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CHAPTER 1 – OVERVIEW & INTRODUCTION

2035 BACKGROUND AND REGIONAL INFORMATION

The Cache Valley Area Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the long-range transportation plan for the Logan Urbanized Area and the Utah portion of the greater Cache Valley area. The plan identifies specific projects that will be needed to meet the transportation demands of the region. At present, most travel in the region is by automobile. However, other modes such as public transit (buses), pedestrian, and bicycle transportation are becoming increasingly important. The RTP identifies future transportation investments for all modes.

Not unlike many communities across the nation, anticipated revenues are not sufficient to fund all the needed transportation improvements in Cache County. Therefore, this plan prioritizes projects for implementation to respond to financial constraints.

CACHE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

The Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) works with Cache County and ten of the nineteen incorporated cities in Cache County to oversee transportation planning activities for the Logan Urbanized Area (See Figure 1). Since transportation needs and problems do not end at the CMPO planning boundary, this plan includes all of Cache County. However, communities outside the CMPO planning area had less official involvement in the plan and are included only by way of general recommendations. However, for meeting the legal requirements of air quality analysis as part of transportation conformity required by the Federal Government, data for all of Cache County and a portion of Franklin County Idaho were used.

The oversight and planning/operational direction for the CMPO is provided by its Executive Council. This board is made up of elected officials from the 10 participating communities (in addition to the Cache County Executive). UDOT and CVTD also have one voting member on the board.

PLANNING PROCESS

This RTP attempts to build on and incorporate concepts and recommendations from previous efforts. Federal law requires the plan to be updated every five years. However the plan can be amended at any time.

The CMPO utilized a simple approach to completing this plan. This plan was developed in the following steps:

1) REGIONAL VISIONING/GOALS AND OBJECTIVES-
The CMPO partnered with the Envision Utah organization to complete a nearly year-long planning and public involvement effort. This effort engaged citizens from all 25 cities and towns in the greater Cache Valley area (including southern Idaho) through the use of interactive comprehensive growth alternative development workshops. Ultimately 53 alternative exploration maps were created by
workshop participants. This public input as well as results from a wider public opinion survey eventually led to the development of four alternative growth scenarios. These scenarios included detailed land use and transportation possible futures. The four scenarios were then evaluated as to their relative impacts in regard to various environmental, transportation and social impacts as well as cost of public service delivery. This information was again taken to the public in a series of 14 town hall meetings or via an online survey. This round of public input lead to the development of the “Cache Valley Vision” preferred land use and transportation scenario as well as a series of guiding Cache Valley Quality Growth Principles. Ultimately, this vision was endorsed by the Envision Cache Valley Steering Committee and the Cache Valley Regional Council.

2) NEEDS ASSESSMENT- Using the specific recommendations from the preferred alternative identified by the Envision Cache Valley process, various transportation projects and solutions were evaluated. To aid in this effort a computer based Travel Demand Model was used to analyze future travel demand and attempt to identify when and where new travel capacity might be most needed.

3) TRANSPORTATION VISION PLAN- This phase of the planning effort developed distinctive sets of transportation improvement recommendations.

a) 2035 Roadway, Transit and Non-motorized Vision Plans- The transportation system improvements suggested as needed to provide levels of transportation service at reasonable levels with anticipated population growth in the year 2035. This also identifies the portion of the 2035 Vision Plans that we can afford to build given a reasonable set of financial revenue assumptions.

b) Ultimate “Buildout” Roadway Vision Plan- Suggested roadway network improvements are needed to support the anticipated rough “buildout” of the known land use plans even beyond the year 2035.

REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The socioeconomic and land use characteristics of the greater Cache County area provide insight into the region’s transportation requirements. County level data provided by the State of Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB) was used for this plan.

POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS

In 2010 Cache County is estimated to have a population of about 113,000 in about 37,000 households. Based on GOPB projections, over the course of the planning horizon of this document, in the year 2035 the population is expected to increase to about 197,000 in about 72,000 households. This is an annual population growth rate of about 2.2%.

Out of roughly 3,000 counties in the United States, Cache County ranked 168 in terms of the rate of population growth from 2000 to 2009
(Source: US Census Bureau)

EMPLOYMENT

In 2010 Cache County’s total employment is estimated at just over 70,000. This is expected to increase to about 119,000 in the year 2035 broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12,605</td>
<td>18,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>12,389</td>
<td>21,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45,292</td>
<td>79,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70,287</td>
<td>119,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Cache Valley is served by a roadway network that makes up the backbone of the transportation system. The roadway network is made up of a variety of road types. Cache County has some state highways that serve higher speed and typically longer distance
mobility needs and the majority of freight truck traffic. Local minor arterial, collector and residential roads typically serve at lower speeds for shorter trip lengths. Cache County is thought to be one of the largest metro areas in the United States that is not directly associated with an interstate freeway system.

Transit buses use the road network to serve 11 fixed routes in greater Logan area and two commuter routes serving a number of outlying north and south valley communities. The Cache Valley Transit District also serves a commuter route to southern Idaho in Franklin County (see Figure 2).

Bicyclist often travel directly on roads. To accommodate this use, a number of roads in Logan City and surrounding communities have bicycle lane striping or share use markings (called sharrows). A number of roads have been designated as bike routes. A portion of these routes have been signed with bike route markings (see Figure 3).

Most of the roadways in the more urbanized communities in Cache County are served by pedestrian sidewalks. However, in many of the older neighborhoods sidewalks are often in need of maintenance or repair and frequently significant gaps exist in the system.

Many communities in Cache County are also served by an expanding network of shared use paths and trails. Often these are in separate rights-of-ways from roadways. While many of these facilities have a purely recreation function, many also serve the mobility needs of commuters or other types of users.

Cache County is also served by a rail “spur” of the Union Pacific Railroad main trunk line. Currently about one train a day uses the rail line in Cache Valley.

The Cache Valley Airport serves mostly personal and private commercial aviation needs and some commercial freight service. Ongoing efforts have been directed to position the airport in the future to resume commercial passenger air service.

AIR QUALITY

Portions of Cache County, Utah and Franklin County, Idaho were designated by the Environmental Protection Agency as “non-attainment” for fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) on December 14, 2009. This means Cache County was found to have particulate matter air pollution levels in excess of the parameters established by the federal Clean Air Act Amendments. Emissions from on-road mobile sources (trucks and automobiles) are certainly a significant contributor to the county’s air quality problem. According to federal regulations, a plan must be developed to demonstrate how this non-attainment area will reduce pollution levels to acceptable levels within a specified timeframe. Sometime in 2012 the Utah State Department of Environmental Quality will complete the State Implementation Plan (SIP) that will detail this strategy. This plan will include a on-road mobile source emissions budget by which all future transportation plans must then document compliance. This process is called transportation “conformity”.

Since the SIP and the associated mobile source emissions budget will not be completed when this plan is scheduled for adoption, a federally approved “interim” conformity analysis was completed.

