

**OGDEN - LAYTON AREA  
RGC TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND  
TRANS COM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 8, 2006  
10:35 AM - 12:10 PM  
MEETING SUMMARY**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>	The Ogden - Layton Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was co-chaired by Wilf Sommerkorn, Davis County, and Andy Thomas, Kaysville City. Wilf opened the meeting by having the TAC members introduce themselves.	None Required
<b>2. Meeting Summary – January 11, 2006</b>	<p>Albert Whipple, HAFB, suggested some minor changes concerning action items for future TAC meetings, they were made to the Salt Lake and Ogden – Layton Area combined RGC TAC January 11<sup>th</sup> meeting summary. They were approved by the Ogden - Layton TAC.</p> <p>Trans Com TAC meeting minutes for the Ogden – Layton Area were approved unanimously by the TAC members.</p> <p>RGC TAC meeting summaries are posted at <a href="http://www.wfrc.org/committee/rgc-ogtac.htm">http://www.wfrc.org/committee/rgc-ogtac.htm</a>.</p>	Approved
<b>3. Discussion and Review of Technical Advisory Committees</b>	<p>George Ramjoue, WFRC, led a discussion on the purpose of the TAC and reviewed his discussion from the January 11<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting.</p> <p>George started his presentation discussing the structure and role of the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC). He noted that WFRC is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Wasatch Front region so regional transportation planning can take place. The primary focus of an MPO is to develop the long range transportation planning, natural disaster planning, and Transportation Improvement Programming (TIP). He referenced the memorandum of agreement between WFRC, UDOT and UTA. George said that the MPO makes it possible to bring hundreds of millions of dollars of federal transportation funds into the WFRC region.</p> <p>The organizational structure of WFRC includes 18 board members, which are elected officials. George noted that the WFRC staff has the same bosses that the cities and counties have. He handed out the “Joint Regional Transportation Planning Committee Structure.” Under the WFRC, there are two committees: one named Transportation Coordinating Committee (Trans Com) and the other the Regional Growth Committee (RGC). Trans Com and its TACs work with short range planning helping to develop the TIP, while the RGC and its TACs work with long range planning helping to develop the RTP. TACs are comprised of city and county engineers and planners, respectively. The RGC also has three sub-committees that meet periodically. These committees are the Corridor Preservation Committee, Transit 2030 Committee, and the Regional Open Space Committee. George explained that WFRC and the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), the MPO for Utah County, coordinate with a combined committee named the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPAC), which has its own technical advisory committee. George stated that the reason the RGC was separated from the Trans Com was to provide more attention and input to the RTP and land use issues.</p> <p>George handed out the WFRC Regional Growth Committee Appointments. This list of Regional Growth Committee members and representatives can be found at the following web address <a href="http://www.wfrc.org/committee/RGC%20Committee.pdf">http://www.wfrc.org/committee/RGC%20Committee.pdf</a>. He discussed the differences between members and representatives. A list of Trans Com members was not handed out during the meeting, however, an electronic copy can be found at <a href="http://www.wfrc.org/committee/Trans%20Com%20Members%20Jan%202006.pdf">http://www.wfrc.org/committee/Trans%20Com%20Members%20Jan%202006.pdf</a>. George also handed out a current copy of the Appointment Status to the WFRC Committee as of February 7, 2006.</p> <p>George stated that each city/county represents themselves on the TAC, and is allowed to have one voting member. Ben Wuthrich, WFRC, noted that a TAC membership list which includes members and alternatives had been sent out via email. The WFRC needs input from the cities of any needed changes or corrections. He noted that this meeting was the first combined meeting between the RGC TAC and the Trans Com TAC, and asked the members their</p>	None Required

