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## SOUTH SALT LAKE VALLEY SAFETY SUMMARY

## South Salt LakeValley Geographic Foous Area

## CSAP OVERVIEW

## "A plan to provide local governments the means to make strategic roadway safety improvements"

Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) is preparing a regional Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP). The CSAP will present a holistic, well-defined strategy to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries in the Wasatch Front region.
The CSAP will analyze safety needs, identify high-risk locations and factors contributing to crashes, and prioritize strategies to address them.

The CSAP will meet eligibility requirements that allow local jurisdictions to apply for Implementation Grants from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) discretionary grant program. The grant program was established by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) with $\$ 5$ billion in appropriated funds, 2022-2026. A Safety Action Plan must include the following elements, as specified by FHWA to satisfy eligibility requirements to apply for an implementation grant:

State Route: Roadways owned, operated, and maintained by UDOT
Federal-Aid Route: Non-UDOT roadways eligible for federal funding - typically minor arterials and collectors
Local Streets: Other non-UDOT / non-Federal Aid roadways, primarily collectors, and residential streets


## Self-Certification Checklist

## Plan must include the following:

- Safety Analysis
- Existing conditions and historical trends
- Crashes by location, severity, and contributing factor
- Systemic and specific safety needs
- Geospatial identification of higher risk locations
$\square \quad$ Identification of comprehensive set of projects and strategies
...And must complete 4 of the 6 elements to the right:

1. Leadership Commitment

- Governing body publicly commit to a zero fatalities and serious injury goal

2. Plan Development

- Committee charged with plan development, implementation, and monitoring

3. Development Activities

- Engagement with public and relevant stakeholders

4. Equity

- Data-driven, inclusive, and representative processes

5. Policies, Plans, Guidelines, and/or Standards

- Assessment policies, plans, guidelines, and/or standards

6. Progress

- Description on how progress will be measured over time


## Safe System Approach

Implementing a Safe System Approach requires moving away from traditional safety paradigms.

The Safe System approach seeks to prevent death and serious injuries.
The Safe System approach designs for human mistakes and limitations.
The Safe System approach focuses on speed management and strategies to reduce system kinetic energy.

- The Safe System approach aims to share responsibility among system users, managers, and others.
- The Safe System approach proactively identifies and addresses risks


| Traditional Approach to Safety | Safe System Approach Paradigm |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prevent crashes | Prevent death and serious injury |
| Improve human behavior | Design for human mistakes/limitations |
| Control speeding | Reduce system kinetic energy |
| Individuals are responsible | Share responsibility |
| React based on crash history | Proactively identify and address risks |

## Safety Analysis Methodology



| Analysis | Composite High Risk Score Element | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical Crash Analysis | Segment 5-Year Crash Totals $\geq 3$ Crashes | 1 |
| Network Screening Analysis | Positive CCR Differential | 1 |
| High-Risk Network Analysis | Crash Profile Risk Score $\geq 20$ | 1 |
|  | usRAP Vehicle Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 1 |
|  | usRAP Pedestrian Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 0.5 |
|  | usRAP Bicycle Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 0.5 |
| Total Possible Composite Risk Score |  |  |

## Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) Emphasis Area Comparison

Based on a comparison of fatal and serious injuries for each Utah SHSP Emphasis area, the following emphasis areas should be considered when developing safety improvement projects specific to the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.

- Intersections
- Teen Driver
- Speed-Related
- Roadway Departure
- Motorcycle

Intersection, Roadway Departure, and Speed-Related emphasis areas rank highest in terms of number of fatal and serious injuries at the Statewide and WFRC Levels.

In addition to Intersection, Roadway Departure, and SpeedRelated emphasis areas within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA, Teen Driver and Motorcycle are also identified as top emphasis areas.

## Strategic Highway Safety Plan Emphasis Area Comparison

| Category | Utah SHSP Safety Emphasis Area | Statewide Totals |  | WFRC Totals |  | South Salt Lake Valley Totals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Change in Rank From WFRC |
| Driver | Teen Driver | 1,640 | 4 | 751 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Older Driver | 1,508 | 6 | 700 | 6 | 36 | 9 | -3 |
|  | Speed-Related | 2,133 | 3 | 936 | 3 | 90 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Aggressive Driving | 555 | 11 | 297 | 10 | 26 | 11 | -1 |
|  | Distracted Driving | 718 | 10 | 286 | 11 | 33 | 10 | 1 |
|  | Impaired Driving | 1,184 | 8 | 623 | 8 | 51 | 7 | 1 |
|  | No Safety Restraints | 1,542 | 5 | 599 | 9 | 59 | 6 | 3 |
| Roadway | Intersection | 3,567 | 1 | 2,163 | 1 | 202 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Roadway Departure | 2,931 | 2 | 1,014 | 2 | 64 | 4 | -2 |
| Special Users | Motorcycle | 1,457 | 7 | 750 | 5 | 63 | 5 | 0 |
|  | Pedestrian | 912 | 9 | 636 | 7 | 38 | 8 | -1 |
|  | Bicycle* | 280 | 12 | 167 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 0 |

*While Bicycles are not one of the eleven Utah SHSP emphasis areas, they are included as part of the CSAP safety analysis.

5-Year Historical Crash Trends in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA

| Route Type | State Route |  | Federal Aid Route |  | Local Street |  | Overall Total |  | \% of WFRC <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity | Crashes |  | Crashes |  | Crashes |  | Crashes |  |  |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |  |
| Fatal | 31 | 0\% | 12 | 0\% | 5 | 0\% | 48 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Suspected Serious Injury | 139 | 1\% | 96 | 2\% | 35 | 2\% | 270 | 1.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Suspected Minor Injury | 762 | 8\% | 579 | 10\% | 133 | 6\% | 1,474 | 8.2\% | 0.8\% |
| Possible Injury | 1,943 | 20\% | 1,013 | 17\% | 246 | 11\% | 3,202 | 17.9\% | 1.8\% |
| No Injury / Property Damage Only | 6,770 | 70\% | 4,368 | 72\% | 1,784 | 81\% | 12,922 | 72.1\% | 7.2\% |
| Route Total | 9,645 | 100\% | 6,068 | 100\% | 2,203 | 100\% | 17,916 | 100\% | 9.9\% |



Annual Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes (2018-2022)


Crash Type


Manner of Collision


Active Transportation

## South Salt LakeValley Geographic Focus Area

## Composite High-Risk Roadway Network

Each of the completed safety analysis methodologies identified segments or intersections that are candidates for safety improvements to reduce fatalities and serious injury crashes.

To provide focused information for jurisdictional decisions regarding prioritization of safety improvements, an analysis was performed to identify overlapping segments from each of the analysis methodologies. A composite score, from zero to five, was assigned to each State Highway or Federal Aid Route segment in the region. State Route or Federal Aid Route segments with a score of " 4 " or higher are included in the Composite High-Risk Network. These represent the top 10\% of State Route and Federal Aid Route segments for the entire WFRC area.

The Composite High Risk Network map on page 8 includes State Route and Federal Aid Route segments with a score of " 4 " or higher.

A list of locally-owned and maintained Federal Aid Route segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA Composite High-Risk Network is included on the next page. Streets operated and maintained by local agencies are an emphasis of the SS4A program.

| Analysis | Composite High Risk Score Element | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical Crash Analysis | Segment 5 -Year Crash Totals $\geq 3$ Crashes | 1 |
| Network Screening Analysis | Positive Local CCR Differential | 1 |
| High Risk Network Analysis | Crash Profile Risk Score $\geq 20$ | 1 |
|  | usRAP Vehicle Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 1 |
|  | usRAP Pedestrian Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 0.5 |
|  | usRAP Bicycle Star Rating $=1-2$ Stars | 0.5 |
| Total Possible Composite Risk Score |  | $\mathbf{5}$ |

## Composite High-Risk Network (State Route/Federal Aid) and Local Street Risk Network

|  |  |  |  |  | RISK TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Limits | Functional Classification | City | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{3} \\ & \frac{1}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 8 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 2 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 0 0 0 0 | 0 8 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 | $n$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{4} \\ & \frac{0}{6} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 第 |
| State Route |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Jordan Parkway | Bangerter Highway to I-15 | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 4.2 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 11400 South | Bangerter Highway to 3420 West | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan, Draper | 0.6 | X | X | X | X |  | x |  |
| 11400 South | Redwood Road to I-15 | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 2.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| 12600 South (SR-71) | Dunhammer Drive to 1630 West | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 1.4 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 12300 South (SR-71) | 265 West to 700 East | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.5 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 2700 West to 13800 South | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton, Bluffdale | 4.5 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 14600 South | Noell Nelson Drive to I-15 | M inor Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 200 West to 13800 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 0.8 | X | X | X | X |  | x |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 9400 South to 9916 South | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 1.5 | X | X | X | X |  | x |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 11400 South to Andover Road | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 0.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 12600 South to Bangerter Highway | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 2.2 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Camp Williams Road (SR-68) | 1500 South to Portter Rockwell Blvd | Other Principal Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 12600 South to 13400 South | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| State Street (US-89) | 11400 South to 12300 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| 700 Easy (SR-71) | 11400 South to 12300 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| Federal Aid Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1300 W | 10400 Sto McClan Dr | Major Collector | South Jordan | 0.1 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| Daybreak Rim Way | Oakmond Rd to Bangerter Hwy | M inor Arterial | South Jordan | 1.3 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 11400 S | State St to 150 E | Other Principal Arterial | Sandy | 0.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| 12300 S | 700 E to 100 E | M inor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| 1300 E | Draper Gate Dr to Ballard Cv | M inor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |

State Route and Federal Aid segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA Composite High-Risk Network are listed at left. Each of these segments received a composite risk score of " 4 " or higher. These segments provide a focus for local jurisdictions or for coordination with UDOT. Each of these segments are shown on the map on page 8.