This conformity test requires that future targeted emissions are lower than 2008 levels. This includes emissions that are a result of future growth in vehicles miles traveled (including that derived from any planned regionally significant highway or transit projects). The projects contained in the Financially Constrained Vision Plans comply with the requirements of interim PM$_{2.5}$ transportation conformity.

All regionally significant projects, regardless of funding source (federal, state, or local) are included in the CMPO RTP. Regionally significant projects are identified as those projects functionally classified as principal arterial or higher, or certain minor arterials as identified through the interagency consultation process. At the time of this document preparation, Cache County has not designated any minor arterials as regionally significant. This action will be considered as needed in the future and in accordance with interagency consultation procedures. Any amendments to this plan that add or substantially change the scope of any regionally significant project will require a new air quality conformity analysis.
Figure 2: Existing Roadway Network & Transit (Bus) Routes
Figure 3: Existing Bicycle, Trails and Pedestrian Pathways
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE

Transportation and land use patterns are inextricably linked. Roadway construction can have a great influence on patterns of land development.

Construction of roadways provides new access to land. Ideally, land use planning policy is mindful of the transportation system needed to support the resulting development. However, this is made difficult because often local communities must blend new development with already developed neighborhoods with a long ago established system of roads. Today in Cache Valley, land use policy makers are often left to deal the result of land development decisions that date back, in some cases, over 100 years when walking or horse buggies were the main form of transportation. In some of the more rapidly urbanizing communities, these historic development patterns often conflict with the modern transportation system needed to support current and future population growth.

The Envision Cache Valley process succeeded in linking long-term development decision making in Cache Valley with the general type and form of the transportation system that will likely be needed. This was done by exploring various tradeoffs and gauging the relative acceptance on the part of the public. However, implementation of this vision at a community level will be the ongoing challenge.

Policy makers and decision makers should be mindful of the rather complex interaction between transportation and land use. For example:

- Will building another “by-pass” road in Cache Valley to relieve Main Street traffic congestion also encourage new sprawling development?
- How do we balance the desire for commercial access with maintaining vehicle capacity on Cache County’s few critical principle arterial roads?
- What level and type of roadway expansion is acceptable through or near established residential neighborhoods?
- Are we going to locate future schools or other centers of high activity in communities to allow for mostly shorter trips that are most accessible by walking or biking?
- What is the cumulative impact on the transportation system of typically lower density, incremental development in the unincorporated portions of Cache County?
- What is the most cost effective way to serve the transportation mobility needs of current and future development?
- Who should pay the cost of the future transportation system?

DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY

While increased development density may create higher travel demand in a specific area, overall it generally encourages shorter auto trips and also a higher percentage of pedestrian, transit and bicycle use.

The density and location of residential and employment development is particularly important for the cost-effectiveness of providing public transit service. Transit service operates most effectively when there is a concentration of activity, particularly for residential and employment locations.

Envision Cache Valley’s preferred or “Vision” alternative contemplates a more compact growth pattern than in the past. The Cache Valley Vision
recommends that most of the new growth be accommodated in, and around already established towns and cities. This recommendation suggests that much of the new growth to 2035 can be accommodated by appropriately situated (and well designed) mixed-use neighborhoods, and a combination of various neighborhood, town and city centers.

It also encourages land to be more effectively used through redevelopment or increased infill development in already established communities.

The willingness of individual communities to implement the “Cache Valley Vision” will have a significant impact on the future transportation system for Cache County.

UTAH’S UNIFIED PLAN

As with the previous 2030 Regional Transportation Plan effort, the CMPO participated in a coordinated planning effort with UDOT and the four other Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the State of Utah as well as the Utah Transit Authority and Cache Valley Transit District and the Federal Highway Administration for the completion of this plan. This coordination effort will eventually result in the production of a combined plan document (Utah’s Unified Plan) that summarizes the priorities of all transportation planning agencies in the state of Utah. In addition, this effort has also worked to manage a common completion schedule and provide for consistency with core financial assumptions and other planning approaches.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

With regard to the front end development of this plan, the CMPO partnered with the Envision Utah Organization and participated in the Envision Cache Valley process for public involvement. Alone, the CMPO would have a very difficult time generating the interest and public involvement achieved through the Envision Cache Valley Process. In addition, the Envision Cache Valley approach gave considerable focus to gaining informed public comment related to various transportation options and how they interact with land use. The CMPO worked with the Envision Utah staff to provide transportation data and travel model support. This very extensive and interactive public involvement effort is well documented in the final report that can be found at: http://www.envisioncachevalley.com/

STAKEHOLDER GROUP INVOLVEMENT

On October 26, 2010, along with the other transportation planning agencies in the state, the CMPO met with federal and state resource agencies to provide information, answer questions and receive input.

The CMPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee provided input and recommendation for the draft plan as did a number of other community and civic stakeholder groups.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION

The CMPO coordinated and received input from participating local jurisdictions through direct involvement and the Cache Technical Advisory Committee (CTAC). This group is made up of city staff (planning and/or public works) from participating communities as well as CVTD and UDOT.

DRAFT PLAN PUBLIC COMMENT

The draft plan will be opened for written public comment for thirty days early in 2011. These comments will be considered in the preparation of the final draft that is anticipated for adoption by the CMPO Executive Council in June 2011.
CHAPTER 2—GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

In 2005 the Federal Government passed the bill known as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act-A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This bill identified eight planning factors that need to be considered when doing regional transportation planning at the metropolitan level.

1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
4) Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight.
5) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
7) Promote efficient system management and operation.
8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

ENVISION CACHE VALLEY-QUALITY GROWTH PRINCIPLES

The following principles were developed as overarching goals to guide the implementation of the Cache Valley Vision developed through the Envision Cache Valley Process. Inclusion of these goals in the RTP indicates general endorsement of these principles in terms of guiding of transportation planning and prioritization on the part of the CMPO’s Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Council.

1) Enhance existing towns and cities and maintain individual community identity by encouraging inward growth and more compact development and buffering community boundaries with agrarian and natural lands.
2) Encourage mixed-use neighborhoods and town centers that include a variety of housing options and that allow individuals and families to live close to where they shop, obtain services, go to school, work and play.
3) Develop clean and sustainable industry and good-paying jobs close to home.
4) Provide a balanced transportation network with improved roadway connections, enhanced public transportation options, and streets that encourage bicyclist and pedestrian mobility.
5) Invest in efficient infrastructure systems to serve existing communities and future growth. These systems manage such services as water, sewer, waste disposal, and energy.
6) Protect, preserve and improve air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat, agricultural land and the scenic beauty of Cache Valley.
7) Maintain and improve access to recreation by connecting local recreational amenities to a regional network.
8) Expand local recreation systems, providing small parks located near where people live and linked by trails for walking and biking.
9) Encourage close coordination among local governments, school districts, universities, businesses, and places of worship to address growth issues and implement the Cache Valley Vision.