	<p>feelings on having future combined meetings. A mixed reaction from the TAC members was heard, ranging from liking combined meetings, to limiting the number of combined meetings to only a couple per year.</p> <p>George asked the question how TAC meetings could be made more meaningful. No suggestions were given, but input can be provided to George by phone or via email.</p> <p><b>Please contact George Ramjoe at 363-4230 x111 for additional information.</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Legislative Update</b></p>	<p>Wilf Sommerkorn, Davis County, gave an update on the 2006 Legislative Session related to land use and transportation. Wilf first talked about Senate Bill (SB) 170. He said the bill had lots of opposition from the cities and counties causing it to be rewritten into two or three separate bills. SB 267 was the first of these bills and was written with the local government input. This bill has four main parts dealing with accountability of impact fees, notification of staff reports, land use applications, and notification of general plan minutes. The other bill split from SB170 into SB 268 which focuses on property rights and sets up oversight of land use and zoning at the state level. This bill is already being rewritten with the advisory board being taken out. There may be a third bill that comes from SB 170, changing the referendum process for rezones, but nothing as of February 8<sup>th</sup> has developed.</p> <p>TAC members asked Wilf about the bills dealing with school density and availability of building inspections. Wilf discussed these bills briefly.</p> <p><b>Please contact Wilf Sommerkorn at 451-3278 for additional information.</b></p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p><b>5. Review of TIP/STIP Schedule and Updated Amendment Process</b></p>	<p>Ben Wuthrich, WFRC, handed out a list of projects submitted for consideration for the 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ben referenced the handout by saying that about \$88 million of STP projects were submitted in the Ogden – Layton area with only \$5.6 million available for new projects. The Ogden – Layton area submitted \$9.5 million of CMAQ projects with only \$2.3 millions available. Ben asked the TAC if they would be willing to recommend to Trans Com the funding of new projects in the 2012 program year or if the money should be held for project cost increases. Ben noted that with the increased cost of steel, concrete, and oil many projects could increase by 25 to 40 percent. The TAC discussed this topic with Max Forbush, Farmington City, making the motion to keep the concept reports active and to hold off programming new projects this year. The motion was seconded by Mike Child, Clinton City, and approved unanimously by the TAC.</p> <p>Ben also handed out TIP/STIP Change Process for MPO – Areas Not Subject to Air Quality Conformity or Rural Areas and for the MPO – Areas Subject to Air Quality Conformity. Ben explained that as a result of the request from FHWA to reduce the number of amendments and streamline the process to modify the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), staff from FHWA, UDOT, MAG, Dixie MPO, Cache MPO, UTA, and WFRC worked together to update the TIP/ STIP modification process.</p> <p>Three branches of the modification process were established; first the “Staff Modification”, second the “Board Modification”, and third the “Full Amendment”.</p> <p>Prior to an amendment or modification to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) WFRC staff and UDOT would consult together and include others as necessary to identify which process would be necessary for the particular action.</p> <p>A “Staff Modification” would include project activities where there was a change in funding source, a need for additional funding less than or equal to 25% or up to \$250,000 of the programmed amount, a minor change in the project scope, or moving projects around in the funded years (first four years) of the program. These modifications would not require a conformity determination or a public comment period. They would require administrative approval from the MPO and DOT Executive Directors.</p> <p>A “Board Modification” would include those actions where adjustments to the TIP/ STIP would change, modify, or add either a new Regionally Significant Project from Phase 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan or a Non-Regionally Significant Project. A Board Modification would also be required for requests for funding greater than 25% or over \$250,000. These</p>	<p>Approved</p>

	<p>projects would not require a new regional emission analysis, but they would require a conformity determination and a public comment opportunity. This public comment opportunity would be provided at a regular Council/ Board meeting. These “Board Modifications” would require approval from the MPO Board and the Transportation Commission.</p> <p>A “Full Amendment” to the TIP/ STIP would only be used for a new or changed regionally significant project not in phase 1 of the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This modification would require an amendment to the RTP, a new regional emission analysis, a conformity determination, and a 30-day public comment period. Following the comment period, the MPO Board and the Transportation Commission would need to take action to approve the amendment. FHWA and FTA would need to concur in the conformity finding. The TAC reviewed the Amendment Process and recommended to Trans Com that they approve and recommend it to the Regional Council.</p> <p>Ben handed out the adjustments to the 2006-2010 TIP and explained that in the past, many of these changes were done behind the scenes as items of program management. However, as we implement the new amendment process these items would be documented and presented to the Committees at their regular meetings for review and direction that may be necessary.</p> <p><b>Please contact Ben Wuthrich at 363-4230 x121 for additional information.</b></p>	
<p><b>6. Visioning Document Report</b></p>	<p>Ted Knowlton, Envision Utah, gave a brief overview of the Wasatch Choices 2040 process. He noted that the WFRC and MAG collaborated to develop a combined or preferred land use scenario. From these land use scenarios, a vision map was created with Growth Principles and Objectives. The 18 month process resulted in the Growth Principles and Objectives being adopted by the WFRC in October 2005.</p> <p>Envision Utah and WFRC are currently writing the final document for Wasatch Choices 2040. This document will include an outline of the process, methods used, Growth Principles, and implementation strategies for the Growth Principles.</p> <p><b>Please contact Ted Knowlton at 303-1458 for additional information.</b></p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p><b>7. Implementation Strategies</b></p>	<p>George Ramjoue, WFRC, discussed the implementation strategies being developed for the Growth Principles and the final document for Wasatch Choices 2040. George had sent copies of the rough draft to the TAC members via email. He noted that there is a task force of local planners that are currently developing and reviewing the implementation strategies. George asked that the TAC members provide comments on the strategies and comments can be sent to George by phone or email. Some comments from TAC members that reviewed the strategies included conflicting internal strategies. For example, strategies include landscaping in one section and then water conservation in another, and questions of whether the strategies encouraged regional compliance. George asked if the TAC would recommend the approval of the direction that is currently being taken by Envision Utah and the WFRC staff. There was a motion made by Albert Whipple, HAFB, to table the approval until more refinements were made to the document. The motion was seconded by Lynn Vinzant, Clinton City. The TAC agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Please contact George Ramjoue at 363-4230 x111 for additional information.</b></p>	<p>Not approved - Issue tabled until more refinement is made</p>
<p><b>8. Hill Air Force Base Development Plan</b></p>	<p>Wynn Covieo, Hill AFB, briefed the TAC on the future Hill Air Force Base (AFB) Enhanced Use Leasing (EUL)/West Side Development with a PowerPoint presentation. He started his presentation with general background information. Wynn explained that a couple of features of the EUL/West Side Development is that it will use a public/private partnership to develop an office and aerospace technology park and it is an opportunity for Hill AFB to secure office space at little or no additional cost to the United States Air Force. The development started as an initiative to collocate the 508 ICBMSW and IPIC contractors. The development will be expanded to include replacement of aging administrative buildings from the World War Two era.</p> <p>Wynn said some benefits of the EUL/West Side Development is that it: (1) dedicates 600 acres to business and economic development; (2) creates significant business job-site zone in Davis County; (3) provides much needed USAF replacement facilities; (4) sustains long term financial health of adjoining communities; (5) attracts large aerospace and aviation corporate entities;</p>	<p>None Required</p>