Composite High-Risk Network (State Route/Federal Aid) and Local Street Risk Network

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | RISK TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Limits | Functional Classification | City |  |  |  |  | Crash Profile Rísk Score |  | $\begin{aligned} & y \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Federal Aid Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1300 E | 13200 S to Bent Pine Cv | M inor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 13400 S | 5600 W to M onarch M eadows Pkwy | M inor Arterial | Riverton, Herriman | 0.1 | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| Bluffdale Blvd (14600 S) | 1515 W to 850 W | M inor Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| Local Streets |  |  |  |  | Local Street Risk Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anthem Park Boulevard | SR-65 to 12600 South | M inor Arterial | Herriman | 1.1 | The Local Street Risk Assessment considered factors such as locations of crashes, proximity to schools, and hardbraking. |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| M onarch M eadow/Ft Herriman | 4800 West to M ain Street | Local | Herriman/Riverton | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| River Heights | 10350 South to 11970 South | M inor Collector | South Jordan | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Rose Crest Road | Autumn Crest Boulevard to Palisade Rose Driv Major Collector |  | Herriman | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Fort Street | 13200 South to 12400 South | Major Collector | Draper | $0.9$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Emmeline Drive | Sun Bloom Lane to Friendship Drive | M inor Collector | Herriman | 0.71.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| 12600 South | M ain Street to 6200 West | M inor Arterial | Herriman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| 3200 West | Rolling Creek Way to 12130 South | Major Collector | Riverton/South Jordan | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| 13200 South | Highland Drive to 300 East | M inor Collector | Draper | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| 6000 West | 13900 South to 1st Street | Major Collector | Herriman | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

State Route and Federal Aid segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA Composite High-Risk Network are listed at left. Each of these segments received a composite risk score of "4" or higher. These segments provide a focus for local jurisdictions or for coordination with UDOT. Each of these segments are shown on the map on page 8.

Local Streets are also listed at left. These segments were identified through a separate analysis that considered factors such as crash location, proximity to schools, and hard braking.

## South Salt L_ke Valley Geographic Focus Area



South Salt LakeValley Geographic Focus Area

## Network Screening - Intersections

Network Screening is one of the inputs to the Composite High Risk Roadway Network. Network screening is based on Critical Crash Rate Differential analysis as documented in the Highway Safety Manual. This analysis identified intersections where historical crash rates exceed those which can be expected for similar facilities.

A list of the top 10 intersections on State Routes, Federal Aid Routes, and Local (Non-Federal Aid) Streets in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA are listed at right, along with their associated number of crashes.

For each intersection, the Critical Crash Rate (CCR) Differential and Equivalent Property Damage Only (EDPO) value is listed. These intersections represent those with the highest potential for safety improvements and can be considered as project candidate locations.

Signalized and unsignalized intersections in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA with a positive Critical Crash Rate Differential (rate exceeds expected rate) are mapped on page 10 .

| $\frac{8}{0}$ <br> $\frac{8}{8}$ <br> $\frac{0}{6}$ <br> $\frac{0}{4}$ | 8 | $\frac{y}{8}$ |  | "8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 됸 } \end{aligned}$ | 3 <br> $\frac{3}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{0}$ <br> $\frac{0}{6}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 9 \\ & 9 \\ & \hline \mathbf{c} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{8}{8}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \delta \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \frac{0}{8} \\ \frac{8}{3} \\ \frac{8}{8} \\ \hline 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{5} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 年 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minuteman Dr $\alpha$ Highland Dr | Draper | 72 | 7.5 | 387 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 50 | 38 | 26 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Palisade Rose D C R Rosecrest Rd | Herriman | 25 | 5.0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300 $\& 12450$ S | Draper | 21 | 3.6 | 52 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pony Express Rd \& H Iighland Dr | Buffdale | 46 | 3.1 | 349 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 30 | 21 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Porter Rockwell Blvd \& Buffdale Blvd | Buffale | 37 | 3.0 | 256 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 28 | 4 | 29 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mountain View Sb Hwy \& Anthem Park Blva | Herriman | 82 | 2.9 | 1719 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 51 | 38 | 32 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Rockwell ParkL $\mathrm{\otimes}$ Shocky Access | Herriman | 25 | 2.9 | 1007 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| M ustang Trail Way \& Herriman Blvd | Herriman | 16 | 2.6 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountain View Sb Hwy \& Rosecrest Rd | Herriman | 40 | 1.2 | 167 | - | 0 | 4 | 4 | 32 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $4000 W \& 11800$ S | South Jordan | 39 | 1.0 | 363 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 22 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2200 W \& Temple View Ln | South Jordan | 17 | 6.9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | , | 0 |
| 300 E Carlquist Dr Roundabout | Draper | 26 | 5.3 | 171 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Creek Meadow Rd \& Creek Meadow Rd | Riverton | 10 | 4.9 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| District D $\& 11500$ S | South Jordan | 10 | 4.1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parkway Plaza dr \& 11550 S | South Jordan | 4 | 3.7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oakmond Rd\& Oakmond Rd | South Jordan | 8 | 3.5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charger Way \& Pheasant View Dr | Draper | 4 | 3.2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eagles Flight R \& Teal Ridge Way | Riverton | 5 | 3.1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anthem Park Blvd \& Herriman Blvd | Herriman | 13 | 2.8 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mike Weir D $\&$ \& Traverse Ridge Rd | Draper | 9 | 2.6 | 51 | 0 | - | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Equivalent Property Damage Only Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $=90-100 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=80-90 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=70-80 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Supporting Information

## South Salt LakeValley Geographic Foous Area

High-Risk Roadway Segments (Federal Aid Routes)


A list of Federal Aid segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA identified from each of the safety analysis methods is listed in the table at left. An "x" is placed to identify the analysis that flagged the segment:

- usRAP Star Ratings (Vehicle, Bicycle, Pedestrian)
- Crash Profile Risk Score
- Network Screening, applying Critical Crash Rate (CCR) and Significant Crashes (three or more crashes over 5-year period)

The maps on page 19 through 23 depict each of these segments identified by the respective analysis.

## South Satt L_ke Valley Geographic Focus Area

High-Risk Roadway Segments (Federal Aid Routes), Cont'd

|  |  |  | RISK TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Limits | City | 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  | Local Streets Pisk Assessment |

## Federal Aid Routes



A list of Federal Aid segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA identified from each of the safety analysis methods is listed in the table at left. An "x" is placed to identify the analysis that flagged the segment:

- usRAP Star Ratings (Vehicle, Bicycle, Pedestrian)
- Crash Profile Risk Score
- Network Screening, applying Critical Crash Rate (CCR) and Significant Crashes (three or more crashes over 5-year period)

The maps on page 19 through 23 depict each of these segments identified by the respective analysis.

## South Salt LakeValley Geographic Foous Area

High-Risk Roadway Segments (Federal Aid Routes), Cont'd


## South Satt L_ke Valley Geographic Focus Area

High-Risk Roadway Segments (Federal Aid Routes), Cont'd


## Federal Aid Routes

| Daybreak Rim Way / Daybreak | Oakmond Road to Bangerter Highway | South Jordan |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11800 South | Bacchus Highway to SR-85 | South Jordan |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 14600 South | Camp Williams Road to 800 West | Bluffdale |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 1300 East | 13700 South to 13200 South | Draper |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| Pony Express Road | South GFA Extent to 14600 South | Riverton |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Rose Canyon Road | 13400 South to 13100 South | Herriman |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| 13400 South | Rose Canyon Drive to SR-85 | Herriman |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 12600 South | Main Street to Bangerter Highway | South Jordan |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 13100 South | Butterfield Canyon Road to Rosecrest Road | Herriman |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Bacchus Highway | Truck Road to Old Bingham Highway | South Jordan |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| Rose Canyon Road | Yellow Fork Canyon to 6400 West | Herriman |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Lake Run Rd | Daybreak Pkwy to Frogs Leap Dr | South Jordan |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| 4050 W | Innovation Dr to 13400 S | Riverton |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| River Heights Dr | Summer Heights Dr to Vista Pradera Way | South Jordan |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| Bluffdale Blvd | 1328 W to 1300 W | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| River Heights Dr | Logan Canyon Rd to 10400 S | South Jordan |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| Traverse Ridge Rd | Highland Dr to Traverse Pointe Dr | Draper |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| Traverse Ridge Rd | Private Driveway to Mike Weir Dr | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |

A list of Federal Aid segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA identified from each of the safety analysis methods is listed in the table at left. An "x" is placed to identify the analysis that flagged the segment:

- usRAP Star Ratings (Vehicle, Bicycle, Pedestrian)
- Crash Profile Risk Score
- Network Screening, applying Critical Crash Rate (CCR) and Significant Crashes (three or more crashes over 5-year period)

The maps on page 19 through 23 depict each of these segments identified by the respective analysis.

## South Salt LakeValley Geographic Foous Area

## Network Screening - Segments (Local Streets)

|  |  |  | RISK TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Limits | City | 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{2} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \frac{y}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Federal Aid Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 700 E | Fox Meadow Drto Golden Pheasant Dr | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| 700 E | Golden Pheasant Dr to Pheasant View Dr | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| 2200 W | 10400 S to Temple View Ln | South Jordan |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Local Streets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 W | Opportunity Way to 11400 S | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Jordan Narrows Rd | Camp Williams Rd to 1400 W | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Heritagecrest Way | Concord Park Dr to 14600 S | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Spring View Pkwy | 14600 S to Stone Fly Cir | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Koins Way | Rising Star Way to Life Dr | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Emma Mine Dr | Mineral Wayto Dynamic Cir | Herriman |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Park Bluff Way | Puma Mountain Way to Cantle Dr | Bluffdale |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Parkway Plaza Dr | 11500 S to 11400 S | South Jordan |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| 12200 S | Spencer Peak Way to 300 E | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Spencer Peak Way | 150 E to 12175 S | Draper |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |

A list of Local Street segments in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA identified from Network Screening, applying Critical Crash Rate (CCR) and Significant Crashes (three or more crashes over 5year period), is shown at left.
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## 1. Introduction

Appendix A10 summarizes the safety analysis performed for the South Salt Lake Valley Geographic Focus Area (GFA) for the Wasatch Front Area Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP).

The analysis of available safety related data informs identification of a potential project locations that may be further considered in the development of safety related projects and project types.