2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES

In addition to the goals and guiding principles already described, the CMPO endorses the following goals and objectives as a guide to development of this plan and future planning efforts.
CMPO 2035 RTP GOALS

**Goal # 1:** Provide increased mobility for persons and freight through a balanced and inter-connected transportation system.

**Objective 1.a Roadway Capacity**
Maintain regional vehicle hours of delay at present level as inflated by population growth rate.

**Objective 1.b Complete Streets**
Build arterial and collector streets as “complete streets”, accommodating automobiles, bikes, buses and sidewalks (See Figure 4).

**Objective 1.c Transportation Choice**
Develop and maintain a public transit system that enhances mobility choices and increases per capita ridership. Develop and maintain a system of safe and efficient pedestrian and bikeways connecting neighborhoods with activity centers.

**Goal # 2:** Increase transportation safety for all modes

**Goal # 3:** Protect and preserve existing transportation systems and opportunities.

**Objective 3.a Access Management**
Manage access to major facilities to maintain throughput and encourage compatible land uses.

**Objective 3.b Corridor Preservation**
Preserve needed future transportation corridors early.

**Goal # 4:** Provide a transportation system that protects the environment and improves the quality of life.

**Objective 4.a Neighborhood Impact**
Roadway widening that may impact existing neighborhoods should be avoided to the extent possible.

**Objective 4.b Vehicle Miles Traveled**
Implement projects and policies that help reduce the growth rate of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to be more consistent with the rate of population growth.

Figure 4: Example of Arterial “Complete Street”
CHAPTER 3—NEEDS ANALYSIS

With significant growth in population and employment, the current transportation system will not be sufficient to accommodate future growth. This chapter provides some information and analysis on components of Cache County’s future transportation needs.

ROADWAY NEEDS

Cache County is served by a network of arterial roads and highways primarily owned and maintained by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Four of these roads serve as the main entrances and exits out of Cache Valley. Managing these roads to maximize throughput capacity is of critical importance.

Over the past two decades the amount of daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by Cache County resident’s has increased at a higher rate than population growth.

This data includes a recent drop in VMT (2008 & 2009) attributed to the recent downturn in the economy (See Figure 5). The reason for VMT outpacing population growth might be attributed to a combination of a more scattered residential growth pattern, higher per family car ownership and perhaps a general trend toward a more mobile lifestyle (traffic engineers assume the average single family home today completes 10 departing and return trips per day).

Over the last two decades in Cache County, daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has increased on average by 4.2% per year while population grew only 3%.

LOGAN’S MAIN STREET CORRIDOR

Highway 89/91 is the main backbone roadway in Cache County. It, along with Highway 165 extending to Hyrum and other southern communities serves the majority of internal longer distance Cache County trips. Currently, for the most part, these roads function fairly well with minimal traffic congestion related delays. The exception is Logan City Main Street. Logan City not only has the largest residential population in the area (generating its own travel demand), but portions also serves as the main shopping, recreation and employment center of the region. Geographically located in the center of the more populated portion of Cache County, Logan’s Main Street is often the point of convergence for those with north or south valley destinations (or simply passing through).

The sheer number of vehicles (nearly 40,000 annual average daily trips) combined with a need to accommodate more east/west cross traffic (i.e. number of intersections) results in fairly routine peak hour traffic congestion in the downtown area mostly due to intersection capacity failure. During these times of peak hours, any benefits from signal timing and coordination is also significantly reduced.

The relatively congested condition of Logan Main Street has led to a “spill over” effect onto some of the more accommodating nearby parallel roads. In terms of north/south mobility, Logan City has a limited number of higher functioning alternatives to Main Street. This is especially true when you consider the alternative routes that can serve the travel demand directly associated with Main Street commercial/retail corridor.
A few parallel collector type roads that many years ago likely served to accommodate only inter-neighborhood traffic are increasingly being used to supply Logan Main Street spill-over travel demand capacity. Currently on the east side of Logan, 100 and 200 East (and to a lesser degree 600 east) serve this purpose. On the West side of Logan’s Main Street, 100 west (and more recently 200 west) provides some “spill over” travel demand capacity. Further to the west, 600 West and 1000 West provides some alternative Main Street capacity, however much of the traffic on these roads already have origins/designations directly on the corridor (or use the roads to serve as a bypass).

One of the challenges with this spill-over of Main Street travel demand is that many of these roads are often already largely built out with development. Much of this development is historic residential neighborhoods. This limits the type of capacity improvements that can be made to the road as residents raise concerns about the safety and other neighborhood impacts associated with accommodating increased traffic. In most cases, these roads are currently not anticipated for improvements beyond building them to a major collector road standard.

In much of Logan City, in the future impacts related to the spill-over of Main Street traffic is anticipated to continue. With Main Street becoming more congested and as the limited adjacent parallel capacity fills up (200 east in Logan already has about 11,000 cars a day) motorists will seek other alternatives. Motorists will increasingly use other parallel routes through residential neighborhoods provided by the historic Logan City roadway grid pattern.

As the main arterial backbone transportation facility in Cache County Hwy 89/91 it is anticipated that any future “premium” public transit (light rail or bus rapid transit) would need to be integrated on or near the corridor to be successful (this may include a dedicated lane).

**ROADWAY NETWORK: EXISTING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE**

A useful way to identify future roadway needs is to analyze how the existing system would perform in the planning horizon year of 2035. For purpose of this analysis, the “existing” system also includes those projects that are not yet built, but have committed funding (1000 West project).

---

**Figure 5: Cache Average Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Verses Population Growth**

![Graph showing Cache Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled /Population Growth](chart.png)

Data sources: VMT data UDOT HPMS data
Population data Utah State GDP

---

Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization
Figure 6: Year 2035 Peak Hour Traffic Congestion (Modeled) with No Roadway Improvements
With projected growth in population and employment, significant traffic congestion will occur if no additional improvements to the transportation system are made (See Figure 6: areas of projected congestion are shown in red).

Areas of particular concern for future traffic congestion include:

- Logan City Downtown area (East and West)
- Roads around Utah State University (including Hwy 89)

PUBLIC TRANSIT NEEDS

An increasingly large segment of Cache County’s population do not have access or are not able to drive. These individuals are either not of driving age, lack physical capacity to drive or do not own a vehicle. For many of these individuals, as well as many students attending Utah State University, the fixed route bus service provided by the Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD) is essential for their daily mobility needs. Cache County is also expected to have an increasing percentage of elderly that will need to rely on transit.

U.S. Census data from 2005-2009 shows 1.9% of those employed in Cache County commuted to work via bus (2.8% for Logan City). Additional public transit service (service area expansion or increased frequency of service) would be necessary to attract more “non-ride dependent” drivers to leave their vehicles at home and ride the CVTD bus system. Certainly this dynamic will change over time as more roads are congested with traffic and transit gains attractiveness in terms of travel time and convenience. The cost of gasoline also influences transit ridership.

