities
- Manageable and reliable traffic conditions
- Quality transportation choices
- Safe, user-friendly streets
- Clean air

WASATCH CHOICE 2050
Implementing Wasatch Choice

- Of the 30 small area plans, 93% are located in a Wasatch Choice 2050 center
Increasing Plans for Active Transportation

- 42 of the 62 communities in the WFRC area have completed or been funded for an active transportation plan
- 26 were directly funded by the TLC Program

68% of communities in the WFRC area have completed or funded Active Transportation
Transportation Choice: Of the 8 initial small area projects, all have a Major Transit Investment Corridor located within the project boundaries.
Land efficiency: From 2012 to 2018, the 8 small areas have absorbed over 5,200,000 square feet of development, an increase of 36%
Tracking Success

**Market Growth:** From 2012 to 2018, the 8 small areas have seen a 64% increase in market value.
## What We’ve Done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Area and Transit Station Area Plans</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinances</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Active Transportation Master Plans</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Updates</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Else Can We Measure?

Key Indicators

- Projects moving into next steps (project value)
- New housing units within ½ mile
- New jobs within ½ mile
- Share of city-wide growth occurring in small area TLC project boundary
- Potential Alternative (Public / Private Investment Dollars)
- Mode split
- Parking reduced from conventional rates
- Increase in the miles of planned and built bicycle infrastructure
- Updated Plan or Zoning with increased building diversity
MPO TRANSPORTATION FUNDING FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES: A REVIEW OF NATIONAL MPO PROGRAMS

DR. REID EWING
DOCTORAL STUDENT NEDA KIANI
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WHAT WAS THE ISSUE?

lack of coordination between MPOs and local governments
In the late 1990s and early 2000s, a few MPOs pioneered new programs to help promote livability by connecting, coordinating and integrating the Transportation and Land use Planning.

The first ones:
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of the Bay area
- Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) in Georgia
Research Questions

• How many MPOs have TLC programs?
• What are the operating characteristics?
• Whether the programs have grown or not?
• What are the impacts on their communities?
What we have done in this study

• In 2018, we conducted a national survey of MPO TLC programs
  • 402 MPOs were contacted from September to October of 2018 through emails
    • 27 MPOs responded to the survey and indicated they do have a TLC program
    • 65 said they did not and filled out a second survey for MPOs without programs.
  • In total, 92 agencies responded to the survey, resulting in a 23 percent response rate.
Map of MPOs with TLC programs
TWO SURVEYS WERE CREATED

Survey one: MPOs with TLC programs
- Goals and objectives
- Program operation
- Funding distribution
- Grant recipients
- Funding sources
- Measuring impact

Survey two: MPOs without TLC programs
- Familiarity with these kinds of programs
- Interest in starting a program
- Challenges or barriers to doing so
SURVEY TWO RESULTS: MPOS WITHOUT PROGRAMS

How interested is your MPO in starting a TLC program?
SURVEY ONE: MPOS WITH TLC PROGRAMS

TLC Program Growth Over Time (Responses of all MPOs with TLC programs)
Types of support provided by the MPOs

**TYPES OF SUPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, TA, Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, TA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING**
We give grants to local entity to do planning such as, create a bicycle master plan or conduct a corridor study.

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)**
We send MPO staff or consultants to help local entity with planning project.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**
We give grants to local entity to construct new or improved sidewalks, bike lanes, etc.
Funding sources for the program

- Federal Government: 72.4%
- Other Sources: 14.3%
- County: 4.8%
- Local Sales Tax: 1.9%
- State DOT: 6.7%
Funding for the programs
The majority of survey respondents do not use formal metrics to measure program success after the grant has been awarded.

What is more commonly seen are MPOs using project selection criteria to support projects with intended impacts that align with their program’s goals.
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT MEASURE

- Increases in non-automobile mode shares
- Measure increased tax revenue
- Assess increased jobs-housing balance in project areas
- Land conservation
- VMT reduction
- Air quality improvements
- Congestion reduction,
- Program reach, and progress on project implementation
MPOs granting earmarked funding to local governments in support of land use planning for promoting livable communities has become a growing trend in the US.