### 1.1. Safety Analysis

The following safety analysis methodologies were completed for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA:

\author{

- Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) Emphasis Area Analysis <br> - Historical Crash Analysis <br> - Crash and Network Screening Analysis <br> - Roadway Characteristic Risk Analysis <br> - Crash Profile Risk Assessment <br> - usRAP Risk Factors Analysis <br> - Local Street Risk Assessment
}

An overview on the methodologies used to perform these safety analyses are described in Technical Memorandum \#1: Safety Analysis Results Summary. Appendix A10 summarizes the results of the analyses for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.

### 1.2. Appendix Organization

This Appendix is organized into the following sections:

## - Section 1 - Introduction

- Section 2 - South Salt Lake Valley GFA study area and roadway network.
- Section 3 - Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) Emphasis Area Analysis for fatal and serious injuries.
- Section 4 - Historical Crash Analysis
- Section 5 - Crash and Network Screening Analysis based on Highway Safety Manual (HSM).
- Section 6 - Roadway Characteristic Risk Analysis
- Section 7 - Safety analysis common risk characteristics and Composite High-Risk Roadway Network.


## 2. Study Area

The CSAP study area includes each jurisdiction within the WFRC area. To organize the large number of jurisdictions within the WFRC area into manageable analysis areas, jurisdictions are organized into Geographic Focus Areas (GFA). The South Salt Lake Valley GFA (Figure 2.1) is located entirely within Salt Lake County and includes the following agencies and jurisdictions:

- South Jordan
- Riverton
- Draper
- Bluffdale
- Herriman
- Copperton (Township)

The safety analyses presented in this Technical Memorandum are specific to the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.

Figure 2.2 highlights the roadway network within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA study area. Roadways within the study area are divided into the following three categories:

- State Routes: UDOT-maintained roads
- Federal Aid Routes: Jurisdiction-maintained roads eligible for federal funding
- Local Streets: Local Jurisdiction-maintained roads that are not Federal Aid routes.

NOTE ON CRASH DATA ANALYSIS: All crash data presented in this Technical Memorandum are specific to the South Salt Lake Valley, for the years 2018-2022. Crash data was obtained from the Utah Department of Transportation.


Figure 2.1 - South Salt Lake Valley GFA Study Area


Figure 2.2 - South Salt Lake Valley GFA Roadway Network

## 3. SHSP Emphasis Area Analysis

The SHSP emphasis area analysis ranks the frequency of fatal and serious injury crashes in South Salt Lake Valley GFA for each of the eleven Utah SHSP emphasis areas. The rankings of the emphasis areas are compared for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA, statewide (all public roads statewide), and the WFRC study area totals. Each reported crash can have more than one emphasis area identified. The results of the SHSP emphasis area analysis are displayed in Table 3.1. The top five ranked emphasis areas are highlighted in the table with the top five for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA listed below:

- Intersections
- Roadway Departure
- Teen Driver
- Impaired Driving
- Speed-Related

Table 3.1 - SHSP Emphasis Areas Analysis

| Category | Utah SHSP Safety Emphasis Area | Statewide Totals |  | WFRC Totals |  | South Salt Lake Valley Totals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Fatal and Serious Injury | Rank | Change in Rank From WFRC |
| Driver | Teen Driver | 1,640 | 4 | 917 | 5 | 98 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Older Driver | 1,508 | 6 | 523 | 8 | 27 | 10 | -2 |
|  | Speed-Related | 2,133 | 3 | 723 | 6 | 74 | 5 | 1 |
|  | Aggressive Driving | 555 | 11 | 243 | 11 | 25 | 11 | 0 |
|  | Distracted Driving | 718 | 10 | 955 | 4 | 64 | 6 | -2 |
|  | Impaired Driving | 1,184 | 8 | 1,234 | 3 | 85 | 4 | -1 |
|  | No Safety Restraints | 1,542 | 5 | 347 | 10 | 39 | 8 | 2 |
| Roadway | Intersection | 3,567 | 1 | 1,975 | 1 | 191 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Roadway Departure | 2,931 | 2 | 1,503 | 2 | 98 | 2 | 0 |
| Special Users | Motorcycle | 1,457 | 7 | 597 | 7 | 49 | 7 | 0 |
|  | Pedestrian | 912 | 9 | 452 | 9 | 30 | 9 | 0 |
|  | Bicycle* | 280 | 12 | 118 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 0 |

*Bicyclists aren't one of the eleven Utah SHSP emphasis areas but was included as part of the CSAP safety analysis.

## 4. Historical Crash Analysis

A historical crash data analysis was conducted for the most recent complete 5-year period from 2018 to 2022. This historical crash analysis is primarily focused on fatal and serious injury crashes.

### 4.1. Overall Crashes

Table 4.1 provides an overview of overall crashes by severity and roadway ownership within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- State Routes recorded $54 \%$ of the total crashes in this GFA
- State Routes recorded 31 of 48 fatal crashes in this GFA
- Federal Aid routes recorded $34 \%$ of fatal and serious injury crashes in this GFA
- Federal Aid routes recorded 12 of 48 fatal crashes in this GFA
- Local Streets (non-Federal Aid) recorded $12 \%$ of fatal and serious injury crashes in this GFA
- Local Streets recorded five of 48 fatal crashes in this GFA

Table 4.1 - Crashes by Severity by Roadway Ownership

| Route Type | State Route |  | Federal Aid Route |  | Local Street |  | Overall Total |  | \% of WFRC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity | Crashes |  | Crashes |  | Crashes |  | Crashes |  | \% |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |  |
| Fatal | 31 | 0\% | 12 | 0\% | 5 | 0\% | 48 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Suspected Serious Injury | 139 | 1\% | 96 | 2\% | 35 | 2\% | 270 | 1.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Suspected Minor Injury | 762 | 8\% | 579 | 10\% | 133 | 6\% | 1,474 | 8.2\% | 0.8\% |
| Possible Injury | 1,943 | 20\% | 1,013 | 17\% | 246 | 11\% | 3,202 | 17.9\% | 1.8\% |
| No Injury / Property Damage Only | 6,770 | 70\% | 4,368 | 72\% | 1,784 | 81\% | 12,922 | 72.1\% | 7.2\% |
| Route Total | 9,645 | 100\% | 6,068 | 100\% | 2,203 | 100\% | 17,916 | 100\% | 9.9\% |

### 4.2. Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Year

Figure 4.1 through Figure 4.3 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by year and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- Fatal crashes have increased during the most recent 5-year period (2018-2022)
- Serious injury crashes have increased during the most recent 5-year period (2018-2022)


### 4.3. Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Location

Figure 4.4 shows the locations of the fatal and serious injury crashes within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. Crashes are largely focused on State Routes.

Figure 4.5 is a density map of fatal and serious injury crashes within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.


Figure 4.1 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Year
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Figure 4.2 - Annual Fatal Crashes by Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.3 - Annual Serious Injury Crashes by Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.4 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes


Figure 4.5 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Density

### 4.4. Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Crash Type

Figure 4.6 through Figure 4.8 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by crash type and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- Left turn at Intersection crash type has the highest number of total fatal and serious injuries with 74 crashes
- Roadway Departure has the most frequency of fatal crashes, followed by Active Transportation


Figure 4.6 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Crash Type


Figure 4.7 - Fatal Crashes by Crash Type and Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.8 - Serious Injury Crashes by Crash Type and Roadway Ownership

### 4.5. Fatal and Serious Injury Vulnerable User Crashes

Figure 4.9 through Figure 4.11 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by vulnerable road user and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- There were 8 pedestrian fatal crashes in the five-year analysis period (2018-2022)
- There were no bicycle fatal crashes in the five-year analysis period (2018-2022)
- Motorcycles represent the most frequent fatal and serious injury vulnerable user crashes
- Pedestrian fatal crashes occur on both State Routes and Federal Aid routes


Figure 4.9 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Vulnerable User


Figure 4.10 - Fatal Crashes by Vulnerable User and Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.11 - Serious Injury Crashes by Vulnerable User and Roadway Ownership

### 4.6. Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Manner of Collision

Figure 4.12 through Figure 4.14 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by manner of collision and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- Angle crashes have the highest number of total fatal and serious injuries with 124 crashes
- Angle crashes are closely followed by single vehicle manner of collision
- Most single fatal crashes occurred on State Routes, while severe injury single vehicle crashes was more evenly split between State Routes and Federal Aid routes


Figure 4.12 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Manner of Collision


Figure 4.13 - Fatal Crashes by Manner of Collision and Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.14 - Serious Injury Crashes by Manner of Collision and Roadway Ownership

### 4.7. Fatal and Serious Injury Intersection Crashes

Figure 4.15 through Figure 4.17 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by intersection and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- More crashes were Intersection Involved than Not Intersection Involved; however, more fatal crashes occurred were Not Intersection Involved
- State Routes accounted for more Intersection Involved and Not Intersection Involved


Figure 4.15 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Intersection
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Figure 4.16 - Fatal Crashes by Intersection and Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.17 - Serious Injury Crashes by Intersection and Roadway Ownership

### 4.8. Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Functional Class

Figure 4.18 through Figure 4.20 provide an overview of fatal and serious injury crashes by functional class and roadway ownership for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. The data shows the following:

- Principal Arterial accounted for highest frequency of fatal crashes, and as well as highest frequency of serious injury crashes
- All of the Principal Arterial fatal crashes occurred on State Routes


Figure 4.18 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by Functional Class


Figure 4.19 - Fatal Injury Crashes by Functional Class and Roadway Ownership


Figure 4.20 - Serious Injury Crashes by Functional Class and Roadway Ownership

### 4.9. Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Trees Diagrams

Fatal and serious injury crash tree diagrams were generated for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA. These crash tree diagrams are presented in Figure 4.23 through Figure 4.22.