Currently the CVTD provides “fixed-route” bus service for much of Cache County (See Figure 2). Service is more extensive and frequent in the populated and more urban core of Logan and surrounding communities. Less frequent express type commuter routes also serve outlying communities including Preston Idaho.

CVTD completes an update of their Short Range Transit Plan every five years (see Appendix 6). This effort evaluates the efficiency of the system, analyses any needed changes or expansion options and provides implementation recommendations. This RTP will be updated to be reflective of future updates.

SERVICE EXPANSION

As Cache County grows new locations of employment and residential housing will need to be served by transit service. Routinely, the CVTD undergoes a process to decide how best to allocate bus service changes with the resources they have available. This is designed to ensure optimization in allocating service to fully capitalize on ridership potential. This important effort will need to continue with periodic adjustments to bus routes and frequency of service as well as passenger amenities.

Longer term needs include:

- Commuter service between Logan and Ogden (Brigham City when served by commuter rail service)
- Circulator Shuttles to serve growing internal needs of communities
- A new larger maintenance facility to support the growing requirements of the CVTD system
- Additional express bus routes that may eventually transition to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

SPECIAL NEEDS PUBLIC TRANSIT

For those individuals not able to ride the fixed route buses due to a documented physical or mental limitation, CVTD also provides “para-transit” bus service. This need is anticipated to grow with Cache County’s anticipated elderly demographic anticipated changes. In addition to CVTD, a large number of private
and non-profit entities provide limited transportation services for individuals with special needs. Often, the extent of these services is limited by the mission of the organization and/or the source and availability of funding.

As currently organized, it is often a real challenge for individuals with specialized transportation needs to get the services they require. Very often the transportation component is an ancillary service provided to allow access to other services provided by the organization. For example, curb-side bus pickup is provided for seniors to get to the senior center for services such as congregate meals. The service contract with the senior center may be for providing the meals. The transportation component, while eligible, is nonetheless limited in amount and purpose. Many of the non-profits that provide transportation services would much rather focus on the services related to their core mission and not have to concern themselves with the mobility needs of their clients. They do it because there is no other option.

The end result of the fractured and often overlapping provision of public transportation services for special needs populations does result in many inefficiencies and serious gaps in service. For example, on any given day in Cache County, one or more public or non-profit agencies might dispatch a bus to pick up a client in one of the outlying communities. Even though the bus may be nearly empty with plenty of remaining seating capacity, it may well drive right past the home of another special needs client of some other organization (that may have very similar ending destinations). However, for a host of reasons (e.g. liability, funding source restrictions, lack of a coordinating mechanism) the trips are not consolidated and two separate trips are made to nearly identical locations.

The CMPO’s Coordinated Human Service Transit Plan (see Appendix 2) and Bear River Association of Government’s Regional Mobility Management Plan recognize this coordination concern and suggest some interim steps that eventually lead to substantial consolidated centralized special need transportation service provision.

### TRANSIT AND LAND USE

The efficiency and cost effectiveness of transit service is very much dependent on the pattern and type of development in the service area. Based on national research applied locally, decision makers in Cache County can maximize the ridership effectiveness of current and future CVTD investments as it relates to influencing land use by (Johnson 2003):

1. increasing residential and commercial density in the areas near transit corridors
2. concentrating mixed-use development within an eighth mile of transit corridors, and
3. channeling a greater proportion of retail development within a quarter mile of transit lines.

These recommendations are consistent with recommendations found in the Envision Cache Valley Report.

Public transit often faces a “chicken-and-egg” problem: it’s hard to fully justify transit systems unless there’s sufficient population density and/or adequate employment and shopping concentration, yet it’s more difficult to persuade people to live in denser neighborhoods or to build more concentrated commercial development unless they come with the advantage of transit access.

### BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN NEEDS

Walking or bicycling is a healthy and viable alternative to the automobile for many trips. In fact, for many that are not of driving age it may be the only alternative. Also, most transit trips will begin or end with some amount of biking or walking.
As Cache County grows and develops so does the need for facilities that accommodate the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. These amenities will include sidewalks, shared use paths, street pavement markings and additional bike route signage.

**PEDESTRIAN NEEDS**

One of the primary considerations in meeting the needs of pedestrians is safety. Pedestrians need adequate sidewalks and safe street crossing opportunities.

In 2009, Logan City was designated as the “most walkable” community in Utah by the Bonneville Research Corporation. Data for Logan City shows a high percentage of commuters for who walking is their main mode of transportation to work.

Most communities in Cache County do a good job of requiring sidewalks (where appropriate) for new development. However development of a continuous efficient pedestrian system is dependent on many factors. Some of the problems in the more urban portions of the county include:

- Missing or deteriorated sidewalks
- Lack of connectivity to major activity centers
- Difficulty with enforcing wintertime sidewalk snow removal
- Accessibility issues for those with a physical limitation
- Less than friendly pedestrian street crossings
- Additional bicycle storage near transit stops.

In rural areas the issues are more unique and site specific. One of the problems is lack of sidewalks or shared use paths as a pedestrian alternative on busier county or state roads that link activities centers or even adjacent communities. For example track team students at Mountain Crest High School often run on the narrow shoulder of State Highway 165 between Hyrum and Paradise Town. Often problems surface when a new school is located and the deficiencies of an inadequate supporting pedestrian system become apparent. Such was the case with the opening of the Mountain Side Elementary School in Mendon.

In the more rural areas, the cost of installing adequate and safe pedestrian supporting infrastructure can be too expensive for many city budgets mostly due to the distances involved.

**BICYCLE NEEDS**

For many, the bicycle is a viable alternative to the automobile. Increased bicycle use as a mode of transportation can play an important role in helping the region improve air quality, reduce congestion and contribute to the overall health of Cache County residents. Working to accommodate and encourage this trend helps to develop a more balance transportation system.

_Census data from 2005 to 2009 indicates 10% of workers in Logan walk to work. For reference, this is higher than Davis California and Boulder Colorado (two communities typically thought of as pedestrian friendly)._
BICYCLING OPTIONS

It is increasingly being recognized that there are various types of commuting and recreation cycling populations. A recent study done for Portland City classified types of cyclist as follows:

“Strong and Fearless” (<1%)—will generally ride regardless of the roadway or weather conditions and prefer direct, unimpeded, quick routes that tend to be along more major roads (collector and arterials).

“Enthused and Confident” (7%)-are generally comfortable sharing the roadway with automotive traffic, but would prefer to do so operating on their own facility.

“Interested but Concerned” (60%)-are those individuals that have some safety concern about riding amongst traffic. This group is less interested in speed and tend to seek greater comfort and a enhanced sense of safety found on more minor roads or separate paths.

“No Way, No How” (33%)-those not interested in bicycling at all.

The percentages listed are the percent of population estimates for Portland. Certainly the separation between these four broad groups is not always clear-cut and riders can change in categorization. Nonetheless, understanding the different types of cyclist suggests the need to provide a multi-level cycling system that caters to different types of cyclists.

