

DIXIE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2009

Five County AOG

PRESENT

Dave Glenn, Ivins City, Public Works Director, Vice-Chair
Mike Shaw, Washington City, Public Works Director
Larry Bulloch, St. George City, Public Works Director
Cameron Cutler, St. George City, Traffic Engineer
Rick Torgerson, UDOT Region Four, Program Manager
Todd Edwards, Engineer, for Ron Whitehead, Washington County, Public Works Director
Nathan Lee, UDOT
Tamerha Maxwell, UDOT
Ross Romero, Washington City
Chuck Gillette, Ivins City Engineer
Arthur LeBaron, Hurricane City Engineer
Lee Cabell, Horrocks Engineering
Russell Youd, Horrocks Engineering
Lowell Elmer, Director, Dixie MPO
Diane Lamoreaux, Program Specialist, FCAOG
Bob Nicholson, St. George City
Bruce Whited, Land Owner
Russell Gallian, Attorney for Jeff Klein
Scott Peterson, Land Owner
Charlie Potter, Land Baron Inv.
Tyler Hoskins, Airport Parkway Development
Curt Gordon, Desert Canyons Development
Brent Bluth, SITLA
Gary Wood, EDAW (Conference Call Participation)
Deloss Hammon, Alliance Consulting

ABSENT

Dave Demas, St. George City, City Engineer, Chair (Excused)
Jack Taylor, Santa Clara City, Public Works Director
Curt Hutchings, MPO, Transportation Manager, FCAOG (Excused)
Kelly Lund, FHWA, Planning Engineer
Steve Call, FHWA, Planning Engineer
Elden Bingham, UDOT Planning
Ryan Marshall, General Manager, SunTran
Lynne Scott, BLM/Dixie Regional Bike and Pedestrian Committee

CALL TO ORDER

Dave Glenn, Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone in attendance. Those asking to be excused include Dave Demas, St. George City and Curt Hutchings, Dixie MPO. It was noted that Todd Edwards, Washington County Engineer, is representing Ron Whitehead today.

MINUTES

Dave Glenn noted that a quorum was present and presented minutes of the February 10, 2009 meeting for discussion and consideration. Diane Lamoreaux reviewed several typographic corrections in the SITLA presentation which have been incorporated into the February 10th minutes.

MOTION WAS MADE BY LARRY BULLOCH, SECONDED BY MIKE SHAW, TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 10, 2009 MEETING, INCLUDING CORRECTIONS AS OUTLINED. MOTION CARRIED.

SHORT RANGE PLANNING UPDATE

Distribute Executed Corridor Preservation Agreements: Lowell Elmer distributed copies of the executed Southern Parkway Corridor Preservation Agreement entered into by the MPO, UDOT, Washington County, St. George and Washington cities. This agreement includes the entire Southern Parkway corridor and describes key things that parties will provide and/or implement. He reported that Washington County has moved forward to establish a County Council of Governments (COG), with no money attached at this time. Hurricane City is moving forward to address business agreed to in the agreement to entertain a re-evaluation of a portion of the corridor adjacent to the Sand Hollow Reservoir.

Lowell mentioned that the state of Utah has established a Utah Authorization Steering Committee to address federal highway and transit authorization which is set to expire on September 30, 2009. This steering committee has conducted meetings to discuss common interests and goals for the new federal transportation program. A handout was provided which outlines key principles identified by this group. This information will be forwarded to the Utah Congressional Delegation to assist their efforts as Congress embarks on this process. Arthur LeBaron asked Lowell to elaborate on the last bullet item. Lowell explained that the request is for Congress to better define the purpose and goals of any newly established transportation program funding authorization. The Steering Committee supports shifting the responsibility to state and local government to develop systems for these programs. Rick Torgerson explained that these principles have been established to give guidance to a new transportation program as SAFTEA-LU expires at the end of September 2009. In development of this legislation, states are seeking more responsibility to fund projects which they determine are best for the state as opposed to federal government subscribed funding. Lowell asked that committee members review the information and provide input to his attention.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

ITS Communications Plan Update: Lowell Elmer indicated that Curt Hutchings is in Salt Lake City attending meetings. No new information is available at this time.

Model TAZ/Socio-Economic/Land Use Adjustments: Lowell Elmer reported that a scope of work has been submitted to UDOT for the socio-economic/land use adjustments. No new information is available on status of this scope.

Regional Transit Corridor Preservation Study: Lowell Elmer provided copies of a draft scope of work for a regional feasibility study for a bus rapid transit line connecting St. George to Hurricane City. The Dixie MPO Long Range Plan includes this study to explore options for a corridor which would connect from Bluff Street, running east along River Road, Redcliff Drive, and Telegraph to SR-9 in Hurricane. Should funding become available, the scope could be revised to include extension of service to Ivins City, Santa Clara City and the St. George new airport area. Future service options will be identified with phased levels of implementation for transit service enhancements appropriate for the corridor. This draft scope is presented today for review and members are asked to provide input to Lowell as soon as possible. Funding in the amount of \$70,000 was programmed into the Dixie MPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

DIXIE TIP

2009-13 TIP Modifications - Stimulus Package Action: Diane Lamoreaux provided copies of the 2009-13 Dixie TIP and outlined modifications to bring in federal Stimulus money to various projects.

Black Ridge Drive/Hilton Drive: It was explained that a portion of MPO funding (\$201,651) for the Black Ridge Drive/Hilton Drive project was already obligated and cannot be moved to the Virgin River Bridge project. Federal Stimulus money (\$2.4M) has been programmed to this project.

