



EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

MINUTES
Rural Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)
November 15, 2012, 1:30 pm
Leeds Town Hall
218 N Main Street, Leeds

RTAC MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Arthur LeBaron
Mr. Derek Imlay
Mayor Alan Roberts
Mr. Daren Cottam
Mr. Dana Meier
Mr. Todd Edwards

REPRESENTING:

Hurricane City
LaVerkin City
Leeds Town
Toquerville City
Utah Dept. of Transportation
Washington County

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Aron Baker
Mr. Mike Heaps
Ms. Annette Densley
Ms. Angela Rohr
Mr. Drake Howell
Mr. Curt Hutchings
Mr. Dave Demas

REPRESENTING:

Horrocks Engineers
Horrocks Engineers
Get Involved, Leeds
Leeds Town Council
S2N Development/Grapevine
Five County Assoc. of Governments
Five County Assoc. of Governments

I. **Call to Order and Quorum Declaration**

Mr. Arthur LeBaron called the meeting to order, welcomed all present, and declared there was a quorum present.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

II. **Approval of Minutes for July 26, August 9, September 27 & October 15, 2012**

A motion was made by Mayor Alan Roberts, seconded by Mr. Todd Edwards, to approve the Minutes for the July 26th, August 9th, September 27th, and October 15th, 2012 meetings of the Eastern Washington County Rural Transportation Advisory Committee, with the following changes:

In the September 27, 2012 Minutes, Page 2, Item III, Paragraph 5, Sentence 1, "Mr. Lee responded..." should be changed to "Mr. Demas responded..."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. **Approval of Capacity Project List**

Mr. Dave Demas made sure that all Committee members had a copy of the Capacity Project Priority List prepared by the Eastern Washington County Rural Planning Organization (EWC RPO). Mr. LeBaron said that Mr. Demas, Mr. LeBaron and Mr. Meier have been working with the list to consolidate duplicate items, take off completed projects, and updated some cost estimates.

Mr. Demas explained that the Capacity List was reviewed at the last Rural Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) meeting, but no vote was taken due to lack of a quorum. The list has since been presented to the EWC RPO Rural Transportation Executive Council (RTEC) where it was approved. The List needs to be voted on by the RTAC mostly as a formality.

Mr. Dana Meier asked if the cost estimates can be modified after formal approval by the RPO. Mr. Meier has been, and is continuing to work on more accurate estimates. He preferred that the cost estimate numbers on the project list when voted upon by the RPO be the same as those submitted to UDOT. Mr. Demas and Mr. Curt Hutchings felt that the numbers can be adjusted at any time and the list can be voted on now and the cost estimates can be adjusted later. Mr. Demas explained that the numbers shown do not include inflationary factors, but Mr. Demas has those figures in a hidden column if UDOT wants those numbers included.

Mr. Meier also had questions regarding the proposed Leeds Town/I-15 northern interchange project. He noted that the project concept indicates it is an interchange upgrade. However the possibility of building a new interchange is included in the Feasibility Study. Mr. Meier asked if the cost estimate listed for this project is for an upgrade or a new interchange. He added that the existing number could be enough to cover the cost of an upgrade to a diamond interchange requiring two ramps and right-of-way. Mr. Todd Edwards stated it was his understanding that it was intended to be an upgrade. Mayor Roberts said that the RPO Corridor Feasibility Study may recommend something different, such as a new

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

interchange. Until the Study is completed, the Committee agreed to list the project as an upgrade and to determine the cost estimate based on the cost of an upgrade.

A motion was made by Mayor Alan Roberts, seconded by Mr. Dana Meier, to accept the Eastern Washington County Rural Planning Organization Capacity Project List as previously approved by the Rural Transportation Executive Council.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

IV. Project Priorities – Studies, Traffic, Trails

Mr. Demas reviewed that the RPO had now prioritized and approved Safety and Capacity project priority lists for submission to UDOT for their consideration of inclusion onto the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) list. Remaining categories of RPO projects to be prioritized include Studies, Traffic, and Trails. These remaining projects were already reviewed at the last RTAC meeting and some changes were made at that time.

During discussion on the following items, it was clarified that the cost estimates shown on the list came from an earlier Metropolitan Planning Organization list or from the UDOT Eastern Washington County Transportation Study. Again, the column indicating cost estimates with inflationary increases is not going to show on the list sent to UDOT.

A. Studies

Mr. LeBaron listed the studies first; 1) Purgatory Road, 2) the Toquerville Bypass, 3) the East-West Corridor, and 4) Babylon Road. The Feasibility Study for these proposed corridors should be completed around June 2013. Because the Study is already underway, after some discussion the members decided to keep the projects on the list and indicate the corridor studies as funded.

