



Jeff Silvestrini, Chair
Mayor, Millcreek

Jeff Scott, Vice Chair
Commissioner, Box Elder County

Mark Allen
Mayor, Washington Terrace

Len Arave
Mayor, North Salt Lake

Ron Bigelow
Mayor, West Valley

Mike Caldwell
Mayor, Ogden

Robert Dahle
Mayor, Holladay

Jim Harvey
Commissioner, Weber County

Scott Jenkins
Commissioner, Weber County

Randy Lewis
Mayor, Bountiful

Erin Mendenhall
Mayor, Salt Lake City

Mike Newton
Councilmember, Morgan County

Mark Shepherd
Mayor, Clearfield

Bob Stevenson
Commissioner, Davis County

Derk Timothy
Mayor, Bluffdale

Troy Walker
Mayor, Draper

Scott Wardle
Councilmember, Tooele County

Jenny Wilson
Mayor, Salt Lake County

Aimee Winder-Newton
Councilmember, Salt Lake County

Senator Wayne Harper
Utah State Senate

Representative Mike Schultz
Utah House of Representatives

Carlton Christensen
Utah Transit Authority

Carlos Braceras
Utah Department of Transportation

Dawn Ramsey
Utah League of Cities & Towns

Lorene Kamalu
Utah Association of Counties

Ari Bruening
Envision Utah

Laura Hanson
State Planning Coordinator

Andrew Gruber
Executive Director

REGIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE AGENDA May 20, 2021

A meeting of the Regional Growth Committee will be held on **Thursday, May 20, 2021 at 9:45 am via Zoom:**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89695184146?pwd=aStwUmkvaWNyTFo2U0JPL1JtcWpWQT09>

Meeting ID: 896 9518 4146 Passcode: 746186

One tap mobile +16699009128,,89695184146#

The agenda will be as follows:

- 1. Introductions and consent agenda**
ACTION: Minutes of the RGC Meeting held March 18, 2021
- 2. Public comment**
- 3. Wasatch Choice - the 2023-50 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**
 - Key plan objectives
 - Discuss ways to address uncertainty and disruption
- 4. ACTION: Amendment #3 to the 2019-2050 RTP**
- 5. ACTION: Point of the Mountain Transit Locally Preferred Alternative**
- 6. Other business**
Next meeting: August 19, 2021
- 7. Adjournment**

Upcoming Events:

- *WFRC Council Meeting, May 27, 2pm*
- *Wasatch Front Economic Development District Meeting, June 2, 3pm*
- *Joint Policy Advisory Committee Meeting, June 3, 11:30am*
- *WFRC Active Transportation Meeting, June 9, 9:45am*
- *WFRC Trans Com Meeting, June 17, 2pm*

Informational materials can be located on WFRC's website at www.wfrc.org.

Wasatch Front Regional Council is an Equal Opportunity program. Public participation is solicited without regard to age, sex, disability, race, color or national origin. Auxiliary aids or translation services are available upon request by contacting WFRC's Title VI Administrator. Call 801-363-4250 (hearing impaired individuals may use Relay Utah by dialing 711) or email apearson@wfrc.org at least 72 hours in advance.

Wasatch Front Regional Council is choosing to continue holding all public meetings electronically, without an anchor location, until it is deemed safe enough to hold public meetings in person.

Wasatch Front Regional Council es una organización de Oportunidad Igual. Se solicita la participación del público, sin importar la edad, el sexo, la discapacidad, la raza, color o nacionalidad. Personas que requieren servicios de traducción deben contactar al Administrador de Título VI de WFRC por teléfono a 801-363-4250 (personas con discapacidad auditiva pueden llamar a Spanish Relay Utah - 1-888-346-3162) o por correo electrónico apearson@wfrc.org, por lo menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

Wasatch Front Regional Council ha elegido seguir manteniendo todas las juntas públicas electrónicamente, sin un lugar de anclaje, hasta que sea considerado lo suficientemente seguro para tener juntas públicas en persona.



WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES
Regional Growth Committee
 March 18, 2021

A meeting was held on Thursday, March 18, 2021, via Zoom connection, due to the safety restrictions put in place by the Utah Governor's Office, in response to continuing COVID-19 concerns. The following were present:

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT		OTHER APPOINTED MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES	
Tyler Vincent, Member (Brigham City)		Natalie Gochnour, Member Utah Transportation Commission	
Jeff Scott, Alternate (Box Elder County)		Kevin Van Tassell, Alternate Utah Transportation Commission	
Len Arave, Member (North Salt Lake)	YES	Beth Holbrook, Member Utah Transit Authority Board of Trustees	YES
Rick Earnshaw, Alternate (Woods Cross)		Carlton Christensen, Alternate Utah Transit Authority Board of Trustees	YES
Joy Petro, Member (Layton)	YES	Erin Mendenhall, Member Utah Air Quality Board	YES
John Pohlman, Alternate (Fruit Heights)		Ari Bruening, Member Envision Utah	
Robert McConnell, Member (Morgan County)	YES	Ryan Beck, Alternate Envision Utah	YES
Matt Wilson, Alternate (Morgan County)		NON-VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
Jenny Wilson, Member (Salt Lake County)	YES	Ben Huot, Member Utah Department of Transportation	
Ron Bigelow, Alternate (West Valley City)	YES	Andrea Olson, Alternate Utah Department of Transportation	
Dawn Ramsey, Member (South Jordan) Chair	YES	Laura Hanson, Member Utah Transit Authority	YES
Richard Snelgrove, Member (Salt Lake County)	YES	Kerry Doane, Alternate Utah Transit Authority	
Troy Walker, Member (Draper)		Bryce Bird, Staff Representative Utah Air Quality Board	YES
Steven Shields, Alternate (Herriman)		Ivan Marrero, Member FHWA-Utah Division	
Dan Peay, Alternate (Magna)		Kelly Lund, Alternate FHWA-Utah Division	YES
Cherie Wood, Alternate (South Salt Lake)		Gary Uresk Utah League of Cities and Towns	YES
Kurt Bradburn, Alternate (Sandy)		Dina Blaes Utah Association of Counties	YES
Kendall Thomas, Member (Tooele County)	YES	Julie Fullmer, Vineyard Mayor Mountainland Association of Governments	
Ed Hansen, Alternate (Tooele City)		WFRC APPOINTMENTS FROM OTHER ORGANIZATIONS	
Mark Allen, Member (Washington Terrace)		Ibi Guevara, Utah Urban Lands Institute	YES
Norm Searle, Alternate (Riverdale)	YES	Evan Curtis, GOMB	YES
Robert Dandoy, Member (Roy) Vice Chair	YES	Jacey Skinner, Utah Transportation Coalition	YES
Jim Harvey, Alternate (Weber County)	YES	Reid Ewing, University of Utah	YES

OTHER ATTENDEES PRESENT, including WFRC Staff:	
Daniel Dugan, Shule Bishop, Kris Nilsen, Michael Maloy,	WFRC: Ted Knowlton, Andrew Gruber, Hugh Van Wagenen,
Linda Johnson, Bret Millburn, Jay Aguilar, Russell Weeks,	Rosie Hernandez, Christy Dahlberg, Megan Townsend,
Gary Brower, Travis Olsen, Wendy Thomas, Tami Moody	Ned Hacker, Nicole Mendelsohn, Bert Granberg, Jory Johner
	Lauren Victor, Ben Wuthrich, Andrea Pearson

1. Introductions and Consent Agenda [00:00:45]

Mayor Dawn Ramsey called the meeting to order at 9:46am. Roll call introductions were made. New members were recognized.

ACTION: Approve Minutes from the January 21, 2021 meeting [00:06:03]

Mayor Ramsey entertained a motion to accept the minutes. Commissioner Jim Harvey made a motion to accept the January 21 minutes and Mayor Norm Searle seconded. Affirmative motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment [00:05:15]

Mayor Ramsey opened the meeting for public comments. There were none.

3. Legislative outcomes, recent progress, and paths forward for the Wasatch Choice Regional Vision [00:07:03]

[00:09:23] Ted Knowlton, WFRC, gave a brief overview of the Wasatch Choice Regional Vision and four of the key strategies that are incorporated into the Vision, the shared framework that assists with coordinating long-term local planning with regional infrastructure planning. The strategies for discussion are:

- a. Transportation choices
- b. Housing choices
- c. Open space
- d. Linking economic development with transportation and housing

[00:14:51] Andrew Gruber, WFRC, summarized the legislative outcomes as related to the four strategies.

- a. Provide Transportation choices
HB433, transit improvement, investment in active transportation
- b. Support Housing options
\$50M state funds, leveraging \$730M in private funding and loans
SB164 Utah Housing Affordability Amendments
HB82
- c. Preserve Open space
\$103.5M one-time funding for new and existing state parks
- d. Link Economic Development with Transportation and Housing Decisions (Coordinated planning)
SB217 Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zones
HB368 State Planning Agencies Amendments
HB348 Economic Opportunity Commission
SB34 housing + transportation elements (2019)

[00:23:56] Ted Knowlton, WFRC, provided information on the recent progress and path forward for the Wasatch Front region. Mr. Knowlton discussed with the group a poll (results included below), using questions that have been posed to cities in the region, regarding how they are being proactive to coordinate planning and meet the demands of the growing population. The poll questions and results are included at the end of this document. **[00:37:00]** Mayor Bob Dandoy, Roy City, shared his thoughts regarding the success of the implementation of Roy's General Plan, and how the progress (over the past three years) has improved and revitalized the area. **[00:47:00]** Megan Townsend, WFRC, presented resources, which can be found here: <https://wfr.org/vision-plans/wc-newresources/> that have been developed by the staffs of the Wasatch Choice Partners (WFRC, UDOT, UTA, and SL County).

4. Transportation and Land Use Connection 2021 program awards [00:53:45]

Megan Townsend, WFRC, announced the Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC) program 2021 awards. This year, the program, which provides technical assistance to local communities to help them achieve their goals and plan for growth, will fund 16 new projects for a total amount of \$1,639,000. This includes four communities that have not participated in the TLC program before now. The TLC goals consist of the following:

- Maximize the value of investment in public infrastructure.
- Enhance access to opportunities.
- Increase travel options to optimize mobility.
- Create communities with opportunities to live, work, and play.