Valley View Bridge: This group previously re-programmed \$1.2M to the Valley View Bridge project from Black Ridge Drive/Hilton Drive. Other funding for the Valley View Bridge includes \$3.8M State and \$1.2M St. George City. St. George Urbanized Area funding for this project is lumped into 2009, but will be spread out over several years as per previously programmed funding. St. George will be required to enter into an agreement with UDOT for advance construction on this project.

Virgin River Bridge: Federal Stimulus funds in the amount of \$760,000 have been programmed into the Virgin River Bridge project and Diane is working with Bob Pelly, State STIP Coordinator, to reprogram the remaining MPO funds from Black Ridge/Hilton Drive into this project. Funding in the amount of \$2.039M is programmed from the anticipated redistribution of unused Stimulus funds from other states. SAFTEA-LU funds are also earmarked for this project.

Mall Drive Bridge: The Mall Drive Bridge project has been brought back onto the TIP with \$20M programmed in anticipation of discretionary grants for projects between \$20M to \$500M.

Additional modifications were outlined to adjust fund amounts in out years for the Valley View Bridge project as well as funds to Virgin River Bridge project. Corrections will be made prior to adoption by DTEC on March 18, 2009. Copies incorporating these changes will be provided via e-mail. Diane also outlined one modification in the 2009-13 Transit TIP to bring in \$1.1M federal Stimulus for bus/facilities. This information was gathered through a meeting with Ryan Marshall, SunTran Director. Lowell Elmer mentioned that the Transit TIP includes the mobility management study which is currently in process. Total funds available to this project include federal funding of \$40,000 and \$10,000 soft match.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MIKE SHAW, SECONDED BY LARRY BULLOCH, TO APPROVE THE 2009-13 TIP MODIFICATIONS, INCLUDING ADDITION OF THE TRANSIT PROJECT AND MODIFICATIONS OUTLINED. MOTION CARRIED.

Lowell Elmer reviewed information contained on a handout depicting estimated funding distribution from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The apportionment to Utah is \$213,546,653 broken out as follows: **1) State Any Area--** 67%, \$143,075,587; **2) Transportation Enhancement--** 3%, \$6,406,370; and **3) Population based area--** 30%, \$64,063,696. The Small Urban Sub-allocation is based on the U.S. Census 2007 population estimates and per agreement between UDOT, MPO's, and the Joint Highway Committee. The Dixie MPO/St. George Urbanized area will receive \$3,160,623 as per previously approved modifications outlined in the 2009-13 TIP. He also provided a handout containing excerpts from the work program for the MPO outlining a project implementation grant and contract for \$40,000 funded by FTA, with \$10,000 local soft match, for human services transportation coordination. Curt Hutchings has been working with state

agencies, local transportation providers, the general public and users of the transportation system on this particular project. Funding for this project is included in the 2009-13 Transit Tip but needs to be brought into the MPO work plan. Information provided modifies the Unified Planning Work Program to include this study in the budget. Inclusion of this funding was presented for committee consideration.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MIKE SHAW, SECONDED BY LARRY BULLOCH, TO AMEND THE DIXIE MPO UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TO ADD \$40,000 IN FTA FUNDING FOR THE HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED PLAN, INCLUDING \$10,000 LOCAL SOFT MATCH. MOTION CARRIED.

2010-14 TIP: The draft 2010-14 TIP will be updated to reflect Stimulus injections.

STATE AND FEDERAL ACTIONS

Program Development - UDOT: Rick Torgerson reviewed project phasing as contained in the Dixie MPO Regional Transportation Long Range Plan outlining Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III projects. Several projects were previously moved into Phase I to accommodate additional funding received from Critical Highway Needs (CHN) funds. Those projects included the Southern Parkway, Dixie Drive, and Telegraph. Phase I includes current projects out to 2015, Phase II includes projects in the time range of 2015 to 2025 and Phase III includes 2025 to 2040. Projects in Phase I were outlined as follows: **1) Widening of I-15--** From MP 0-13 to a six lane facility; **2) St. George Boulevard to Red Hills Parkway--** Widening; **3) Red Hills Parkway--** Grade separated interchange; **4) Dixie Drive--** Split Interchange; **5) I-15--** Widening from MP 13-16; **6) Bluff Street--** Interchange improvements; **7) SR-18--** South bound flyover at Sunset Boulevard, etc.

UDOT was able to undertake some additional modeling in conjunction with the I-15 study. This modeling takes into account that by 2015 all of the projects in Phase I would be built. He reviewed handouts depicting the Level of Service (LOS) noting that some of the corridors caught UDOT's attention. UDOT staff wants to assure that the MPO is heading in the same direction with programming transportation funds for the most critical projects. Information presented today will also be provided to the State Transportation Commission during their March meeting. Growth projections utilized in the MPO model are consistent with those provided by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB). Several projects were reviewed from the LOS, which includes major arterial sections inside and outside the Dixie MPO, depicting current capacity, 2015 capacity, 2025 capacity and 2040 capacity. The LOS assumes that all projects in Phase I are completed as programmed. Information provided depicts outcomes for capacity if specific projects such as the Southern Corridor, Dixie Drive, Red Hills Parkway, Bluff Street, St. George Boulevard and SR-9 are not built as outlined. This information is used for comparison purposes to locate problem areas in the St. George area. Specific projects were reviewed as follows: **1) Dixie Drive--** Tonaquint Drive to Canyon View Drive and Canyon View Drive to River Road segments show that these facilities are currently at a "C" LOS and continue to drop by 2015 to level "D", even if a lot of the corridors in Phase I are built. By 2025, these segments are at level "F" even with what is planned in the system. These segments obviously have some concerns and will experience a lot of congestion. UDOT is suggesting that the MPO may want to begin looking at some of these issues. The LOS information suggests that the Dixie Drive project should be in Phase II; **2) Red Hills Parkway--** With assumptions that the Parkway is built to a five lane facility, issues with the LOS begin in 2025; **3) Bluff Street, St. George Boulevard to Sunset Drive Segment--** This is a corridor of concern based on modeling which depicts service levels currently at "F". If all planned projects in Phase I are completed, this segment would go to an "E" LOS. A lot of congestion will continue on this