This categorization can also be helpful in deciding how to allocate resources for improvements designed to encourage more cycling and less auto dependent travel. Different levels of cyclist feel comfortable on different types of facilities. These include separated shared paths, designated bicycle lanes, or bike routes that share vehicle lanes.

BICYCLE PARKING

Providing convenient parking accommodations for bikes will help encourage more cycling use. Safe and secure bicycle parking should be provided as necessary in parks, schools, libraries, recreational centers and other activity centers. Bike racks should be required of all new major commercial or retail development.

Covered bike racks are needed in locations with a high concentration of cycling use and near transit stops.

CONNECTING DESTINATIONS

Cyclist and pedestrians require safe and convenient connections between their residence and destination such as school, employment, entertainment or shopping destinations. Figure 7 shows many of the major activity centers throughout Cache County that should be a priority for ensuring safe and accommodating bicycle and pedestrian access.

Some areas of particular concern include:

- Logan Boulevard Trail endpoint connections (street crossing).
- Highway 89 (400 North) areas below Utah State University (street crossings)
- Downtown Logan (Main Street crossings)
- South Logan “Y” Intersection Area (Main Street and Highway 165 Street crossings)
- Mendon Road from Logan to Mendon (shoulder widening)
- Highway 23 from Wellsville to Mendon (shoulder widening and shared path)
- Highway 165 from Hyrum to Paradise (shoulder widening and shared path)
- State Route 30, Logan between 1st and 6th West (street crossings)
- Highway 101 from Hyrum to Wellsville (shoulder widening)
- 600 West, Logan (shoulder widening)
- 400 East, North Logan (shoulder widening)

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION

The CMPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) has identified bicycle and pedestrian safety education as a high priority. This is an ongoing need for public education targeted to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of motor vehicles to increase awareness and knowledge of appropriate roles, laws and responsibilities.
Figure 7: Cache County Major Activity Centers
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FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

As the “crossroads of the west”, Utah plays a major role in the movement of freight across the United States. The smooth flow of freight in and out of Cache County is of critical importance to continued economic vitality of the region.

TRUCK FREIGHT

Truck transportation represents the largest mode for freight to and from Cache County. According to the Transearch commodity movement database from Global Insight Inc., Cache County in 2007 imported over 2.4 million tons of freight valued at $2.2 billion. For that same time period, Cache County exported just under 1 million tons of freight valued at $1.6 billion.

Accommodating the needs of truck freight movement in Cache County today and in the future are of critical importance. A large portion of the employment in Cache County is dependent on industries that require reasonable freight mobility in, out and through Cache County. Also, the availability and price of consumer goods and services in Cache County is directly linked to the level of mobility for freight.

For the most part, roadways that are built to accommodate higher volumes of cars and light trucks generally also work well for trucks. Recent local input received from truck drivers and freight industry representative (see appendix ?) highlight the need for roads with adequate shoulders that do not have a great deal of residential use. Inadequate intersections are often identified as major problems for truck drivers. With the increase trailer lengths of many trucks, inadequate intersection turning radiuses presents a significant problem for trucks. Most of the local input from freight industry representatives centered on the need to improve specific intersection turn radiuses. Many of those intersections are on 1000 West which is scheduled for major reconstruction in 2011-2012.

TRUCK FREIGHT ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS

In 2007, 70% of the truck freight by tonnage and 82% of the truck freight by value from within the state of Utah that was brought to Cache County originated from counties located on the Wasatch Front. These same Wasatch Front counties received 60% of the in state truck freight by tonnage and 73% of the truck freight by value exported from Cache County.

When considering freight outside the state of Utah in 2007, Casper Wyoming (26.3%) and Franklin County Idaho (7.6%) are the top contributors to freight imported into Cache County by weight. Likewise, Los Angeles California receives the most freight exported by weight from Cache County (13.4%).

In terms of the dollar value of freight imported into Cache County from outside the state of Utah in 2007, a number of counties mostly in the western United States contributed. These included Maricopa County Arizona (5%), Spokane Washington (4.9%), Billings Montana (4.5%) and Los Angeles County California (4.4%) with the remainder scattered across the United States. In terms of where Cache County exports truck freight out of the State, over 30% of the freight (by value) had destinations somewhere on the west coast.
CACHE RAIL FREIGHT

Cache County is served by the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad on the Cache Valley Branch. Indirectly, Cache County is also served by rail service via Union Pacific’s Salt Lake City Intermodel Terminal. At this facility, rail containers can be transferred on or off trucks for transport to destinations to or from Cache County.

The Salt Lake City terminal serves much of the intermountain west. For the foreseeable future, Cache County has nowhere near the volume of rail freight to justify the expense of developing its own intermodal terminal.

One of the most important assets for Cache County and its ability to attract future businesses is the retention of railroad service. Further, the future of possible rail passenger transit service would be eliminated without the preservation of the Cache Valley Branch Line.

Retention of Cache County’s railroad service in the future largely hinges on the ability for Union Pacific to keep the service profitable. This can be helped locally by encouraging and facilitating the location of new business and industry on the rail line to generate new business for Union Pacific.

CACHE AIR FREIGHT

Air freight is the smallest component of the freight transportation system serving Cache County. However, often the goods shipped by air are of higher value and more time sensitive items that can be important to the regional economy. The United Parcel Service (UPS) provides one afternoon flight from the Logan Municipal Airport to the Salt Lake International Airport each weekday. However, air freight for Cache County is primarily a service provided by the Salt Lake International Airport.

TRANSPORTATION SAFETY NEEDS

As a member of the Utah Safety Leadership Team, the CMPO participated with other stakeholder groups and agencies in the development of the Utah Comprehensive Safety Plan. While statewide in focus, this plan provided the analysis framework for investigating local transportation safety issues. The stated goal of this plan is to improve transportation safety for all modes.

CRASH DATA

Statistics that document types, severity and contributing factors can be very helpful in identifying problem areas or safety issues. However, one needs to exercise caution when drawing conclusions from crash data. A higher number of crashes at a particular location does not necessarily indicate a problem or a roadway deficiency. Locations with a concentration of higher volume transportation activity will likely have more crashes. It is often more useful to analyze the crash data in terms of crash rates or comparisons with other locations.

In terms of crashes per mile, Highway 91 and 1400 north in Logan has a higher than expected frequency of crashes.

Additionally, Cache County has a number of intersections with safety issues scattered throughout the county. However, due to relatively low volumes of traffic they may not have the frequency of crashes as in the more populated urban areas. Inadequate shoulder
width is also a significant contributor to roadway departure crashes in rural portions of the county.

The identified needs are beyond the control of the CMPO and require partnerships with other agencies and groups. Nonetheless, the CMPO’s long range planning process can identify those areas where progress can be made on implementation.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Engineering
- Increase the shoulder width on new and reconstructed roads.
- Complete a fully accessible sidewalk network in more urban areas (also require of new development).