Mr. Curt Hutchings added that Sheep Bridge Road and Hurricane Cliffs Bypass projects were not included in the Feasibility Study. The Hurricane Cliffs Bypass is basically a different route up the Hurricane Cliffs than SR-59.

B. SR-17 Widening & Safety Improvements

Mr. LeBaron next addressed the improvements to SR-17 from the Maverick in LaVerkin City to its intersection with I-15 (mile post 0.0 to mile post 6.1). This length of SR-17 is also mentioned on the Safety and Capacity lists. The proposed improvements include road widening along much of the Route, some uphill truck passing lanes, and the straightening of sharp S curves and installation of guardrails.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

If the Toquerville Bypass project is undertaken by UDOT, a majority portion of the funding for the SR-17 improvements will be supplanted for the Bypass. As stated on the Capacity List: "If the Toquerville Bypass project moves forward, this project (SR-17 improvement) would reduce significantly in scope with the majority of the funding moving to the Bypass project."

Mayor Roberts noted that even if the Bypass is built, the improvements mentioned are still needed on the sections of SR-17 before and after the Bypass. Mr. Derek Imlay pointed out that there is a particular need for widening from the Maverick in LaVerkin City down to LaVerkin Creek where there is a school. Mr. LeBaron responded that this section will be included in the SR-17 improvement project regardless of a bypass.

Mr. Meier stated that the complete length of SR-17 should be improved for safety. However, if the Bypass is built and reduces traffic counts significantly on the bypassed section, that original section may not remain a valid safety concern. Mr. Demas remarked that widening and guard rails on the S curves might still be necessary to accommodate vehicular and bicycle traffic, especially since SR-17 is a designated bicycle route.

C. SR-17A Signal Power Backups

Mr. LeBaron next addressed the proposal to add a back-up power source to the two signals at the intersection of SR-9 and SR-17, and SR-9 and Center Street in LaVerkin. A power surge causes the lights to go into a flash mode and a full power outage turns off the lights completely. Mr. Hutchings inquired if this should be considered maintenance. Mr. Meier responded that UDOT has a statewide traffic and signals division and a regional maintenance division. There is funding available through the traffic and signals division.

D. SR-17F Widening

Mr. LeBaron stated that this item is already included under the SR-17 Improvements project. It was agreed to strike the project.

E. SR-7 Southern Parkway Segment IVb (2nd Barrel)

This project, along with other segments of the Southern Parkway, are listed on the Capacity Project List, therefore it was decided to strike this item from the list.

F. SR-9 Widening to Accommodate Bicycle Traffic

Mr. LeBaron shared his opinion that the section of SR-9 from Virgin to Rockville does not need improvement, but the other sections are dangerous. It was agreed that this is a good project.

G. SR-9A Pedestrian Walkway on Virgin River Bridge

All members agreed this is a good project. Mr. Meier asked if any cost estimates were available. Mr. LeBaron answered in the negative. Mr. Demas asked if there was enough

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

load capacity to handle the addition of widening for a sidewalk on the old side of the bridge. Mr. Meier suggested that the RPO send a request to the UDOT Structures Division to see if there is capacity to add on to the bridge. He suggested sending the letter directly to the Structures Division and a cc: of the letter to Mr. Nathan Lee. Mr. Lee is both the Region Four Director and the UDOT representative on the EWC RTEC. Mr. Roberts pointed out that this is an important safety issue.

H. SR-9 Visitor Center

Committee members agreed to strike this project as it does not directly pertain to transportation and there is no funding source available.

I. SR-9H Widening

It was decided that this project is redundant with the SR-9 Widening for Bicycle Traffic project and to strike it from the list.

J. SR-9I Turn Lanes

Mr. Meier explained that adding turn lanes involves a left turn lane and storage bay on one side, then a deceleration lane/ acceleration lane on the other side and so essentially is an intersection improvement. The mile posts were specifically identified in the Eastern Washington County Transportation Study. Some of these intersections may have already been constructed. Mr. LeBaron suggested that some committee members drive the Route and look at the suggested intersection points. Mr. LeBaron and Mr. Demas agreed to do this, both being engineers. Their recommendations will be added specifically to the project description.

K. SR-59 Widening at Big Plain Junction

Committee members recognized that the mile posts given for this project do not correlate with the location of Big Plain Junction. Although the name was familiar to some, no one was able to determine the actual location of Big Plain Junction. It was decided to strike the wording "from Big Plain Junction to SR-9" from the project description.

L. SR-59C, 59D, 59F Widening and Turn Lanes

Mr. LeBaron noted these projects were on the list, but there was no discussion on them. The projects remained on the list.