[00:55:10] Salt Lake County Mayor Jenny Wilson, **[01:00:10]** Salt Lake City Mayor Erin Mendenhall and **[01:05:40]** Layton City Mayor Joy Petro provided comments on projects in their communities and the benefits as each area plans for and incorporates growth.

5. Other Business [01:11:50]

Mayor Ramsey reminded the group that the next meeting of the Regional Growth Committee will be held on Thursday, May 20, 2021, and highlighted upcoming events.


6. Adjournment [01:12:27]

Mayor Ramsey called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Jim Harvey made the motion, Mayor Erin Mendenhall seconded. The affirmative vote was unanimous, and the meeting adjourned at 11:00am.

A recording of this meeting, as well as meeting materials, may be found on the WFRC website at www.wfrc.org

Results of poll taken during item 3:

1. Has your community undertaken any of these planning or zoning modifications in 2019 or 2020? (Multi choice)
 - a. Parks and Open Space
 - b. Street Connectivity
 - c. Street Design
 - d. Parking
 - e. Bicycling
 - f. Other



1. Does your General Plan include the center(s) on the Wasatch Choice 2050 Centers Map? (Single choice)
- a. Yes, all
 - b. Yes, some
 - c. No
 - d. Not applicable



1. Does your general plan consider the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) developed by WFRC? (Poll question)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Not applicable



DATE: May 13, 2021
AGENDA ITEM: 3
SUBJECT: Wasatch Choice - the 2023-50 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
PREPARED BY: Ted Knowlton

At the May 20 meeting, the Regional Growth Committee (RGC) will engage in its role as the steering committee for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a central component of the Wasatch Choice Regional Vision. The RTP is adopted every four years – the next RTP will be adopted in May 2023 and will address transportation needs through the year 2050. At this meeting, staff will seek feedback on objectives for the RTP process. We will all then discuss a key focus area of the RTP: improving the Region’s resilience in the face of rapid growth, recovery from COVID-19, and new external forces such as rapidly shifting transportation technologies and behaviors.

BACKGROUND:

The [Wasatch Choice](#) Regional Vision is our shared framework to prepare our communities and region to address the challenges of growth as well as the recovery from COVID-19. It coordinates regional transportation planning with local land use and economic development efforts. The regional transportation element of Wasatch Choice is the officially adopted [Regional Transportation Plan](#).

WFRC, together with all of Utah’s State and regional transportation agencies (UDOT, UTA, Mountainland AOG, Cache MPO, and Dixie MPO) work together to develop Utah’s Unified Transportation Plan. Each agency uses shared goals and assumptions to assemble complementary plans into a seamless Unified Plan. This approach to creating a statewide Unified Plan is unique in the nation and has been nationally recognized as state-of-the-practice. The [Unified Plan](#) web site includes an interactive map and all project details. WFRC’s RTP is integrated within Utah’s Unified Transportation Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

CONTACT PERSON:

Ted Knowlton, WFRC 801-425-3534, ted@wfr.org

DATE: May 12, 2021
AGENDA ITEM: 4
SUBJECT: **ACTION:** Amendment #3 to the 2019-2050 Regional Transportation Plan
PREPARED BY: Jory Johner

At the Regional Growth Committee (RGC) meeting, WFRC staff will present the proposed Amendment Number 3 to the 2019-2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2019-2050 RTP) - the regional transportation element of the Wasatch Choice Regional Vision. Project amendments are organized into three levels. "Level 1 - Staff modifications" include minor adjustments and are included in the Exhibit to this memo. The action requested on May 20th is to make a formal adoption of the "Level 2 - Board Modification" projects and release the "Level 3 - Full Amendment" projects for public comment. The projects within this amendment were presented to their respective Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) on April 28, 2021 and will be presented to the Box Elder, Weber, Davis and Salt Lake County Councils of Governments (COGs) following the May 20, 2021 RGC meeting.

BACKGROUND:

Every four years the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) prepares and adopts a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a component of the Wasatch Choice Regional Vision. WFRC adopted the current 2019-2050 RTP in May 2019. While the RTP receives considerable review before being formally adopted, circumstances may warrant a change to the RTP after its initial adoption, including the identification of new funding sources, the determination of final environmental impact statements, or the rapid development of certain projects. Recently the RTP amendment process was reviewed by transportation partners, local communities, and WFRC staff to help streamline the process while maintaining the rigor of the planning process. The modified [amendment process](#) was reviewed by the RGC and was formally adopted by the Regional Council in March 2020.

Amendment 3 includes a total of 22 projects that will be presented for your information per the updated process:

- 13 Level 3 (full amendment of regionally significant projects) requests, 11 from UDOT and two from UTA;
- Eight Level 2 (board modifications of non-regionally significant projects) requests, one each from Brigham City, Draper, Sandy, and Murray, and two each from South Weber and West Jordan; and
- One Level 1 (staff modification) request from the Military Installation Development Authority (MIDA).

A description of each of the proposed revisions are included with this memo. Technical analysis of each of the projects will be shared at the RGC meeting.

With the legislature passing House Bill 433 and giving direction to the Transportation Commission and UDOT to program the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) out to 2030, most proposed recommendations are to phasing, alignment/extent changes, costs adjustments, and deletions. Other local recommendations of projects include city-wide active transportation plans, Wasatch Choice neighborhood- or town-center changes, deletions, and individual active transportation projects. Technical considerations were considered in evaluating the projects, from a regional perspective, and will be presented at the RGC meeting.

PROCESS:

The WFRC staff has discussed the amendment requests with their respective sponsors, analyzed the scope of the project, potential technical considerations, and financial implications and determined that the 2019-2050 RTP is able to maintain its fiscal constraint and air quality conformity for these projects in all phases. The RTP is required to be “fiscally constrained” which means that it is reasonably based on the projected availability of funding from current or potential additional sources. It is also required to conform to the air quality emissions limitations in official air quality plans.

A formal 30-day public review and comment period for the Level 3 - Full Amendment projects will take place from June 26 through July 31, 2021, with public open houses on July 13th and 15th, in coordination with the public review period for WFRC’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The WFRC staff presented these amendments to the RGC’s Salt Lake County PlanTAC (Technical Advisory Committee – TAC) and the Ogden-Layton RGC TAC on April 28, 2021, groups composed predominantly of the planners from the communities in the WFRC region. The RGC TACs made a recommendation to RGC to approve the Level 2 - Board Modification projects and release the Level 3 - Full Amendments to public comment. No changes have been made to the 22 projects from what the RGC TACs reviewed. At the May 20, 2021 Regional Growth Committee meeting, public comment will be taken on the Level 2 - Board modification projects. RGC makes the final decision to adopt the Level 2 projects with the revised amendment process.

RECOMMENDATION:

Following public comment during the meeting, the WFRC staff requests that the Regional Growth Committee approve the Level 2 - Board Modifications within Amendment Number 3 to the 2019-2050 RTP. The WFRC staff then requests that the Regional Growth Committee release the Level 3 - Full Amendment projects, along with the Draft Air Quality Memorandum 40, for public review and comment.

Suggested motion language: *I make a motion to approve the Level 2 - Board Modification projects and release the Level 3 - Full Amendment projects and the air quality conformity determination as found in Draft Air Quality Memorandum 40 for public comment for Amendment Number 3 to the 2019-2050 RTP.*

CONTACT PERSON:

Jory Johner, WFRC 801-458-3090, jjohner@wfr.org

ATTACHMENT:

Amendment Number 3 Project Overviews
Draft Air Quality Memorandum 40

AMENDMENT NUMBER 3 PROJECT OVERVIEWS

Level 1 – Staff Modifications (For information only)

MIDA

1. Addition of the 3 Gate Rail Trail

Cost: \$9 Million

MIDA is requesting an amendment to add a new regional active transportation project from the Roy Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) Gate to the Clearfield West HAFB Gate. This proposed trail is a 2.8-mile off-street trail adjacent to the I-15 corridor from the Roy Gate to the West Gate of HAFB. The project will utilize an abandoned rail corridor. Potential funding sources include the Defense Community Infrastructure Pilot Program and the Military Installation Development Authority. This is a new Phase 1 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project.

Level 2 – Board Modifications

BRIGHAM CITY

1. Phase Change to Forest Street Railroad Crossing

Cost: \$22 Million

Brigham City is requesting an amendment to move up in phase the new construction of a grade-separated railroad crossing on Forest Street at approximately 900 West. This project will improve travel time reliability and increase safety of the railroad crossing. This project has revenue from bonding approved during the 2021 Legislative Session.

DRAPER

2. City-wide Active Transportation Plan

Cost: \$15.3 Million

The City of Draper is requesting an amendment that will include the facilities within the City's recently adopted Active Transportation Plan that was facilitated through the Transportation and Land Use Connection Program. This plan identifies new active transportation facilities, updates existing bicycle facilities to higher comfort, identifies intersections requiring safer crossings, and improves connections to existing and planned regional trails. There are 13 total projects that will be added to the regional AT map and project list. These facilities are found throughout Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the RTP. Other projects from the plan will be added to the Base Bicycle Network, but not included in any phases. RTP maps and projects lists will be updated upon approval of the request. Possible funding sources include City funds, County funds, STP, CMAQ, TAP, TIF Active, and/or TTIF First/Last Mile.

MURRAY

3. Modification to the Murray Fashion Place Mall Center

Murray City is requesting an amendment to combine an existing neighborhood, industrial, and employment center into a new urban center. The new center is bounded by I-15, Fashion Boulevard, 6100 South, and 6790 South and includes Fashion Place West TRAX station and the Fashion Place Mall. This center will increase connectivity between transit, Fashion Place Mall, and the medical employment centers and will create an opportunity for improved urban design in future mall expansion projects.