stretch of road as traffic increases. If some of the other systems are not built, the Los will remain at "E". Without improvements, this segment will remain consistent with the current service level. Dixie Drive and Red Hills Parkway do not really have an impact on this segment of road. St. George Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard is an independent segment in the system, which is not impacted with construction of Dixie Drive and Red Hills Parkway. Traffic issues will remain on this segment. Even with widening of Bluff to a seven lane facility and constructing the south bend flyover, the facility is still at a "C" LOS. No funding is currently included in the TIP to build these facilities by 2015. Traffic will continue to worsen unless funding is identified to address this segment; and **3) St. George Boulevard, I-15 to 700 East--** This facility is currently at a "C" LOS. If everything that is planned in Phase I were to be built, it drops down to an "E" LOS and by 2025 it is at an "F" level. Kim Manwill is going to begin analysis utilizing MPO funding which was established for the study of Exit 8. As traffic approaches Exit 8 it currently backs up two to three blocks. It is anticipated that in out years traffic will be forced down St. George Boulevard. Therefore, Exit 8 is a very important study; **4) SR-9--** This facility depicts a couple of interesting things between 2015 and 2025 if the Southern Corridor is not built. Without this facility, SR-9 drops to a "F"LOS. This is an important connection between the back side of SR-9 all the way to the airport and I-15 which needs to be built and functional in between those periods.

Information was developed with funding left over from the I-15 study which was recently completed. Information is included in the packet which shows northbound and southbound I-15 LOS and change in volume from current year to 2040. High negative numbers indicate that traffic is backing up in the system.

The MPO STIP request was outlined as follows: **1) Snow Canyon Parkway/Snow Canyon Drive, Roundabout--** \$160,000; **2) Red Hills Parkway, Design & Engineering for Grade Separated Diamond Interchange at SR-18--** \$440,000. UDOT capacity projects include: **1) SR-18, St. George Boulevard to Sunset, Preliminary Design and Environmental--** \$1M in 2012; **2) I-15, MP 0 to MP 16, Preliminary Design and Environmental--** \$4M into concept development to begin the process of widening I-15; **3) Southern Parkway and SR-9, Phase III and Phase IV--** \$31M, broken into three segments to address alignment of the entire parkway, right-of-way preservation, etc.

Rick reviewed the decision support system sheet outlining new interchange improvements, which includes the SR-18 South Bound Flyover at Sunset Boulevard as project #4. This project is an upgrade from a signal intersection to a flyover to create a free flowing intersection. The project scored relatively high on a statewide basis for funding at an estimated cost of \$13M. This project is included in Phase I of the Dixie MPO Long Range Plan and is scoring high when being presented to the State Transportation Commission. He suggested that the MPO begin to explore options to gather some type of funding support for this project to move it forward. This project could easily see a funding injection from the Transportation Commission. It was pointed out that this project should receive MPO funding consideration in the near future. The recently completed modeling stresses the importance of widening Bluff Street from St. George Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard, as well as limiting access on and off the facility to move traffic through this segment. Chuck Gillette asked if modeling the Western Corridor construction or transit options could impact the Sunset/St. George Boulevard area. Rick Torgerson responded that transit generally provides a 1-2 percent decrease in vehicle usage which would not provide a great impact. Inclusion of this project on the Dixie TIP could increase the possibility of receiving funding from the Transportation Commission. In summary, the Transportation Commission is not going to pick this project until either the MPO or UDOT requests funding. UDOT requested that the SR-18 Red Hills Parkway project be added to the new interchange improvements decision support system because of recent action taken by

the MPO to program funding to this project. This project scored number 11 statewide. He pointed out that the Red Hills Parkway project scored 20 as opposed to the South Bound Flyover at Sunset which scored 60. Modeling suggests that the South Bound Flyover project should be given consideration for funding.

The Southern Parkway project scored #2 overall for new facility major capacity improvements. This is the reason that the Transportation Commission has shown high interest in providing funding to move this project along.

Rick Torgerson reviewed a sheet depicting major capacity improvements to widen existing facilities and noted that projects outlined in blue are fully funded. The St. George Boulevard to Red Hills Parkway Intersection is #9 on this list. However, there are only two projects above this project which are not fully funded. This project has a high likelihood to receive consideration for some funding. Item #37 is the widening of I-15 MP 13-16 which is outside the MPO boundaries and #40 is I-15 MP 0-13 widening. Larry Bulloch asked what would move projects up on the scoring and if there is anything that can be done locally to improve funding possibilities. Rick Torgerson responded that the Commission has requested that UDOT take a consistent look at these types of facilities to put some type of prioritization process together which is being called Decision Support System. This process puts everything on the same playing field to provide scoring and the best information possible to base their decisions. The best thing that could be provided is to begin showing support at the MPO level by programming funds to begin the planning and/or environmental process. Copies of the Washington County I-15 and Eastern Washington County studies are posted on the UDOT website under planning, East-West Transportation Studies H.B. 108. The I-15 study indicates that I-15 MP 0-16 should be widened to six lanes by 2020. The environmental document should be undertaken in approximately 2015 to prepare for this widening. In the meantime, smaller projects such as auxiliary lanes and/or widening should be considered. UDOT Region Four is requesting another \$1M to begin the environmental/design process for St. George Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard in the year 2012, if not sooner. Rick suggested that the DTAC may need to consider shifting some funding around in the TIP to better address needs depicted from this modeling. Perhaps funding needs to be shifted from Red Hills Parkway to the South Bound Flyover at Sunset based on this capacity analysis. Due to modeling provided by InterPlan, UDOT has a new outlook which will be discussed with the Transportation Commission during their March workshop. This information was developed to outline needs and a time line for funding prior to congestion becoming a major factor for projects. Lowell suggested that a work meeting be scheduled with DTAC outside of the monthly meeting to examine and discuss this information. An e-mail will be provided to determine a time that this group could meet between now and the regularly scheduled April 1st meeting.

