



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

MINUTES Rural Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) December 02, 2025, 1:30 pm Parowan City Office 35 East 100 North Parowan, UT 84761

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kent Fugal
Chris Hall
Hayden White
Dan Jessen
Brett Hamilton
Tyler Allred

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Todd Robinson
Bret Howser

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Nate Wiberg
Thomas Nguyen
Darin Bushman

REPRESENTING:

Cedar City
UDOT
Enoch City
Parowan City
Iron County
Kanarraville

REPRESENTING:

Paragonah
Brian Head

REPRESENTING:

Five County AOG
Five County AOG
Five County AOG



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

1. Quorum Declaration

Vice Chair Kent Fugal called the meeting to order and declared a quorum was present.

2. Approve Minutes – October 7, 2025

- Kent Fugal entertained a motion to approve the October 7, 2025 RTAC minutes.
- **Motion by Tyler Allred: Approve the October 7, 2025 RTAC minutes as presented.**
- **Motion Seconded by Dan Jessen**
- **Vote: Unanimous approval**

3. Jobs Map Travel Demand Model

Presenter: Natalia Brown, UDOT, Travel Demand Model Program Manager

- Follow-up to the August discussion on the household portion of the regional travel demand model. Household data is now set; focus has shifted to employment (jobs) allocations for 2023 base year.
- A web map link with job totals by TAZ is included in the agenda PDF and will also be emailed to members. Natalia explained the map.
- Requested feedback:
 - Identify “big red flags” such as:
 - Areas with jobs shown where there are actually no businesses.
 - Areas that should have substantial employment but are coded as zero or very low.
 - UDOT does not expect exact employee counts.
- Members were shown how to:
 - Change base maps for context.
 - Use the comment tool in the web map to drop points and describe corrections (e.g., “jobs here are too high/too low)
 - The base year is 2023 for existing conditions.
 - Clarified the data reflect total jobs, not FTEs.
- Future Development Map:
 - A separate web map will be provided for proposed / future developments:
 - Members can drop pins and enter basic info about the development. Include the timeframe (e.g., within 5 years, 20 years, etc.).
 - This helps the model direct growth to known development areas out to 2055.
- Timeline for comments on both maps:
 - Participants were asked to provide comments before the holidays, ideally within the next two weeks.



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

4. Cedar Valley Belt Route Corridor Preservation, Parcel # E-0186-0000-000

Presenter: Brett Hamilton

- Project: Additional Cedar Valley Belt Route corridor preservation acquisition just north of SR-56, near the Iron Springs corridor.
- The property owner wishes to sell; The corridor bisects the property. The county seeks to acquire only the roadway corridor (approx. 3.44 acres), leaving two viable parcels.
- Discussion items:
 - Appraisal is \$59,980
 - Corridor Preservation funding request amount: \$59,980, which includes appraisal costs, closing fees, etc. (approx. \$1,500).
 - Discussion about severance damages.
 - Ensuring there are no problematic remnant parcels.
 - Clarifying whether closing costs and title fees are covered or will fall to the County vs. corridor preservation funds.
- **Motion by Dan Jessen: Positive recommend to the RTEC to use corridor preservation funds to acquire the Cedar Valley Belt Route corridor segment as described, in the amount of \$59,980, and affirm that RTAC is comfortable with reasonable additional closing costs if those reasonable costs are presented to and accepted by RTEC.**
- **Second by Tyler Allred**
- **Vote: Unanimous**

5. Transportation Priority List Application & List Name Change

Presenter: Nathan Wiberg and Eric Sweat from Kimley-Horn

- Iron County contracted with Kimley-Horn to help update corridor preservation materials and improve recordkeeping.
- Historically:
 - There has been confusion between:
 - The “Transportation Priority List”, and
 - The “Corridor Preservation Priority List.”
- Proposal:
 - Rename the current transportation project list (reviewed at RTAC each meeting) from “Transportation Priority List” to “RPO Long Range Plan.”
 - This aligns with what the list is and will be, when the area transitions to an MPO.
 - Formalize an application process to add projects to the RPO Long Range Plan:
 - A fillable application template is now posted in the shared Google Drive under: Iron County RPO → Long Range Plan → Long Range Plan Application Template.
 - Applicants download, complete, and upload completed forms to the “Completed” folder.
 - The form consolidates information previously on the concept reports.
- Discussion:



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- Existing projects will not all be retroactively updated; instead the new process will apply going forward.
- Long-term goal: staff will work with each jurisdiction to update projects currently on the list.
- Approved long-range plan projects often become candidates for funding (UDOT, grants, corridor preservation, etc.)
- **Motion by Chris Hall: Approve (1) renaming the “Transportation Priority List” to the “RPO Long Range Plan”, and (2) adopting the Long Range Plan Application as the official process for adding projects to the plan.**
- **Second: Brett Hamilton**
- **Vote: Unanimous**