SANDY

4. City-wide Active Transportation Plan

Cost: \$20.9 Million

The City of Sandy is requesting an amendment that will include the facilities within the City's recently adopted Active Transportation Plan that was facilitated through the Transportation and Land Use Connection Program. This plan identifies new active transportation facilities, updates existing bicycle facilities to higher comfort, identifies intersections requiring safer crossings, and improves connections to existing and planned regional trails. There are 22 total projects that will be added to the regional AT map and project list. These facilities are found throughout Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the RTP. Other projects from the plan will be added to the Base Bicycle Network, but not included in any phases. RTP maps and projects lists will be updated upon approval of the request. Possible funding sources include City funds, County funds, STP, CMAQ, TAP, TIF Active, and/or TTIF First/Last Mile.

SOUTH WEBER

5. Alignment Change to South Bench Drive from I-84 to South Weber Drive

Cost: \$14.0 Million

South Weber City is requesting an amendment to realign the new construction project South Bench Drive between I-184 and South Weber Drive. South Weber Drive is proposed as a three-lane collector. This project will increase street connectivity and provide access in an undeveloped section of South Weber City. Funding sources include possible developer funds, impact fees, city funds, county funds, or state funds.

6. Project Removal of South Bench Drive from South Weber Drive to Fairfield Road

Cost: \$43 Million

South Weber City is requesting the removal of the new construction project South Bench Drive between South Weber Drive and Fairfield Road. The removal of this project will better align the Regional Transportation Plan with the adopted South Weber General Plan.

WEST JORDAN

7. Phase Change to 7800 South

Cost: \$11 Million

West Jordan is requesting an amendment that will allow for a phase change of widening 7800 South from SR-111 to 5600 West from Phase 3 to Phase 1. Funding sources include approved STP funds.

8. City-wide Active Transportation Plan

Cost: \$13.1 Million

The City of West Jordan is requesting an amendment that will include the facilities within the City's recently adopted Active Transportation Plan that was facilitated through the Transportation and Land Use Connection Program. This plan identifies new active transportation facilities, updates existing bicycle facilities to higher comfort, identifies intersections requiring safer crossings, and improves connections to existing and planned regional trails. There are six total projects that will be added to the regional AT map and project list. These facilities are found throughout Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the RTP. Other projects from the plan will be added to the Base Bicycle Network, but not included in any phases. RTP maps and projects lists will be updated upon approval of the request. Possible funding sources include City funds, County funds, STP, CMAQ, TAP, TIF Active, and/or TTIF First/Last Mile.

Level 3 – Full Amendments

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1. Cost Update for I-15 Interchange at 5600 South (Weber County)

Cost: \$188 Million

This amendment will update the cost of the I-15 interchange at 5600 South in Weber County rebuild and upgrade to \$188 Million. This project includes widening and active transportation facilities along 5600 South between I-15 and 3500 West. Funding sources include an approved one-time Legislative appropriation.

2. Phase Change to I-15 from Farmington to Davis/Salt Lake County Line

Cost: \$1.339 Billion

UDOT is requesting a phase change of I-15 from the Davis/Salt Lake County Line to Farmington from Phase 3 to Phase 1. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

3. Project Removal of I-15 from 2600 South to Davis/Salt Lake County Line

UDOT is requesting an amendment to change the phase of the reconstruction and widening project along I-15 from Farmington to 600 North in Salt Lake City from Phase 3 to Phase 1. Due to this project moving forward, a Phase 1 widening project of I-15 from 2600 South to the Davis/Salt Lake County Line is requested to be removed from the RTP as these two projects would be redundant. Funding sources include anticipated Transportation Investment Fund funding.

4. Phase Change of I-15 from Davis/Salt Lake County Line to 600 North

Cost: \$329 Million

UDOT is requesting a phase change of I-15 from the Davis/Salt Lake County Line to 600 North from Phase 3 to Phase 1. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

**5. Extent and Cost Update of Northbound I-15 from 2100 South to Bangerter Highway
Cost: \$289 Million**

UDOT is requesting an extent and cost change of northbound I-15 widening from 2100 South to Bangerter Highway. The request would change the limits to 600 South to I-215. The new cost is \$289 Million. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

**6. Extent and Cost Update of Northbound I-15 Collector and Distributors from I-215 to Bangerter Highway
Cost: \$296 Million**

UDOT is requesting an extent and cost change of the northbound I-15 Collector and Distributor system. The request would change the northern limit from I-215 to 9000 South. The new cost is \$296 Million. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

**7. Project Removal of Bangerter Highway Interchange at SR-201
Cost: \$18 Million**

UDOT is requesting an amendment to remove the upgrade of the SR-201 interchange at Bangerter Highway. A system-to-system improvement at this interchange will remain on the RTP. UDOT expects cost savings by prioritizing the system-to-system improvements.

**8. Phase Change and Extent Update of Mountain View Corridor from Old Bingham Highway to 13400 South
Cost: \$316 Million**

UDOT is requesting an amendment to update the phase, cost, and extent of Mountain View Corridor from Old Bingham Highway to 13400 South. The request would change the southern extent from 13400 South to Porter Rockwell Boulevard. The phase change is requested from Phase 2 to Phase 1. The new cost is \$316 Million. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

**9. Extent and Cost Update of Mountain View Corridor from 13400 South to Salt Lake/Utah County Line
Cost: \$126 Million**

UDOT is requesting an amendment to update the extent and cost of the future widening of Mountain View Corridor from 13400 South to the Salt Lake/Utah County line. The request would change the northern extent from 13400 South to Porter Rockwell Boulevard. The new cost is \$126 Million. This project is expected to receive Transportation Investment Fund funding.

**10. Phase Change and Cost Update of US-89 Interchange at I-84
Cost: \$240 Million**

UDOT is requesting an amendment to change the scope of the US-89 interchange at I-84 to separate the interchange project into two projects (see below). This amendment request would change the phase of the existing system-to-system interchange from Phase 1 to Phase 2. The new cost is \$240 Million. Funded through the Transportation Investment Fund.

11. New Project US-89 Interchange at I-84

Cost: \$60 Million

UDOT is requesting an amendment to change the scope of the US-89 interchange at I-84 to separate the interchange project into two projects (see above). This amendment request is a new Phase 1 project and would upgrade the interchange to a Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI). This project would allow for a less expensive, near-term solution while allowing a full system-to-system upgrade to be phased in with little “throw away.” Funding sources include additional Transportation Investment Fund funds to construct the Phase 1 SPUI upgrade.

UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY

12. Phase Change to FrontRunner Strategic Double Tracking

Cost: \$200 Million

UTA is requesting an amendment to change the phase of strategic double tracking FrontRunner from Phase 2 to Phase 1. This project will increase reliability, reduce travel times, and may allow for increased frequency and additional service. Funding sources include approved one-time Legislative appropriation and bonding revenue from the Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF).

13. Phase Change to S-Line Streetcar Extension from McClelland to Highland Drive

Cost: \$12 Million

UTA is requesting an amendment to change the phase of extending the S-line Streetcar from McClelland to Highland Drive in Salt Lake City from Unfunded to Phase 1. Funding sources include bonding revenue from the Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF).

Air Quality Memorandum

REPORT NO. 40 - DRAFT

DATE May 12, 2021

SUBJECT CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR AMMENDMENT #3 OF THE WFRC 2019-2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

ABSTRACT The FAST Act and the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) require that all regionally significant highway and transit projects in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas be derived from a “conforming” Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. A conforming Plan or Program is one that has been analyzed for emissions of controlled air pollutants and found to be within emission limits established in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) or within guidelines established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) until such time that a SIP is approved. This conformity analysis is made by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Salt Lake-West Valley and Ogden-Layton Urbanized Areas, and submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for their concurrence. This conformity analysis is being prepared according to the EPA transportation conformity regulations published in Federal Register March 2012 and according to FHWA final rulemakings found in the FAST legislation. The EPA approved MOVES model for estimating vehicle emissions was used for this conformity analysis.

This conformity analysis addresses the emissions impact of the 2019-2050 RTP, including Amendments 1, 2, and 3. The projected vehicle activity is based on Version 8.3.1 of the WFRC travel demand model and the 2012 Household Travel Survey of trip making activity. For a detailed list of projects included in this conformity analysis, see Appendix L of the Regional Transportation Plan: 2019-2050 at https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1kX4byj_BkDd9F_64-jCSw5ftao7_65eC.

The Amendment 3 revisions to this project list can be found in Appendix-2 at the end of this document. Based on the analysis presented in this document, the WFRC 2019-2050 RTP conforms to the State Implementation Plan or the Environmental Protection Agency interim conformity guidelines for all pollutants in applicable non-attainment or maintenance areas. Therefore, all transportation projects in Box Elder, Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Tooele Counties included in the Amended 2019-2050 RTP are found to conform.

Wasatch Front Regional Council

41 North Rio Grande Street, Suite 103
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
A. Conformity Requirements	4
Conformity Process.....	4
Latest Planning Assumptions.....	5
Latest Emissions Model.....	5
Consultation Process.....	6
TCM Implementation.....	6
Emissions Budget	6
Currently Conforming Plan and TIP.....	6
Projects from a Conforming Plan and TIP	6
Regionally Significant.....	7
CO, PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} “Hot Spot” Analysis.....	7
PM ₁₀ Control Measures.....	8
Other Conformity Requirements	8
B. Transportation Modeling	9
Planning Process	9
Travel Characteristics	9
Peak and Off-Peak Trip Distribution	11
Comparison of Modeled Speeds with Observed Data	12
C. Emission Modeling.....	13
I/M Programs	13
VMT Mix	13
Vehicle Weights.....	13
Post Model Adjustments.....	14
MOVES Inputs.....	14
Road Dust Estimates.....	16
D. Conformity Determination.....	17
Salt Lake City CO Conformity	17
Ogden CO Conformity	18
Ogden PM ₁₀ Conformity	19
Salt Lake County PM ₁₀ Conformity	21
Salt Lake PM _{2.5} Conformity.....	22
Appendix – 1 Definition of Regionally Significant Projects.....	28
Appendix – 2 Amendment 3 Projects	32