M. Leeds North Interchange

Mr. LeBaron noted this project was on the list, but there was no discussion on it. The project remained on the list.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

A motion was made by Mr. Derek Imlay, seconded by Mayor Alan Roberts, of the Rural Transportation Advisory Committee to recommend the Studies, Traffic, and Trails Project Priority List as per the above discussion along with future determinations regarding SR-9 Turn Lanes and alterations to cost estimates. The recommendation goes to the Eastern Washington County Rural Transportation Executive Council for their approval and subsequent submission to the Utah Department of Transportation for consideration of inclusion onto the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program List.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Meier raised the general question of whether it is confusing to have projects included on more than one project category list. He believes it will raise a red flag at UDOT. Mr. Meier stated that he will have a follow-up discussion with Mr. Curt Hutchings on this issue.

V. **Urban Cluster**

A. **Urban Cluster Boundary**

Mr. LeBaron explained that UDOT has provided the RPO with two urban cluster maps: 1) the Raw Census Urban Cluster Boundary, and 2) the Smoothed Urban Cluster Boundary. The Raw Boundary is based on population and density using figures from the 2010 decennial census. The Smooth Boundary includes growth areas projected to increase significantly within the next twenty years. It also includes the regional highway network.

These two maps were sent to Mr. Demas at the Transportation Planning Office of the Five County AOG and to Mr. LeBaron at the City of Hurricane for review. Mr. LeBaron felt comfortable with the boundaries that UDOT determined for the Smoothed Boundary. It does not include Leeds Town, but a third boundary, the Planning Boundary, extends further out and does include Leeds Town.

Mr. Daren Cottam commented that Toquerville has changed its zoning for a planned development of 1600 acres with 0.5 acre lots that lies west of the Smoothed Boundary. LaVerkin has a similar situation with their 'topside' area that is planned for development. Mr. Cottam and Mr. Imlay wondered if these planned growth areas should be included within the Smoothed Boundary area. It was pointed out that if those areas have successful development, it will show up on the next decennial census and they can then be included in the next Smoothed Boundary map.

Mr. Todd Edwards inquired if the Toquerville Bypass is within the Smoothed Boundary; part of it is and part is not. He questioned if the Smooth Boundary should be extended to the west to fully include the proposed Toquerville Bypass.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

Mr. Meier questioned how much difference it makes to be within the Smoothed Boundary map in terms of available road funding. He said that the functional classifications don't impact many roads outside of the State system. Mr. LeBaron previously contacted UDOT with this same question. He was told by Mr. Abdul Wakil that it will make no real difference for the RPO.

B. Functional Class Roads

Roads within the Planning Boundary area are classified according to Functional Class. Functional Class may determine what kind of funding a road project is illegible for. After UDOT determines the Urban and Smoothed Boundaries, the Boundary maps and Functional Classification maps are sent to the Federal Highway Administration which has the authority to make any changes they deem appropriate. Functional classification designations can be changed more often than every ten years.

There remained questions that need to be answered regarding the funding benefits of being located within the Smoothed Boundary. Functional Road Classifications are indicated on sections of SR-17, SR-9, SR-59, and SR-228 that are outside of the Smoothed Boundary. The question was raised as to whether only the portions of those roads within the Smoothed Boundary have access to additional sources of funding.

Mr. LeBaron had some requests for changes to the Functional Class designations and will provide Mr. Demas with copies of the changes that he will be sending to Mr. Abdul Wakil at UDOT. These are according to how the roads are classified in the Hurricane City Master Plan. UDOT will determine classification based on a formula.

Mr. Todd Edwards noted that one drawback of having a certain functional classification is if a road is damaged, such as in Santa Clara when the check dam failed, the repair money has to come through Federal Highways instead of directly from FEMA.

A motion was made by Mr. Darren Cottam, seconded by Mayor Alan Roberts, of the EWC Rural Transportation Advisory Committee to recommend the approval of the EWCRPO 2010 Smoothed Boundary Map by the EWC Rural Transportation Executive Council.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

A motion was made by Mr. Arthur LeBaron, seconded by Mr. Todd Edwards, of the EWC Rural Transportation Advisory Committee to recommend the approval of the EWCRPO 2010 Functional Class Map by the EWC Rural Transportation Executive Council with the following changes:

- 1) Correction of the alignment of SR-7; and with**
- 2) The changes submitted by Hurricane City.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

VI. Inclusion into MPO Update

Mr. LeBaron reviewed for the Committee that the elected officials of the RPO who comprise the Rural Transportation Executive Council (RTEC) and the elected officials of the MPO who comprise the Dixie Transportation Executive Council (DTEC) worked together to create the terms by which the Eastern Washington County Rural Planning Organization (EWCRPO) will merge with the Dixie Metropolitan Planning Organization (Dixie MPO) beginning July 1, 2013. Mr. Demas provided a handout indicating some of the terms of the merger, such as vote share allocation and matching fund monies.

The EWCRPO will not be dissolved until June 30, 2013 in order to complete the deliverables outlined in the existing Memorandum Of Understanding between the EWCRPO and UDOT.