Education
- Provide public education on who to call to report maintenance issues (street sweeping, system repairs etc.).
- Provide safe cycling training to middle school aged children and adults.
- Provide public education to improve the safety of motorized scooters and bicycles.
- Expand drivers education curriculum to include information on bicycling safety.

Enforcement
- Select a focus day to conduct some high profile targeted bicycle law enforcement in the region.
- Implement a “did you know” public service announcement education campaign for bicycle and pedestrian safety.
- Provide coordination for law enforcement to ensure a complete and consistent understanding of laws related to bicycles and pedestrians.

DROWSY & DISTRACTED DRIVING

Engineering
- Install more rumble strips in road sides and middle
- Safe stopping areas (rest areas). Enhance commercial rest stop partnerships.

Education
- Provide more education outreach to schools and general public. Use real stories that convey the impact to families and individuals. Partner with perpetrators and victims (public service requirement).
- Require or voluntarily offer 2 hour drivers’ education session targeted to parents.
- Encourage people to not use mobile devises of any kind while driving.
Enforcement
- Work toward getting more unmarked police cars out on the road. Utilize more police motorcycles.
- Penalties should be enhanced when an infraction results in a fatality. This would require a change in laws (Similar to New Jersey’s “Maggie’s Law”).

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Engineering
Where possible, provide for wider travel lanes as a safety buffer.

Education
- Provide more public service announcements on specific holidays that are known to have problems.
- More education targeting college age students.
- Provide public education related to the dangers of using legal prescription drugs while driving.
- Provide some more graphic result based education to increase the shock value of the message.
- Provide some public recognition or praise for people that report an impaired driver when it results in an arrest.

Enforcement
- Expand the amount of DUI enforcement blitzes and saturation patrols on holidays which are known to have problems.
  Determine a way to increase law enforcement capacity for large public events or private parties that occur in Forest Service Areas.

YOUNGER (TEEN) DRIVING

Engineering
- Monitor emerging “vehicle monitoring and accountability technology” and encourage parents to use when available and affordable.

Education
- Consider requiring younger drivers to attend periodic follow-up drivers education training.
- Encourage and facilitate more peer based training.
- Capitalize on perpetrator and victim based training.
- Consider obtaining driver simulator technology and facilities.

Enforcement
- Work toward increasing the penalties (cost and driving points) for serious moving violation that involve younger drivers and passengers.
- Develop a reporting program that is centered around a “How’s my Teen Driving” bumper sticker that provides a number to call.
- Provide a mechanism where someone can report road violations or unsafe behavior by teen drivers where an information letter and safety information will be sent. It could be patterned after the “blue card” program for reporting violation of child restraint laws.
CHAPTER 4- ENVISION CACHE VALLEY

ENVISION Cache Valley PROCESS

With the help of the Envision Utah Organization, many residents of the Cache Valley (including Southern Idaho) participated in numerous “visioning” workshops held throughout the valley over the course of about one year. This process allowed citizens and community officials to explore various land use and transportation solutions as to how to accommodate the expected population growth. This effort resulted in the aggregation of themes into four alternative growth scenarios. Information about the relative trade-offs of these alternatives were provided and another round of public involvement workshops eventually culminated in the production of the “Cache Valley Vision” or recommended preferred alternative. The Vision describes a set of land use recommendations as well as suggested transportation solutions. A copy of the Envision Cache Valley final report can be found in appendix 9.

ENVISION Cache Valley TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the recommendations of the Vision as it relates to transportation include (See Figure 8):

- Improved Roadway Connections -- Maximize connectivity providing multiple routes to destinations. Better connections for local roads.
- Enhanced Public Transportation Options-- Future Bus Rapid Transit, increased express bus service and peak-time bus loops as well as working to facilitate more peak-time vanpools.
- Additional Bike Commute Routes -- Make possible roadway Improvements and signage for suggested routes that link many of the communities.
- Mobility for Everyone -- Context sensitive design, construction and operation of streets to support all users including pedestrians, bicyclist and those riding public transportation.
- Infrastructure Efficiency -- Strive for a shorter road network that costs least to construct and maintain.
Figure 8: Envision Cache Valley Transportation Recommendation
CHAPTER 5 - CMPO TRANSPORTATION VISION PLANS (2035 & BEYOND)

The Cache Transportation Vision Plan shows roadway, bicycle, transit and pedestrian projects that attempt to address the needs identified in the previous sections. The plan attempts to define what is needed and also what we can afford to build given the anticipated future revenues. This exercise is necessary to produce a “fiscally constrained” plan as required by the federal government. This also helps local jurisdictions understand the resources available and what funding gaps might exist. The Transportation Vision Plans also attempts to implement the recommendations from the Cache Valley Vision recommendation that was the result of the Envision Cache Valley process. Collectively these plans constitute the CMPO’s long term vision of the future as it relates to Cache County’s transportation system. In most cases the improvements described in the plans are consistent with the planning documents of participating local jurisdictions. The contents of the CMPO Vision Plans constitute recommendations and become “official” only as recognized by the individual jurisdiction’s planning documents.

2035 TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Funding assumptions for the 2011 update to the 2035 Cache Regional Transportation Plan are based on coordination between the four Utah MPOS (Cache, Dixie, Wasatch Front, and Mountainland) and UDOT. Utah follows an advanced practice in the development of a Unified Transportation Plan, encompassing a summary of the Regional Transportation Plan of each of the four MPOS as well as the rural areas planned by UDOT. In order to ensure consistency for this Unified Plan, each individual Regional Transportation Plan followed a common set of demographic, financial, cost estimating, and related assumptions. Therefore, the cost assumptions included in the CMPO Regional Transportation Plan Update are consistent with those made statewide.

This section is a response to the Federal requirement to produce a “financially constrained” Regional Transportation Plan. Future transportation funding assumptions are developed for planning purposes only. They do not suggest endorsement of any particular tax or transportation funding solution on the part of the CMPO or the Executive Council. This effort is also not intended to craft optimal public taxing policy to fund transportation infrastructure. Rather it is a statewide attempt to develop a reasonable set of funding assumptions that are based, at least in part on the history of the Federal Government and the Utah State Legislature as it relates to funding transportation infrastructure. The amount and identified funding mechanisms in all likelihood will end up different than what is described. Increased statewide economic growth that results in greater than expected increase in revenue from existing funding sources would also eliminate the need to even consider additional funding sources.

2035 STATEWIDE FUNDING ASSUMPTIONS

The following statewide assumptions regarding long-term funding for transportation projects in Utah are drawn collectively from all concurrent transportation plans (part of Utah’s Unified Plan) and included in the CMPO Regional Transportation Plan.

