



# IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ICRTEC CHAIR—MAYOR CONNIE ROBINSON • ICRTAC CHAIR—TOM STRATTON • PLANNING MANAGER—CURT HUTCHINGS

---

## MINUTES

### Rural Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)

October 1, 2014, 1:30 pm

UDOT Cedar Offices

1470 N Airport Rd., Cedar City, Utah

#### **MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mr. Tom Stratton  
Mr. Shayne Scott  
Mr. Steve Platt  
Mr. Monte Aldridge  
Mr. Stoney Shugart

#### **REPRESENTING:**

Brian Head Town  
Parowan City  
Iron County  
Utah Dept. of Transportation  
Kanarraville

#### **MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Mayor Connie Robinson  
Mr. Kit Wareham  
Mr. Rob Dotson

#### **REPRESENTING:**

Paragonah Town  
Cedar City  
Enoch City Manager

#### **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mr. Dave Demas  
Mr. Daniel B. Kuhn  
Mr. Tim Boschert  
Mr. Vern Keeslar  
Jim McConnell

#### **REPRESENTING:**

Five County Assoc. of Governments  
UDOT  
UDOT PT  
InterPlan  
UDOT

#### **I. Quorum Declaration**

Mr. Stratton welcomed all present and declared there was a quorum present.

#### **II. Approve Minutes for Aug. 6, 2014**

A motion was made by Mr. Steve Platt, seconded by Mr. Shayne Scott, to approve the Aug. 6, 2014 Minutes of the Iron County Rural Transportation Advisory Committee. Mr. Demas noted a couple of typos and a time stamp that had to be corrected.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**



# IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ICRTEC CHAIR—MAYOR CONNIE ROBINSON • ICRTAC CHAIR—TOM STRATTON • PLANNING MANAGER—CURT HUTCHINGS

---

### III. Brian Head Transit

Mr. Stratton introduced the item. He gave a brief description of the history of the transit issue at Brian Head. Indicated that in the past Brian Head tried to create a transit system from Parowan Canyon thru Brian Head. It was voted down in Cedar as an extension of CATS. Mr. Boschert asked what year was the vote. Mr. Stratton responded it was in 2012. Mr. Demas then provided information regarding several contacts he has had with Mr. Boschert. Mr. Demas suggested discussing the email items list he had prepared from the previous meeting that had been sent to Mr. Boschert and received responses. He thought this would be a good starting point. All agreed. Mr. Demas then went through each of the items. Mr. Boschert indicated that the PTT's portion of the previous study was \$96,000 +/- which means the cost of the study was about \$120,000+/- . The question asked was could the existing study just be updated or would it require a new study to answer the more specific question. Mr. Demas thought that there should be a new or updated study that took the existing information and then focused on what it is now that Brian Head want to accomplish. And to provide more specific answers. Mr. Boschert agreed indicating that some of the existing information would still be good, he feels that existing study establishes the need. And that additional study should focus on what are the questions or the vision now. Mr. Boschert suggested that the study look at the next step beyond what is operating now. One step would be taking the existing van service from Cedar (or Parowan) to Brian Head that is happening now and look at it as a commuter service. The next step might be a standalone transit service for Brian Head - Parowan that would tie into a fixed route service in Brian Head. Several of these different situations might be looked at. Mr. Boschert noted that when Federal monies are added to the system many more requirements are attached and their costs need to be figured in.

Tim indicated that participation in operating costs get chewed down because it is based on population in the area and suggested that it might only be 5 to 10 percent of what the costs are. He indicated that monies are competitive throughout the state and that he only has \$400,000 to go around. Tim indicated that funds to purchase vehicles are available but would most likely be around the year 2020.

Tim also has planning money available to do the planning side of things. Tim expressed that if he puts federal money into a commuter system it needs to operate year round.

Mr. Demas asked if we have a fixed route system on top and a commuter system from say Cedar to Brian Head, how do we capture all the additional riders that want to use the system, for example the skiers, tourists, those seeking medical etc.



# IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ICRTEC CHAIR—MAYOR CONNIE ROBINSON • ICRTAC CHAIR—TOM STRATTON • PLANNING MANAGER—CURT HUTCHINGS

---

Mr. Stratton indicated that maybe instead of creating this great big thing it would be better for them to continue doing just what they are doing now.

Mr. Boschert indicated that he has no system that he is fully funding. It is all assistance money. This money is tied to certain populations such as low income, disabled for example.

Mr. Demas ran through the remaining items on the list to see what additional discussion was needed. Some of

Mr. Stratton remarked as to what happened between now and then because when they first started with this idea of Brian Head Transit those involved thought it would work. Mr. Boschert replied that MAP 21 changed things.