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Wasatch Front Region Non-attainment Designations	5
Table 2a Vehicle Miles Traveled (HPMS Adjusted Average Winter Weekday)	10
Table 2b Vehicle Miles Traveled (HPMS Adjusted Average Summer Weekday).....	10
Table 3 Percent of Trips by Time of Day.....	11
Table 4 Percent of Trips by Purpose.....	11
Table 5 WFRC Planning Area Modeled Speeds Compared to Observed Speeds	12
Table 6 MOVES Data – Input Database Folders.....	15
Table 7 Ogden CO Conformity	18
Table 8a Ogden PM10 Conformity – Direct Particulates	20
Table 8b Ogden PM10 Conformity – NOx Precursor	20
Table 9 Salt Lake County PM10 Budgets.....	21
Table 10a Salt Lake County PM10 Conformity – Direct Particulates	22
Table 10b Salt Lake County PM₁₀ Conformity – NOx Precursors	22
Table 11a Salt Lake Area PM_{2.5} Conformity – NOx Precursor	23
Table 11b Salt Lake Area PM_{2.5} Conformity – VOC Precursor	25
Table 11c Salt Lake Area PM_{2.5} Conformity – Direct PM Emissions.....	25
Table 12a Northern Wasatch Front Ozone Conformity – NOx Precursor	26
Table 12b Northern Wasatch Front Ozone Conformity – VOC Precursor	27

A. Conformity Requirements

Conformity Process

Since the commencement of the federal transportation planning requirements in the late 1960s, further requirements (most recently the 2015 Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST) and the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments) have added to the responsibilities and the decision making powers of local governments through the Metropolitan Planning Organization. The Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Salt Lake/West Valley and Ogden / Layton Urbanized Areas. This report summarizes WFRC's conformity analysis of the 2019-2050 RTP with the Division of Air Quality's State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the Environmental Protection Agency's interim conformity guidelines. This conformity analysis is subject to public and agency review, and requires the concurrence of the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

In November, 1993, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Transportation issued rules establishing the procedures to be used to show that transportation plans and programs conform to the SIP. The conformity rules establish that federal funds may not be used for transportation projects that add capacity in areas designated as "non-attainment (or maintenance) with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards", until and unless a regional emissions analysis of the Plan and TIP demonstrates that the projects conform to the SIP. This restriction also applies to "regionally significant" transportation projects sponsored by recipients of federal funds even if the regionally significant transportation project uses local funds exclusively.

Davis and Salt Lake Counties, Salt Lake City, Ogden City and portions of Weber, Box Elder and Tooele Counties are designated as non-attainment (or maintenance) for one or more air pollutants. Specifically, there are four areas in the Wasatch Front region for which the conformity rules apply. These areas are listed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1
Wasatch Front Region Non-attainment Designations**

Area	Designation	Pollutant	Attainment Date
Salt Lake City	Maintenance Area	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1983
Ogden City	Maintenance Area	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1983
	Moderate Non-Attainment Area	Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	TBD
Salt Lake County	Moderate Non-Attainment Area	Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	2003
Salt Lake (including Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber, Box Elder, and Tooele Counties)	Serious Non-Attainment Area	Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	2019
Northern Wasatch Front (including Salt Lake, Davis, and portions of Weber and Tooele Counties)	Marginal Non-Attainment Area	Ozone (O ₃)	2023

The CAAA established requirements for conformity. These requirements are outlined in 40 CFR 93.109 and include the following:

- Latest planning assumptions
- Transportation Control Measures (TCM)
- Emissions budget
- Projects from a conforming plan and TIP
- PM₁₀ control measures
- Latest emissions model
- Consultation
- Currently conforming plan and TIP
- CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} “hot spots”

Each of these requirements will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Latest Planning Assumptions

Current travel models are based on socioeconomic data and forecasts from local building permits, the Utah Division of Workforce Services, and the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget (GOMB). Base year socioeconomic data are for calendar year 2015. Forecasts of population and employment by traffic analysis zone were developed by WFRC in 2019 and are controlled to county-level forecasts produced in 2017 by the University of Utah’s Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute (GPI) funded by the Utah legislature.

Latest Emissions Model

The conformity analysis presented in this document is based on EPA mobile source emissions models: MOVES3 for tailpipe emissions and AP-42 section 13.2.1 for paved road dust emissions. The application of these models will be discussed in greater detail in the Emissions Model section of this document.

Consultation Process

Section 105 of 40 CFR Part 93 (Conformity Rule) requires, among other things, interagency consultation in the development of conformity determinations. To satisfy this requirement, the State Division of Air Quality (DAQ) prepared a Conformity SIP to outline the consultation procedures to be used in air quality and transportation planning. The Conformity SIP also defines the membership of the Interagency Consultation Team (ICT) as representatives from DAQ, WFRC, Mountainland Association of Governments, Utah Department of Transportation, Utah Transit Authority, EPA, FHWA, and the FTA. The Conformity SIP has been approved by EPA. WFRC followed the consultation procedures as outlined in the Conformity SIP in the preparation of this conformity analysis. As part of the public involvement procedures referenced in the Conformity SIP, WFRC presented this report to the Regional Growth Committee for review and comment. The TransCom committee includes a member of the Utah Air Quality Board as well as representatives of UDOT, UTA, and FHWA. Management level staff members from the Utah Division of Air Quality are notified of meetings and agendas of the above committees. The Utah Division of Air Quality and other members of the ICT were also provided with a copy of this report during the public comment period for the 2019-2050 RTP.

This Conformity Analysis for the 2019-2050 RTP was made available for public inspection and comment for a 30-day period in accordance with EPA conformity regulations. This analysis was also posted on the WFRC website during the comment period. Notification of the comment period was sent by electronic mail to interested stakeholders. In addition, public comment was taken during various committee meetings of the Wasatch Front Regional Council.

TCM Implementation

A conformity analysis for the 2019-2050 RTP must certify that the RTP does not interfere with the implementation of any Transportation Control Measure (TCM) identified in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP). There are not any TCM's identified in any of the currently applicable SIP documents for the Wasatch Front Region.

Emissions Budget

A comparison of mobile source emission estimates to emission budgets defined in the SIP is outlined in this document in Section D - Conformity Determination.

Currently Conforming Plan and TIP

The existing 2019-2050 RTP for the Wasatch Front Area conforms to State air quality goals and objectives as noted in a letter from FHWA and FTA dated June 17, 2019. The existing 2021-2024 TIP for the Wasatch Front Area was also found to conform and this was noted in a letter from FHWA and FTA dated September 4, 2020.

Projects from a Conforming Plan and TIP

TIP Time Frame - All projects which must be started no later than 2024 in order to achieve the transportation system envisioned by the 2019-2050 RTP are included in the 2021-2024 TIP. The TIP is fiscally constrained, meaning that only those projects with an identified source of funds are included in the TIP. Estimated funding availability is based on current funding levels and reasonable assumptions that these funds will continue to be available. Conformity for the 2021-2024 TIP is addressed separately in Air Quality Memorandum 39a.

Regionally Significant

All regionally significant projects, regardless of funding source (federal, state, or local) are included in the RTP. All regionally significant projects are also included in the regional emissions analysis of the RTP. Regionally significant highway projects are identified as capacity projects on roadways functionally classified as a principal arterial or higher order facility, and certain minor arterials as identified through the interagency consultation process (see Appendix 1 for a complete definition of regionally significant projects). The latest Utah Department of Transportation Functional Classification map is used to identify functional classification. Capacity projects on interstate highways, freeways, expressways, principal arterials, certain minor arterials, light rail, and commuter rail are treated as regionally significant projects.

Because of their relative impact on air quality, all regionally significant projects regardless of funding source must be included in the regional emissions analysis, and any significant change in the design or scope of a regionally significant project must also be reflected in the analysis. All regionally significant projects have been included in the regional emissions analysis, and the modeling parameters used for these projects are consistent with the design and scope of these projects as defined in the RTP. In order to improve the quality of the travel model, minor arterials and collectors, as well as local transit service, are also included in the regional travel model (and thus the regional emissions analysis) but these facilities are not considered regionally significant since they do not serve regional transportation needs as defined by EPA. For a list of projects included in this conformity analysis, see Appendix L of the Regional Transportation Plan: 2019-2050 at

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1kX4byj_BkDd9F_64-jCSw5ftao7_65eC.

The Amendment 3 revisions to this project list can be found in Appendix-2 at the end of this document.

CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} “Hot Spot” Analysis

In addition to the regional emissions conformity analysis presented in this document, specific projects within carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) non-attainment areas are required to prepare a “hot spot” analysis of emissions. The “hot spot” analysis serves to verify whether localized emissions from a specific project will meet air quality standards. This requirement is addressed during the NEPA phase of project development before FHWA or FTA can issue final project approval.

FHWA has issued guidance on quantitative PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} “hot spot” analysis to be used for the NEPA process. This guidance can be found at:

<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/projectlevel-hotspot.htm>.

PM₁₀ Control Measures

Construction-related Fugitive Dust - Construction-related dust is not identified in the Utah SIP as a contributor to the PM₁₀ non-attainment area. Therefore, there is no conformity requirement for construction dust. Section 93.122(d) (1) of 40 CFR reads as follows:

“For areas in which the implementation plan does not identify construction-related fugitive PM₁₀ as a contributor to the non-attainment problem, the fugitive PM₁₀ emissions associated with highway and transit project construction are not required to be considered in the regional emissions analysis.”

In the Utah PM₁₀ SIP, construction-related PM₁₀ is not included in the inventory, nor is it included in the attainment demonstration or control strategies. Control of construction-related PM₁₀ emissions are mentioned in qualitative terms in Section IX.A.7 of the SIP as a maintenance measure to preserve attainment of the PM₁₀ standard achieved by application of the control strategies identified in the SIP. Section IX.A.7.d of the SIP requires UDOT and local planning agencies to cooperate and review all proposed construction projects for impacts on the PM₁₀ standard. This SIP requirement is satisfied through the Utah State Air Quality Rules. R307-309-4 requires that sponsors of any construction activity file a dust control plan with the State Division of Air Quality.

Other Conformity Requirements

Transit Fares - Transit fares have increased periodically and will continue to increase in response to rising operating costs. The RTP assumes that transit fare revenues will cover a constant percentage of all transit operating cost, so future fare increases are consistent with the Plan. With any price increase some market reaction is expected. While there have been some short term fluctuations in transit patronage in response to fare increases, the implementation of light rail service and other transit improvements has retained and increased transit patronage consistent with the levels anticipated by the RTP.

