



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Monday, November 15, 2010– 8:30 to 11:00 a.m.
Historic Utah County Courthouse–Suite 212
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Adam Cowie, Lindon City
Ben Bloodworth, Division of Forestry, Fire, and
State Lands (FFSL)
Chris Keleher, Utah Department of Natural
Resources; Vice-chair
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove City
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City; Chairman
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Robert Autrey, American Fork City
Mike Mills, JSRIP

ATTENDEES:

Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City
Reed Price, Executive Director

VISITORS:

Jim Price, Mountainland Association of
Governments (MAG)
Shawn Eliot, MAG
Andrew Jackson, MAG
Jim McNulty, Saratoga Springs City Planner
Adam Olsen, American Fork City, Senior Planner
Brandon Larson, Utah County

ABSENT:

Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Division of Wildlife Resources, Division of Water Quality, Genola Town, Highland City, Mapleton City, Orem City, Santaquin City, Springville City, Utah Division of Water Resources, US Army Corps of Engineers, Utah County, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, Utah Lake Water Users, Vineyard Town, and Woodland Hills Town.

1. Welcome.

Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. He welcomed everyone in attendance. Everyone introduced themselves to the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), presenters, Mr. Jim Price, Mr. Shawn Eliot, and Mr. Andrew Jackson.

2. Review and approve minutes from the October 25, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom noted one correction of the minutes on the first page, last paragraph, Item 2, stating it should read “2030 plans” and “2040 plans.” There were no further corrections, comments, or discussion on the minutes. Mr. Jim Hewitson motioned to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Mr. Lee Hansen, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Review draft version of the model Utah Lake Shoreline Ordinance.

Mr. Beckstrom stated the Technical Committee had reviewed the Utah Lake Shoreline Ordinance in detail at the previous month's meeting. Modifications based on the Committee's discussion were made and incorporated into the present documents. He explained the three documents including the companion document, the overlay zone ordinance, and the MAG trail requirements had been forwarded to the Governing Board for review and consideration. He asked for Committee input on issues with language, effect, or magnitude and any changes or modifications to the ordinance. These would be amended and sent as corrections to the Governing Board before voting. He invited everyone to attend the Governing Board meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom summarized the three documents. The first document was the Utah Lake shorelines overlay protection zone summary document. This is the "why" document, which is an explanation for Board members, municipal council members, planning commissioners, and those not familiar with the Utah Lake history and the Master Plan development. The second document is the formal model ordinance, which will be recommended to the communities to adopt and incorporate into their development regulations. He noted the ordinance is the "what" of the recommendations the Commission is proposing to the individual communities. Each individual community will tweak the original format to make the ordinance consistent with their own land use-zoning and development policies.

The third document is the Utah Lake non-motorized trail standards and is only a reference document. It is mentioned in the model ordinance last section 11.000, which was added regarding the shoreline trail. The intent of the ordinance is to adopt the current version and, as it evolves over time, each community would then adopt the standards for the shoreline trail into their community plans. The intent is not to formally incorporate this document into the ordinance itself, but only by reference. The current version is included for everyone's information and reduces the bulk of the ordinance being adopted. Over the course of time, as MAG revises the standards, the cities will not need to revise their ordinance because of MAG's guidelines. The intent is, as this is revised over time by MAG, it will continue to be adopted and utilized by each of the communities who adopt the model ordinance.

After the explanation of the three documents, Mr. Beckstrom asked for thoughts, questions, recommendations, disagreements, errors, or issues regarding anything in the companion document or the ordinance document itself. Mr. R. Price said that after reviewing the document, it appeared the ordinance, with the 50-foot buffer, was suggesting development clear to the edge of the lake ignoring potential flood-hazard zones. In a discussion, he was told the existing flood-based restrictions would supersede anything the ordinance said about development close to the lake. He asked the land-use planners if the information was correct.

Mr. Adam Cowie said with the floodplain requirements many municipal jurisdictions have flood standards in place. However, if it meets the city's requirements a lot of the municipalities and other areas would not prohibit development in the floodplain. He believed the buffer zone was still applicable because of the aspect. He cited an example in Lindon where a train acted as a buffer between the lake and development. The buffer requirement should remain so each jurisdiction can decide.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Brandon Larson, county employee, how the county dealt with the floodplain in the Lakeshore area. Mr. Larson said the county allowed development within the floodplains as long as the requirements were met.