6. Corridor Preservation Policy Updates

Presenters: Nathan Wiberg & Eric Seat from Kimley-Horn

- Background:
 - Iron County, RTAC members, Nathan Wiberg and Kimley-Horn have been working to clarify and streamline the Corridor Preservation Fund procedures.
 - Existing “Steps 1–10” in the policies and procedures document were difficult to follow in practice.
- Key updates:
 - Replace the existing multi-page textual steps with a simplified, color-coded flowchart (blue and green sections):
 - Green = Process for the Corridor Preservation Priority List process
 - Blue = Process for the Corridor Preservation Funding process.
 - Adopt two updated application forms:
 - Corridor Preservation Fund Priority List Application
 - Includes required eligibility from the Utah State Code.
 - Allows applicants to reference an existing Long Range Plan application to avoid duplicating information.
 - Corridor Preservation Funding Application
 - Used when ready to fund a specific acquisition; similar to the previous form but updated and aligned with the new process graphic.
- Legislative context:
 - State statute authorizes counties to collect corridor preservation fees (via vehicle registration) and sets conditions and requirements for how funds are used and how priority lists are adopted.
 - Corridor Preservation Priority List can be adopted/updated only once per year; last adoption occurred in July, and the same timing is anticipated going forward.
- Relationship between lists:
 - Most corridor preservation projects will come from the RPO Long Range Plan, but the statute does allow certain local-only corridors (e.g., in Enoch) to qualify even if not regionally significant.
- **Motion by Chris Hall:**
Adopt the updated Corridor Preservation Policy procedures, including:



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- Replacing the existing “Steps 1–10” in the policy document with the new process sheet; and approving the presented Corridor Preservation Fund Priority List Application and presented Corridor Preservation Funding Application as the official forms.
- **Second: Tyler Allred**
- **Vote: Unanimous**

7. Transportation Expo Discussion

Facilitator: Kent Fugal, with input from multiple members

Venue & Layout:

- The current venue (Festival Hall) was generally well-liked and conveniently located.
 - Constraints:
 - No items allowed on walls (no tape/adhesives), and the venue does not provide pipe and drape. This limited use of large posters/boards and forced reliance on easels and TV/monitor displays.
 - Suggestions:
 - Make better use of the space. Consider using the center of the room for additional booth rows to provide more space per exhibit.
 - Explore rolling whiteboards or similar portable display panels.

Publicity & Attendance:

- Attendance was decent for a first-time event, but members felt public turnout could be higher.
- Feedback from comment forms and online submissions:
 - Many attendees appreciated the format, maps, and staff availability.
 - Several comments requested more biking infrastructure and emphasized public awareness.
 - One comment explicitly asked that the event be better publicized (radio, social media, etc.).
- Ideas for improved outreach:
 - Begin promotion earlier, with coordinated reminders at RTAC and RTC meetings.
 - Ask cities to include event information in utility bill inserts or newsletters—possibly twice (early notice and a reminder).
 - Use local social media and community information groups.
 - Invite local media to cover the event.
 - Highlight a short “menu” of key projects in publicity materials to catch public interest.

Date & Time:

- Original time was roughly 3:00–7:00 p.m.; observation:
 - Traffic dropped substantially after 5:00 p.m.; anticipated after-work surge did not materialize.
- Consider changing to 12:00–5:00 p.m. to:
 - Capture lunch-hour visitors.
 - Avoid conflicts with evening City Council meetings.
- Discussion of month/day:
 - October overlaps with hunting seasons and other events.



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- The third Thursday in September is the preference if the venue is available.

Next steps:

- Kent will check Festival Hall availability.

8. Transportation Priority List Discussion

Presenter: Nathan Wiberg

Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Plan Integration:

- Kimley-Horn's SS4A plan for Iron County identified 29 candidate projects.
- Of these, nine (9) are already on the existing RTAC project list; the rest may represent new candidates.
- Kimley-Horn has pre-populated the new Long Range Plan application for each SS4A project.
- Next steps:
 - Nathan will email the projects identified in the SS4A and completed draft applications to RTAC members.
 - Members will have until the February meeting to review and consider which projects should be formally added to the RPO Long Range Plan.
- Adoption schedule:
 - The RPO Long Range Plan (formerly Transportation Priority List) is typically adopted annually; target for next adoption is May.
 - Having projects on the adopted plan allows RTAC/RTEC to quickly provide letters of support for grant applications and UDOT programming requests—per RTAC's previous decision that any project on the adopted list can receive a support letter signed by the Chair.

9. Transportation Projects/Studies/Updates

Iron County:

- The county has kicked off the transportation element of the Capital Facilities Plan update. They are currently gathering data, coordination on corridors, annexations, and access management was discussed.

UDOT / Cedar–Enoch Interconnect & South Parowan:

- UDOT Technical Planning Assistance (TPA) grants:
 - UDOT is holding application-help sessions for the planning assistance grants; one more session is scheduled on December 8.
- South Parowan study:
 - The consultant has generated modeling results and is packaging them for presentation.
- Cedar–Enoch Interconnect study:
 - When Kimley-Horn finalizes the results, Chris will share them. And more discussion will be had at that time.
 - Preliminary finding: under 2050 conditions, many intersections still fail even with the tested alternatives.



IRON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- Study may conclude with short- to medium-term concepts, acknowledging that further long-term solutions will be needed.

Cedar City:

- South Interchange Project:
 - Ongoing collaboration with UDOT and the consultant team on the new south I-15 interchange and associated improvements.
 - Still on track for construction in 2027–2028.
- 800 West Federal-Aid Project:
 - Federal-aid project on 800 West (south of Coal Creek) advancing.
 - Cedar is coordinating with UDOT Project Manager Sam Grimshaw and the consultant on scope and budget so contracts can be executed.
 - This will create a continuous connection from south of SUU through to Coal Creek Road.

There was an Access Management & Standards Discussion.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2025 in Kanarraville.

11. Other Discussion/Adjourn

- There was no further discussion
- Kent Fugal entertained a motion to adjourn.
- Motion: Dan Jessen made a motion to adjourn
- Second: Tyler Allred
- Vote: Unanimous