Plans to expand light rail service, to increase and enhance bus service, and to extend commuter rail operations are moving forward. These transit projects are envisioned in the Plan and the steps necessary to implement these projects are moving forward including various voter approved sales tax increases for transit funding.

B. Transportation Modeling

Improvement to the WFRC travel demand model practice and procedure is an ongoing process. This conformity analysis is based on the latest version (8.3.1) of the travel demand model. Version 8.3 of the travel demand model has a 2015 base year and incorporates the results of the 2012 Household Travel Survey conducted by WFRC. Version 8.3.1 of the model made minor updates to the transportation network and socio-economic data since the previous version 8.3.

Planning Process

Federal funding for transportation improvements in urban areas requires that these improvements be developed through a comprehensive, coordinated, and continuous planning process involving all affected local governments and transportation planning agencies. The planning process is certified annually by the Regional Council and reported to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. Every four years FHWA and FTA conduct a comprehensive certification review. The certification review of August 2017 found that the WFRC planning process meets federal requirements. Recommendations were made to continue to improve WFRC's planning process and these are being addressed.

The documentation of the planning process includes at a minimum, a twenty-year Regional Transportation Plan updated at least every four years; and a four-year Transportation Improvement Program (capital improvement program) updated and adopted at least every four years. The planning process includes the involvement of local elected officials, state agencies, and the general public.

Travel Characteristics

The WFRC travel model is used to estimate and forecast highway Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and vehicle speeds for Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties. The Utah State Travel Model (USTM) is used to estimate VMT and speed in Box Elder County and Tooele County. The WFRC travel demand model is based on the latest available planning assumptions and a computerized representation of the transportation network of highways and transit service. The base data for the travel demand model is reviewed regularly for accuracy and updates. The travel model files used for this conformity analysis are available upon request.

Shown below in Table 2a and Table 2b is a summary of winter and summer weekday VMT for the cities and counties in designated non-attainment areas. Totals for VMT are given for various air quality analysis years from 2019 to 2050. Note that the VMT values for Box Elder and Tooele Counties are not for the entire county but only that portion of the county designated as non-attainment for a criteria pollutant.

Seasonal factors for highway VMT variations have been revised and refined by research commissioned by the Utah Department of Transportation. Seasonal factors are determined for each link of the highway system based on the functional class (freeway or arterial) and the area type (rural, transitional, suburban, and urban). Other considerations include traffic volume and recreational activity.

Table 2a**Vehicle Miles Traveled (HPMS Adjusted Average Winter Weekday)**

	2021	2024	2030	2040	2050
Ogden City	1,831,472	1,887,665	1,991,352	2,153,508	2,278,618
Salt Lake County	31,163,465	31,892,811	35,548,352	39,567,354	42,600,730
Davis County	8,724,763	9,372,186	10,411,624	11,507,417	12,453,173
Weber County	5,502,705	5,665,134	6,108,741	6,769,241	7,301,225
Box Elder County*	2,150,397	2,226,867	2,469,230	2,888,821	3,362,191
Tooele County*	1,772,599	1,928,781	2,269,896	2,775,621	3,245,074

*non-attainment portion of the county

Table 2b**Vehicle Miles Traveled (HPMS Adjusted Average Summer Weekday)**

	2021	2024	2030	2040	2050
Salt Lake County	34,977,247	35,587,921	39,623,309	43,957,099	47,241,871
Davis County	10,058,191	10,769,660	11,942,379	13,158,736	14,198,200
Weber County	6,472,502	6,618,305	7,130,873	7,910,633	8,532,464
Tooele County*	2,202,571	2,400,702	2,815,115	3,432,616	4,005,208

*non-attainment portion of the county

Peak and Off-Peak Trip Distribution

The modeled VMT and the modeled vehicle speed depend on the number of vehicle trips assigned for each time period (AM, midday, PM, and evening) defined in the travel demand model. The percentage of trips by purpose varies for each time period. The percentages in Table 3 and Table 4 below are based on data from the 2012 Household Travel Survey.

Table 3
Percent of Trips by Time of Day

Trip Purpose	AM	Mid Day	PM	Evening	Grand Total
Home Based - Other	11%	27%	24%	37%	100%
Home Based - Personal Business	9%	50%	25%	16%	100%
Home Based - School	40%	29%	26%	5%	100%
Home Based - Shopping	2%	43%	26%	29%	100%
Home Based - Work	35%	18%	28%	19%	100%
Non-home Based - Non-work	6%	46%	25%	23%	100%
Non-home Based - Work	13%	49%	29%	9%	100%
Grand Total	15%	34%	26%	25%	100%

Table 4
Percent of Trips by Purpose

Trip Purpose	AM	Mid Day	PM	Evening	Grand Total
Home Based - Other	25%	26%	31%	50%	33%
Home Based - Personal Business	3%	8%	5%	4%	5%
Home Based - School	19%	6%	7%	1%	7%
Home Based - Shopping	1%	13%	10%	12%	10%
Home Based - Work	37%	8%	17%	12%	16%
Non-home Based - Non-work	7%	25%	18%	18%	19%
Non-home Based - Work	8%	13%	11%	3%	9%
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Comparison of Modeled Speeds with Observed Data

WFRC strives for a high level of consistency between speeds predicted by its travel demand model and those observed in the real world. As part of WFRC's travel model's post-calibration validation process, observed travel speeds were collected in the Fall of 2018 and compared to speeds predicted by the Wasatch Front Travel Demand Model (v.8.3 beta).

Observations were collected for weekdays, from real time trip-routing web applications for the morning and evening peak travel periods for a set of 138 origin-destination pairs within the Wasatch Front region. Several web applications and data sources were evaluated before selecting the observed data source most consistent with real world experiences.

For the validation comparison, 43 trip origins, from traffic analysis zone (TAZ) centroids, were selected by staff, balancing the desires for region-wide coverage and trips volume representation. A set of up to 6 TAZ centroid destinations were selected for each trip origin point.

For each origin-destination pair, average trip speed was collected on the half-hour for each of the three peak hours of both the AM and PM periods. A weighted average of the hourly observed travel speeds for each peak period was calculated using observed travel volume as the weight factor.

Across the region, as shown in Table 5, averaged modeled trip speeds were 11% faster than the observed speed during the AM peak period and 6% faster during the PM peak period.

Table 5
WFRC Planning Area Modeled Speeds Compared to Observed Speeds

	AM Peak	PM Peak
Modeled Speeds (mph)	41	36
Observed Speeds (mph)	37	34
Percent Difference	11%	6%

C. Emission Modeling

I/M Programs

Assumptions for the input files for EPA's MOVES vehicle emissions model include I/M programs in Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber Counties. Box Elder and Tooele Counties do not presently have I/M programs.

VMT Mix

The VMT mix describes how much a particular vehicle type is used in the transportation network. While no longer a required input for the MOVES model as it was for MOBILE6.2, VMT mix is used in several instances to generate the input files required to run the MOVES model. The national default VMT mix found in the MOVES database was used to disaggregate local vehicle type data collected in 2017. The local vehicle type data is collected by UDOT as part of the federal HPMS data collection system and is based on automated counters which classify vehicles based on vehicle length. The UDOT classification is used to calculate control percentages for light duty (LD) vehicles and heavy duty (HD) vehicles for each facility type. The EPA default VMT mix is then applied to disaggregate the two UDOT control percentages into detailed percentages for the thirteen vehicle classes used in MOVES.

Vehicle Weights

Facility specific VMT mix data described above was also used to estimate the average vehicle weight on each facility type. Since vehicle weight affects the rate of re-entrained road dust emissions estimated using the AP-42 method, vehicle weight variations on different facilities will affect the amount of fugitive dust created. The VMT mix for each facility type was used to estimate an average vehicle weight for each facility type with the following results:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Average Vehicle Weight</u>
Urban - Freeway	6,500 lbs, or 3.25 tons
Urban - Arterial	6,100 lbs, or 3.05 tons
Urban - Local	3,900 lbs, or 1.95 tons

Post Model Adjustments

For conformity analyses prior to 2000, the WFRC applied post model adjustments to vehicle emission estimates. Emission credits for work trips were modeled for reductions in single occupant vehicle rates based primarily on increased investments in transit service and rideshare programs, and the projected increase in telecommuting. Other less significant post model adjustments were also estimated for incident management, pavement re-striping, and signal coordination. Additional emission reducing programs and projects supported by CMAQ funds such as park and ride lots, bicycle facilities, transit vehicles, intelligent transportation systems (ITS), and intersection improvements have also been implemented.

WFRC believes that these programs have a positive effect in reducing vehicle emissions. In practice, however, WFRC has found that documenting the air quality benefits of these programs can be challenging. WFRC will continue to support these emission reduction programs, but credits from these programs have not been included in this conformity analysis.

MOVES Inputs

The MOVES model is a very data intensive computer program based on the MariaDB software. Through the interagency consultation process the required MOVES inputs reflecting local conditions have been established.

Data files defining local conditions by county and year are required inputs to the MOVES model including vehicle population, emission testing programs, fuel supply, fuel formulation, meteorological conditions, and vehicle age. Vehicle population estimates are based on 2019 registration data by county and the estimated VMT for the same year. This vehicle population to VMT ratio is then applied to model projections of VMT to estimate future year vehicle population. By estimating vehicle population in this way the calculation considers the effects of human population and employment projections, as well as mode choice options that are included in the travel demand model.

Vehicle activity input files for the MOVES model are generated by the WFRC travel demand model using a customized in-house program for this purpose. The MOVES input files required include data for road distribution, speed distribution, and VMT by vehicle type for each county (Box Elder, Davis, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber) and analysis year as required for operating the MOVES model.

The input files listed above are read into the MOVES program as database files. The input database folders in Table 6 below contain the database files used for each county and year modeled using MOVES for this conformity analysis. The results of the MOVES model are stored in the output database “Conf21_wt_out” and “Conf21_sm_out” for each county and analysis year identified in Table 6.