Mr. Jim Hewitson asked for an appropriate time to take the documents to the development committees. Mr. Beckstrom said anytime. He further explained the Governing Board could immediately adopt the ordinance or decide the document has issues needing to be answered, and postpone approval. The expectation is the Governing Board will formally approve and adopt the Model Ordinance in their November meeting or within the next few months, but their approval has no technical, legal, or

regulatory significance. The action of the Governing Board merely states it is a good policy and ordinance that helps implement the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake Master Plan. The Board's adoption will encourage the local communities with shoreline frontage along Utah Lake to consider adopting the ordinance or a version with minor variations into their specific development regulations. Mr. Hewitson asked if the Governing Board would approve the ordinance on behalf of the respective cities or forward it to the cities. Mr. Beckstrom restated the Board's approval encourages the cities to adopt it into their regulations and helps implement the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan.

He called again for any remaining questions in a technical, editorial, or wordsmithing nature to be incorporated before it was sent to the Governing Board.

Mr. Cowie asked Mr. R. Price if the trail specifications from MAG were reviewed. Mr. R. Price stated the specifications were copied and pasted by Mr. Jim Carter from what MAG provided. Mr. J. Price said having the trail specifications adopted for reference only was a good idea, as it is updated regularly and will be revised again in the next several months. Mr. Cowie questioned the last page, section 11.2 on the trail construction and dedication. It appeared the intent of the trail was to be within the 50-foot buffer. He recommended even though the trail location will be reviewed at the time of the development proposal, the ordinance should state the intent of the ordinance was to have the trail be within the 50-foot buffer or the shoreward side of a development. The present wording is ambiguous as it states the trail will be around the lake, and it does not say what side of the development in section 11.2. Mr. J. Price stated it was a preference rather than a requirement because of wetland issues. Mr. Beckstrom read the 11.1 trail corridor (page eight of nine, item B), "Jurisdiction has identified the Utah Lake Trail as a component of its trail Master Plan and has identified a preferred alignment for the trail on its future mapping." He suggested beginning of the next sentence the wording could be "the preferred location of the trail is to be as close to the lakeshore as possible." The remaining wording concerning the exact location of the Utah Lake Trail would continue as presently stated. Mr. Cowie agreed with the wording, stating the communities could shoot for a lake-ward trail around the lake. There were no further recommendations to the wording. Mr. Beckstrom said the change would be incorporated.

Mr. Beckstrom summarized stating the feedback and changes from the prior month's meeting had been successfully incorporated. He asked for a motion recommending the model ordinance documents with the changes discussed in section 11 be forwarded to the Governing Board. Mr. Cowie motioned the Technical Committee recommend the draft ordinance with the two associated companion documents referenced as amended be forwarded to the Governing Board. Mr. Hewitson questioned the motion asking if the documents were static or if they could be changed after the recommendation. Mr. Beckstrom reiterated the document might be revised by the Governing Board. After approval, it will be placed on the Commission's website and be forwarded to the communities as recommended from the Utah Lake Commission Governing Board. Individual communities have full legal authority and responsibility to modify the document tweaking it to their own regulations. Mr. Hewitson stated it might get mixed up with the Utah Lake Technical Committee or city's development committees. Mr. Beckstrom said he expected a consensus vote from the Governing Board, which has representation from each of the communities concerned and should carry sufficient weight and credibility to be adopted into their ordinances. Mr. Hewitson asked if the motion could state, "It does not commit the individual membership to accept, not accept, or alter the ordinance." Mr. Beckstrom said it was implied as the Governing Board operates by consensus and agreement rather than as an authority. Mr. Hewitson asked if the motion could say, "In no way does the recommendation commit the individual cities and towns to accept this ordinance." Mr. Beckstrom said after adoption by the Governing Board, no community is under any legal obligation or penalty to consider it, but it is hoped the cities would implement it into their municipal's ordinances.