The crash trees are limited to the top 3 categories for crash type and manner of collision. Each crash tree diagram displays the total fatal and serious injury crashes ( T ), fatal crashes (K), and serious injury crashes (A). The data shows the following:

- There are not rural State Route or Federal Aid crashes in this GFA
- State Routes recorded the highest number of crashes (54\%), with Federal Aid at 34\% and Local Routes at 13\%
- Intersection-related crashes exceed that of non-intersection on State Routes and Federal Aid routes; on Local Streets, non-intersection related crashes exceed intersection-related crashes
- Of the intersection related, Left Turn at intersection was prominent on State Routes and Federal Aid routes



Figure 4.22 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Tree Diagram (Manner of Collision)


Figure 4.23 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Tree Diagram (Active Transportation)

## 5. Crash and Network Screening Analysis

A crash and network screening analysis was prepared for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA informed by four sub-analyses:

- Number of Crashes
- Critical Crash Rate (CCR)
- Probability of a Specific Crash Type Exceeding Threshold Proportion
- Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO)

CCR Differential by roadway ownership are mapped in the following figures:

- Figure 5.1 - CCR Differential - Segments (State Routes)
- Figure 5.2 - CCR Differential - Segments (Federal Aid Routes)
- Figure 5.3 - CCR Differential - Segments (Local Routes)
- Figure 5.4 - CCR Differential - Intersections (Signalized)
- Figure 5.5 - CCR Differential - Intersections (Unsignalized)

A positive Local CCR Differential is an indication of a location with a potential for safety improvement (PSI).

A list of the top 10 CCR Differential segments and intersections for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA are located in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 along with their associated number of crashes, probability of a specific crash type exceeding threshold proportion, and EPDO analysis results.

These locations represent those with the highest potential for safety improvements and can be considered as project candidate locations.


Figure 5.1 - CCR Differential - Segments (State Routes)


Figure 5.2 - CCR Differential - Segments (Federal Aid Routes)


Figure 5.3-CCR Differential - Segments (Local Routes)

Table 5.1 - Crash and Network Screening Analysis Results - Segments

| Facility | Limits | Functional Classification | City | $\frac{y}{8}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $8$ | $\frac{\mathbb{1 8}}{20}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{0}{6}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{8} \\ & 8.8 \\ & \underline{8} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{6} \\ & \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \frac{8}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{5} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \frac{8}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangerter Hwy (SR-154) | SB Ramp to 600 W | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 9 | 132.3 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangerter Hwy (SR-154) | NB Ramp to 12600 S | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 3 | 121.3 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangerter Hwy (SR-154) | WB Rampto Redwood Rd | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 14 | 46.4 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangerter Hwy (SR-154) | 11400 Sto NB Ramp | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 9 | 32.0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Porter Rockwell Blvd (SR-131) | Freedom Point way to 15100 S | Other Principal Arterial | Bluffdale | 4 | 8.9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountain View Hwy (SR-85 SB) | Lake Ave to South Jordan Pkwy | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 10 | 7.2 | 208 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 700 E(SR-71) | 11900 Sto Kimballs Ln | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 9 | 5.2 | 122 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mountain View Hwy (SR-85 SB) | South J ordan Pkwy to Bingham Creek | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 9 | 4.9 | 927 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Porter Rockwell Blvd (SR-131) | Rising Star Wayto 14600 S | Other Principal Arterial | Bluffdale | 3 | 4.8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mountain View Hwy (SR-85 SB) | Lake Ave to Private Driveway | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 3 | 4.4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Aid Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lake Run Rd | DaybreakPkwy to Frogs Leap Dr | Major Collector | South Jordan | 3 | 200.6 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4050 W | Innovation Dr to 13400 S | Major Collector | Riverton | 6 | 46.8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| River Heights Dr | Summer Heights Drto Vista Pradera Wa | Minor Collector | South Jordan | 8 | 43.4 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bluffdale Blvd | 1328 W to 1300 W | Minor Arterial | Bluffdale | 3 | 29.6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| River Heights Dr | Logan Canyon Rd to 10400 S | Minor Collector | South Jordan | 12 | 28.5 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Traverse Ridge Rd | Highland Dr to Traverse Pointe Dr | Minor Arterial | Draper | 4 | 26.9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traverse Ridge Rd | Private Driveway to Mike Weir Dr | Minor Arterial | Draper | 5 | 26.7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 700 E | Fox Meadow Dr to Golden Pheasant Dr | Minor Collector | Draper | 4 | 25.5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 700 E | Golden Pheasant Drto Pheasant View LM | Minor Collector | Draper | 6 | 23.5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2200 W | 10400 Sto Temple View Ln | Major Collector | South Jordan | 11 | 22.3 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Streets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 W | Opportunity Wayto 11400 S | Local | Draper | 3 | 463.3 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Jordan Narrows Rd | Camp Williams Rd to 1400 W | Local | Bluffale | 3 | 278.5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heritagecrest Way | Concord Park Dr to 14600 S | Local | Bluffdale | 6 | 192.2 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | , | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Spring View Pkwy | 14600 Sto Stone Fly Cir | Local | Bluffdale | 3 | 184.3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Koins Way | Rising Star Way to Life Dr | Local | Bluffdale | 3 | 180.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Emma Mine Dr | Mineral Way to Dynamic Cir | Local | Herriman | 4 | 175.3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Park Bluff Way | Puma Mountain Way to Cantle Dr | Local | Bluffdale | 3 | 129.1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parkway Plaza Dr | 11500 Sto 11400 S | Local | South Jordan | 3 | 100.4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 12200 S | Spencer PeakWayto 300E | Local | Draper | 3 | 86.3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spencer PeakWay | 150 Eto 12175 S | Local | Draper | 3 | 81.5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Equivalent Property Damage Only Crashes |  |  | $=90-100 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=80-90 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=70-80 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Figure 5.4 - CCR Differential - Intersections (Signalized)
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Figure 5.5 - CCR Differential - Intersections (Unsignalized)

Table 5.2 - Crash and Network Screening Analysis Results - Intersections

|  | $8$ | $\frac{8}{8}$ |  | $8$ | $5$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \% \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{0}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \delta \\ & \hline 8 \\ & \hline 8 \\ & \hline 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{10} \\ & 0 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8 \\ 8 \\ \hline 0 \end{gathered}$ | 道 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minuteman Dr \& Highland Dr | Draper | 72 | 7.5 | 387 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 50 | 38 | 26 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Palisade Rose Dr \& Rosecrest Rd | Herriman | 25 | 5.0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $300 \mathrm{E} \& 12450 \mathrm{~S}$ | Draper | 21 | 3.6 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pony Express Rd \& Highl and Dr | Bluffdale | 46 | 3.1 | 349 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 30 | 21 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Porter Rockwell Blvd \& Bluffdale Blvd | Bluffdale | 37 | 3.0 | 256 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 28 | 4 | 29 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mountain View Sb Hwy \& Anthem Park Blvd | Herriman | 82 | 2.9 | 1719 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 51 | 38 | 32 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Rockwell Park Ln \& Shocky Access | Herriman | 25 | 2.9 | 1007 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MustangTrail Way \& Herriman Blvd | Herriman | 16 | 2.6 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountain View Sb Hwy \& Rosecrest Rd | Herriman | 40 | 1.2 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 32 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4000 W \& 11800 S | South Jordan | 39 | 1.0 | 363 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 22 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2200 W \& Temple View Ln | South Jordan | 17 | 6.9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300 E \& Carlquist Dr Roundabout | Draper | 26 | 5.3 | 171 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Creek Meadow Rd \& Creek M eadow Rd | Riverton | 10 | 4.9 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| District Dr \& 11500 S | South Jordan | 10 | 4.1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parkway Plaza Dr \& 11550 S | South Jordan | 4 | 3.7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oakmond Rd \& Oakmond Rd | South Jordan | 8 | 3.5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charger Way \& Pheasant View Dr | Draper | 4 | 3.2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eagles Flight Rd\& Teal Ridge Way | Riverton | 5 | 3.1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anthem Park Blvd \& Herriman Blvd | Herriman | 13 | 2.8 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mike Weir Dr \& Traverse Ridge Rd | Draper | 9 | 2.6 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1. Equivalent Property Damage Only Crashes |  | $=90-100 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=80-90 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented $=70-80 \%$ probability that crash type is over-represented |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 6. Roadway Characteristic Risk Analysis

A roadway characteristic risk analysis was performed using the following three sub-analysis:

- Crash Profile Risk Assessment
- usRAP Risk Assessment
- Local Street Risk Assessment


### 6.1. Crash Profile Risk Assessment

This risk assessment sub-analysis identifies common roadway characteristics for fatal and serious injury crashes that occurred within the WFRC study area. Based on the scoring of the various roadway characteristic risks identified from analysis of crash reports, a risk score was assigned to all state and federal aid routes within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA consistent with the methodology described in Tech Memo \#1 Section 3.4. The results of the Crash Profile Risk Assessment are mapped in the following figures:

- Figure 6.1 - Crash Profile Risk Assessment Results (State Routes)
- Figure 6.2 - Crash Profile Risk Assessment Results (Federal Aid Routes)

Table 6.1 provides an overview of urban and rural segments with the highest risk scoring. Up to ten urban and rural segments are listed if the segment received at least $67 \%$ of the overall total risk score.