Each program has its own goals, but there are several areas of overlap and themes, the most common being increasing travel options, especially around alternative modes of transportation and supporting projects that align with the MPOs’ long-range transit plans.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Consider Why and How to Track Impact
- Measure What Matters
- Track Indicators
- Find Hacks to Help with Measurement
- Track Impact Less Often, But More In Depth
- Borrow Success Metrics from Grantees
- Get the Community Involved
Thank you
REFERENCES


New State Transportation Funding Prioritization Criteria

Regional Growth Committee
October 10, 2019
Capacity Fund Decision Making

- Major source of capacity funding since 2005
  - Current prioritization process has continually evolved and improved

- Recently updated by SB 136, 72, and 34
  - Creates Transportation (TIF) and Transit (TTIF) fund
  - Expands type of eligible capacity projects with each fund
  - Introduces new decision factors and requirements

- Legislation requires written prioritization process
  - Process codified in Utah Administrative Rule
  - Further guidance provided through UDOT Policy updates
DRAFT Prioritization Framework

- **Collaboratively developed** with internal and external stakeholders
- Balances **simplicity and complexity**
- **Addresses known issues** with current decision model
- Compares **across project types and geographies**
- Shared framework **enables future cross-asset evaluation**
- Prepares for **continual improvement and refinement**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Health</th>
<th>Better Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Economy</td>
<td>Connected Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity Programs

TIF - Highway

Active Transportation

TTIF - Transit

First and Last Mile
Capacity Decision Support Models

- TIF - Highway
- TIF - Active
- TTIF - Transit
- TTIF - First/Last Mile
Multimodal Framework

**Good Health**
- Safety
- Public Health
- Environment

**Strong Economy**
- Accessibility
- Transport Costs
- Economic Development

**Better Mobility**
- Travel Time
- Throughput
- Risk and Resiliency

**Connected Communities**
- Connectivity
- Land Use and Community
- Integrated Systems
TIF Highway Model

DRAFT – REVISED SEPTEMBER 13, 2019

Good Health 25%
- Safety 60%
  - UDOT USRAP Star Rating (#)
  - UDOT Safety Index (#)
- Public Health 20%
  - Active transportation component (Y/N)
- Environment 20%
  - Environmental Improvement (Y/N)

Strong Economy 20%
- Accessibility 35%
  - Connectivity to education and tourism destinations
- Transport Costs 20%
  - Truck percentage (#)
- Economic Development 45%
  - Current job destinations (#)
  - Future employment growth (#)
  - Transportation Reinvestment Zone or Other Outside Funding Source for Project (Y/N)

Better Mobility 40%
- Travel Time 55%
  - Existing reliability (#)
  - Delay (#)
- Throughput 30%
  - Existing volume (#)
  - Future volume (#)
- Risk and Resiliency 15%
  - Adds redundancy (Y/N)

Connected Communities 15%
- Connectivity 35%
  - Future population growth (#)
- Land Use and Community 35%
  - Solutions Development or Access Management (Y/N)
- Integrated Systems 30%
  - Transit component (Y/N)
## TTIF Transit Model

**DRAFT – REVISED SEPTEMBER 16, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Health</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>- Safety component index (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Percent of population physically inactive (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- Connectivity to education and tourism destinations (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commute costs as percent of household income (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>- Current job destinations (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Future employment growth (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Connections to TRZ and local economic development areas (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>- Safety component index (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reliability component index (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Costs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- Estimated system ridership increase (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>- Address identified risk in state, regional or local plan (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>- Connectivity for low-income households (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>- Future population growth (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>- Regional and local plan consistency (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Systems</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>- Project includes an active transportation component or is part of highway project (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIF Active Model

**DRAFT – REVISED SEPTEMBER 16, 2019**

#### Good Health 25%
- Safety 60%
  - Non-motorized crash trends (#)
  - Project safety component index (Y/N)

#### Strong Economy 20%
- Accessibility 40%
  - Connectivity to education and tourism destinations (#)

#### Better Mobility 40%
- Reliable travel time 30%
  - Travel time component index (Y/N)

#### Connected Communities 15%
- Connectivity 60%
  - Percent of workers commuting by non-SOV modes (#)
  - Future population growth (#)
  - Accessibility for low-income households (#)