Para-transit was briefly discussed with the thoughts that there would be no para-transit if the commuter route was established but if there was a fixed route on top then it would be required have para-transit attached with it. Further discussion suggested that this service would be minimal and that there could be many options of how to handle it. It was felt that the existing study didn't adequately address this aspect of the service.

If the group chooses to do the study any of the local agencies could be the sponsor of the study.

Also briefly discussed was the issue of "how to capture the additional revenue for those riders going to Brian Head or other areas instead of charging just the base rate. It was noted that differing fare structures could be used including a "zone based" fare system. Additional general discussion occurred concerning other items on the list. At the end, Mr. Stratton suggested that based on all that has been brought up that we need to table the transit issue indefinitely.

#### **IV. Freight Presentation**

The group introduced themselves to Mr. Kuhn who is the Railroad and Freight Planner for the State of Utah. Mr. Dan Kuhn introduced himself to the group. He began his presentation using a power point presentation for the group. A few of the items discussed:

- We are the major cross-roads for the freight movement for the western half of the US. Utah doesn't produce or use a lot of freight. Trucking is the dominant mode.
- If I-15 were built today it would not be where it is today. It would be by the rail road.
- If you have rail service you have a very good carrot to dangle for economic development.
- Geography has really controlled the freight corridors. Big issues are the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the Colorado River.
- Must look at the big picture because freight doesn't recognize state lines.
- Most trucks won't use I-70 because of the long grades. Directly related to the steep grade.



# IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ICRTEC CHAIR—MAYOR CONNIE ROBINSON • ICRTAC CHAIR—TOM STRATTON • PLANNING MANAGER—CURT HUTCHINGS

---

- Throughout the US the average truck traffic is 12%, in Utah it is 23%.
- Most coal hauling is by rail, except in Utah. Utah is by truck.
- There are many geometric issues involving the movement of freight trucks. Passing lanes are critical in rural areas, both uphill and downhill. Full width, paved shoulders are also a major safety need. And there is a big need for truck parking.
- One of the biggest problems faced by the trucking industry is turning radii and signal timing at intersections and interchanges.

Mr. Keesler then passed out a spread sheet prepared with data provided by the trucking industry. This spread sheet presents the industry proposed needs in Utah. Mr. Keesler discussed projects on the list with respect to Iron County. One identified was widening of Iron Springs road out to the pipe terminal. The other is exit 59 northbound ramp needs better truck access and turning radii.

Mr. Keesler stated that if a project is on the state freight plan then it has a 95% federal match instead of a 93%.

Mr. Stratton expressed concerns that the freight list is more interested in the interstate whereas the small communities of the RPO have big concerns regarding freight in their immediate area such as concrete trucks and gravel haulers. These don't seem to get much consideration in a plan such as this. Mr. Keesler replied that if we have any projects that should be on the list we need to provide it to them. On State routes they should be submitted through Monte. If we have projects send it to them and they will put it on the list and then see how it shakes out. Send Dan an e-mail and copy Vern. They want our input. If a project is not on a state route send it in; they want to include it in the plan. Vern suggested to copy Monte when something is sent in.

## **V. Project Discussion**

- A. Concept Reports. Mr. Demas reminded those with projects to complete the concept report and send it to him. We need to discuss these next meeting. To date we only have a couple done. If help is needed please contact Mr. Demas
  
- B. Prioritization List  
Mr. Demas provided a copy of the prioritization list to each member. He noted a couple of additional items he had added to the list. These items are noted in red. Cedar has identified a bridge widening at I-15 on Coal Creek Road. Also added the south Main Street Bridge that needs some rehabilitation. These along with any others submitted should be considered when we evaluate the list at the next meeting. We are in the STIP process and projects are in the process of being evaluated by UDOT. Mr. Stratton asked if highway planning or master planning could be added to the STIP. Monte was not aware of this. If the state participates in this it is usually done with planning funds. Mr. Stratton indicated that his CIB application was denied.



# IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ICRTEC CHAIR—MAYOR CONNIE ROBINSON • ICRTAC CHAIR—TOM STRATTON • PLANNING MANAGER—CURT HUTCHINGS

---

Mr. Demas suggested that the TAP projects should be on the list as well. Mr. Kuhn identified several of the projects in the RPO prioritization list to go on the freight plan. The first is optimize signal timing on SR-56. The others are the projects on I-15 at SR-56 dealing with the accel and decel lanes. Mr. Demas noted that any of the projects coming from the Alton Study could be freight projects as well.

Timing for the Prioritization List will be to complete this list at the December meeting so that it could be presented to the RTEC in January.

**VI. Other Discussion Items**

- A. Next meeting will be held on Dec. 3, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.
  - i. Location: Iron County (Justice Center) - Steve's house!

**VII. Adjourn**

**A motion was made by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Steve Platt, to adjourn the meeting.**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**