Table 6.1 - Crash Profile Risk Segments (Federal Aid Routes)

| Area Type | Road Segment | Extents | Risk Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urban | Jordan Gateway | 12300 South to North GFA Extents | 25 |
| Urban | 4000 West | 12600 South to North GFA Extents | 23 to 25 |
| Urban | Draper Parkway | 700 East to 1300 East | 22.8 |
| Urban | Daybreak Rim Way / Daybreak <br> Parkway | Oakmond Road to Bangerter Highway | 22.1 |
| Urban | 11800 South | Bacchus Highway to SR-85 | 20.2 to 21 |
| Urban | 14600 South | Camp Williams Road to 800 West | 20.4 to 20.5 |
| Urban | 1300 East | 13700 South to 13200 South | 20.2 |
| Urban | Pony Express Road | South GFA Extent to 14600 South | 20 |
| Rural | Rose Canyon Road | 13400 South to 13100 South | 22.3 |
| Rural | 13400 South | Rose Canyon Drive to SR-85 | 22.3 |
| Rural | 12600 South | Main Street to Bangerter Highway | 21.5 to 21.9 |
| Rural | 13100 South | Butterfield Canyon Road to Rosecrest <br> Road | 21 |
| Rural | Bacchus Highway | Truck Road to Old Bingham Highway | 20.6 |
| Rural | Rose Canyon Road | Yellow Fork Canyon to 6400 West | 20.2 |
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Figure 6.1 - Crash Profile Risk Assessment Results (State Routes)


Figure 6.2 - Crash Profile Risk Assessment Results (Federal Aid Routes)

## 6.2. usRAP Risk Assessment

A roadway characteristic risk assessment was performed using roadway feature data collected for Utah state and federal aid routes. The risk assessment was performed using the usRAP tool. The output of the usRAP tool is a star rating or risk rating for vehicle, pedestrian, and bicyclist features. The results of the usRAP risk assessment by star rating are mapped in the following figures:

- Figure 6.3 - Vehicle Star Rating (State Routes)
- Figure 6.4 - Vehicle Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)
- Figure 6.5 - Pedestrian Star Rating (State Routes)
- Figure 6.6 - Pedestrian Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)
- Figure 6.7 - Bicycle Star Rating (State Routes)
- Figure 6.8 - Bicycle Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)

A summary of the highest risk segments (1-2 Stars) for federal aid routes in the South Salt Lake Valley GFA are located in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 - usRAP Risk Segments (Federal Aid Route)

| Road Segment | Extents | Vehicle Risk | Pedestrian Risk | Bicycle Risk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bacchus Highway | South Jordan Parkway to North GFA Extents |  | X | X |
| Bacchus Highway | 13100 South to South Jordan Parkway |  | X |  |
| South Jordan Parkway | M ountain View Corridor to Cardinal Park Road |  | X | X |
| 10400 South | Vermillion Drive to Bangerter Highway |  | X |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 13100 \\ \text { South/13090 } \\ \text { South } \end{gathered}$ | Bacchus Highway to Rosecrest Road |  | X | X |
| Rose Canyon Road | 13400 South to 13100 South |  | X | X |
| 13400 South | 2700 West to Redwood Road |  | X | X |
| 13400 South | Mountain View Corridor to 2700 West |  | X |  |
| 13400 South | Rose Canyon Road to M ountain View Corridor |  | X | X |
| 11800 South | Bacchus Highway to 6000 West |  | X |  |
| 11800 South | 6000 West to M ountain View Corridor | X | X | X |
| Daybreak parkway | Mountain View Corridor to Oakmond Road |  | X | X |
| Daybreak parkway | Oakmond Road to Bangerter Highway | X | X | X |
| Freedom Park Drive | Anthem Park Blvd to 11800 South |  | X |  |


| Road Segment | Extents | Vehicle Risk | Pedestrian Risk | Bicycle Risk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anthem Park Blvd | Miller Crossing Drive to M ountain View Corridor |  | X |  |
| 11800 South | M ountain View Corridor to Anthem Court |  | X |  |
| 11800 South | 2480 West to Redwood Road | X | X | X |
| 4000 West | 12600 South to Kilt Street |  | X |  |
| 12600 South | M ain Street to Bangerter Highway |  | X | X |
| 4570 West | Geronimo Road to 12600 South | X |  |  |
| 2700 West | 15000 South to Van Ross Drive |  | X |  |
| 2240 West | 12600 South to 11800 South | X |  |  |
| 15000 South | 2700 West to Camp Williams Road |  | X |  |
| 1300 West | Y worry Lane to North GFA Boundary |  | X |  |
| 1300 West | Withers Lane to Y worry Lane | X | X | X |
| 1300 <br> West/Loumis Parkway | Blue Quill Drive to Ryanna Drive |  | X | X |
| Loumis Parkway | Redwood Road to Blue Quill Drive |  | X |  |
| 1690 West | 14600 South to Redwood Road | X |  |  |
| 14600 South | 1690 West to 1515 West | X |  |  |
| 14600 South | 1515 West to Heritage Crest Way | X | X | X |
| 10000 South | 1000 West to East GFA Extents | X | X | X |
| Jordan Gateway/Lone Peak Parkway | 12300 South to North GFA Extents |  | X |  |
| Jordan Gateway/Lone Peak Parkway | Golden Harvest Road to 12300 South | X | X |  |
| 200 West | Bangerter Highway to Galena Park Blvd |  | X |  |
| 13800 South | 600 West to 200 West |  | X |  |
| Galena Park Blvd/Vista Station Blvd | 13490 South to 700 West | X | X | X |
| 700 West | Galen Park Blvd to 11400 South | X | X | X |
| Pony Express Road | South GFA Boundary to 14600 South |  | X |  |


| Road Segment | Extents | Vehicle Risk | Pedestrian Risk | Bicycle Risk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 East | 11800 South to 11400 South | X |  |  |
| Willow Springs Lane | 300 East to Whisper Bend Drive | X |  |  |
| 2000 East | Graystone Drive to Genova Drive | X | X | X |
| 13800 South | Wadsworth Park Drive to Bangerter Highway | X | X | X |
| Bangerter Parkway | Highland Drive to 13800 South |  | X | X |
| Traverse Ridge Road | Deer Ridge Road to Highland Drive |  | X |  |
| Draper Parkway/12300 South | 700 East to North GFA Extents | X | X | X |
| 1300 East | M anfield Way to North GFA Extents | X | X | X |
| 1300 East | 13200 South to M anfield Way |  | X | X |
| 1300 East | 13700 South to 13200 South | X | X | X |
| Fort Street | 13400 South to 12400 South | X |  |  |
| 12400 South/Pioneer Road | 970 East to Highland Drive |  | X |  |
| Highland Drive | Bangerter Parkway to Pioneer Road |  | X |  |



Figure 6.3 - Vehicle Star Rating (State Routes)


Figure 6.4 - Vehicle Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)


Figure 6.5 - Pedestrian Star Rating (State Routes)


Figure 6.6 - Pedestrian Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)


Figure 6.7 - Bicycle Star Rating (State Routes)


Figure 6.8 - Bicycle Star Rating (Federal Aid Routes)

### 6.3. Local Street Risk Assessment

A local street risk assessment was performed for all local roads within WFRC that are not included in the usRAP network. The results of the local street risk assessment are summarized in Table 6.3 and Figure 6.9. Mapped segments include the top $5 \%$ risk segments within the WFRC study area and the top 10 segments or high priority segments within the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.

Table 6.3 - Local Street High Priority Segments

| Road Segment | Extents |
| :---: | :---: |
| Anthem Park Boulevard | SR-65 -12600 South |
| Monarch Meadow/Ft Herriman | 4800 West - Main Street |
| River Heights | 10350 South -11970 South |
| Rose Crest Road | Autumn Crest Boulevard - Palisade Rose Drive |
| Fort Street | 13200 South -12400 South |
| Emmeline Drive | Sun Bloom Lane - Friendship Drive |
| 12600 South | Main Street -6200 West |
| 3200 West | Rolling Creek Way -12130 South |
| 13200 South | Highland Drive -300 East |
| 6000 West | 13900 South $-1^{\text {st }}$ Street |



Figure 6.9 - Local Street Risk Assessment Results

## 7. Safety Analysis Summary

This section summarizes the safety analysis performed for the South Salt Lake Valley GFA by identifying common risk characteristics and a composite high-risk roadway network.

### 7.1. Common Risk Characteristics

Based on the SHSP Emphasis Area Analysis and the Historical Crash Analysis summarized above, the following are common risk characteristics that should be considered when developing safety improvement projects specific to the South Salt Lake Valley GFA.

- Intersections
- $56.6 \%$ of all fatal and serious injuries
- Teen Driver
- $25.5 \%$ of all fatal and serious injuries
- Speed-Related
- $25.2 \%$ of all fatal and serious injuries
- Roadway Departure
- $17.9 \%$ of all fatal and serious injuries
- $17.0 \%$ of all fatal and serious injury crashes
- Motorcycle
- $17.6 \%$ of all fatal and serious injuries
- $5.3 \%$ of all fatal and serious injury crashes
- Active Transportation
- $11.9 \%$ of all fatal and serious injury crashes
- Left Turn at Intersection
- $23.3 \%$ of all fatal and serious injury crashes


### 7.2. Composite High-Risk Roadway Network

Each of the safety analysis methodologies completed identified segments that can be improved to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

To identify an overall high-risk roadway network and provide focused information for jurisdictional decisions regarding prioritization of safety improvements, an analysis was performed to identify overlapping segments from each of the analysis methodologies. A composite score, from zero to five, was determined using the approach in Table 7.1. The high-risk roadway network is a composite of the various risks as presented in Section 4 through Section 6 of Tech Memo \#1. The top 10\% of roadway segments for the entire WFRC area are included in the Composite High-Risk Network. These segments have a composite risk value of four or higher.

The South Salt Lake Valley GFA Composite High-Risk Network for Federal Aid routes is summarized in Table 7.2.

The results are also mapped in Figure 7.1 (State Routes) and Figure 7.2 (Federal Aid Routes).