Table 6
MOVES Data – Input Database Folders

Box Elder	Weber	Davis	Salt Lake	Tooele	Ogden
Conf21_wt_be _2021_IN	Conf21_wt_we _2021_IN	Conf21_wt_da _2021_IN	Conf21_wt_sl _2021_IN	Conf21_wt_to _2021_IN	Conf21_wt_og _2021_IN
Conf21_wt_be _2024_IN	Conf21_wt_we _2024_IN	Conf21_wt_da _2024_IN	Conf21_wt_sl _2024_IN	Conf21_wt_to _2024_IN	Conf21_wt_og _2024_IN
Conf21_wt_be _2030_IN	Conf21_wt_we _2030_IN	Conf21_wt_da _2030_IN	Conf21_wt_sl _2030_IN	Conf21_wt_to _2030_IN	Conf21_wt_og _2030_IN
Conf21_wt_be _2040_IN	Conf21_wt_we _2040_IN	Conf21_wt_da _2040_IN	Conf21_wt_sl _2040_IN	Conf21_wt_to _2040_IN	Conf21_wt_og _2040_IN
Conf21_wt_be _2050_IN	Conf21_wt_we _2050_IN	Conf21_wt_da _2050_IN	Conf21_wt_sl _2050_IN	Conf21_wt_to _2050_IN	Conf21_wt_og _2050_IN
	Conf21_sm_we _2021a_IN	Conf21_sm_da _2021_IN	Conf21_sm_sl _2021_IN	Conf21_sm_to _2021_IN	
	Conf21_sm_we _2024_IN	Conf21_sm_da _2024_IN	Conf21_sm_sl _2024_IN	Conf21_sm_to _2024_IN	
	Conf21_sm_we _2030_IN	Conf21_sm_da _2030_IN	Conf21_sm_sl _2030_IN	Conf21_sm_to _2030_IN	
	Conf21_sm_we _2040_IN	Conf21_sm_da _2040_IN	Conf21_sm_sl _2040_IN	Conf21_sm_to _2040_IN	
	Conf21_sm_we _2050_IN	Conf21_sm_da _2050_IN	Conf21_sm_sl _2050_IN	Conf21_sm_to _2050_IN	

Road Dust Estimates

In January 2011, the EPA released new guidance for estimating dust emissions from paved roads. These guidelines are published in Chapter 13.2.1 of the AP-42 document. The new formula is

$$E = k (sL)^{0.91} \times (W)^{1.02}$$

where: E = particulate emission factor (grams/mile),
 k = particle size multiplier for particle size range and units of interest (for PM₁₀, k=1.0 and for PM_{2.5} k=0.25),
 sL = road surface silt loading (grams per square meter - g/m²), and
 W = average weight (tons) of the vehicles traveling the road.

Based on vehicle type counts on roads in the WFRC region, average vehicle weights for local roads, arterials, and freeways are 1.95, 3.05, and 3.25 tons respectively. The silt load (sL) factor varies by highway functional class and by traffic volume. The default silt load factors found in Table 13.2.1-2 of the AP-42 document are summarized below.

Traffic Volume	Functional Class	Silt Load (grams/meter²)
500-5,000	local roads	0.200
5,000-10,000	arterial roads	0.060
limited access	freeways	0.015

A precipitation reduction factor is also applied to the above equation using the following expression:

$$(1 - P/4N)$$

Where: P = number of "wet" days with at least 0.254 mm (0.01 in) of precipitation during the averaging period, and
 N = number of days in the averaging period (e.g., 365 for annual, 91 for seasonal, 30 for monthly).

The AP-42 guidance recommends a value of 90 precipitation days per year for the Wasatch Front region. Using these values, the precipitation reduction factor yields a value of 0.9384. Combined with the basic road dust emission rate, the net PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ road dust factors by highway functional class are as follows:

Functional Class	PM₁₀ Road Dust Rate (grams/mile)	PM_{2.5} Road Dust Rate (grams/mile)
local roads	0.429	0.107
arterials	0.226	0.057
freeways	0.068	0.017

D. Conformity Determination

The following conformity findings for Amendment 3 of the 2019-2050 Regional Transportation Plan for the Wasatch Front are based on the transportation systems and planning assumptions described in this report and the EPA approved vehicle emissions model (MOVES3).


Salt Lake City CO Conformity

Carbon monoxide levels in Salt Lake City have been at healthy levels for over 20 years which has resulted in the EPA removing the non-attainment designation. Salt Lake City was first designated as a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide in 1978. After 42 years of monitoring CO pollution, implementing vehicle emission testing, and adopting much improved vehicle emission standards, the air in Salt Lake City continues to be clear of unhealthy levels of carbon monoxide pollution.

The chart below shows the dramatic reductions in CO pollution in Salt Lake City since 1980. The EPA health standard for CO is 9 ppm. Salt Lake City has not exceeded that level since 1987.

This dramatic improvement in CO pollution is primarily due to improved vehicle emission standards and cleaner fuels. Before 1966, passenger cars and light duty trucks emitted about 80 grams/mile and 102 grams/mile of CO respectively. Following a series of vehicle emission standard improvements, the emission rate for both types of vehicles since 2006 now stands at 3.4 grams/mile for CO – a reduction of over 96%.

Over the years as older vehicles have been replaced with newer, cleaner vehicles the accumulated CO pollution has gone down steadily to the point that Salt Lake City carbon monoxide has remained in the healthy range for the last 33 years. Ogden City has also experienced decades of safe carbon monoxide levels and is on track to be designated in 2021 as attaining the CO health standard. Emissions of other pollutants such as nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds – precursor emissions to particulate pollution and ozone pollution – have likewise been reduced but more work remains for management of these pollutants.



Source: Second highest 8-hour observation. 1980-1994 EPA AIRS data for Salt Lake City, station unidentified; 1995-1996 Utah DAQ monitoring archive, Cottonwood station; 1997-2019 Utah DAQ monitoring archive, Hawthorne station.

Ogden CO Conformity

The carbon monoxide maintenance plan for Ogden City was approved by EPA effective November 14, 2005 as recorded in the Federal Register (Vol. 70, No. 177, September 14, 2005). The maintenance plan defines a motor vehicle emission budget for the years 2005 and 2021 of 75.36 and 73.02 tons/day respectively. Table 8 below demonstrates that projected mobile source emissions are within the emission budget defined in the maintenance plan for the 2021 budget year. The other years listed in Table 8 are in accordance with requirements of the Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93) as noted in the table.

From this demonstration it is concluded that the 2019-2050 RTP conforms to the applicable controls and goals of the State Implementation Plan (Maintenance Plan) for Carbon Monoxide in Ogden City.

**Table 7
Ogden City - CO
Conformity Determination**

Year	<i>b</i> 2021	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
Budget[#] (tons/day)	73.02	73.02	73.02	73.02
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	5.3896	2.4635	1.9217	1.8337
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	1,831,472	1,991,352	2,153,508	2,278,618
Projection* (tons/day)	10.88	5.41	4.56	4.61
Conformity (Projection < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

b - budget year, *c* - 10-year rule, *d* - no budget 5-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

[#] Federal Register Vol. 70 No. 177, September 14, 2005, Table V-2.

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Ogden PM10 Conformity

Ogden City was designated as a PM₁₀ non-attainment area in August of 1995 based on PM₁₀ violations in 1993 or earlier. Since a PM₁₀ SIP for Ogden has not yet been approved by EPA, it must be demonstrated that Ogden PM₁₀ emissions are either less than 1990 emissions or less than “no-build” emissions. The analysis years 2024, 2034, 2040, and 2050 were selected in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR Section 93.119(e).

PM₁₀ emissions are present in two varieties referred to as primary and secondary PM₁₀. Primary PM₁₀ consists mostly of fugitive road dust but also includes particles from brake wear and tire wear and some “soot” particles emitted directly from the vehicle tailpipe. The methods defined in the January 2011 version of the EPA publication known as “AP-42” were used to estimate dust from paved roads. Secondary PM₁₀ consists of gaseous tailpipe emissions that take on a particulate form through subsequent chemical reactions in the atmosphere. Nitrogen oxides are the main component of secondary PM₁₀ emissions with sulfur oxides a distant second.

As summarized in Tables 8a and 8b, emission estimates for the 2019-2050 RTP satisfy the “Build < 1990” test for secondary PM₁₀ (NO_x precursors) and primary PM₁₀ (direct tailpipe particulates, brake wear, tire wear, and road dust) in Ogden City. The 1990 emission estimates based on the Mobile6.2 vehicle emissions model for the 2003 conformity analysis have been updated for this conformity analysis using the MOVES model and the January 2011 AP-42 road dust methodology for consistency with current emission modeling requirements. Specifically, the NO_x precursor budget (1990 emission estimate) changes from 4.57 tons/day to 6.92 tons/day, and the direct PM₁₀ budget (1990 estimate) changes from 2.28 tons/day to 1.28 tons/day. The 1990 primary PM₁₀ estimate for Ogden City includes emissions from the unpaved access road to the Ogden landfill which was closed in 1998.

For projections of primary PM₁₀ emissions, no credit was taken for a number of programs adopted since Ogden City last violated the PM₁₀ standard. These particulate reducing programs include covered load ordinances, increased frequency of street sweeping, and reduced application of deicing and skid resistant materials (salt and sand). Documentation of these programs has been provided by Ogden City but the actual benefits of these programs are not included in the emission projections below. Other areas that have estimated the benefit of these programs have found a silt load reduction of over 30% for effective street sweeping programs and a 5% silt load reduction when limiting the amount of sand and salt applied to the roads. Ogden City has also implemented a number of specific projects that have a positive effect in reducing particulate emissions including park and ride lots, storm water improvements, shoulder widening and edge striping, and addition of curb and gutter on several roadways.

From this demonstration it is concluded that the 2019-2050 RTP conforms under the Emission Reductions Criteria for areas without motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM₁₀ in Ogden City.