Mr. Hewitson asked for the language of the motion again. Mr. Cowie amended the motion to read, “We are recommending approval of the model ordinance as amended by the Technical Committee to the Governing Board, with the understanding that if the Governing Board approves the ordinance, it will be forwarded to the individual communities.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Hewitson, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Beckstrom encouraged any land-use staff of the communities to attend the Governing Board meeting on November 18 at 7:30 a.m. Mr. Cowie suggested Mr. R. Price send a cover letter with the final version to each community’s representative, and possibly the city council, mayor, and planning directors. Mr. R. Price said he envisioned communicating directly with the city staff, planners, and/or administrators, who can alert and inform the mayors of the ordinance prior to the city councils addressing the ordinance. He believed the Commission would work primarily with city staff and the planning departments to fine tune the document to their specifications and requirements, and then move it forward to the planning commission and city councils.

Mr. McNulty believed many of the city councils and elected officials will want the consultant, Mr. Carter, to go through the ordinance with them prior to adoption and may need explanations of how the ordinance would benefit their community. Mr. R. Price assured the group, when invited and appropriate Mr. Carter would go to individual councils, as long as the Commission had funding. Mr. McNulty said the Technical Committee decided not to move far until the Governing Board found the ordinance acceptable and elected official work with the ordinance. Mr. R. Price agreed stating the Governing Board recognizes the Technical Committee efforts to go through and fine tune any work and have it in a near-final format.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested the Technical Committee representatives forward the contact information of the planning director, community development director, city manager, or any individual responsible for supervising planning efforts and coordinating with the planning commission to Mr. R. Price. A cover letter signed by the Executive Director and Chairman of the Governing Board, along with a copy of the documents can be forwarded to the local mayor and/or leader of planning efforts to create the momentum for the ordinance to be considered at the next level. Mr. R. Price said after the ordinance is approved, he would communicate through email to find the best way to approach each entity.

Mr. Beckstrom again thanked the members for their participation and time, as well as feedback in preparing and reviewing the model ordinance. He noted their endeavors were successful taking about six months’ time and effort.

5. Other items.

Mr. Beckstrom moved to agenda items five and six secondary to the time involvement in Agenda Item 4. He announced Provo City’s Channel 17 was airing segments of Utah Lake Symposium hosted by the JSRIP and Utah Valley University. The presentations on the Provo City website, Provo.org, are linked under channel 17, miscellaneous items.

He announced Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL) is conducting an open house on Thursday, November 18 from 6-8 p.m. in the Rotunda of the Historical County Courthouse. The public open house is required for solicitation of input, feedback, and communication concerning the proposal by Leon Harward, which is under formal review and consideration concerning the impacts on the sovereign lands of Utah Lake. The open house is one of two, which will be held during the scoping process. Although there is no formal environmental NEPA, the open house is part of the NEPA process to notify and inform people of what is being proposed, and to solicit preliminary feedback and reaction. The Technical Committee will have an opportunity in the future to review the application. Formal public meetings may be held in the future by the Governing Board during the process.

Mr. Mike Mills asked how this public meeting would differ from the public hearing one year ago. Mr. Beckstrom said it is not a public hearing, but an open house. The 2009 meeting was a public hearing with a presentation, minutes, and public feedback on record. The open house format provides posters and available information for people to find out the nature of the application. They will have an opportunity to provide comments or feedback during the open house process by either personally writing, on the internet, or email references. Mr. Mills asked if new information was anticipated or if it was the same. Mr. Beckstrom did not believe any new information would be revealed at the meeting. Mr. R. Price concurred. He said the application would be made available on line, which may contain additional details, such as financial, which were previously withheld. He suggested the members look at the information provided on FFSL's website. Mr. Beckstrom only noticed an announcement of Thursday's meeting and no new background information. Mr. R. Price said he would find out and email the Technical Committee what new information would be available in the near future.

6. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Suite 212 on Monday, December 13, 2010 at 8:30 AM, or consider alternate date due to holiday season.

He announced the meeting tentatively scheduled for December 13, will be held if a need arose, but expectations are the December meeting will be cancelled due to the holidays. The criteria for the meeting to be held would be bridge-related issues or re-evaluating aspects of the model ordinance. Mr. R. Price will notify members of a meeting two weeks in advance. The meeting Schedule for 2011 is available on line.