Table 7.1 - Composite High-Risk Roadway

| Analysis | Risk Type | Approach | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical Crash Analysis | Historical Crash Risk | 5-Year Crash Totals $\geq 3$ Crashes | 1 |
| Crash and Network Screening <br> Analysis | Systemic Crash Risk | Positive Local CCR Differential | 1 |
| WFRC Risk Assessment | Roadway Risk | Risk Score $\geq 20$ | 1 |
| usRAP Risk Assessment | Vehicle Risk | Vehicle Star Rating =1-2 Stars | 1 |
| usRAP Risk Assessment | Pedestrian Risk | Pedestrian Star Rating =1-2 Stars | 0.5 |
| usRAP Risk Assessment | Bicycle Risk | Bicycle Star Rating =1-2 Stars | 0.5 |
| Total Possible Composite Risk Score |  |  | $\mathbf{5}$ |

Table 7.2 - South Salt Lake Valley High-Risk Roadway Network (State Routes and Federal Aid Routes)

|  |  |  |  |  | RISK TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Limits | Functional Classification | City | $\pi$ <br> $\frac{\pi}{5}$ <br> 5 <br> 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State Route |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Jordan Parkway | Bangerter Highway to I-15 | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 4.2 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 11400 South | Bangerter Highway to 3420 West | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan, Draper | 0.6 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 11400 South | Redwood Road to I-15 | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 2.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| 12600 South (SR-71) | Dunhammer Drive to 1630 West | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 1.4 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 12300 South (SR-71) | 265 West to 700 East | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.5 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 2700 West to 13800 South | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton, Bluffdale | 4.5 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 14600 South | Noell Nelson Drive to I-15 | Minor Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 200 West to 13800 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 0.8 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 9400 South to 9916 South | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 1.5 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 11400 South to Andover Road | Other Principal Arterial | South Jordan | 0.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| Redwood Road (SR-68) | 12600 South to Bangerter Highway | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 2.2 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Camp Williams Road (SR-68) | 1500 South to Portter Rockwell Blvd | Other Principal Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Bangerter Highway (SR-154) | 12600 South to 13400 South | Other Principal Arterial | Riverton | 1.0 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| State Street (US-89) | 11400 South to 12300 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| 700 Easy (SR-71) | 11400 South to 12300 South | Other Principal Arterial | Draper | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| Federal Aid Routes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1300 W | 10400 S to McClan Dr | Major Collector | South Jordan | 0.1 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| Daybreak Rim Way | Oakmond Rd to Bangerter Hwy | Minor Arterial | South Jordan | 1.3 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 11400 S | State St to 150 E | Other Principal Arterial | Sandy | 0.3 | X | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| 12300 S | 700 E to 100 E | Minor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| 1300 E | Draper Gate Dr to Ballard Cv | Minor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 1300 E | 13200 S to Bent Pine Cv | Minor Arterial | Draper | 0.5 | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| 13400 S | 5600 W to M onarch M eadows Pkwy | Minor Arterial | Riverton, Herriman | 0.1 | X | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| Bluffdale Blvd (14600 S) | 1515 W to 850 W | Minor Arterial | Bluffdale | 1.2 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |



Figure 7.1 - South Salt Lake Valley High-Risk Roadway Network (State Routes)
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Figure 7.2 - South Salt Lake Valley High-Risk Roadway Network (Federal Aid Routes)

## ATTACHMENT A

## SOUTH SALT LAKE VALLEY CASE STUDY PROJECT INFORMATION SHEETS

South Salt Lake Valley

| Project ID | Jurisdictions | Project Name |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 10.52 .1 | Bluffdale | 14600 South from SR 68 to I-15 |
| 10.52 .2 | Bluffdale | 2700 West \& 14400 South Intersection Improvements |
| 10.53 .1 | Draper | 12300 South from 700 East to 1300 East |
| 10.53 .2 | Draper | Minuteman Drive \& Highland Drive |
| 10.54 .1 .1 | Herriman, <br> Riverton | 13400 South from 6400 West to Bangerter Highway |
| 10.54 .2 | Herriman | $12600 /$ Herriman Boulevard \& Anthem Park Boulevard |
| 10.54 .3 | Herriman | Sentinel Ridge Boulevard: 14230 South to 13400 South |
| 10.55 .1 .1 | Riverton, <br> Herriman | 13400 South from 6400 West to Bangerter Highway |
| 10.56 .1 | South Jordan | South Jordan Parkway from Bangerter Highway to Redwood Road |
| 10.56 .2 | South Jordan | Daybreak Parkway/SR 175 from 4000 West to 3600 West |
| 10.56 .3 | South Jordan | Redwood Road and Shields Lane Intersection Improvements |
| 10.57 .1 | Copperton | SR 209/SR 48 from Kennecott Road to 10200 South |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | $\mathbf{1 4 6 0 0}$ South from SR 68 to I-15 | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Bluffdale | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Medium |  |

Location Description

| Roadway: | 14600 South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | SR 68 |  |
| To: | I-15 |  |
| Length: | 2.29 | miles |

Key Intersection Locations:
1300 West 950 West
1690 West Heritagecrest Wa
1630 West Spring View Parkway Pony ExpressRoad

## Project Location Map 10.52.1



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | 2.29 |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{3 , 8 1 6}$ |
| Functional Classification | Other Principal Arteria |
| Roadway Ownership | State |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{9}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | $\mathbf{4 7}$ |
| $r \mid$ Total Crashes | $\mathbf{6 0}$ |
| Total EPDO Crashes | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) | $\checkmark$ |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle | $\checkmark$ | Sideswipe (SS) | $\checkmark$ |
| Front to Rear (FR) |  | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/ Bike | Angle | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\underset{5}{ }$ |
| 1300 West \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1690 West \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1630 West \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 950 West \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heritagecrest Way \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring View Parkway \& 14600 So |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1000 West \& 14600 South |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 115 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| Porter Rockwell Boulevard \& 1460 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 | 4 | 37 | 505 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pony ExpressRoad \& 14600 Sout | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1 | 10 | 30 | 21 | 62 | 678 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project Description/How is safety improved?
While this segment extends from Camp Williams Road/SR 68 to $\mathrm{I}-15$, City of Bluffdale is already improving a large portion of this segment from the Jordan River Parkway to the 1000 W roundabout. The underway construction will remove the S -curve under the railroad and construct a new bridge under the railroad. It is proposed that other segments be improved with wider shoulders to allow for the installation of a buffered bicycle lane. It is also recommended that sidewalk infill be included in this project. The Jordan River Parkway Crossing should be upgraded to a high visibility crossing.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.
Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4 Additional Improvements \#5 $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

# Project Information Sheet 

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Name: | $\mathbf{2 7 0 0}$ West \& 14400 South Intersection Improvements | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Bluffdale | JSF |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver | BCC |
| Equity Priority: | Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | NA | Key Intersection Locations: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | NA | 2700 West \& 14400 South |
| To: | NA |  |
| Length: | NA |  |

## $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Project Location Map } & \text { Map ID: } \\ 10.52 .2\end{array}$



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | NA |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | NA |
| Functional Classification | NA |
| Roadway Ownership | NA |
| Urban/Rural Designation | NA |
| Number of Key Intersections | NA |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | NA |
| Historic Crashes | NA |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | NA |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | NA |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | NA |
| Local Street Assessment | NA |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | NA |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | NA |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | NA |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | NA |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | NA |
| Total Crashes | NA |
| Total EPDO Crashes | NA |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Fatal | NA | Head On (HO) | NA |
| Serious Injury | NA | Parked Vehicle (PV) | NA |
| Pedestrian (Ped) | NA | Single Vehicle | NA |
| Bicycle (Bike) | NA | Rear to Rear (RR) | NA |
| Motorcycle | NA | Rear to Side (RS) | NA |
| Angle | NA | Sideswipe (SS) | NA |
| Front to Rear (FR) | NA | Other/Unknown | NA |

## Intersection Crash History



This project is focused on identifying and implementing the best intersection control type at this intersection. This will be accomplished through conducting an intersection control evaluation study and implementing the results. It could be possible that a roundabout will be the prefered alternative to improve safety based on the results of the study.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |

## Intersection Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price |  | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perform an Intersection Control Evaluation and Implement | NA | All Crashes | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 225,000 | \$ | 225,000 |
| Convert Existing Intersection to Modern Roundabout | 0.18-0.59 | All Crashes | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 2,500,000 | \$ | 2,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | ov | ts Subtotal: | \$ | 2,725,000 |
|  |  |  |  | bilization | (\% | * 10\% | \$ | 75,000 |
|  |  |  |  | fic Con | $1:($ | 5\% | \$ | 136,250 |
|  |  | Items Not Es | timated / Con | ntinge | : | 30\% | \$ | 817,500 |
|  |  |  |  | Estima |  | ction Cost: | \$ | 3,753,750 |

Local Match ${ }^{\dagger}$ : 20\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ Toward SS4A Implementation Grants

Preconstruction Engineering/Design
Utilities**
ROW**
Construction Engineering/Management
Estimated Project Total:

| $12 \%$ | $\$$ | 450,450 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | $\$$ | - |
| $15 \%$ | $\$$ | - |
|  | $\$$ | 563,063 |
| Total | $\$$ | $4,768,000$ |
|  | $\$$ |  |

4,768,000
*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1: Set Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users
Additional Improvements \#2: Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5: $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | $\mathbf{1 2 3 0 0}$ South from $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ East to $\mathbf{1 3 0 0}$ East | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Draper | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Medium, Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | 12300 South | Key Intersection Locations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | 700 East | 800 East |
| To: | 1300 East |  |
| Length: | $0.88 \quad$ miles |  |

## Project Location Map



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{0 . 8 8}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{2 6 , 3 5 3}$ |
| Functional Classification | Minor Arterial |
| Roadway Ownership | Federal Aid - Local |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 2 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 4 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 11 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 59 |
| Total Crashes | 76 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 461 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury | $\checkmark$ | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle | $\checkmark$ | Sideswipe (SS) | $\checkmark$ |
| Front to Rear (FR) | $\checkmark$ | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/Bike |  | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\underset{5}{ }$ |
| 800 East \& 12300 South |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 136 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Project Description/How is safety improved?

This project is focued on systemic corridor access management and bicycle safety improvements. It is proposed that a center curbed median be installed along the entire length of the project in the existing two-way left-turn lane to address angle (turning) crashes along the corridor. All unsignalized intersections and access driveways should be considered for right-in/right-out or $3 / 4$ access. It is also proposed that lane narrowing and wider lane lines be implemented for traffic calming and to allow for the striping of a bicycle lane.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5: $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Name: | Minuteman Drive \& Highland Drive | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Draper | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | NA | Key Intersection Locations: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | NA | Minuteman Drive |
| To: | NA |  |
| Length: | NA |  |

## Project Location Map



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | NA |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | NA |
| Functional Classification | NA |
| Roadway Ownership | NA |
| Urban/Rural Designation | NA |
| Number of Key Intersections | NA |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Composite Safety Score |  |
| Historic Crashes |  |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential |  |
| Crash Profile Risk Score |  |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) |  |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | NA |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | NA |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | NA |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | NA |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | NA |
| Total Crashes | NA |
| Total EPDO Crashes | NA |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) |  | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/Bike | Angle | FR | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\boldsymbol{S S}$ |
| Minuteman Drive \& Highland Driv, | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 38 | 102 | 918 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Project Description/How is safety improved?