	<p>(6) supports Utah's Aerospace Economic Cluster Initiative, and provides professional and skilled labor employment opportunities; and (7) enhances recruitment and retention of experienced talent.</p> <p>Wynn showed a map of the development area with the current and projected populations for Weber and Davis Counties. He showed another map with the EUL/West Side Development phases. The first phase will include 130 acres to be developed in the next seven years consisting of administration buildings and retail office space near HAFB's Roy Gate and the West Gate. The second phase will be about 140 acres to be built some time over the next seven and 20 years and will consist of administration buildings located around the 1200 zone and defense reutilization area. The third phase will be around 330 acres to be constructed sometime within the next 15 to 25 years and is planned to be administrative and light industrial buildings near the current railroad overhaul area.</p> <p>Currently, the Malcolm Pirnie Developing Business Case Analysis (BCA) is under review. The Air Force installation Executive Steering Committee approval of the BCA should be completed in the summer of 2006. Negotiation with partners, the development a master plan for the area and construction of the first buildings should all occur within the next two to three years.</p> <p><b>Please contact Wynn Covieo at 777-5999 for additional information.</b></p>	
<b>9. Other Business</b>	None.	None Required
<b>10. Next Meetings</b> <b>RGC TAC –</b> <b>March 8, 2006</b>	The next RGC Ogden – Layton TAC meeting will be on Wednesday March 8, 2006 at 10:30 AM at the Clearfield City Hall (55 South State Street) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor.	None Required
<b>OATS –</b> <b>April 5, 2006</b>	The next OATS meeting will be on Wednesday April 5, 2006 at 10:00 AM at the Clearfield City Hall (55 South State Street) on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor.	None Required

ATTENDANCE ROLL

OGDEN - LAYTON AREA

RGC RGC TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND TRANS COM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: 2/8/06

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>		
Jory Johner	WFRC	Steven Brough	Fruit Heights City
George Ramjoue	WFRC	Mike Child	Clinton City
Val John Halford	WFRC	Lynn Vinzant	Clinton City
Ted Knowlton	Envision Utah	Tyler Palmer	Clinton City
Jan Ukena	Riverdale City	Justin Aller	Centerville City
Albert Whipple	Hill AFB	Scott Miklos	UTA Rideshare
Mark Larson	Roy City	Dean Pace	Morgan City
Gregg Benson	Clearfield City	Tony Reynolds	Roy City
Rodger Worthen	Syracuse City	V. Dian Williams	UDOT
Andy Thompson	Kaysville City	Bryce Wilcox	J-U-B Engineers / Clinton City
Randy Park	UTA	Mark Christensen	Washington Terrace City
Barry Burton	Davis County	Shari Peterson	Washington Terrace City
Jeff Monroe	Washington Terrace City	Kent Bush	Clearfield City
Wilf Sommerkorn	Davis County – O-L Chair	Kelly Harris	Korve Engineering
Jeff Holden	Uintah City	David Petersen	Farmington City
Scott Hodge	Clearfield City	Max Forbush	Farmington City
Curtis Christensen	Weber County	Rick McKeague	UDAQ
Joe Gentge	South Weber City	Rex Harris	UDOT – Region 1
Tom Smith	Davis County	Dave Hardman	Ogden/Weber Chamber of Commerce
Brett Swanson	Hill AFB	Ben Wuthrich	WFRC
Wynn Covieo	Hill AFB		
Brian Carver	GOPB		
Larry Davis	Ogden City		
Carrie Jacobson	Ogden City		