Table 8a

**Ogden City - PM10 (NO_x Precursor)
Conformity Determination**

Year	<i>d</i> 2024	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
1990 Emissions (tons/day)	6.92	6.92	6.92	6.92
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	0.6673	0.4533	0.3503	0.3342
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	1,887,665	1,991,352	2,153,508	2,278,618
Projection* (tons/day)	1.39	0.99	0.83	0.84
Conformity (Projection < 1990 Emissions)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

c - 10-year rule, *d* - no budget 5-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Table 8b

Ogden City - PM10 (Primary Particulates)
Conformity Determination**

Year	<i>c</i> 2021	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
1990 Emissions (tons/day)	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28
<i>emission rates (grams/mile)</i>				
<i>total exhaust particulates</i>	0.0282	0.0164	0.0127	0.0125
<i>brake particulates</i>	0.0630	0.0518	0.0517	0.0528
<i>tire particulates</i>	0.0128	0.0124	0.0123	0.0123
<i>road dust particulates</i>	0.2672	0.2664	0.2640	0.2629
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	1,831,472	1,991,352	2,153,508	2,278,618
Projection* (tons/day)	0.75	0.76	0.81	0.86
Conformity (Projection < 1990 Emissions)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

** Includes total PM10 exhaust particulates, road dust, tire wear, and brake wear.

c - 10-year rule, *d* - no budget 5-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Salt Lake County PM10 Conformity

The PM₁₀ SIP for Salt Lake County does not define a budget beyond the year 2003. Therefore, conformity tests are required only for analysis years which are identified in accordance with 40 CFR 93.118. All analysis years after 2003 must meet the 2003 budgets for primary particulates and secondary particulates (see the discussion above under Ogden PM₁₀ Conformity for an explanation of primary and secondary PM₁₀ emissions). The State air quality rule R307-310 allows a portion of the surplus primary PM₁₀ budget to be applied to the secondary PM₁₀ budget for conformity purposes. However, for the analysis years, 2021, 2030, 2040 and 2050, no budget adjustments were necessary.

Table 9
Salt Lake County - PM10 Budgets
Direct (Dust) and Precursor (NO_x) PM10 Emission Budgets
 (tons/day)

Year	2021	2030	2040	2050
Total PM10 Budget	72.60	72.60	72.60	72.60
<i>Direct PM10 Budget to be Traded</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Direct PM10 Budget	40.30	40.30	40.30	40.30
NO_x Precursor PM10 Budget	32.30	32.30	32.30	32.30

Table 10a and Table 10b below demonstrate that projected mobile source emissions are within the emission budget defined in the SIP. The years listed in Table 10a and Table 10b are in accordance with requirements of the Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93) as noted in the tables.

From this demonstration it is concluded that the 2019-2050 RTP conforms to the applicable controls and goals of the State Implementation Plan for PM₁₀ in Salt Lake County.

Table 10a
Salt Lake County - PM10 (NOx Precursor)
Conformity Determination

Year	<i>c</i> 2021	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
Budget (tons/day)	32.30	32.30	32.30	32.30
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	<i>0.6167</i>	<i>0.2854</i>	<i>0.2179</i>	<i>0.2060</i>
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	<i>31,163,465</i>	<i>35,548,352</i>	<i>39,567,354</i>	<i>42,600,730</i>
Projection* (tons/day)	21.19	11.18	9.50	9.67
Conformity (Projection < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

WFRC Memo to Jeff Houk of EPA, April 15, 1994.

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Table 10b
Salt Lake County - PM10 (Primary Particulates)**
Conformity Determination

Year	<i>c</i> 2021	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
Budget (tons/day)	40.30	40.30	40.30	40.30
<i>emission rates (grams/mile)</i>				
<i>total exhaust particulates</i>	<i>0.0287</i>	<i>0.0096</i>	<i>0.0091</i>	<i>0.0100</i>
<i>brake particulates</i>	<i>0.0462</i>	<i>0.0324</i>	<i>0.0326</i>	<i>0.0330</i>
<i>tire particulates</i>	<i>0.0112</i>	<i>0.0032</i>	<i>0.0101</i>	<i>0.0102</i>
<i>road dust particulates</i>	<i>0.2031</i>	<i>0.1931</i>	<i>0.1897</i>	<i>0.1893</i>
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	<i>31,163,465</i>	<i>35,548,352</i>	<i>39,567,354</i>	<i>42,600,730</i>
Projection* (tons/day)	9.93	9.34	10.53	11.38
Conformity (Projection < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

** Includes total PM10 exhaust particulates, road dust, tire wear, and brake wear.

WFRC Memo to Jeff Houk of EPA, April 15, 1994.

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Salt Lake PM_{2.5} Conformity

Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber, Tooele, and Box Elder Counties have been designated as a maintenance area under the new PM_{2.5} standard (35 µg/m³) that was established in 2006. As reported in the November 6, 2020 Federal Register, EPA approved the following motor vehicle

emission budgets for the Salt Lake PM_{2.5} area effective in 2035 and thereafter: 21.63 tpd of NO_x, 20.57 tpd of VOC, and 1.38 tpd of direct PM_{2.5}.

For years prior to 2035 no motor vehicle emission budget is specified. It is expected, however, that a qualitative assessment of emission reductions be provided for these intervening years. As part of this qualitative assessment, Tables 11a-11c below include a comparison of projected emissions for select years prior to 2035 and compares those emissions to 2008 levels which was the previous interim conformity test. Since 2008, emissions related to PM_{2.5} pollution have been reduced by half or more. The VMT estimates found in Tables 11a-11c reflect the strong economic growth anticipated in the region and there is no reason to expect a dramatic increase in VMT growth beyond these estimates which could bring into question the emission projections.

Table 11a below demonstrates that projected mobile source emissions of NO_x (a precursor to PM_{2.5} emissions) in the five-county PM_{2.5} non-attainment area are less than 2008 NO_x emissions prior to 2035, and less than the approved budget after 2035. Table 11b below demonstrates that projected mobile source emissions of VOC (also a precursor to PM_{2.5} emissions) in the five-county PM_{2.5} non-attainment area are less than 2008 VOC emissions prior to 2035, and less than the approved budget after 2035. Table 11c below demonstrates that direct particle emissions of PM_{2.5} in the five-county PM_{2.5} non-attainment area are also less than 2008 direct particle emissions prior to 2035, and less than the approved budget after 2035. Direct particle emissions include exhaust emissions of elemental carbon, organic carbon, and sulfates (SO₄); and mechanical emissions from brake wear and tire wear.

From this demonstration it is concluded that the RTP conforms under the interim conformity guidelines for PM_{2.5} areas without an approved motor vehicle emissions budget for the Salt Lake PM_{2.5} non-attainment area.

Table 11a

**Salt Lake Area[#] - PM_{2.5} (NO_x Precursor)
Conformity Determination**

	^c	^c	^c	^c	^e
Year	2021	2024	2030	2040	2050
2008 Emissions (tons/day)	97.98	97.98	97.98	--	--
Budget[#] (tons/day)	--	--	--	21.63	21.63
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	<i>0.6987</i>	<i>0.4911</i>	<i>0.3268</i>	<i>0.2515</i>	<i>0.2397</i>
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	<i>49,313,929</i>	<i>51,085,779</i>	<i>56,807,842</i>	<i>63,508,455</i>	<i>68,962,394</i>
Projection* (tons/day)	37.98	27.65	20.46	17.61	18.22
Conformity (Projection < 2008 Emissions or < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

[#] Salt Lake PM_{2.5} Non-Attainment Area includes: Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber, Box Elder and Tooele Counties.

^c - 10-year rule, ^e - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Table 11b

**Salt Lake Area[#] - PM2.5 (VOC Precursor)
Conformity Determination**

Year	<i>c</i> 2021	2024	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
2008 Emissions (tons/day)	61.35	61.35	61.35	--	--
Budget[#] (tons/day)	--	--	--	20.57	20.57
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	0.5081	0.2489	0.1887	0.1666	0.1632
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	49,313,929	51,085,779	56,807,842	63,508,455	68,962,394
Projection* (tons/day)	27.62	14.02	11.81	11.66	12.41
Conformity (Projection < 2008 Emissions or < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Salt Lake PM2.5 Non-Attainment Area includes: Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber, Box Elder and Tooele Counties.

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Table 11c

Salt Lake Area[#] - PM2.5 (Direct PM Emissions)
Conformity Determination**

Year	<i>c</i> 2021	<i>c</i> 2024	<i>c</i> 2030	<i>c</i> 2040	<i>e</i> 2050
2008 Emissions (tons/day)	4.77	4.77	4.77	--	--
Budget[#] (tons/day)	--	--	--	1.38	1.38
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	0.0359	0.0219	0.0149	0.0143	0.0146
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	49,313,929	51,085,779	56,807,842	63,508,455	68,962,394
Projection* (tons/day)	1.95	1.23	0.94	1.00	1.11
Conformity (Projection < 2008 Emissions or < Budget)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Salt Lake PM2.5 Non-Attainment Area includes: Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber, Box Elder and Tooele Counties.

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

** Direct PM for conformity includes total PM2.5 exhaust particulates, brake wear, and tire wear. Road dust is excluded.

Northern Wasatch Front Ozone Conformity

A new ozone standard of 70 ppb was approved October 2015. The Northern Wasatch Front Area was designated as a marginal non-attainment area for ozone by EPA effective December 2018. The Northern Wasatch Front Area includes Salt Lake and Davis Counties, and portions of Weber and Tooele Counties. Pending development and approval of a State Implementation Plan for ozone, interim conformity is based on future ozone precursor emissions being less than the 2017 base year.

Table 12a below demonstrates that projected mobile source emissions of NOx (a precursor to ozone emissions) in the four-county ozone non-attainment area are less than 2017 NOx emissions. Table 12b below demonstrates that projected mobile source emissions of VOC (also a precursor to ozone emissions) in the four-county ozone non-attainment area are less than 2017 VOC emissions.

From this demonstration it is concluded that the RTP conforms under the interim conformity guidelines for ozone areas without an approved motor vehicle emissions budget for the Northern Wasatch Front Area ozone non-attainment area.