- Federal funds and programs are projected to increase at a rate of two percent per year.
- State B&C program are projected to continue at present 30 percent of total fuel tax revenue.
- All financial assumptions are presented in future year dollar values including inflation.
- Currently 50% of all auto related sales tax statewide goes to dedicated funding sources for transportation. The remainder goes to the Utah State general fund. For planning purposes, it is assumed that by 2015, 75% of auto related sales tax statewide is dedicated to transportation with that increasing to 100% by 2017. This does not represent any new tax, rather a reallocation of how the existing tax revenue is allocated.
- For planning purposes, the revenue projections generated for this report assumes a 5 cent increase in statewide fuel tax (or some other equivalent) in 2014, 2024 and 2034.
- For planning purposes, this report assumes a $10 statewide increase in vehicle registration fees in 2018, 2028 and 2038.
2035 Local Transportation Funding Assumptions

- Voter approved, additional ¼ cent local option sales tax for transportation sometime before 2017.

2035 Estimated Highway Funding for Cache County

After applying the funding assumptions as described, Cache County’s total 2035 estimated available roadway capacity funding is $712 million. This includes all anticipated Federal ($53 million), State ($497 million) and local funds ($166 million).

However, it should be noted that this assumes an even distribution of state’s capacity transportation improvement funds based on Cache County’s share of the state’s population (currently 4%). Based on this approach (state Unified Plan method) state funds are the largest source of available roadway capacity funding anticipated for Cache County.

While this is a reasonable approach for long term planning purposes, it does pose somewhat of a challenge for Cache County. Unless there is a change in state policy, state appropriated capacity funds can only be applied on state (UDOT) roads. Also, in practice the state appropriated funds are not distributed based on any geographic equity formula using the county’s population. The Utah Transportation Commission allocates these funds based largely on statewide transportation and traffic congestion need. Lacking an interstate freeway and also being somewhat underserved by existing state routes that are well positioned and therefore attractive for UDOT improvements, Cache County has not historically been allocated (on average) 4% of the state’s transportation capacity funding. In addition to lacking eligible state roads, this is also largely because Cache County must compete for state (UDOT) funding with bigger urban areas in the state with higher levels of congestion and in some cases faster population growth rates.

For purposes of this plan, the CMPO assumption is that Cache County will receive 2% of the statewide highway capacity increasing funds in all years of the plan (see Figure 9 & Table 3). Under this assumption, just over $712 million in total funds are anticipated between 2011 and 2035.

Figure 9: Cache 2035 Highway Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$21,196,824</td>
<td>$20,545,448</td>
<td>$11,902,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$130,255,971</td>
<td>$202,126,479</td>
<td>$165,216,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$43,681,449</td>
<td>$71,152,477</td>
<td>$50,916,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$195,134,243</td>
<td>$293,824,404</td>
<td>$228,036,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available all Phases</td>
<td>$712 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2035 Estimated Transit Funding for Cache County

The majority of the funds used by the Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD) are from a local option sales tax. This has been approved by a number of communities that make up the CVTD service area. A mixture of local
sales tax funds and federal funds help provide the operational revenue needed to run the CVTD bus system. This includes staffing (bus drivers and support staff) as well as ongoing maintenance and fuel.

Federal funds are used largely to help pay capital expenditures (e.g. purchase of replacement or expansion buses) as well as the cost of providing service support facilities (e.g Transit and operation/maintenance center).

Some of the federal funds received by CVTD are distributed based on a formula applied by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA 5311, FTA 5307). However, unlike highway funds, much of the federal funding for capital transit expenditures comes from discretionary grants or earmarks. In the past CVTD has been successful in securing grants for the purchase of new and replacement buses as well as to construct facilities such as the transit center and the current operation/maintenance facility. However, due to the discretionary nature of some of this funding; it is difficult to estimate future revenues for the next 30 years.

Table 4 shows the total expected transit funding to the year 2035. It should be noted this is the total revenue available for both system operation and capital. With transit service operational expenses represent the largest category of expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: 2035 TOTAL TRANSIT FUNDING BY PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available all Phases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2035 ESTIMATED BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN FUNDING FOR CACHE COUNTY

Many of the anticipated bicycle and pedestrian improvements (e.g. bike lanes, sidewalks and in some cases shared-use pathways or trails) to the year 2035 will be completed either as part future roadway improvement projects or required of developers as new development occurs (required by most city ordinances). However, there will still be significant needs in terms of completing missing linkages and retrofitting bicycle and pedestrian facilities in already developed areas. There also will be a need to provide system-wide improvements.

In Cache County, there is not a consistent annual funding source for bicycle and pedestrian type improvements (however various communities will often budget a small portion of their general funds or impact fee revenues to these types of improvements).

Typically, most of the funding sources that have been used for non-motorized types of improvements in Cache County have come from competitive grants. From the federal government these have included Transportation Enhancement Grants (TE) and a newer source called Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ). These sources are allocated based on project merit (and programmatic intent) either locally or at a statewide level. The State of Utah also funds some non-motorized trail projects based on a competitive selection process.

A major source of additional local funding is the countywide Restaurant and Recreation, Arts, Parks and Zoos (RAPZ) tax. Jurisdictions with trails and pathways projects that have some recreational benefit (often with duel transportation use) are eligible to apply.

Table 5 shows the estimated 2035 available funding for eligible bicycle and pedestrian related projects. Since all of these funds are dependent on project merit and successfully earning funding through competitive applications, some assumptions were necessary based on the county’s past history.
For purposes of planning, the following 2035 assumptions were used for bicycle and pedestrian related projects revenue:

- Cache County receives $500,000 in Transportation Enhancement Grants about every 4 years (along with some funds already programmed for 2011 & 2013).
- 25% of the anticipated revenue from CMAQ for Cache County will be used for bicycle and pedestrian related projects.
- Cache County will receive a $50,000 Non-motorized State Trails grant about once every 5 years.
- 25% of the anticipated revenue from RAPZ tax for Cache County will go to bicycle and pedestrian related projects.
- Local jurisdictions will contribute or match a combined $20,000 per year (that grows annually by 2%) for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

For the various Cache Valley growth scenarios developed as part of Envision Cache Valley process (see appendix 9), information was provided to the public and community officials comparing the relative environmental impacts of each of the described futures. Environmental factors considered by the Envision Cache Valley process included the impact of growth on water quality (and quantity), residential energy consumption, prime agricultural, wetlands and air quality.

Additionally, to the extent practicable, transportation improvements have been situated in the more developed core areas to be supportive of increased land use densities and minimize urban sprawl. This is consistent with the recommendations of Envision Cache Valley to accommodate most of the growth in the incorporated cities.

Finally, the CMPO utilized a new environmental planning tool provided by UDOT. Uplan is a web based mapping and analysis tool that delivers relevant and up-to-date geographic environmental map data. The tool allowed draft CMPO projects to be evaluated relative to proximity to environmentally sensitive locations. The system also was able to produce a number of project specific environmental summary reports. These reports were used to evaluate the merits of various projects.