This project recommends the following improvements to the intersection of Minuteman Drive/Highland Drive: westbound left, transition to protected phasing; northbound/southbound left, transition to flashing yellow arrow format; east and south approaches, add right-turn storage lane; add crossing visibility improvements on the east and south legs; add advance warning signage to north and south approaches to intersection.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |

Intersection Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price |  | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change Permissive Left-Turn to Protected or Protected/Permissive | 0.79-0.95 | Left-Turn | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 8,000 | \$ | 8,000 |
| Change a 5-section "Doghouse" to Flashing Yellow Arrow | 0.75-0.93 | Left-Turn | 2.00 | INT | \$ | 8,000 | \$ | 16,000 |
| Provide Right-Turn Lanes | 0.74-0.86 | All Crashes | 2.00 | LANE | \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 300,000 |
| Upgrade Existing Crosswalk to High-Visibility Crosswalk | 0.6-0.75 | Pedestrian | 2.00 | XING | \$ | 37,000 | \$ | 74,000 |
| Systemic Low-Cost Countermeasures at Stop-Control Intersection | 0.73-0.9 | All Crashes | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 19,000 | \$ | 19,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | ovement | Subtotal: | \$ | 417,000 |
|  |  |  |  | obilization | (\% +/-)* | 10\% | \$ | 41,700 |
|  |  |  |  | fic Contr | : (\% +/-) | 5\% | \$ | 20,850 |
|  |  | Items Not E | timated / Con | ntingen | : (\% +/-) | 30\% | \$ | 125,100 |
|  |  |  |  | Estimate | Constru | tion Cost: | \$ | 604,650 |

Local Match ${ }^{\dagger}$ : $\quad$ 20\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ Toward SS4A Implementation Grants

Preconstruction Engineering/Design
Utilities**
ROW**
Construction Engineering/Management
Estimated Project To

|  | $12 \%$ | $\$$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\$$ | 72,558 |
|  | $\$$ | - |
| $15 \%$ | $\$$ | - |
|  | $\$$ | 90,698 |
| Total | $\$$ | 768,000 |

768,000
*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.
Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5: $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | $\mathbf{3 / 1 4 / 2 0 2 4}$ |  |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Herriman, Riverton | Prepared By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver | Checked By: |
| Equity Priority: | Medium, Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | 13400 South |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | 6400 West |
| To: | Bangerter Highway |
| Length: | $3.20 \quad$ miles |

Key Intersection Locations:
Rose Canyon Road Rosecrest Road
5200 West
Towne Market Place
Mountain View Corridor
Bangerter Highway

Project Location Map
Map ID: 10.54.1.1


## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{3 1 , 7 8 9}$ |
| Functional Classification | Minor Arterial |
| Roadway Ownership | Federal Aid - Local |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{6}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 2 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 26 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 28 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 199 |
| Total Crashes | 255 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 1,284 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury | $\checkmark$ | Parked Vehicle (PV) | $\checkmark$ |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle | $\checkmark$ |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) | $\checkmark$ | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/ Bike | Angle | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\boldsymbol{S}$ |
| Rose Canyon Road \& 13400 Sout | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 21 | 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5200 West \& 13400 South | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 18 | 196 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Towne Market Place \& 13400 Sol |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 21 | 231 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rosecrest Road \& 13400 South | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 9 | 55 | 38 | 102 | 864 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain View Corridor \& 13400 ¢ | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 2 | 6 | 60 | 21 | 89 | 1,024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangerter Highway \& 13400 Sout\| | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 3 | 28 | 85 | 26 | 143 | 2,785 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Project Description/How is safety improved?

This project is focused on systemic safety improvements along the corridor including constructing sidewalk in locations where no sidewalk is present, installing center curbed median and limiting access at unsignalized intersections, and striping a buffered bicycle lane where it currently does not exists west of Rosecrest Road. It is also proposed that all school crosings be upgraded to high visibility crosswalk markings.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



Crosswalk
Visibility
Enhancements

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/$ - of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5 $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Name: | 12600/Herriman Boulevard \& Anthem Park Boulevard | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Herriman | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Medium |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | NA | Key Intersection Locations: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | NA | Herriman Boulev |
| To: | NA |  |
| Length: | NA |  |

## Project Location Map 10.54 .2



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | NA |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | NA |
| Functional Classification | NA |
| Roadway Ownership | NA |
| Urban/Rural Designation | NA |
| Number of Key Intersections | NA |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Composite Safety Score |  |
| Historic Crashes |  |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential |  |
| Crash Profile Risk Score |  |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) |  |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | NA |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | NA |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | NA |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | NA |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | NA |
| Total Crashes | NA |
| Total EPDO Crashes | NA |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) |  | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History



This project recommends the following improvements to the intersection of W Herriman Blvd/Anthem Park Blvd: protected intersection improvements including bulbouts on all possible approaches and other improvements to increase pedestrian visibility; eastbound and westbound right-turn lane; advance warning signage on east and west approaches; retroreflective backplates/borders; high-visibility crossing, signage and ADA improvements at the intersection.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



Backplates with Retroreflective Borders

Crosswalk Visibility Enhancements

Dedicated Left and
Right-Turn Lanes
at Intersections

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |

Intersection Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price |  | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protected Intersection | NA | All Crashes | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 650,000 | \$ | 650,000 |
| Provide Right-Turn Lanes | 0.74-0.86 | All Crashes | 2.00 | LANE | \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 300,000 |
| Systemic Low-Cost Countermeasures at Stop-Control Intersection | 0.73-0.9 | All Crashes | 1.00 | INT | \$ | 19,000 | \$ | 19,000 |
| Install Retroreflective Backplates/Boarders |  |  | 8.00 |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Install High-Visibility Crosswalk | 0.6-0.75 | Pedestrian | 1.00 | XING | \$ | 36,000 | \$ | 36,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | ovements | Subtotal: | \$ | 1,005,000 |
|  |  |  |  | bilizatio | (\% +/-)* | 10\% | \$ | 75,000 |
|  |  |  |  | fic Con | : (\% +/-) | 5\% | \$ | 50,250 |
|  |  | Items Not E | timated / | ntingen | : (\% +/-) | 30\% | \$ | 301,500 |
|  |  |  |  | Estimat | Constru | ion Cost: | \$ | 1,431,750 |


| Local Match ${ }^{\dagger}$ : | 20\% | \$ | 363,800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

${ }^{\dagger}$ Toward SS4A Implementation Grants
Preconstruction Engineering
Construction Engineering/Man
Estima
${ }^{*}$ Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design
vere not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific infor
w. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety
for All Road Users

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

# Project Information Sheet 

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | Sentinel Ridge Boulevard from 13400 South to 14230 South | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Herriman | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | Sentinel Ridge Boulevard |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | 13400 South |
| To: | 14230 South |
| Length: | $1.09 \quad$ miles |

Key Intersection Locations: 14230 South

## Project Location Map



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{1 . 0 9}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{8 , 5 4 2}$ |
| Functional Classification | Local |
| Roadway Ownership | Local |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score |  |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score |  |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) |  |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 0 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 1 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 4 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 18 |
| Total Crashes | 23 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 86 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) | $\checkmark$ |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) | $\checkmark$ | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/Bike | Angle | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\underset{5}{ }$ |
| 14230 South \& Sentinel Ridge Bo |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 82 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project Description/How is safety improved?
This project recommends the systemic safety improvements along the corridor including traffic calming, median installation, and active transportation improvements. These improvements include lane narrow and median installation along the entire corridor. Active transportation improvements include the extension of the muti-use path and bulbouts at all school crossings. It is also proposed that the intersection of 14230 South/Sentinel Ridge Boulevard be evaluated through Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) study. Also the intersection should consider RRFB and higher visibility crosswalks. A pedestrian refuge island should be considered at the existing HAWK sianal crossina
This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



Crosswalk
Visibility Enhancements


Rectangular Rapid
Flashing Beacons
(RRFB)

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
**To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5: $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

# Project Information Sheet 

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | $\mathbf{3 / 1 4 / 2 0 2 4}$ |  |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Riverton, Herriman | Prepared By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver | Checked By: |
| Equity Priority: | Medium, Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | 13400 South |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | 6400 West |
| To: | Bangerter Highway |
| Length: | $3.20 \quad$ miles |

Key Intersection Locations:
Rose Canyon Road Rosecrest Road
5200 West
Towne Market Place
Mountain View Corridor
Bangerter Highway

Project Location Map
Map ID: 10.55.1.1


## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{3 1 , 7 8 9}$ |
| Functional Classification | Minor Arterial |
| Roadway Ownership | Federal Aid - Local |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{6}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 2 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 26 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 28 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 199 |
| Total Crashes | 255 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 1,284 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury | $\checkmark$ | Parked Vehicle (PV) | $\checkmark$ |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle | $\checkmark$ |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) | $\checkmark$ | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/ Bike | Angle | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\boldsymbol{S}$ |
| Rose Canyon Road \& 13400 Sout | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 21 | 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5200 West \& 13400 South | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 18 | 196 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Towne Market Place \& 13400 Sol |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 21 | 231 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rosecrest Road \& 13400 South | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 9 | 55 | 38 | 102 | 864 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain View Corridor \& 13400 ¢ | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 2 | 6 | 60 | 21 | 89 | 1,024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangerter Highway \& 13400 Sout\| | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 3 | 28 | 85 | 26 | 143 | 2,785 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project is focused on systemic safety improvements along the corridor including constructing sidewalk in locations where no sidewalk is present, installing center curbed median and limiting access at unsignalized intersections, and striping a buffered bicycle lane where it currently does not exists west of Rosecrest Road. It is also proposed that all school crosings be upgraded to high visibility crosswalk markings.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



Corridor Access
Management


Crosswalk
Visibility
Enhancements

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
**To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1
Additional Improvements \#2: Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5 $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

# Project Information Sheet 

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: | $3 / 14 / 2024$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | South Jordan Parkway from Bangerter Highway to Redwood Road | Prepared By: | JSF |
| Jurisdiction(s): | South Jordan | Checked By: | EJS |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |  |
| Equity Priority: | Medium, Low |  |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | South Jordan Parkway | Key Intersection Locations: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Bangerter Highway | 2200 West |
| To: | Redwood Road |  |
| Length: | $1.98 \quad$ miles |  |