4. Presentation by Mountainland Association of Governments on long-range transportation plan.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. R. Price to introduce the guest presenters who were Mr. Jim Price, Mr. Shawn Eliot, and Mr. Andrew Jackson from MAG. The PowerPoint would enlighten the Technical Committee on MAG's transportation planning efforts for the upcoming decades. He noted Mr. J. Price was familiar as an adviser for trails and transportation issues. He had recommended staff from MAG explain the latest draft version of the long-range plans.

Mr. J. Price said MAG is asked their position whenever there is a discussion of the proposed bridge and the effects on Utah county transportation. MAG has been updating their long-range plans, which is completed every four years, with an anticipated approval date of June 2011 for the new plan. In the near future, the draft of the plan will be open for official public comment. Because of continued interest in transportation around the lake and especially the concern of a crossing over the lake, MAG wanted to inform the Technical Committee of their plans. Mr. Shawn Eliot would present the information of MAG.

Mr. Eliot said if MAG did not plan, Utah County would end up congested. He presented the phases of the projects to be completed in the next 10, 20, and 30 years. MAG obtained their data from the base year 2007 and then modeled transportation and traffic from the criteria. He cited how some roads have a lot of congestion at peak times during the day and other roads do not. He noted traffic chokepoints, which are areas where traffic is monitored on the number of trips per day. The first phase in 2020, no new improvements were made to the road system. With the 2020 population, the roads were modeled. Some congested areas are resolved with Pioneer Crossing and other projects were moved up at the request of city mayors. He noted the increase in choke points from 100,000 trips to 300,000 trips per day.

Mr. Keleher asked if the traffic counts were calculated by population growth, how MAG makes their projections of where people would be living. Mr. Eliot said the traffic and socio-economic data that goes into the model is received from the governor's Office of Planning and Budget, which produces the county-wide totals for each decade based off of a running economic model. MAG works with the cities and their general plans, and tries to balance the visionary plans of planning ahead and/or environmental

aspects of sprawling out too far. Most of the growth is contained in the areas that already have some type of development and city infrastructure. At the request of the city's elected officials, he outlined city-specific projects for the first phase to relieve the individual community's traffic congestion.

Phase Two takes place after 2030. With the population growth and increased vehicle trips per day on the roads, there are more chokepoints and traffic congestion. One main area MAG is addressing is the Lehi and Lindon areas in the north and Springville in the south county. Mr. Hewitson asked about the congestion of Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain because of the number of roads through the area. Mr. Eliot explained with a lake, a mountain range, and a large amount of people wanting to come there by 2040, more facilities, and roads are needed. Mr. Andrew Jackson said more business growth occurring in the southern part of Utah County, and more jobs are created, then more homes and facilities are needed for the influx. The additional roads are needed for those who will commute to the new businesses. Mr. Eliot said by 2040, the Saratoga Springs/Eagle Mountain areas will not be bedroom communities, and their citizens will commute to their jobs in the outlying areas.

In 2040, only two projects in central Utah County are proposed which are the north end of University Avenue and 800 North on the east side of Orem, going to six lanes each. With the 2040 demographic projections and working with cities and the state, MAG will be addressing larger facilities including other arterials and six-lane roads. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the majority of population growth over the next 30 years would be south of Provo and west of Lehi. Mr. Eliot said yes because the areas are closer to the build out and growth. The general plans of these two areas support growth and there is room for the increase. South County has interstate through it already, but connectivity is their main problem. Mr. Beckstrom asked if MAG's growth figures are based largely upon the existing general plans of the various communities. Mr. Eliot confirmed his statement. Mr. Beckstrom said a lot of growth in the unincorporated county area is not occurring because the county is not projecting growth into those areas. Mr. Jackson said the county's philosophy is to funnel the growth to the cities.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if growth in the Lakeshore area, such as Saratoga Springs, would change their projections. Mr. Eliot stated MAG updates their plans every four years. Although MAG projects 30 years in the future, they address the traffic plans every four years. He noted by 2040 it is estimated 1.1 million people would live in Utah County. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) ideal would be to use a grid pattern utilizing major and minor arterials and freeways to transport citizens all throughout Utah. A question was posed to the cities and mayors asking where MAG should go with the need to start looking at something larger. The first thing MAG did was model a freeway and addressed a belt route on the west side of Utah Lake to get traffic off of I-15 in Utah County. They have been asked for years why they don't put a belt route on the west side to get traffic off I-15 in Utah county on the east side. Three scenarios for traffic models were evaluated including Camp Williams, Highway 73, and the Hidden Valley Route.