Mr. LeBaron continued by explaining that the impetus of the merger is ongoing, and it is already important for RPO members to be present for MPO planning discussions. Mr. LeBaron urged all members of the RPO to begin immediately attending the appropriate MPO Committee or Council (DTAC or DTEC).

The regularly scheduled RPO meetings will continue unless decided otherwise on a meeting by meeting basis.

Mr. Curt Hutchings shared that it has been a very positive experience for the Five County AOG Transportation Planning Office staff to support the RPO and he thanked all present for contributing to the efforts of the past four years. Mr. Hutchings also suggested that the RPO members have valuable information and ideas to contribute to the MPO. Mr. LeBaron thanked the Five County AOG for getting the RPO organized. Mr. Cottam noted the financial contributions from UDOT necessary for the RPO to form and continue.

VII. COG Priority List Update

Mr. Dave Demas provided handouts of the March 2010 List of Project Submissions, the November 2010 Council of Government (COG) Rankings, the Transportation Corridor Preservation Fund Policies document, and the COG Concept Report application.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

Mr. Todd Edwards explained the history of the formation of the COG and the implementation of a vehicle registration fee that funds the COG, currently accumulating approximately one million dollars each year. The COG fund is available for the purchase of property located along planned/proposed future transportation corridors in Washington County.

Mr. Edwards explained that the COG Rankings Page is dated 16 Nov 2010, which was the date of the first ranking of projects. The list has been updated and the one provided to the Committee is current as of the date of this meeting.

If a project is on the list, then it is eligible for funding no matter where it is ranked. However, the COG is required to prioritize the list annually and projects can go on and off the list. What is required is a willing buyer and seller for a piece of property that is part of a transportation corridor, which corridor has been submitted to the COG and been placed on the list.

Mr. Edwards continued that Washington County is requesting the submission of all corridors which the County, Dixie MPO, EWC RPO, and UDOT consider important for immediate development or preservation that are not already on the list.

Mr. Edwards provided an example of an application based on a Concept Report format, but an application does not need to use this exact style.

The RPO needs to create a list of corridor projects that are not already on the list and to prioritize the projects before submitting them to the COG. Mr. Edwards pointed out that a project needs to meet the terms of the COG policy; however, the Washington County policy is more stringent with its requirements than those decided by the State Legislature. For that reason, if a project does not strictly adhere to all the criteria in the Washington County policy, argument could be made for an exception. For example, the Policy states that if a project is listed on the STIP or TIP list, it should not be included on the COG project list. This is local policy, not State policy. A number of the questions on the Application are worded that the answer "should" be this or that. This indicates a qualification stricter than the State Legislature requires.

The lists will initially be submitted to Washington County, then reviewed and prioritized by a meeting of one representative each from the County, the MPO, and the RPO. Then that list will be reviewed and accepted or revised by the COG (Mayors and County Commissioners. Mr. Demas asked for clarification regarding the RPO's Mr. Edwards answered that he doesn't believe it is necessary for the RTEC to vote on the application. The RTAC should also indicate any projects which should come off the COG list.

EASTERN WASHINGTON COUNTY RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RTEC CHAIR-TOM HIRSCHI RTAC CHAIR-ARTHUR LEBARON PLANNING MANAGER-CURT HUTCHINGS

The purpose of the COG Corridor Preservation Fund is to preserve a corridor until it is built. A home site could be purchased by a willing seller and rented out until that land is needed,

but it cannot be used for condemnation. And it is not intended to be project money. It is intended to be long term corridor preservation that should be part of a long term plan. Mr. Edwards added that the State also has Corridor Preservation funding. Mr. Meier emphasized the importance of having any possibly desired future corridor or road on the list just in case it becomes needed.

Mr. LeBaron agreed to represent the RPO in this process. Since the RTEC members are also members of the COG, the project applications can be sent directly from the RTAC to the first evaluation group of representatives from the County, RPO, and MPO. The COG does not have a date scheduled for their review meeting. It will probably be sometime in the first half of 2013. It was agreed to discuss and prioritize the RPO list at the next RTAC meeting in January 2013. Any applications by entities within the RPO should be sent to Mr. Demas so he will have them available for the next meeting.

VIII. **Other/Future Topics**

A. Next RTAC meeting Jan. 24, 2013, 1:30 pm in Hurricane City Hall.

B. Mr. Demas will produce a meeting calendar for 2013 by the next meeting.

C. Status of RPO Corridor Feasibility Study from Horrocks Engineers

Mr. Cottam requested an update on the EWC RPO Corridor Feasibility Study. Mr. Hutchings explained that the study has been on hold until population numbers from the 2010 census could be acquired and entered into the CUBE model. The numbers will be finalized at any time, at which point the Study will be re-activated using the Five County AOG on-call contract.

IX. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm by motion.