## Project Location Map Map ID: $\quad 10.56 .1$



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | 1.98 |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | 18,403 |
| Functional Classification | Other Principal Arteria |
| Roadway Ownership | State |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 0 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 6 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 12 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 75 |
| Total Crashes | 93 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 345 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) | $\checkmark$ | Other/Unknown | $\checkmark$ |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Ty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/Bike |  | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\underset{5}{ }$ |
| 2200 West \& South Jordan Parkw | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 17 | 46 | 451 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project Description/How is safety improved?
This project is focused on systemic access management and active transportation safety improvements. It is proposed that center curbed medians be installed in the existing two-way left-turn lane and all unsignalized intersections and access drives become right-in/right-out or $3 / 4$ access. It is also proposed that all school crosswalks be upgraded to include high visibility markings. All signalized intersections include bicycle treatment upgrades. The intersections of 2200 West and 2700 West should be upgraded to flashing yellow area type left-turn signal heads.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes <br> All Crashes | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Quantity } \\ \hline 0.86 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Unit } \\ \hline \text { MILE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install Raised Medians on Roadways with Existing TWLTL | 0.29 |  |  |  | \$ 928,000 | \$ | 798,080 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Intersection Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price |  | Cost |
| Change a 5-section "Doghouse" to Flashing Yellow Arrow | 0.75-0.93 | Left-Turn | 1.00 | INT | \$ 8,000 | \$ | 8,000 |
| Upgrade pedestrian push buttons to Audible Pedestrian Signals (APS) | NA | Pedestrian | 1.00 | INT | \$ 4,000 | \$ | 4,000 |
| Install High Visibility Crosswalk Markings | 0.6 | Pedestrian | 6.00 | XING | \$ 2,500 | \$ | 15,000 |
| Add Bicycle Treatments at Intersections | NA | All Crashes | 5.00 | INT | \$ 9,000 | \$ | 45,000 |
| Change a permissive only to Flashing Yellow Arrow | 0.5-0.6 | Left-Turn | 1.00 | INT | \$ 8,000 | \$ | 8,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | ovements Subtotal: | \$ | 878,080 |
|  |  |  |  | bilizatio | : $\%$ +/-)* $10 \%$ | \$ | 75,000 |
|  |  |  |  | fic Contr | l: (\% +/-) 5\% | \$ | 43,904 |
|  |  | Items Not E | stimated / Con | ntingen | : (\% +/-) 30\% | \$ | 263,424 |
|  |  |  |  | Estimat | Construction Cost: | \$ | 1,260,408 |
| Local Match ${ }^{\dagger}$ : 20\% $\quad$ \$ 320,200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ Toward SS4A Implementation Grants | Preconstruction Engineering/DesignUtilities |  |  |  |  | \$ | 151,249 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | $\xrightarrow{\text { ROW }}$ ** |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | Construction Engineering/Management 15\% |  |  |  |  | \$ | 189,061 |
|  |  |  |  | Esti | ated Project Total: | \$ | 1,601,000 |

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.
Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5: $\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: $3 / 14 / 2024$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Project Name: | Daybreak Parkway/SR 175 from 4000 West to $\mathbf{3 6 0 0}$ West | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | South Jordan | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | Daybreak Parkway/SR 175 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | 4000 West |  |
| To: | 3600 West |  |
| Length: | $0.50 \quad$ miles |  |

Key Intersection Locations: 4000 West

## Project Location Map 10.56.2



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{3 0 , 8 1 8}$ |
| Functional Classification | Other Principal Arteria |
| Roadway Ownership | State |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Urban |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | $\checkmark$ |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | $\checkmark$ |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | $\checkmark$ |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 0 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 4 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 8 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 31 |
| Total Crashes | 43 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 211 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal |  | Head On (HO) |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle |  | Sideswipe (SS) |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) |  | Other/Unknown |  |

## Intersection Crash History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | What Crash Ty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Signal | K | A | B | C | 0 | Total | EPDO | K/A | Ped/Bike |  | R | HO | PV | RR/RS | $\underset{5}{ }$ |
| 4000 West \& Daybreak Parkway | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 2 | 10 | 47 | 27 | 86 | 971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project Description/How is safety improved?
This project is focused on systemic bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements along the corridor. Improvements include intersection improvements and a bicycle signal at the Bangerter Highway interchange. Green bicycle markings/lanes should also be considered at this location. Leading pedestrian intervals are proposed at the 4000 West, River Heights Drive, and Parkway Plaza Drive intersections.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |

Intersection Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
**To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1:
Additional Improvements \#2: Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5

Set Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users

| Green Bicycle Lanes |
| :--- |

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: | $3 / 14 / 2024$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Redwood Road and Shields Lane Intersection Improvements | Prepared By: | JSF |
| Jurisdiction(s): | South Jordan | Checked By: | BCC |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |  |
| Equity Priority: | Medium |  |  |

Location Description

| Roadway: | NA |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | NA |
| To: | NA |
| Length: | NA |

## Project Location Map 10.56 .3



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | NA |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | NA |
| Functional Classification | NA |
| Roadway Ownership | NA |
| Urban/Rural Designation | NA |
| Number of Key Intersections | NA |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score | NA |
| Historic Crashes | NA |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | NA |
| Crash Profile Risk Score | NA |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) | NA |
| Local Street Assessment | NA |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | NA |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | NA |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | NA |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | NA |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | NA |
| $r \mid$ Total Crashes | NA |
| Total EPDO Crashes | NA |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Fatal | NA | Head On (HO) | NA |
| Serious Injury | NA | Parked Vehicle (PV) | NA |
| Pedestrian (Ped) | NA | Single Vehicle | NA |
| Bicycle (Bike) | NA | Rear to Rear (RR) | NA |
| Motorcycle | NA | Rear to Side (RS) | NA |
| Angle | NA | Sideswipe (SS) | NA |
| Front to Rear (FR) | NA | Other/Unknown | NA |

## Intersection Crash History



## Redwood Road and Shields Lane Intersection Improvements

Project Description/How is safety improved?
This project recommends the following improvements to the intersection of Shields Lane and Redwood Road: protected intersection improvements, performing a Road Safety Audit (RSA), and Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) study to determine the optimal intersection control type for this location to improve safety for all users. It is anticipated that the study results could result in an intersection control type that reduces left-turn conflicts. Other improvements are proposed to increase pedestrian and bicyclist visibility.

This project description represents potential safety improvement strategies that could be implemented at this location, as well as other locations with similar conditions. Additional improvement strategies could be considered subject to engineering analysis.

## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

| Item Description | CMF | Applicable Crashes | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |


*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
${ }^{* *}$ To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.

Additional Improvements \#1: Set Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users
Additional Improvements \#2: Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5:

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## Project Information Sheet

| GFA(s): | South Salt Lake Valley | Date Prepared: |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Name: | SR 209/SR 48 from Kennecott Road to 10200 South | Prepared By: |
| Jurisdiction(s): | Copperton | Checked By: |
| Emphasis Areas: | Intersections, Roadway Departures, Teen Driver |  |
| Equity Priority: | Low |  |

## Location Description

| Roadway: | SR 209/SR 48 | Key Intersection Locations: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Kennecott Road |  |
| To: | 10200 South |  |
| Length: | $0.41 \quad$ miles |  |

## Project Location Map Map ID: $\quad 10.57 .1$



## Segment Information and Safety Analysis Areas Summary

| Roadway Characteristics | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length (miles) | $\mathbf{0 . 4 1}$ |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles per day) | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 4}$ |
| Functional Classification | Major Collector |
| Roadway Ownership | State |
| Urban/Rural Designation | Rural |
| Number of Key Intersections | $\mathbf{0}$ |


| Why Was This Location Identified? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Composite Safety Score |  |
| Historic Crashes | $\checkmark$ |
| Critical Crash Rate Differential | $\checkmark$ |
| Crash Profile Risk Score |  |
| usRAP - Star Rating (Veh, Ped, Bike) |  |
| Local Street Assessment |  |

## Segment Crash History

| Crash History (2018-2022) | \# of crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Crashes (K) | 0 |
| Suspected Serious Injury Crashes (A) | 0 |
| Suspected Minor Injury Crashes (B) | 1 |
| Possible Injury Crashes (C) | 1 |
| No Injury/PDO Crashes (O) | 6 |
| Total Crashes | 8 |
| Total EPDO Crashes | 40 |


| What Crash Types are Over-Represented? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fatal | Head On (HO) |  |  |
| Serious Injury |  | Parked Vehicle (PV) |  |
| Pedestrian (Ped) |  | Single Vehicle |  |
| Bicycle (Bike) |  | Rear to Rear (RR) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle |  | Rear to Side (RS) |  |
| Angle | Sideswipe (SS) |  |  |
| Front to Rear (FR) | Other/Unknown |  |  |

## Intersection Crash History



## Proposed Proven Safety Countermeasures



Walkways

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Segment Improvements

*Mobilization is $10 \%+/-$ of the subtotal with a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ and a maximum of $\$ 75,000$
**To be evaluated during feasibility study/design

## Additional Potential Improvements

Additional safety improvements could be considered that were not included due to availability of data, need for site-specific information, and/or agency/jurisdiction input. Potential additional countermeasures are listed below. Refer to the Countermeasure Toolbox for a complete list of safety countermeasures.
Additional Improvements \#1: Targeted Enforcement and Deterrence
Additional Improvements \#2:
Additional Improvements \#3: Additional Improvements \#4: Additional Improvements \#5:
$\qquad$

## Disclaimer:

Disclaimer: The cost estimates provided in this document are for comparison purposes only. Actual project costs will vary. The recommended safety improvement strategies were based on available data and reasonable engineering judgment and a more detailed assessment may suggest additional safety strategies that could be considered.

## SOUTH SALT LAKE VALLEY CASE STUDY PROJECT LOCATION MAP



## SOUTH SALT LAKE VALLEY EQUITY INDEX MAP