Larry Bulloch expressed concern in regard to UDOT's proposal to open the Southern Parkway from Exit 2 to River Road in June. St. George City is concerned about the Arizona connection being in place prior to opening the roadway. Tamerha Maxwell indicated that in conversation with SITLA they are confident that this issue will be resolved prior to June. UDOT is considering this towards the end of June or first of July time frame. The only other option would be temporary with a right in, right out on the Arizona side directing traffic to the River Road interchange. Larry expressed his preference would be to hold off on opening the road until the Arizona piece is in place.

Federal Oversight Update - FHWA: None, no representatives in attendance.

CORRIDORS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE - POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS/ISSUES

Arthur LeBaron, Hurricane presented correspondence and a map outlining an application for a general plan land use change to permit a proposed school/theme park project that is bisected by the EIS approved route for the Southern Parkway. He referenced the segment of the Southern Corridor on the map which is located southeast of the Sand Hollow Reservoir as the corridor turns north heading towards SR-9. The proposed project consists of 2,000 acres in this location. He read correspondence from Hurricane City to UDOT providing notification of this land use application which may affect an identified transportation corridor. A conceptual plan that accommodates the Parkway alignment has been submitted by an applicant. However, Hurricane City has chosen to delay holding a public hearing on this matter pending a feasibility study and other details provided by the applicant. The letter further states: "In the event that UDOT would like to add comments to the application process or obtain the right of way prior to the general plan amendment, this letter serves as notice." This is just a concept which is a huge undertaking with a lot of feasibility issues beginning with funding. The total project cost is estimated to be \$3.5 billion dollars. Rick Torgerson indicated that UDOT will be working with Hurricane City in regard to this proposed project and the Southern Corridor alignment/right-of-way issues.

PHASE III STUDY - SOUTHERN PARKWAY STEERING COMMITTEE

Lee Cabell, Horrocks Engineering, welcomed those in attendance, provided a set of handouts and asked that everyone sign in on the sheet being circulated. Results of the updated modeling will be reviewed, based on land use information provided by stakeholders. Horrocks staff would like the group to reach agreement that the correct land use assumptions are being used in their work or if not what additional information they need to move forward. Revised roadway networks will also be reviewed and discussed with new traffic volumes depicted based on stakeholder input. Again, Horrocks would like some indication that they are heading down the right path in terms of general concept for a roadway network or if not what other information is required to get to this point. In addition, a couple of new topics will be introduced as part of the goals and objectives to discuss common access management scenarios and common roadway networks.

Discussion of Revised Travel Demand Model: Lee Cabell reviewed the updated land use assumptions on a map which has been revised since the last meeting. Land use information was provided by Washington City for the following: **1) South Mountain Area--** Includes revised plans for their layout. The top portion depicts layout of villages with acreage set aside for residential. Those land uses and roadway networks at the north end of the airport have been incorporated into the Travel Demand Model; and **2) Warner Valley Area--** Master plan information indicates that there could be as many as 12,000 units in this area. This accounts for traffic coming in from this area to the Warner Valley Interchange. For the 2035 scenario a 25% build out was assumed. From their perspective, it appears that this area would develop last. He solicited input from the group in this regard. He also reviewed the incorporation of roadway networks and proposed land use plans provided in the State and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) presentation encompassing the area east of the north end of the airport and everything on the west side of the airport.

All of the above mentioned developments have been incorporated into the Travel Demand Model. Based on those changes for South Mountain, Warner Valley, SITLA development, Land Barons, Desert Canyon, etc. the main difference is that the number of dwelling units increased. The number of employees in terms of retail, service and non-retail decreased slightly. Reasons for this include the fact that the Airport Vicinity Land Use Plan (AVLUP) showed the entire area as business park and industrial type uses. SITLA's more detailed analysis identified several acres in these areas that

because of detention basins, etc. will be open space. Some of the development is not as intense and depicts different distributions of business park versus industrial uses versus residential uses. From the employment standpoint, the bulk of these numbers which decreased on the employment side has been made up in an increase of dwelling units. He solicited input from the group in terms of where they are heading from a land use perspective. Larry Bulloch commented that where the SITLA land use plans conflict with the city land use plan, numbers from the city's adopted AVLUP will need to be utilized in the modeling. Gary Wood acknowledged that this was documented in the minutes from the last meeting. He noted that the general plan adopted by St. George City is very specific that there is to be a very detailed land use and planning study around the airport. This is included in the policy statements in the AVLUP. SITLA assumes that this group is engaging in this study to re-exam in detail the circulation and land uses around the airport. The result of this study would be the basis for general plan updates for the two cities. Larry Bulloch responded that this process may result in revisions to adopted land use plans, but for the time being numbers need to be consistent with the current AVLUP as adopted by St. George City. At this point, the City Council has not authorized use of these updated land uses for this area. Mr. Wood again referenced the policy statement contained in the adopted St. George City AVLUP indicating that a detailed land use and planning study would occur around the airport. SITLA's understanding is that this planning study would engage in this process in conformance with the general plan policy statement. Lee Cabell explained that the funded scope of this transportation study would not directly address development of revised land use plans verses use of land use plans which have already been adopted. The scope of work could be revised to address this if approved by the Steering Committee. He asked to address this option later in the meeting.

