

**SALT LAKE AREA
RGC TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND
TRANS COM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 8, 2006
1:35 PM - 3:00 PM
MEETING SUMMARY**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Welcome and Introductions	The Salt Lake Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was chaired by John Janson, West Valley City, and Trace Robinson, West Valley City. John opened the meeting by having the TAC members introduce themselves.	None Required
2. Meeting Summary – January 11, 2006	<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 11th meeting summary. A motion was made by Tom Roach, Salt Lake County, and seconded by Nick Norris, Taylorsville City to approve the minutes and they were approved unanimously by the Salt Lake TAC.</p> <p>Trans Com TAC meeting minutes were not sent via email and will sent for approval in the next meeting.</p> <p>RGC TAC meeting summaries are posted at http://www.wfrc.org/committee/rgc-sltac.htm.</p>	Approved
3. Discussion and Review of Technical Advisory Committees	<p>George Ramjoue, WFRC, led a discussion on the purpose of the TAC and reviewed his discussion from the January 11th 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 http://www.wfrc.org/committee/RGC%20Committee.pdf. 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 http://www.wfrc.org/committee/Trans%20Com%20Members%20Jan%202006.pdf. 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</p>	None Required

	<p>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 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. TAC members asked for more action items and recommendations to give to the RGC. George Shaw, Sandy City, suggested that cities give a brief overview of transportation issues at the TAC meeting. Bill Baranowski, West Jordan City, suggested video training and big project discussions. John Janson suggested the Kennecott West Bench development and interchanges on Bangerter Highway as possible big project discussions items. Dave Lovell, Salt Lake County, asked to have input on how to get projects through the TIP process. Trace Robinson, West Valley City, asked to discuss construction costs versus budgeted amounts in the TIP.</p> <p>Please contact George Ramjoue at 363-4230 x111 for additional information.</p>	
<p>4. Review of TIP/STIP Schedule and Updated Amendment Process</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 \$198 million of STP projects were submitted in the Salt Lake area with only \$11.9 million available for new projects. The Salt Lake area submitted \$39 million of CMAQ projects with only \$4.9 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 Mike Gladbach, Sandy City, making the motion to keep the concept reports active and to hold off programming new projects this year. The motion was seconded by Dave Lovell, Salt Lake County, 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 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</p>	<p>Approved</p>

	<p>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>Please contact Ben Wuthrich at 363-4230 x121 for additional information.</p>	
<p>5. Amendment and Funding Request for 2006 - 2010</p>	<p>Ben explained that the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) has received four requests from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to amend the 2006-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</p> <p>The first request is to bring a Safety project located on I-215 between 1300 East and 5300 South in Salt Lake to FY2006 from FY2010. The request will improve the drainage and minimize standing water and ice on the facility.</p> <p>The second request involves two projects that were scheduled to receive traffic & Safety funds but require additional funds to complete. The first located on SR-171 (3500 South) from 8400 West to 5600 West, requires an additional \$410,000, and the second located on SR-111 (8400 West) from 5400 South to 3500 South, requires an additional \$835,000. These two projects are pavement rotomill and overlays and the additional funds will come from the minimum guarantee program.</p> <p>The third request identifies those projects that received appropriations for 2006 within the Wasatch Front Area including; I-15 Reconstruction reimbursement (\$ 4 million), I-15 North and Commuter Rail Coordination (\$ 1.5 million), the I-15 Layton Interchange(\$ 1.5 million), and the 2000 West from Syracuse road to Midland Drive (\$ 1.75 million).</p> <p>The fourth request is for additional funding for the Jordan Trail 3900 South Street Crossing Transportation Enhancement project. This request is for an additional \$79,000 in Transportation Enhancement funds. The current funding for this project is at \$636,228, which includes local matching funds and an administrative adjustment of \$ 123,437. The cost increases are due to unexpected increases in materials and construction contingency required by UDOT.</p> <p>Ben mentioned that the proposed Transportation Improvement Program amendment does not need to be reviewed for conformity and consistency with the State Implementation Program, because the amended projects are already included in the TIP or are exempt from air quality conformity requirements according to 40 CFR Part 93.126 Table 2 Exempt projects. Also that the amendment was not made available for public review and comment by the Utah Department of Transportation nor by the Wasatch Front Regional Council. This will be accommodated in the Regional Council meeting with an opportunity for public review and comment as part of the agenda. The TAC reviewed the amendment and recommended to Trans Com that they approve and recommend it to the Regional Council.</p> <p>Ben also explained that over the past four months WFRC has received requests for several projects along the Wasatch Front for additional federal funds. In a letter dated December 20, 2005, Sandy submitted a request for an additional \$ 462,000 in Urban Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the intersection improvement project located on State Street and 11400 South. The amount requested would pay for the dramatic increase of the cost of materials, especially concrete and steel costs.</p> <p>West Valley submitted a request for an additional \$566,422 in Urban Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the reconstruction project located on 3200 West from 4100 South to 4700 South. The cost overrun for this project was caused by the inflation of materials similar</p>	<p>Approved</p>