#### Public Health 20%
- Percent of population physically inactive (#)

#### Environment 20%
- Air quality designation (#)
- Environmental feature index (Y/N)

#### Economic Development 20%
- Current employment
- Future employment growth (#)
- Connections to TRZ and local economic development areas (Y/N)

#### Risk and Resiliency 25%
- System redundancy index (Y/N)

#### Integrated Systems 15%
- Number of bike routes and transit stops that the project connects to (#)

#### Transport Costs 40%
- Percent of workforce living and working within project area (#)

#### Throughput 45%
- Active transport demand (#)
- Level of Traffic Stress Score and Project Element Index (#)

#### Land Use and Community
- Local plan consistency (Y/N)

---

20% 20% 40% 15% 20% 20% 60% 40% 30% 25% 60% 15% 25%
TTIF First/Last Model

DRAFT – REVISED SEPTEMBER 16, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Health</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Safety 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-motorized crash trends (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Project safety component index (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- Percent of population physically inactive (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- Air quality designation (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental feature index (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Economy</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Accessibility 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Connectivity to education and tourism destinations (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport costs</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>- Percent of workforce living and working within project area (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Mobility</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Reliable travel time 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Travel time component index (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ridership of transit stations served (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and resiliency</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>- System redundancy index (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- Current employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Future employment growth by area type (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Connections to TRZ and local economic development areas (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>- Percent of workers commuting by non-SOV modes (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Future population growth (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accessibility for low-income households (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>- Local plan consistency (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and community</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>- Number of bike routes and transit stops that the project connects to (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated systems</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>- Connections to TRZ and local economic development areas (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Transportation Capacity Project Prioritization Process Document

udot.utah.gov/go/projectprioritizationprocess
Draft TIF Highway Process

In Phase 1 of Unified Plan and >$5 million

Yes

Other Projects Identified as a Phase 1 Need May Be Considered

No

Commission may consider

Project May be Nominated by Local Government or District

No

Possible Considerations:
- Identified as a Phase 1 Need
- Proposed additional funding sources

Ranked Highway Projects
Draft TIF Active Process

- Project Nominated by Local Government or District
- In UDOT Approved Active Transportation Plan
- Demonstrate that project will mitigate traffic congestion
- Demonstrate that local government will be responsible for maintenance
- Demonstrate 40% match (can be in-kind)
- Ranked Active Transport Projects
Draft TTIF Transit Process

Project Nominated by Local Government or District

- Demonstrate Ongoing Funding Source for Operations and Maintenance
- Demonstrate 40% Match (can be in-kind)

Ranked Transit Capacity Projects

New Fixed Guideway Projects Need to be Identified in Phase 1 of LRP
Draft TTIF First/Last Process

Project Nominated by Local Government or District

- Demonstrate that local government will be responsible for maintenance

- Demonstrate 40% match (can be in-kind)

- Demonstrate project will connect and improve access to transit

Ranked First and Last Mile Projects

SB 136

• Implement a Road User Charge (RUC) – Jan 2020
  • Alternative to paying a flat fee for electric vehicles:
  • Eligible types: EV, PHEV, hybrids

• Establish a RUC advisory committee

• Report annually on program & future research projects

SB 72

• Rulemaking authority for UDOT

• Rulemaking authority for Transportation Commission

• UDOT/DMV information sharing
National Fuel Tax Purchasing Power Decline

Utah Legislative Countermeasures:

- Indexing to CPI
- Road Usage Fees
Size & Growth of Utah’s Vehicle Fleet

Total Registered Vehicles
2,594,746 (2019)

Year-over-year Growth (%)

- 2015–16: 89.5%
- 2016–17: 8.5%
- 2017–18: 2%
- 2018–19: 0.2%

EVs: 0.2%
PHEVs & Gas Hybrids: 0.1%
All Others: 1.5%

- 5,526 Vehicles (Feb 2019)
- 42,770
- 2,546,450
Total Annual Costs for Typical Utah Drivers

