

**SALT LAKE AREA  
REGIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 9, 2008  
1:35 PM – 3:00 PM  
MEETING SUMMARY**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>1. Meeting Summary – October 10, 2007 – Salt Lake RGC TAC</b></p>	<p>The Salt Lake Area Regional Growth Committee Technical Advisory Committee approved the October 10, 2007 meeting summary unanimously.</p> <p>The Regional Growth Committee's Salt Lake Area Technical Advisory Committee meeting summaries are posted at the WFRC website (<a href="http://www.wfrc.org">www.wfrc.org</a>) under the "Committee" section on the left side of the front page. You can access these summaries by selecting the Technical Advisory Committee tab or with the following link: <a href="http://wfrc.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=70&amp;Itemid=44">http://wfrc.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=70&amp;Itemid=44</a>.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
<p><b>2. Overview of WFRC Staff Presentation to City Councils</b></p>	<p>Sam Klemm, WFRC, presented the TAC with a PowerPoint presentation about the WFRC. Sam and other WFRC staff are making the same presentation to all city councils in Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties over the next few months. The purpose of these presentations is to inform city councils about the WFRC and its various roles. He handed out the same packets that all city council members will receive, which includes the RTP brochure, the WFRC staff brochure, a copy of the presentation, and the Wasatch Choices Principles and Objectives for Transportation Planning.</p> <p>The presentation defined what a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is, who makes up the WFRC's board members, what products the WFRC is responsible for, and other projects the WFRC is involved in. Sam discussed the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), corridor preservation, challenges, growth issues, and the Wasatch Choices 2040 Vision and Growth Principles.</p> <p>Sam expects that WFRC will complete the presentation to all city councils within Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties by the end of May.</p> <p><b>Please contact Sam Klemm at 363-4230 x116 for additional information or for a copy of the presentation.</b></p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p><b>3. Growth Principles and Outreach to City Planning Commissions</b></p>	<p>Val John Halford, WFRC, discussed the Wasatch Choices 2040 Growth Principles and future outreach efforts to planning directors and city planning commissions. Val John reminded the TAC of the Wasatch Choices 2040 document that was prepared a couple years ago with their help. He and other WFRC staff will contact the city planners to set up a meeting to discuss how the Growth Principles and Vision can be applied to each city individually. Val John wanted to make sure the TAC understood that WFRC is not endorsing high rise development in all areas, but more of village centers type developments in specific areas.</p> <p>Val John asked the attending city planners where they were with respects to their general and master plans. Responses are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Jordan would like to be a priority with respect to having Envision and WFRC meet with the planners and their city council.</li> <li>• West Valley City has adopted the Growth Principles, and is in the process of updating their General Plan.</li> <li>• Salt Lake County has several General Plans in the process of updating or being written.</li> <li>• Salt Lake City is updating the North West Quadrant of their plan, along with looking at TOD's along North Temple.</li> <li>• Draper City has had a General Plan in place for a couple years, and an</li> </ul>	<p>None Required</p>

	<p>update is planned in a couple years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Salt Lake City is in the process of updating their General Plan.</li> <li>• Taylorsville City last updated their General Plan in December 2006.</li> <li>• Cottonwood Heights recently updated their General Plan.</li> <li>• Midvale would like to be a priority with respect to having Envision and WFRC meet with the planners and their city council.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please contact Val John Halford at 363-4230 x108 for additional information.</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Transportation Issues and Concerns - Taylorsville</b></p>	<p>Michael Meldrum, City Planner for Taylorsville, presented some of the transportation issues and concerns Taylorsville is currently facing. Taylorsville is 13 square miles with the highest residential density in the state, and is currently 97% built out. Major transportation issues include I-215, Bangerter Highway, 6200 South, 5400 South, and 4500 South. The city has an abundant amount of through traffic with a limited amount of destinations within the city. Other issues include noise, congestion, air quality, and the “Not In My Back Yard” (NIMBY) problem. Taylorsville City currently has no fixed mass transit within its boundaries. The biggest issue the city council deals with is the East / West traffic. Taylorsville plans on the City Hall area (2700 West and 5400 South) as its future Town Center.</p> <p><b>Please contact Michael Meldrum at 963-5400 for additional information.</b></p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p><b>5. RCL Consultants – Retail Market Analysis</b></p>	<p>Gabe Epperson, Envision Utah, gave a presentation on the Wasatch Front Development Trends study which was completed by Robert Charles Lesser and Co. (RCL) Consultants. Envision Utah hired RCL to perform a retail market analysis on the Wasatch Front’s four county urban area. The objective of the study was to understand from a market perspective the growth and development trends in the Wasatch Front, specifically the role of major activity centers, where centers may develop, and how they might impact regional growth.</p> <p>The study set out to also answer key questions, which included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the key centers in the SLC metro area and what are their characteristics? How can we strengthen these existing centers?</li> <li>• Can the Wasatch Front support additional centers from a market perspective? Are additional centers necessary? Where could they be located?</li> <li>• Would the creation of additional centers change the marketability of the region?</li> <li>• How could new centers help contribute to a more sustainable region?</li> <li>• Would new centers allow for workforce housing?</li> <li>• How would new centers affect existing centers, esp. Downtown?</li> <li>• How could new centers help to implement the strategies presented in the Wasatch Choices 2040 document?</li> <li>• What elements make a community “sustainable”, and can a new center be developed in a sustainable way?</li> </ul> <p>The RCL report discussed metropolitan development trends, the primary path of growth, the basic types of employment in the metro area, future metropolitan development trends, infill development along mass transit corridors, unique urban development that offer walkable access, employment projections, and household projections.</p> <p>Gabe presented the locations of the core export firms within the Wasatch Front. The RCL report defined existing cores and future cores within the Wasatch Front and included the generation the core came into existence in the area. Existing Cores included; International Center / North West Quadrant / Airport, SR-201 / California Avenue, Downtown Salt Lake City, University of Utah, Cottonwood Heights, Ft. Union, Sandy, Provo / BYU, Layton Hills, and Ogden Downtown. Future cores include; Sugarhouse, West Valley City, Jordan Landing, Daybreak, and Thanksgiving Point.</p>	<p>None Required</p>