Traffic Volumes for 3 Options: Based on new land use numbers and transportation network revisions provided by stakeholders, revised transportation scenarios were laid out as follows: **1) Updated Option #1, now titled Option 1-A, St. George/Washington City Combined Street Plan--** Depicts the Washington Fields Road as a major arterial road shifted closer to the Southern Parkway; **2) Option #2, now titled Option 2-A, St. George/Washington City Combined Street Plan--** Depicts Washington Fields Road as a major arterial shifted closer to the airport; and **3) Option #4, now titled 4-A, St. George/Washington City Combined Street Plan--** Depicts the Washington Fields Road from the EIS alignment, which did not show any other interchanges on the Southern Parkway between the airport and Warner Valley but depicts grade separated crossings at two other locations. Option #3 was eliminated from further consideration by this group at the last meeting.

Updated Option 1-A

Roadway networks have been laid out in accordance with information provided by stakeholders. In addition, land use changes have been incorporated. He reviewed the Washington Fields Road alignment for Option 1-A which incorporates information provided by SITLA, the Land Barons, and Desert Canyon with the road shifted closer to the Southern Parkway and tying back into the second intersection on Airport Parkway due to the Desert Canyons alignment issues. A smaller 66' collector road runs along the eastern edge of properties next to the airport. The previous Option 1 had the Washington Fields road tying in at the first interchange on Airport Parkway. Numbers in this option now represent new numbers based on land use plans. The figure includes two sets of numbers, one in parentheses and one not in parentheses which depict differences in densities of land use. Previous numbers used 10 employees for non-retail/service and 20 employees per acre for retail, which are now depicted as the first number. The intensity of employment in the area was doubled for non-retail/service to 20 employees and 40 employees per acre for retail and is depicted by the number in parentheses. For the most part, numbers are still in the

same ballpark with no dramatic difference in most cases. In terms of roadway network, the difference in numbers does not make a difference from the standpoint of a 2-4 lane road or a 4-6 lane road. Based on approved land uses for this area and plans that have been presented, differences based on this sensitivity analysis show that the transportation network can function under either scenario. This brings up the question of how much time should be spent on land uses as part of this study versus what Mr. Wood is anticipating from a detailed land use study. The roadway network will work with proposed land uses as well. Land use discussions can become fairly intense and require a lot of time and effort when based on the modeling scenario there does not appear to be a lot of difference. This would be more dramatic if there is a big change in dwelling units in the area. Based on the AVLUP, SITLA plans, etc. roadway networks for either scenario are adequate. This group needs to decide where efforts will be focused in terms of land use issues versus concentrating efforts on roadway layout locations, connections, Southern Parkway alignment, etc. The SITLA South Block land use is also included at 14,000 units in the traffic modeling. This area also contains a significant amount of commercial and business park uses as well. This is in addition to the land use plan for Desert Canyon which was presented to the St. George City Council and contains a total of 5,000 units.

Mr. Wood acknowledged that the broad analysis of the roadway system is correct in terms of having sufficient capacity to absorb traffic generation at a number of different levels and the land use is not guiding this in a way that it might have otherwise. When the AVLUP was developed several years ago, SITLA was told that it was not the time to bring forward a general plan land use amendment. It appears that this is not the correct time once again during the new study of the airport. He questioned when would it be the right time for SITLA to present a general plan amendment. Bob Nicholson, St. George City, provided instruction that a general plan amendment application can be submitted at the discretion of SITLA to St. George City. At that time, it will be considered through the appropriate city planning processes by the Planning Commission and City Council. Gary Wood commented that discussion of transportation plans completely divorced from land uses is a little curious. Lee Cabell explained that they are not ignoring land use plans, but it appears that there is not enough difference in options with information which has been presented to spend a lot of time on this issue. Modeling shows that the roadway network is going to handle whatever comes forward through this process. There is quite a broad range in how the land use can shift in this area and the roadway network would still handle the projected volumes. Mr. Wood mentioned that in terms of the SITLA proposal on the west side of the airport those residential uses are outside of the constrained area of the airport whereas in both the cities of Washington and St. George there are approved residential land uses within those constrained areas.

Russell Youd explained that if this group could reach agreement today that land use assumptions are correct for use in this study, it allows their schedule to move forward. This group can get hung up on land use issues for months and not meet schedule. Horrocks is seeking approval agreement from this group that this is representative of what was learned from their sensitivity analysis, which indicates that numbers can change substantially and still end up with the same road network. Without this approval today, the study will have a much longer schedule in order to accommodate additional land use discussion. Larry Bulloch commented that this group cannot agree on any specific land use but this group can agree that these specific land uses do not affect the transportation system and it is not necessary to argue land issues. Land use changes will minutely change traffic volumes but will not change the type of road system. Horrocks is seeking an agreed upon transportation Traffic Demand Model. Mr. Wood agreed that it would not be productive to get bogged

down on land use issues. However, in moving forward it needs to be clear that this is not a validation of a land use configuration that SITLA could agree with when SITLA land uses originally incorporated into the 2002 general plan was a cursory review. He noted that the AVLUP process did not allow participation of property owners. This is not a confirmation of those land uses carried forward in the general plan and that changes can be considered in the future. The land uses developed in 2002 were a policy statement and should likely be revisited. Russell Youd indicated that one option would be to pause on future modeling to allow SITLA the opportunity of presenting a land use change application to St. George City for consideration. Mr. Wood explained that this could occur at the same time as long as this study is not a confirmation of land uses. It was proposed that Horrocks provide a statement that could be incorporated into the study in regard to land uses for review next month.