Next, MAG slightly modified the three models and evaluated a bridge over Utah Lake. A model of the current bridge proposal was developed using its proposed termination points and flow of traffic through its use. Mr. Eliot noted 800 North has the highest traffic counts of I-15 in Utah County, even into 2040. MAG's concern is a major facility in that area that is already highly congested and adding more people will increase the congestion. MAG'S concern is the bridge is not going to help traffic on this east side. Mr. Cowie asked if MAG's concerns were expressed to FFSL. Mr. Eliot did not think so, but felt the concerns should be communicated. Mr. Jackson said MAG was asked to model the air quality impacts on 800 North termination points. The Technical Committee had questions and discussion concerning the future of the roads on the west side of Utah Lake. Mr. Eliot said MAG had met extensively with Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Lehi and they all have their own ideas where they want a corridor. In order to accommodate the three cities all three models were developed. Lehi does not want freeways through its community and would rather have it at the top of the point of

the mountain. This was looked at as part of the Mountain View Corridor environmental and UDOT dismissed it. What it does in modeling, is it makes I-15 fail at the Point of the Mountain, which is a choke point from Utah Valley into Salt Lake County. By having two major facilities connect right at this choke point, makes it worse. The Mountain View Corridor, EIS's preferred UDOT alternative, is to have a freeway along 2100 North. UDOT has already purchased the right of way for the area. Lehi's major concern is a freeway to freeway interchange on I-15. Options are still being studied. Mr. Hewitson said the 2100 North freeway cuts out a lot of Lehi's commercial area. Lehi is also working on their plans for the future. Mr. Eliot stated 2100 North has a collector distributor system with frontage roads that allow access to commercial businesses. He explained to the Committee how the mountain crossover and freeway makes the connection another choke point with the increase in trips per day. Concentration of trips causes massive congestion and it badly fails in the long-range goal. Mr. Eliot discussed various routes and plans for 2040 to avoid congestion and lessen the chokepoints.

The second scenario through Cedar Pass was modeled as an expressway called Hidden Valley. An expressway has lights and is not as fast as a freeway. MAG is still working on the model. Mr. Mills said the past discussion implied 1900 South in Lehi and Pioneer Crossing were two alternatives for lessening traffic, but in going forward MAG is not considering them as two alternatives but they both are needed. Mr. Eliot said the latest model was still being evaluated. In working with the cities, some are saying to make it a major facility of a six-lane expressway and others are saying they are not sure they a freeway that big throughout their city.

Mr. Jackson answered Mr. Cowie's question about a different termination point for the Lake Crossing. The state requested a study pertaining to air quality impacts of the bridge. He had a meeting about a year ago the Utah Lake Commission Executive Committee, which had a representative from the state. They discussed the bridge development and toll in Saratoga Springs with numbers as well as reviewing the previous studies. If the bridge was brought further south to the Springville area, it does better in the modeling because it cuts distance and makes a shortcut more valuable. However, the further north the bridge is located, the distance cutting across the lake is not saving very much in time, distance, or money, especially as a toll road. If the bridge were located farther south, the benefit would be greater. Mr. R. Price said a review team put together by FFSL had representatives from UDOT. MAG's presentation will be considered by FFSL along with the other issues they are trying to consider.

Mr. Mumford asked if an official written comment stating congestion would be worse if the bridge was in one location as opposed to another. Mr. Eliot said he did not know if MAG had tied the bridge in with the congestion and trips across the bridge at the proposed location. Mr. R. Price said the commenting period would begin on November 18. When UDOT evaluates the location and they want MAG involved, perhaps UDOT will request MAG submit a comment listing their concerns. Mr. McNulty said in previous meetings, Mr. Leon Harward implied UDOT said it is a toll road and to go ahead and build it. He asked what UDOT's present position is or if they will take a position during the commenting period. Mr. Jackson said statements Mr. Harward made in the past were not official statements and some question if any of those statements were made even in an unofficial basis. Whether the statements were made or not, something questions at what point is private development told to choose another location, such as a manufacturing plan. The public tries to spur economic development, and one asks if this is an economic development tool or is it a private development. We need to make sure it is not impacting air quality, the environment, or those types of things. If the private company wants to assume the risks then let them assume it, but then another group says we don't want to have someone partially build something with greater public impact than if someone partially builds a manufacturing plant and leaves it idle for a while. There are different impacts and they are trying to look at those.

