

**SALT LAKE AREA
REGIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 11, 2006
1:30 PM – 2:45 PM
MEETING SUMMARY**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Meeting Summary – August 9, 2006 – Salt Lake RGC TAC	<p>The Salt Lake Regional Growth Committee Technical Advisory Committee approved the August 9, 2006 meeting summary as written. The TAC approved the August meeting minutes unanimously.</p> <p>Salt Lake Regional Growth Committee Technical Advisory Committee meeting summaries are posted at http://www.wfrc.org/committee/rgc-sltac.htm.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
2. Update on West Bench Master Plan	<p>Tom Roach, Salt Lake County, updated the Technical Committee on the West Bench Master Plan. He said that the draft plan was released in June, 2006 and public hearings followed in August, September, and October. Tom noted that the next step for the Plan includes consolidating and responding to comments, one-on-one meetings with cities along West Bench, and preparing a draft plan for the Salt Lake County Council in April 2007. Interested cities should contact Tom to set up a one-on-one meeting with Salt Lake County with coordinating plans on the West Bench Master Plan.</p> <p>Please contact Tom Roach at 468-2074 for additional information.</p>	<p>None Required</p>
3. UDOT Highway Construction Projects	<p>Jason Davis, UDOT Region 2, was unable to attend the meeting. This agenda item will be rescheduled for a later meeting.</p> <p>Please contact Jason Davis at 975-4806 additional information.</p>	<p>None Required</p>
4. RTP Alternatives Highway Network Transit Network	<p>Val John Halford, WFRC, made a PowerPoint presentation to the Technical Committee on the three alternatives that the WFRC will analyze for the 2007-2030 RTP. He noted that single alternative is a stand alone solution, but that the WFRC will be compiling the best project from each of the alternative to form the RTP. Val covered the timeline leading up to the alternatives and then briefed members on the basis for the project selection. WFRC is planning on having a finalized project list in December for the TAC, RGC, Trans Com, COG's, and the Regional Council to review. Val covered the alternatives system process, which included the system needs assessment, the unconstrained scenarios, and the refinement of system alternatives. The three alternatives selected are the Alternative 1 - Current RTP / Wasatch Choices Vision Emphasis, the Alternative 2 - Freeway / BRT on Freeway Emphasis, and the Alternative 3 - Arterial / Streetcar Emphasis.</p> <p>Jory Johner, WFRC, covered the major highway projects in each alternative. The major projects in Alternative 1 (Current RTP / Wasatch Choices Vision Emphasis) in Salt Lake County include I-15 in North Salt Lake County at 6 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes, Mountain View Corridor at 4 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes, and I-15 in South Salt Lake County at 8 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes. Alternative 2 (Freeway / BRT on Freeway Emphasis) projects include I-15 in North Salt Lake County at 8 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes, Mountain View Corridor at 6 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes, I-15 in South Salt Lake County at 8 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes to Bangerter Hwy and 10 lanes plus 2 HOV to the Utah County line, a new freeway corridor around the 6200 South alignment from I-215 to Mountain View Corridor, converting Bangerter Highway to a freeway between I-15 and 13400 South and a freeway connection at 13400 South between Mountain View Corridor and Bangerter Highway. Alternative 3 (Arterial / Streetcar Emphasis) projects include I-15 in North Salt Lake County at 6 lanes plus 2 HOV lanes, 4500 South/4700 South between 700 East and 5600 West as an 8 lane super arterial, 9000 South/9400 South between Highland Drive and 5600 West as an 8 lane super arterial, and numerous arterials being widened.</p> <p>Greg Scott, WFRC, presented the transit projects in each alternative. He presented a map of all transit corridors considered. He noted there were core transit projects that were included on all alternatives. These projects included the Ogden – Provo Commuter Rail, Airport LRT, Draper LRT to 12400 South, Mid-Jordan LRT, and West Valley LRT. Some of the major transit</p>	<p>None Required</p>