Russell Gallian indicated that an issue of his land owners is roadway location and development of more defined arterial roadways outside of the Southern Parkway because those particular land owners really do not know the type of development which will occur on their parcels or what roadways will be required for access. Information has not been provided by those land owners because it is not yet available. His group sees problems with designation of these roadway locations. Even though roads will handle large volumes, it does not mean that the location of these roadways or access restrictions are necessarily conducive to these property owners. Lee Cabell responded that this is the next step of the study. The first thing is to make sure that they have the right base to document volumes, and the next step is to look at some of the options to locate where roadways will be placed. The group also needs to realize that these are only collector roads and there will be a myriad of roads that will be in this area to provide access to parcels. Those networks of a smaller nature will come forward as developers present their plans outlining preliminary plats, etc. The purpose of the master plan is basically to show connections of a certain size which will be required to provide access from point A to point B. As this area develops and property owners come forward they will provide the layout of roadways through their parcels. The next level of this study will embark on layout of a road network. Mr. Wood commented that it is important to move into access management principles to determine how local roads will interface. Russell Gallian responded that establishing major and minor collector roads without knowing uses is a problem. For example, some of the 20 acre parcels that front along the airport will not have access because of spacing requirements. Larry Bulloch indicated that those properties have roads along the property lines that provide access. Russell indicated that roads along the back property lines may not provide access to some properties. It was pointed out that intersections would be located every 250 feet for a roadway of that size. Lee Cabell acknowledged that this is an issue that this group will need to discuss. Russell also pointed out that St. George and Washington cities have different standards which may cause some problems. Steering Committee members responded that this is part of what the study will address.

Updated Option 2-A

This option shows basically the same roadway scenario only with the Washington Fields Road closer to the airport and the collector road closer to the Southern Parkway. This option depicts a collector road in front of some of the parcels referenced above. It was acknowledged that larger roads impose different access management standards which would impact those properties. Alignment of the collector road was reviewed as well. This option pushes traffic to different roads depending on size. However, roadway capacities are sufficient with either option. Russell Gallian commented that each of the options present different challenges for property owners. This particular option posed problems with access

and spacing issues in terms of the minor arterial as well as a separate road. It was pointed out that the graphic is somewhat misleading and there is two miles distance from the airport road to the Southern Parkway. Lee Cabell explained that the Southern Parkway Development Standards call for the closest intersection of the ramps being 500 feet away and distances are adequate. He also acknowledged that another purpose of this study is to examine the difference between standards for St. George and Washington cities. Some of these roadways cross between city boundaries in various locations. Part of the study's purpose is to come to agreement on some of these issues. In accordance with UDOT standards, no roadway will be allowed within 500 feet of the ramp to the nearest intersection. There are issues in terms of which roads are smaller collector versus arterial roads coming into that space.

Updated Option 4-A

This option is from the EIS which includes no interchanges between the airport and Warner Valley. Other interchanges were removed from this option and replaced with local road networks. This option could include some underpasses for back and forth traffic flow. This option places more traffic at each of the interchanges as well as more traffic on the Southern Parkway. Russell Gallian asked why this option is being studied and if it is a serious option. Tamerha Maxwell indicated that this option has been left open as an interim option until funding is available in the future to address additional potential interchanges. This will determine how traffic will be handled and functionality of the Southern Parkway without additional interchanges prior to development of various areas. Crossing access would be allowed through the use of overpasses or underpasses depending on what the developer wants to build for future interchange access. However, access to the Parkway will not be allowed on an intersection traffic signal basis. Tamerha explained that Phases 1 and 2 have a four lane divided highway with interchanges. Russell Youd explained that this question was asked numerous times by developers during planning for Phases I and II, but UDOT has maintained this posture throughout. Lowell pointed out that there are a number of interim solutions which could be put in place before full build that would allow free flow movement. Tamerha indicated that on Phase II UDOT is actually allowing developers to build ramps with right on/off access and no crossing of the Parkway. They are also allowing one side of the facility (two lanes) with interchange to be built until full build out.

Lee Cabell indicated that the three scenarios covered have been modeled to this point. He asked the group if other scenarios should be given consideration. Current modeling consists of an arterial and a smaller collector road with spacing requirements and good separation to handle traffic in this area from a land use and development standpoint. Now the process will embark on more detailed analysis of where these roads should be located and what will work best for land owners. This will assist with planning and setting aside required right-of-way. He reviewed areas on the map where other local roads could be constructed to provide access to parcels. The focus of this study is collector roads and above looking at a roadway network backbone that identifies the type of roads and connection locations to the Southern Parkway.

Gary Wood commented that it is important where these roads are located and how they cross from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, where they stub up from one property owner to another, etc. He pointed out that SITLA spent a substantial amount of time working on airport development to make sure that the Washington Fields Road through their development was optimal with connection to what they call road "A" and into the Land Baron property. A considerable amount of effort was expended just to make sure that everyone agreed on that alignment. As the Parkway continues further south there needs to be a collective understanding to where the road goes and it is difficult to separate access management issues from the alignment.