Mr. Mumford asked if Mr. McNulty was concerned UDOT would say to go ahead and build the bridge, as they have in the past. Mr. McNulty cited an example of golf course developers building a course, but not being financially sound, and the city ends up taking over the golf course. He felt UDOT is posturing saying, "Go ahead Mr. Harward and build the road and we will see how it goes."

Mr. Eliot said MAG had a regional meeting with the mayors and the county commissioners going over the proposals and information. In the end, the preferred scenario is for larger facilities, trying to balance environmental issues as well as other concerns, and working with the various cities.

Mr. McNulty said the bridge crossing was modeled as a freeway, and asked if a freeway wouldn't work. Mr. Eliot said it was also modeled as an expressway, which is not the ideal scenario for long distances to get to destinations. It is appropriate MAG re-evaluates its plans every four years so if changes are needed to the visionary plans, they can be made. He pointed out different plans to relieve the chokepoint locations throughout Utah County, discussing the best plans, modeling the traffic flow, interchanges, freeways, expressways, population growth, and trip numbers on the road.

Mr. Cowie said a key component to MAG's decision and location is the best spot where traffic can be dispersed. It seems inevitable there will be a crossing over Utah Lake. The Commission should ask if we want to encourage or even allow something in a location that is detrimental to the region.

Mr. R. Price said he felt as more information comes forth and Utah Lake Commission is convinced there is or will be a need for a crossing, they will continue to work with MAG and the regional transportation commission. The Commission will evaluate the best way the bridge can be done, recognizing there are still a need and the impacts such a bridge will have. Mr. Mumford said another aspect is deciding whether it is better to have the second or third choice location be done by private development or the first choice to be paid by the taxpayers. A lot of taxpayers say let him do it. We would rather go with choice number two and have someone else pay for it than go with number one and we have to pay for it.

Mr. McNulty asked if Mr. Harward wanted the bridge put on the regional transportation plan and if he is requesting the alignment of his lake bridge to be shown on the plan. Mr. Jackson said Mr. Harward has asked to be put on the plans, but it was beyond MAG's immediate phase one. We are just showing there is a crossing in the future phases. Mr. Beckstrom stated from a traffic standpoint, discussion of the issue of bridge alignment might take the private proposal off of the table for consideration. If MAG were doing this in a conventional public financing and sequencing format, the Payson to Provo freeway may be a higher priority project earlier than a lake crossing. Mr. Jackson concurred and said, when discussing emergency issues, there is no alternative for north/south traffic if there was a need for evacuation. Mr. Beckstrom agreed. Mr. Eliot said another reason is there is more population in the area and there is more connectivity between the two areas. South County generally doesn't have anywhere to go except in the south county or to come to Provo/Orem region. With employment, population, and household data traffic zones are used to base attraction to the areas. MAG's highest priorities are based off of moving traffic, which depends on higher volumes and congestion. The original model for the Utah Lake crossing had less population on the west side, but the current figures are higher. The bridge would carry more people than originally anticipated. Mr. Mumford asked what phase a bridge across Utah Lake would occur and Mr. Eliot said possibly in the third phase but not in the first.

Mr. Eliot reviewed a transit plan with the maps in the vision including commuter, front-runner rail from Salt Lake to Santaquin, and would be completed in three phases. A light rail from Salt Lake to Lehi/American Fork with an inter-mobile center, and may go to UVU along Geneva Road. The other commuter plan is with the transit bus from Payson to Eagle Mountain. Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain both would like to be a center for a light rail. Commuter rail and light rail are not utilized in Utah because of the density numbers. He noted Salt Lake County is slowly getting into transit development planning. MAG does model transit services, but the transit is not a major part in figuring