	<p>to that of Sandy City's project. The lowest bid received came in approximately 26 % over the engineer's estimate.</p> <p>Draper City submitted a request for an additional \$355,000 in Congestion Mitigation/ Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the Porter Rockwell Trail from 11400 South to 12400 South. The request comes as a result of the cost increase of materials, the need for additional right-of-way to align the trail outside the UTA rail right-of-way, and the new UDOT 10% contingency requirements.</p> <p>Ben pointed out that these requests will impact the program but that the projects on the program will need to be adjusted over the six year period of the TIP. This alone will be a good reason not to add new projects to the program at this time and will hopefully minimize a project needing to be removed from the program. He also encouraged project sponsors to do all they can to get their projects ready so that if another project is delayed or additional funding becomes available the projects can move forward. The TAC reviewed the request for additional funds and recommended to Trans Com that they approve and recommend it to the Regional Council.</p> <p>Please contact Ben Wuthrich at 363-4230 x121 for additional information.</p>	
<p>6. Visioning Document Report</p>	<p>Gabe Epperson, 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>Please contact Epperson at 303-1460 for additional information.</p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p>7. Implementation Strategies</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. George Shaw, Sandy City, suggested that the cities put them into their general plans and then develop and implement ordinances for the strategies. Tosh Kano, Holladay City, made the observation that the strategies were for only cities that were growing and suggested that a section be made for cities that are built out. George asked if the TAC would recommend the approval of the direction that is currently being taken by Envision Utah and the WFRC staff. It was recommended that this item be put on the next agenda. George Ramjoue requested that suggestions to the implementation strategies be faxed, emailed or a hard copy sent to him. George will send out a reminder to TAC members asking for comments.</p> <p>Please contact George Ramjoue at 363-4230 x111 for additional information.</p>	<p>Not approved - Issue tabled until more refinement is made</p>
<p>8. Legislative Update</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 8th has developed.</p> <p>TAC members asked Wilf about the bill dealing with redirecting the county sales tax. Wilf discussed this bill briefly.</p> <p>Please contact Wilf Sommerkorn at 451-3278 for additional information.</p>	<p>None Required</p>

9. Other Business	None.	None Required
10. Next Meetings RGCTAC – March 8, 2006	The next Salt Lake TAC meeting will be on Wednesday March 8, 2006 at 1:30 PM at the West Valley City Hall (3600 South Constitution Blvd.) in the Multi-Purpose Room.	None Required
SLATS – April 5, 2006	The next SLATS meeting will be on Wednesday April 5, 2006 at 2:30 PM at the Salt Lake County Complex (2001 South State Street) in Room N2003.	

ATTENDANCE ROLL

SALT LAKE AREA AND OGDEN - LAYTON AREA COMBINED RGC TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: 2/8/06

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Jory Johner	WFRC
David Beecher	UTA
Tom Roach	Salt Lake County
Brad Gilson	Cottonwood Heights City
George Ramjoue	WFRC
John Janson	West Valley City – SL Chair
Val John Halford	WFRC
Dennis Hamblin	Murray City
George Shaw	Sandy City
Lesley Burns	Midvale City
Nick Norris	Taylorsville City
Wilf Sommerkorn	Davis County
Frederick Lutze	Riverton City
Blaine Gehring	Bluffdale City
Gabe Epperson	Envision Utah
V. Dian Williams	UDOT
Kelly Harris	Korve Engineering
Bill Baranowski	West Jordan City
Nestor Gallo	Draper City
Brad Jensen	Draper City
Tom Cluff	UTA
Scott Miklos	UTA Rideshare
Mike Gladbach	Sandy City
Brian Tucker	Midvale City
Lynn Larsen	Salt Lake County
Tosh Kano	Holladay City
Ed Rufened	South Salt Lake
Darryl Johnson	West Valley City
Russ Willardson	West Valley City
Tim Boschert	UDOT Planning
Jim Bolser	Draper City
Mark McGrath	Taylorsville City
Brian Preece	South Jordan City
Shane Greenwood	South Jordan City
Rick Johnston	Salt Lake City
Mike Meldrum	West Jordan City
Trace Robinson	West Valley City
Andrea Pullos	Salt Lake County
David Lovell	Salt Lake County
Russell Fox	Kennecott Land
Ben Wuthrich	WFRC