Table 12a

**Northern Wasatch Front Ozone# - NOx Precursor
Conformity Determination**

	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>
Year	2021	2024	2030	2040	2050
2017 Emissions (tons/day)	48.64	48.64	48.64	48.64	48.64
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	<i>0.5756</i>	<i>0.4173</i>	<i>0.2821</i>	<i>0.2099</i>	<i>0.1991</i>
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	<i>53,710,512</i>	<i>55,376,589</i>	<i>61,511,677</i>	<i>68,459,086</i>	<i>73,977,744</i>
Projection* (tons/day)	34.08	25.47	19.13	15.84	16.23
Conformity (Projection < 2017 Emissions)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Northern Wasatch Front Ozone Non-Attainment Area includes: Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber and Tooele Counties.

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Table 12b

**Northern Wasatch Front Ozone# - VOC Precursor
Conformity Determination**

	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>
Year	2021	2024	2030	2040	2050
2017 Emissions (tons/day)	28.69	28.69	28.69	28.69	28.69
<i>emission rate (grams/mile)</i>	0.3559	0.1939	0.1177	0.0921	0.0856
<i>seasonal VMT</i>	53,710,512	55,376,589	61,511,677	68,459,086	73,977,744
Projection* (tons/day)	21.07	11.83	7.98	6.95	6.98
Conformity (Projection < 2017 Emissions)	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Northern Wasatch Front Ozone Non-Attainment Area includes: Davis, Salt Lake, and portions of Weber and Tooele Counties.

c - 10-year rule, *e* - last year of Plan,

* Projection = Emission Rate x Seasonal VMT / 453.6 grams per pound / 2,000 pounds per ton.

Appendix – 1

Definition of Regionally Significant Projects

**Process for Determining Regionally Significant Facilities
for Purposes of Regional Emissions Analysis (see CFR 93.105.2.c.1.ii)**

Background: 40 CFR 93.101 defines “regionally significant project” and associated facilities for the purpose of transportation conformity. The federal definition does not specifically include minor arterials. The following definitions and processes will be used by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) in consultation with DAQ, UDOT, UTA, FHWA, FTA, and EPA to determine which facilities shall be considered regionally significant for purposes of regional emissions analysis. It is the practice of the MPO to include minor arterials and collectors in the travel model for the purpose of accurately modeling regional VMT and associated vehicle emissions. The inclusion of minor arterials and collectors in the travel model, however, does not identify these facilities as regionally significant.

1. Any new or existing facility with a functional classification of principal arterial or higher on the latest UDOT Functional Classification Map shall be considered regionally significant (see <https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=494d57208ea4464bb664ac2da38f9c91&extent=-116.9385,35.9224,-106.1719,42.8498>).
2. Any fixed guide-way transit service including light rail, commuter rail, or portions of bus rapid transit that involve exclusive right-of-way shall be considered regionally significant.
3. As traffic and land use conditions change in the future, the MPO’s - in consultation with DAQ, UDOT, FHWA, and EPA - will consider 1) the relative importance of minor arterials serving major activity centers, and 2) the absence of principal arterials in the vicinity to determine if any minor arterials in addition to those listed in Exhibit A should be considered as regionally significant for purposes of regional emissions analysis.

Exhibit A
Minor Arterials Determined to be Regionally Significant
for Purposes of Regional Emissions Analysis

40 FR 93.105(c)(ii), “Consultation – Interagency consultation procedures: Specific processes” specifies that Interagency Consultation shall include a process to identify which minor arterials should be considered as “regionally significant” for the purpose of regional emissions analysis. In consultation with DAQ, UDOT, FHWA, and EPA; and based on inspection and engineering judgment of current traffic conditions; and based on application of the “Process for Determining Regionally Significant Facilities for Purposes of Regional Emissions Analysis” agreed upon by the aforementioned agencies; the WFRC designated eight minor arterials as regionally significant.

Since 2015, all but one of the minor arterials referenced above have been reclassified with the functional type of principal arterial and are therefore by definition regionally significant. The remaining minor arterial to be considered as regionally significant for emissions analysis is listed below. It should also be noted that all collectors, minor arterials, and principal arterials are included in the highway network used in the WFRC travel demand model.

Davis County

none

Salt Lake County

none

Weber County

SR-79 (Hinckley Drive): SR-108 to I-15

**Process for Determining Significant Change in Design Concept and Scope
for Purposes of Regional Emissions Analysis (see CFR 93.105.2.c.1.ii)**

Changes to regionally significant projects may or may not necessitate a new regional emissions analysis. The following definitions and processes will be used to determine what changes to project concept and scope are to be considered significant or not for purposes of regional emissions analysis.

1. Adding or extending freeway auxiliary lanes or weaving lanes between interchanges is not considered a significant change in concept and scope since these lanes are not normally included in the travel model.
2. Adding or extending freeway auxiliary/weaving lanes from one interchange to a point beyond the next interchange is considered a significant change in concept and scope.
3. A change to a regionally significant project defined in the Regional Transportation Plan that does not change how the project is defined in the travel model is not considered a significant change in concept and scope. These changes include but are not limited to lane or shoulder widening, cross section (other than the number of through lanes), alignment, interchange configuration, intersection traffic control, turn lanes, continuous or center turn lanes, and storage lanes.
4. A change to a regionally significant project defined in the Regional Transportation Plan that does alter the number of through lanes, lane capacity, or speed classification as defined in the travel model is considered a significant change in concept and scope.
5. Advancing or delaying the planned implementation of a regionally significant project that does not result in a change in the transportation network described in the travel model for any horizon year (as defined in CFR 93.101) is not considered a significant change in concept and scope.
6. Advancing or delaying the planned implementation of a regionally significant project that does result in a change in the transportation network described in the travel model for any horizon year (as defined in CFR 93.101) is considered a significant change in concept and scope.
7. Project changes not addressed in the above statements will be decided on a case by case basis through consultation by representatives from DAQ, WFRC, MAG, UDOT, UTA, FHWA, FTA, and EPA.

Appendix-2
RTP 2019-2050 – Amendment 3 Projects

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT CORRIDOR	PROJECT EXTENTS	PROJECT TYPE	LEVEL	AGENCY
N/A	3 Gate Rail Trail	Roy HAFB Gate to Clearfield West HAFB Gate	New regional active transportation project	Level 1	MIDA
N/A	Sandy Active Transportation Plan	City-wide	New regional active transportation plan	Level 2	Sandy
N/A	West Jordan Active Transportation Plan	City-wide	New regional active transportation plan	Level 2	West Jordan
N/A	Draper Active Transportation Plan	City-wide	New regional active transportation plan	Level 2	Draper
N/A	Murray Fashion Place Mall Center	Fashion Place Employment District	Center modification	Level 2	Murray
R-B-15	Forest Street RR Crossing	@ 900 West RR Crossing	Move from Phase 3 to Phase 1	Level 2	Brigham City
R-D-44	South Bench Drive	I-84 to South Weber Drive	Alignment change	Level 2	South Weber
R-D-47	South Bench Drive	South Weber Drive to Fairfield Road	Project removal	Level 2	South Weber
R-S-46	7800 South	MVC and SR-111	Move from Phase 3 to Phase 1	Level 2	West Jordan
T-W-1, T-D-2, T-S-1	Double Tracking FrontRunner	Spot locations	Move from Phase 2 to Phase 1	Level 3	UTA
T-S-17/T-S-19	S-line Streetcar Extension	McClelland to Highland Drive	Move a portion from Unfunded to Phase 1	Level 3	UTA
R-W-77	I-15 Interchange	@ 5600 South	Update costs	Level 3	UDOT
R-D-53	I-15	Farmington to SLCo Line	Move from Phase 3 to Phase 1	Level 3	UDOT
R-S-137	I-15	Davis Co Line to 600 N	Move from Phase 3 to Phase 1	Level 3	UDOT
R-S-102	Mountain View Corridor	Old Bingham Hwy to 13400 South	Move from Phase 2 to Phase 1 and update extents	Level 3	UDOT
R-D-51	I-15	2600 South to SLCo Line	Delete	Level 3	UDOT
R-S-133	I-15 Northbound	2100 South to Bangerter Hwy	Update extents and costs	Level 3	UDOT
R-S-134	I-15 Collector and Distributors (North Bound)	I-215 to Bangerter Hwy	Update extents and costs	Level 3	UDOT
R-S-188	Bangerter Hwy Interchange (Upgrade)	@ SR-201	Delete	Level 3	UDOT

R-S-97	Mountain View Corridor	13400 South to Utah Co. Line	Update extents and costs	Level 3	UDOT
R-W-82	US-89 Interchange	@ I-84	Scope change and costs	Level 3	UDOT
R-W-83	US-89 Interchange	@ I-84	Move System-to-System to Phase 2 - costs update, new project number	Level 3	UDOT

DATE: May 20, 2021
AGENDA ITEM: 5
SUBJECT: **ACTION:** Point of the Mountain Transit Locally Preferred Alternative
PREPARED BY: Lauren Victor

At the Regional Growth Committee (RGC) meeting, Patti Garver with the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) will give a brief overview of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Point of the Mountain Transit project. The action requested is a vote of approval and support of this LPA in preparation for the upcoming environmental phase of the project.

BACKGROUND:

The Point of the Mountain Transit Study project kicked off summer of 2019 as a partnership of local governments and agencies, including WFRC, to explore transit corridor improvements in Utah's fastest growing areas of southern Salt Lake County and northern Utah County. The purpose of this project was to identify a Preferred Alternative that met the needs of the proposed land use and communities in the area.

PROCESS:

A "Common Ground" segment was identified through analysis, including extensive community input, of alternative transit pathways to connect southern Salt Lake County and northern Utah County. The project team convened and developed five draft alternatives that were evaluated and refined down to two alternatives, and then, ultimately, with the Common Ground Segment and mode being agreed upon as the Preferred Alternative. The Common Ground Segment will be a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line that operates through the center of the proposed redevelopment on that corridor.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Utah Transit Authority requests the approval of the Common Ground Segment and will move into the environmental phase of the project.

Suggested motion language: *I make a motion to approve the Common Ground Segment as the Locally Preferred Alternative.*

CONTACT PERSON:

Patti Garver, PGarver@rideuta.com
Lauren Victor, lauren@wfrc.org