traffic numbers. Mr. Keleher asked if freeway traffic numbers accounted for the traffic transportation. Mr. Eliot said they account for the light and commuter rail systems. Only two percent would travel on transit. Even by 2030, the transit numbers may only be 10 percent, secondary to density of the people around certain areas. Mr. Keleher asked if the transit plan was based on capacity or lifestyle choices. Mr. Eliot confirmed they were based on the state's lifestyle and capacity. Mr. Hewitson asked if MAG's analysis considered future availability of fuel for the gasoline engine. Mr. Eliot said no, but in discussion with the Wasatch Regional Council, and it is anticipated future fuel development and new reserves. Another plan will be developed if fuel is not available in the next four years. Mr. Jackson said when gas prices went up and the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) dropped dramatically and has not returned to the pre-levels. Roadway system fatalities dramatically dropped and the rate of fatalities have not returned pre-reset gas level prices. The fatalities are figured in the lower VMT.

Mr. Cowie asked considering financing, if the commuter rail extension down to Payson was planned at the front end of 2020 or more at the 2030 year. Mr. Eliot said the project needs a funding infusion with a tax increase or other financial infusion. UTA owns most of the track. A few places UDOT has to do some costly jumping for the track and the track has to be improved. At present, there is not funding allocated. Mr. Beckstrom asked if usage of the rail services have equaled or exceeded the early projections. Mr. Jackson said a concept is they will have it built, but there will not be sales tax revenues to operate it for a couple of years. At present, with a dramatic decline, it will be constructed but won't be used for a couple of years, because they don't have the funds to operate it. Mr. Eliot added the rail lines in Salt Lake have done better than when they first opened.

Mr. Jackson summarized his perception of the roads and transit systems. He said mayors ask why roads are not put in a location, which is the best place for it, and be done with the decision rather than working with the different cities. If MAG moved forward without discussion, there would be no controlled road development and flow of traffic. Although the ITE and engineers may say there is a "best place," MAG's reasons not to locate it there include not having money to put it in a specific location, politics are involved, or an uncooperative property owner. There are tradeoffs in the decision-making. MAG'S Board is represented by every mayor of every community plus the three county commissioners. MAG works with the different communities to make the plans work within their communities. In this effort of working as closely as possible with the cities, decisions on what is best for the municipalities, MAG acknowledges the political realities of working with property owners. Some owners will donate their land and others will go through a lengthy lawsuit.

Mr. Beckstrom said in dealing with the lake crossing proposal, there are cooperative end-points in place, and it appears to have minimal environmental impacts, at least compared to alternative alignments, and there is a private financier. Mr. Jackson replied said other aspects may enter into the equation, including as environmental or cultural aspects, such as an ancient native-American village.

Mr. Beckstrom noted MAG had bike and pedestrian projects in their plans. One of the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan is to have a trail around the perimeter of the lake close to the shoreline. He asked what the appropriate mechanism would be to get the Utah Lake trail conception included on the bike and pedestrian map. Mr. J. Price said plans are before the Utah County Commission to adopt a corridor or alignment so MAG can include it into their plans. MAG would prefer to see the Commission adopt the corridor through the unincorporated areas. Mr. Beckstrom said the Commission should have discussions with the county. Through Utah County's Master Plan, the Commission needs to work with high elevation planning and get the trail concept on MAG's long-range plans. Mr. J. Price said MAG had been trying to get the county to adopt a county-wide trail as planned. Mr. R. Price stated he talked to Mr. Richard Nielsen who said he would try to put funding for a transportation plan into this year's budget. Mr. J. Price said the trail could be shown as a vision.

Mr. R. Price thanked MAG for coming out and briefing the Technical Committee considering Utah Lake Commission's understanding what needs to be considered as proposals come forward. This meeting helped the Committee have an understanding about what MAG is thinking about in terms of future transportation-related issues, such as trails and roads. Mr. Beckstrom also thanked MAG for their presentation.

7. Adjourn.

Mr. Beckstrom reminded the Committee the meeting scheduled on Dec. 13 would be cancelled due to the holidays. If a meeting were held, it would be due to issues with the model ordinance or the bridge. If cancelled, the next following problem, that would be four weeks from today, Dec. 13. The next scheduled meeting will be January and Mr. R. Price will let everyone know the results of the Governing Board meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the meeting at 10:43.