	<p>projects in Salt Lake County in Alternative 1 include the Foothills Blvd. /I-215, Magna/West Bench, Mountain View, Redwood Road, State Street, 700 East, 1300 East, Draper South, 3500 South/Sugarhouse, 4100 South/3900 South, 5400/5600 South. Alternative 2 projects include the Foothills Blvd/I-215/1300 East, Mountain View, Bangerter Hwy, Redwood Road, State Street, 700 East, 1300 East, 3500 South/Sugarhouse, 4700/4500 South, 6200 South. Alternative 3 projects include Foothills, Magna/West Bench, Mountain View, Bangerter Hwy, Redwood Road, State Street, 700 East, 1300 East, 3500 South/Sugarhouse, 4100/3900 South, 5400/5600 South. Greg noted that only preliminary modes had been chosen for any of the alternatives and that all lines would be compared to each other as rail.</p> <p>Val John covered the evaluation process for both the highway system and the transit system. He informed the Technical Committee that the RTP project selection for highway projects will include volume/capacity, needs assessment, growth principles, environmental impacts, safety, and cost/benefit analysis. The transit analysis for project selection includes land use, mobility, ridership, growth principles, environmental impacts, and cost/benefit analysis.</p> <p>The RTP phases include Phase 1 – 2007 to 2015, Phase 2 - 2016 to 2025, and Phase 3 - 2026 to 2030. The RTP will also be financially constrained, and projects without funding will be placed in the unfunded section. The WFRC will use its ranking criteria for all three phases and will provide UDOT Phase 1 projects from the RTP. UDOT will then rank all Phase 1 projects from all four MPO's and the rural areas of the State. This project ranking process will help identify the most important projects statewide.</p> <p>Input from Technical Committee members on the alternatives included the following: 3000 East project is needed; intersection at Highland Drive and Fort Union needs improvement; Bingham Junction Blvd. has funding and needs to stay in Phase 1; check current lanes on State Street South of I-215 and current lanes on 300 West/Main Street/Cottonwood Street; and the WFRC staff should contact Tom Bacus of Kennecott to discuss alternatives.</p> <p>Please contact Val Halford at 363-4230 x108 for additional information.</p>	
<p>5. County Sales Tax Proposal</p>	<p>Sam Klemm, WFRC, updated the Technical Committee on the ¼ cent county tax proposal. He handed out a summary of the sales tax proposal and noted that the voters may approve a ¼ cent sales tax increase placed on the ballot by a Salt Lake County legislative body for the purpose of funding transportation infrastructure. The respective county COG must subsequently approve a system of weighted criteria to evaluate and rank proposed projects. The COG may approve a prioritized project list only once per year and the County legislative body must also approve the same list. Highway and transit projects will be ranked together. The Executive Appropriations Committee of the legislature must approve the prioritization criteria and associated weights on a county-by-county basis for those of the first and second class. One quarter of the 1/4 cent sales tax increase will be used for corridor preservation within the local, county based, corridor preservation fund. In counties of the first class (Salt Lake County only) the corridor preservation money may only be used for new state highway projects. The rest of the money must be prioritized according to the county COG prioritization criteria and may be committed to highway, or transit projects, or both. This revenue stream may be used for bonding purposes. After ranking, the COG may choose to take projects out of rank order, but must give a written reason for doing so. This money may not supplant any other funds UDOT was planning to spend within the respective county.</p> <p>Please contact Sam Klemm at 363-4230 x116 for additional information.</p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p>6. Other Business</p>	<p>Sam Klemm, WFRC, handed out the Wasatch Front Regional Council Public Involvement Policy. The main changes in this document include improvements to the WFRC website, email notices, visualization/maps, unified work program on the website, and Communiqués Newsletters.</p> <p>Dennis Hamblin, Murray City, recommended that the Public Involvement Policy be forwarded to the Regional Growth Committee for approval. Tom Roach, Salt Lake County, seconded the motion and the committee agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Please contact Sam Klemm at 363-4230 x116 for additional information.</p>	<p>Approved</p>

	A suggested agenda items for future meetings would be an update on the local corridor preservation fee.	
7. Next Meeting Salt Lake RGC TAC – January 10, 2007	The next Salt Lake RGC TAC meeting will be on Wednesday, January 10, 2007 at 1:30 PM at the West Valley City Hall (3600 South Constitution Blvd.) Multi-Purpose Room.	None Required

ATTENDANCE ROLL

SALT LAKE AREA RGC AND TRANS COM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

DATE: 10/11/06

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Jory Johner	WFRC
George Ramjoue	WFRC
Val John Halford	WFRC
Brian Preece	South Jordan City
Sam Klemm	WFRC
Rick McKeague	UDAQ
Dennis Hamblin	Murray City
James Sorensen	Sandy City
Larry Gardner	South Salt Lake City
Lesley Burns	Midvale City
Mark McGrath	Taylorsville City
Jim Bolser	Draper City
Nathan Francis	Kennecott Lands
Frederick Lutze	Riverton City
Greg Scott	WFRC
David Beecher	UTA
Tom Roach	Salt Lake County
Michael Black	Cottonwood Heights