- Federal Fuel Tax: $0.18/gal
- Utah State Fuel Tax: $0.30/gal
- Hybrid Fee: $20/yr
- EV Fee: $120/yr
- Gasoline: $2.52/gal
- Electricity: $0.11/kWh

- 15 MPG Pickup: $3,109
- 20 MPG Utah Avg: $2,331
- 35 MPG Sedan: $1,332
- 50 MPG Gas Hybrid: $952
- Electric Vehicle (EV): $595

Notes:
- Federal Fuel Tax: $0.18/gal
- Utah State Fuel Tax: $0.30/gal
- Hybrid Fee: $20/yr
- EV Fee: $120/yr
- Gasoline: $2.52/gal
- Electricity: $0.11/kWh
Elements of Utah’s Initial RUC System

**Technology**
- Telematics
- Phone App/OBD-II

**Privacy**
- Flat Fee or RUC
- Data Retention
- Data Distribution
- User Agreement

**Vehicle Types**
- Electric (EV)
- Plug-in (PHEV)
- Gas Hybrid

**Enrollment**
- Online
- VIN
- Odometer Capture
- DMV Interface
- Registration Holds

**Comm Acct Mgr**
- Prepaid Wallet & Cap
- Credit/Debit Card
- Monthly Statement
- User Options
- App Interface
Utah’s Alternative Fuel Vehicle Payment Choice

**Annual Flat Fee**
- EV: $120
- PHEV: $52
- Gas Hybrid: $20

**Usage-based Fee**
- 1.5¢ / Mile*

*Usage-based fees will not exceed annual flat fee
Vehicles Enrolled in RUC or Paying Flat Fee

5-year Vehicle Totals
Flat Fees: 111,000 (97%)
RUC: 4,000 (3%)
Total: 115,000

Assumed Annual Growth
PHEVs: 5%
EVs: 50%
Gas Hybrids: 12%
Revenue from Flat Fees & RUC

2019 2020 2021 2022 2023

Flat Fees:
$17,200,000 (95.5%)
RUC:
$806,000 (4.5%)
Total:
$18,006,000

5-year Revenues

2019 2020 2021 2022 2023

PHEVs
EVs
Gas Hybrids

Millions of Dollars

$1.0 $1.9 $3.3 $4.6 $6.4

$0.07 $0.15 $0.23 $0.35

Flat Fee RUC Flat Fee RUC Flat Fee RUC Flat Fee RUC
RUC Research & Pilot Projects across the US

- RUC West members (15 states)
- I-95 Corridor Coalition members (17 states)
- Completed pilot program (7 states)
- Ongoing operational program (2 states)
Considered annual fees (12 states)
Adopted annual fees (19 states)
Adopted one-time fees (1 state)

Considered annual fees (15 states)
Adopted annual fees (26 states)
US Alternative Fuel Vehicle Fees

**National**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL FEES</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVs</td>
<td>$50–$225</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHEVs</td>
<td>$30–$200</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Hybrids</td>
<td>$20–$100</td>
<td>$58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL FEES</th>
<th>2021*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVs</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHEVs</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Hybrids</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fees are lower in 2019-20 and indexed to CPI after 2021

Considered annual fees (15 states)
Adopted annual fees (26 states)
Market-based or User-Pay System Exploration Across the US - Policy Considerations

Demand-responsive pricing
- NYC Congestion pricing
- Seattle Congestion pricing
- Oregon Local-option pilot
- San Francisco ride hailing tax

Interoperability between states
- WA Pilot – ID, OR, CA Pricing Schema
- OR/CA Pilot – System Integration
- I-95 Corridor Coalition – Multi Agency

Integration with tolling operations
- I-95 Corridor Coalition Pilot

Rural residents & low-income households
- Pay more gas tax than average due to lower MPG and more miles driven
- May benefit from RUC at a revenue neutral price point
Possible Future Elements

Vehicle Types
- Gas/Diesel
- Alt Fuel
- Heavy Trucks
- Fleets
- Autonomous

Interoperability
- Neighboring States
- National RUC
- Local RUC

Differentiation
- In-/Out-of-state
- Public/Private
- Paved/Unpaved

Integration
- Tolling
- Emissions Testing
- Multimodal Payment Bundling
Questions?