Scott Peterson asked about the purpose of the “S” curve located close to the interchange as opposed to a straight connection. Lee Cabell acknowledged that there are some issues with alignment and configuration of property lines, parcel sizes, location, etc. An attempt was made to run roads along property lines. It is also based on the Airport Parkway connecting in through Desert Canyon and the land use plan which has been approved by the city for Desert Canyon. Russell Youd mentioned that more spacing with higher level roads was also desired. Option 1-A and 4-A are the same with the exception of whether the middle area is an interchange or over/under pass. The question is whether the green road could run straight along property lines with a curve bend to connect into the Southern Parkway. Curt Gordon indicated that from a development standpoint that alignment would not work for Desert Canyon. Gary Wood asked if there was an understanding of property lines in this area in terms of which ones are meaningful versus those which are not. This may be helpful because some property ownership is on both sides and those property lines may not be a meaningful constraint. Lee Cabell agreed that this would be helpful because at this point they only have names of property owners and do not necessarily know which property lines are critical. This type of information needs to be provided by property owners. Scott Peterson mentioned that it appears that the road is aligned through these properties in order to accommodate the Desert Canyon development located on the other side. It appears that the road could curve on either side of the line and still work. Curt Gordon responded that Desert Canyon has provided several options for where the road could intersect their property line and go through their property. Removing the “S” curve and making a sharp diagonal from east to west does not work for the ramp which they already have approved. It was pointed out that drawings from the last meeting depicted a straight alignment. Lee Cabell explained that this area is a clean slate with no development at this time. These type of factors need to be discussed and agreed upon to determine a best alternative for alignment. Charlie Potter commented that anywhere the “S” curve is located it could penalize a property owner and potentially create an odd shaped parcel of land. He proposed that the roadway be aligned straight through with a jog in the east/west road providing alignment with the intersection. Lee Cabell outlined concerns as roadway flow, functionality and capacity with this type of alignment. It will be a difficult task to get the road along property lines and satisfy all owners. Tyler Hoskins commented that the purpose of this road is to serve as a frontage road to the Southern Parkway. It appears that the same alignment pattern could continue straight down through those properties with a bend to connect at the intersection. It is difficult to see why this would not work from a development standpoint. It was suggested that property owners meet separately outside of this meeting to discuss these type of issues and come to some type of agreement. Another option would be for property owners to bring a list of pros and cons for discussion next month. Gary Wood mentioned that the scale of these drawings is deceiving and previously depicted curves were very gentle turns in the roadway and not dramatic “S” curves. Keeping this scale of these plans in mind is very helpful. A good example of using gentle curves would be the Fort Pierce Industrial Park which consists of large industrial parcels. This is an issue but not an insurmountable issue. Bob Nicholson pointed out that these are long gentle curves which would likely accommodate development. It was suggested that Horrocks provide detail of those curves to Scott Peterson and Charlie Potter for review and comment. This would be helpful to assist in consideration of options for all property owners in the area. Curt Gordon agreed that it may be beneficial for property owners to meet separately to discuss options for roadway alignment. It was noted that some property owners are not attending these meetings. Notification has been provided utilizing property tax records. Land owners are encouraged to provide contact information for other property owners who are currently not participating in this process. Lee Cabell pointed out that the goal of this group over the next few months is to solve these issues.

Access Management Discussion: Lee Cabell provided a handout outlining the four major street types incorporated into the study with an access management comparison of St. George and

Washington cities taken from their adopted plans. There is not an issue with collectors and major collectors. As you get into the minor arterial and major arterial there are differences in city standards. Signal spacing is the same but access spacing is different. There are some dramatic differences between cities with major arterial streets. One of the objectives of this study is development of a common access management plan through this area. This can be accomplished by cities adopting changes to their standards or consideration of a supplemental access management plan for the airport south area. Lee Cabell pointed out that higher spacing provides less conflict and better traffic flow. However, standards from either city will work from a design standpoint. The Washington Fields Road is the only major arterial in this area. Gary Wood suggested that the function of Washington Fields Road needs to be analyzed because this roadway will provide access north or south to a collector road onto the Southern Parkway. In studying the functionality of this roadway, access characteristics may flow from that understanding other than typical standards. Lee Cabell agreed that the Washington Fields Road will likely provide the main access into this area for many years until funding for the Southern Parkway, including interchanges, is secured.

St. George/ Washington Standards

Lee Cabell presented information for St. George and Washington cities adopted access management plans for group analysis and future input in regard to access management in this area. Both of these documents are available on the respective city website.

Roadway Design Discussion: Lee Cabell reviewed roadway standards depicting a comparison of St. George and Washington cities standards for right-of-way versus pavement. From a traffic standpoint, the important numbers are the pavement widths to make sure that where streets meet city boundaries those width and lane numbers match up. Numbers in blue are standard pavement widths and numbers in black are alternate pavement widths which are included in the St. George City standards. The handout provided contains street standards for both jurisdictions. It appears that this group would not need to spend a large amount of time discussing these standards because the roadways will line up to function properly. It will not be necessary to develop new roadway standards in this area. Issues in regard to side treatments and sidewalks would be items for each city to take into consideration.

St. George/Washington Arterial Standards

Copies of the roadway standards were provided for information and comparison purposes.

Stakeholder Presentations/Information Sharing: Lee Cabell indicated that copies of today's presentation will be posted on the MPO website. He asked what information could be provided by Horrocks to assist stakeholders in this process. Curt Gordon indicated that he would be happy to host a meeting in his office for property owners to discuss road alignment issues.

Tyler Hoskins made reference to the land use map and questioned why numbers decreased. Lee responded that this occurred because information which was presented contained more residential units than what the AVLUP showed. Plans submitted also included more open space. Tyler also questioned Inter Turning Zone (ITZ) and what this actually means. The current airport AVLUP specifically states that inside of these zones the intent is to provide facilities that have a lesser concentration of people. As land uses are further discussed, someone needs to provide a definition in terms of the number of people per acre. He questioned if numbers in the ITZ are different. Lee Cabell responded that right now it is the same in terms of what has been plugged into the model. However, this question needs to be answered because it is brought up in the AVLUP. Gary Wood commented that making clarity of all the ambiguous statements in the AVLUP would be a major