	<p>These cores were given scores and ranked to help determine how employment growth projections were distributed. Scoring criteria included; employment, access to executive housing, access to the region, office space, etc. Gabe presented the results of the scores and ranks. Scores ranged from 337 points for Downtown Salt Lake City to 112 points for Ogden Downtown. Employment projections were allocated to each core bases on the scores. The RCL report addressed how each existing core individually could be strengthened and made more sustainable by addressing their deficiencies. The report discussed how the low scoring cores tend to be smaller, more distant, or out of balance with jobs and households.</p> <p><b>Please contact Gabe Epperson at 303-1453 for additional information or for a copy of the presentation.</b></p>	
<p><b>6. Overview of Special Studies</b></p>	<p>Greg Scott, WFRC, briefly informed the TAC of the planning projects in Salt Lake County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport LRT EIS is currently looking at the Airport tie-in and has decided on the 400 South alternative in Downtown Salt Lake City.</li> <li>• Foothill Drive had completed a baseline report and has just started the alternative process.</li> <li>• Westside Transit Study is looking to select a consultant.</li> <li>• East / West Study in Salt Lake is looking at alternatives.</li> <li>• Mountain View Corridor's public comment period will be up at the end of January.</li> <li>• I-15 South is in the public comment portion of the plan.</li> <li>• Taylorsville / Murray Corridor Alternatives Analysis has an RFP for East / West Transit.</li> <li>• Sugarhouse Study has a locally preferred alternative which is a Streetcar.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please contact Greg Scott at 363-4230 x119 for additional information.</b></p>	<p>None Required</p>
<p><b>7. Other Business</b></p>	<p>Jory Johner, WFRC, proposed an amendment to the 2030 RTP to the TAC. The proposed projects include the 5600 West Transit Corridor, Interchanges at Bangerter Highway and 6200 South, 7800 South and 600 West, and that the 14600 South Railroad crossing be moved from Phase 2 to Phase 1. Members of the WFRC made the requests to include these projects into the Plan. He also informed the TAC that other proposed amendments were also presented to the Ogden - Layton RGC TAC.</p> <p>TAC members asked if Continuous Flow Interchanges (CFI) are being considered for Bangerter Highway improvements instead of only interchanges.</p> <p>John Bennett, GOPB, made a motion that the proposed amendment be forwarded to the Regional Growth Committee (RGC) for public comment and that any new project that is placed into the 2030 RTP also have funding available. Larry Gardner, South Salt Lake, seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Please contact Jory Johner at 363-4230 x110 for additional information.</b></p> <p>Lesley Burns, Midvale City, will be the new Chairperson of the Salt Lake RGC TAC. A Vice-Chairperson will be chosen at the March 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p>	<p>Approved</p> <p>None Required</p>
<p><b>8. Next Meeting Salt Lake RGC TAC – March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008</b></p>	<p>The next Salt Lake RGC TAC meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 at 1:30 PM at the West Valley City Hall (3600 South Constitution Blvd.) Multi-Purpose Room.</p>	<p>None Required</p>

ATTENDANCE ROLL  
SALT LAKE AREA RGC AND TRANS COM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES  
DATE: 1/9/08

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Jory Johner	WFRC
Val John Halford	WFRC
Sam Klemm	WFRC
Dennis Hamblin	Murray City
John Janson	West Valley City – SL Chair
Glenn Symes	Cottonwood Heights City
Lesley Burns	Midvale City
Gordon Haight	Herriman City
Max Johnson	Salt Lake County
Larry Gardner	South Salt Lake City
Greg Scott	WFRC
Michael Meldrum	Taylorsville City
Nick Britton	Salt Lake City
Gabe Epperson	Envision Utah
Jim Bolser	Draper City
Jared Gerber	Sandy City
Steve Call	FHWA
John Bennett	GOPB
Evan Curtis	GOPB
Vaughn Pickell	Bluffdale City
Brad Sanderson	South Jordan City