task. Tyler agreed that transportation and land use plans go hand in hand. He also agreed with Lee's analysis that if numbers are doubled roadways could still handle those volumes. However, at some point this land use needs to be readdressed to define specific areas because those uses randomly cut through the middle of some properties. This will require adjustment as roadway placement is determined. As this process begins making adjustments and begins clarifying the ITZ and boundaries, it provides the opportunity to take a look at what that land use should actually be. Gary Wood suggested that perhaps a city policy statement should be presented outlining how their plan is implemented. The AVLUP is very general and not the detailed plan called for in St. George General Plan Policy Statement. Larry Bulloch commented that the AVLUP was developed with the intent of giving guidance as a general plan level document, not to serve as a zoning plan. This group should not make assumptions that are not consistent with this adopted plan. The Inter Turning Zone is an area where there is going to be a huge amount of noise and overflights. This zone should not have residential or areas of public gathering because these uses are not compatible with people. Those guidelines need to be utilized in this area for land use planning. This document is not meant to be detailed but general by design and should be respected in the planning process. The purpose of the Phase III study is to provide transportation planning which can be accomplished without going into additional land use planning efforts. Gary Wood agreed that this is exactly what the General Plan Policy Statement says. Lee Cabell noted that the only problem he could see would be if at some point a super WalMart were to be located at an interchange on the Southern Parkway. This use as opposed to industrial or office would cause problems with differing traffic patterns. Russell Youd indicated that they would like to present a land use statement at the next meeting for consideration and incorporation into the study. Gary Wood agreed that this would be helpful because land uses in and around the airport need to be supportive of the airport and not constrain airport operations or functions. Issues such as employment, residential and business park/office uses need to be studied as well.

Charlie Potter mentioned that during the last meeting there was a fair amount of discussion in regard to the alignment of the Southern Parkway and interchanges. The segment adjacent to the interchange which was moved has caused impacts resulting in his parcel being bisected. Until maps were presented today he did not realize that this would be the result of shifting that road. There needs to be further discussion in this area to address this specific situation because there are things other than topography which need to be considered. He asked at what point, as a property owner, would he be able to provide input for consideration in the decision making process. It appears that there is a current planning effort in which he has no involvement. Lee Cabell responded that as this process continues and roadways are laid out more specific discussion will occur. Brent Bluth, SITLA, indicated that part of the reason for moving the alignment is an inundation area (Stucki Basin) that they cannot breach. This alignment will need to be examined closely at some point with either a detailed design study or possibly a reevaluation. It was explained that UDOT is working on a separate in-house process dealing with alignment of the Parkway. The purpose of this study is to evaluate from a community standpoint where some of the interchange locations should be sited. Tamerha Maxwell responded that right now there is no funding for detailed design. However, funding may become available in the future to embark on design. At that point, UDOT will involve property owners who will be asked to provide detailed planning for their development for consideration in the design phase. Minor issues can be addressed with a reevaluation, and UDOT would partner with property owners to undertake this process. However, she stressed that UDOT will not be opening up their environmental document. Detailed design is not available to make any determination on alignment at this point. Input from property owners in regard to moving an interchange is an important part of this study. As information regarding design funding becomes available, it will be provided to this group. This study could identify specific issues which need to be addressed during the design phase.

Gary Wood asked if information was provided through Deloss Hammon in regard to the Stucki basin and constraints placed by a piece of geography around the detention basin. The Southern Parkway original planning and EIS was very clear that the Parkway was intended to align around that basin. The constrained ground may indicate that it needs to shift further east depending on analysis and actual configuration of that basin. It was his understanding that this would be part of this review. Russell Youd responded that it is part of the study but the level of analysis will depend on funding. The outcome of this study may simply be a list of things that need to be considered during design of the facility. UDOT funding was put a hold for the design portion of this study. Over the next few weeks as the legislature and Transportation Commission meets, this funding could be restored. Further discussion will occur in future DTAC meetings.

Curt Gordon asked if each of the cities may be willing to change their access management standards in this area. Mike Shaw indicated that Washington City is in the process of revisiting their Access Management Plan at this time. They will look at St. George standards to see if this is something Washington City wants to adopt. At any length, Washington City will work with St. George City to come up with a compromise for this area.

Lee Cabell solicited input from those in attendance in terms of roadway widths, roads along property lines, concerns with some of those standards and impact to land owners. Horrocks will coordinate with the MPO office to send out a notice for the meeting which will be hosted by Curt Gordon. Russell Youd asked if this meeting should include stakeholders or just property owners. Property owners have the option to meet separately to work out issues and bring recommendations back to this group. If members from the team were to be included, it would be good for Lowell Elmer to attend as well.

Gary Wood requested that the list of meeting action items needs to include Larry Bulloch working with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in regard to the issue previously discussed along the airport frontage road to South Mountain which crosses a piece of airport property.

Conclusions:

- Horrocks Engineering received feedback today on the updated traffic analysis and traffic demand modeling for the area encompassed in the study.
- St. George and Washington City access management plans are posted on the respective city Website for access.
- Copies of presentations provided by Horrocks Engineering for the February 10th and March 4th meeting are posted on the Dixie MPO website.

Action Items:

- Property owners need to provide specific comments to Lowell at the MPO outlining the benefits, challenges and/or consensus for each of the revised options presented today for additional review and analysis.
- Horrocks Engineering will provide a statement that could be incorporated into the study in regard to land uses for review next month.

Dixie Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes
March 4, 2009

- Horrocks Engineering will provide curve detail to Scott Peterson and Charlie Potter for review and comment.
- Curt Gordon volunteered to host a meeting for property owners, Horrocks study team staff, and Lowell Elmer to discuss and evaluate roadway alignment impacts to specific properties. Notification will be provided to property owners by the MPO.
- Request was made that Larry Bulloch contact FAA to address areas where proposed roadways cross into airport property.
- Design phase funding will be a discussion item in future meetings as new information becomes available.

ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 1, 2009 at the Five County Association of Governments Office, Conference Room, at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.