It should also be noted that all federally funded projects will need to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This law requires extensive environmental resource evaluation and analysis as well as significant public involvement for any federally funded project. The State of Utah has a similar process for state funded projects. It is the intent of the CMPO to integrate long range planning and NEPA by attempting to utilize quality environmental resource information as early as possible in the planning process.

### Table 5: 2035 TOTAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FUNDING BY PHASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2020</td>
<td>2021-2030</td>
<td>2031-2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$3,209,281</td>
<td>$2,591,130</td>
<td>$1,921,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3,520,691</td>
<td>$5,645,069</td>
<td>$4,003,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,829,972</td>
<td>$8,336,199</td>
<td>$5,975,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds Available all Phases $21 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Environmental impacts and trade-offs were analyzed and considered as part of developing this plan and ultimate project selection. Potential particulate matter (PM 2.5) air quality impacts were evaluated to establish that this plan meets the EPA “interim” air quality conformity test (See appendix 1). The EPA requires an detailed analysis to document that mobile source PM 2.5 emissions resulting from projected growth in vehicle miles traveled in the last year of this plan is less than 2008 levels.
2035 CMPO HIGHWAY VISION PLAN

The 2035 CMPO Roadway Vision Plan shows those projects that are needed to provide a reasonable level of mobility (based on computer based travel demand modeling) for future years (see Figure 10). Table 6 shows what can be afforded with anticipated federal, state and local roadway eligible funds to the year 2035. Table 7 shows the projects that are considered unfunded (based on future revenue estimates) however they should be considered for future inclusion as funding becomes available.

Table 8 shows potential maintenance or operational roadway improvements. These are generally not capacity motivated improvements (such as adding additional lanes). These are important roadway improvements that are needed to correct some sort of roadway deficiency and may include such things as pavement rehabilitation, shoulder widening or corrections of roadway or intersection deficiency (such as poor roadway or intersection geometry).

Funding for these projects has not been specifically identified. The reason these projects have been acknowledged is because they represent a serious and growing problem that will only get worse with time. This is largely because State category “B” and “C” road maintenance funds received by Cache County Corporation and each individual city have not been keeping pace with the need. This funding challenge is not unique to Cache County and will need to be addressed at the state and local levels.

Figure 11 shows the year 2035 peak hour traffic congestion (modeling estimates) that would likely result if all of the financially constrained projects were built. This should be compared with Figure 6 in the needs section of this plan.
Figure 10: Cache 2035 Highway Vision Plan (Financially Constrained Projects)
### TABLE 6: 2035 Highway Capacity Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>2010 Cost</th>
<th>Inflated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10th West</td>
<td>US 89/91 to 2500 N &amp; portion of 2500 N</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$56,000,000</td>
<td>$56,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>SR 30</td>
<td>~1400 West to Main Street, Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>$41,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>200 East So #1</td>
<td>300 South to Center Street, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$10,115,510</td>
<td>$11,733,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>200 East Logan</td>
<td>Center Street to 1400 North, Logan</td>
<td>Operational &amp; Safety to 10th</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$7,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>600 West South</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to 400 North, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$14,440,232</td>
<td>$16,750,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100 W Logan so</td>
<td>600 South to Hwy 165, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$6,982,455</td>
<td>$8,099,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>200 East North</td>
<td>2200 North to 2500 North, No Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$270,829.24</td>
<td>$314,224,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1700 South</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to Hwy 165</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$4,392,427</td>
<td>$5,095,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3200 South</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to 1600 West, Nibley</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$2,031,800</td>
<td>$2,356,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>200 East So # 2</td>
<td>300 South to 100 East Intersect, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$4,383,724</td>
<td>$6,838,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Western Art</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to Hwy 218, Logan to Smithfield</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$100,684,944</td>
<td>$157,068,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>SR 101 Hyrum</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to 200 West, Hyrum</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$24,443,994</td>
<td>$38,132,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Canyon Rd</td>
<td>300 South to 400 North, Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$14,713,733</td>
<td>$22,953,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>200 East North</td>
<td>1400 North to 1800 North, Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$442,918.68</td>
<td>$690,952,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>200 East North</td>
<td>2500 North to Hyde Park Lane, Hyde Park</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$10,500,107</td>
<td>$16,386,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>UDOT SR 30</td>
<td>Rural UDOT Cache County line to 1900 W.</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$106,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91</td>
<td>3200 South to Y Intersection, Logan</td>
<td>6 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$40,659,202</td>
<td>$63,428,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1200 East</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to 300 North, Hyde Park</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$25,141,505</td>
<td>$39,220,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>455 W. Prov</td>
<td>100 North to 2300 So, Providence</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$7,742,495</td>
<td>$14,246,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1200 W Nibley</td>
<td>300 North Hyrum to Hwy 89/91 Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$28,475,795</td>
<td>$52,395,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Mendon Road</td>
<td>10th West to 100 East, Mendon</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$62,465,175</td>
<td>$114,933,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Hwy 91 North</td>
<td>2500 North to Hyde Park Lane, Hyde Park</td>
<td>6 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$43,687,940</td>
<td>$80,385,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7: Unfunded Highway Capacity Projects (To be Considered for future Inclusion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>2010 Cost</th>
<th>Inflated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100 East Logan</td>
<td>300 South to 400 North, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$6,412,646</td>
<td>$10,003,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Old 238</td>
<td>100 North to 200 South, Millville</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$15,601,424</td>
<td>$24,316,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>400 N Wells</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to Center, Wellsville</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$8,265,681</td>
<td>$12,894,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Center HP</td>
<td>Hwy 91 to 400 East, Hyde Park</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$7,298,601</td>
<td>$11,385,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>600 S. Smith</td>
<td>Hwy 89/91 to Center Smithfield</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$8,258,261</td>
<td>$13,882,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3100 N No Logan</td>
<td>1200 East to Hwy 91, North Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$10,653,786</td>
<td>$16,619,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Airport Rd</td>
<td>1000 West to 3400 North, Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$18,022,332</td>
<td>$28,114,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>200 W Logan</td>
<td>500 North to 2500 North, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$18,908,868</td>
<td>$29,497,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>600 West North</td>
<td>400 North to 2500 North, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$18,879,096</td>
<td>$29,451,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>600 E Logan</td>
<td>400 North to 2500 North, Logan</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$19,051,735</td>
<td>$29,720,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100 N Prov</td>
<td>Hwy 165 to 300 East, Providence</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$9,898,031</td>
<td>$15,440,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>200 W No Lo</td>
<td>2500 North Logan to 600 South, Smithfield</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$18,589,306</td>
<td>$28,999,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>200 East North</td>
<td>1800 North to 2200 North, No Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>4390320.96</td>
<td>6848906.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>200 East North</td>
<td>2200 North to 2500 North, No Logan</td>
<td>4 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$3,305,690</td>
<td>$5,156,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>455 W. Prov</td>
<td>2300 So. To Mill Road, Millville</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$5,530,205</td>
<td>$8,627,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8: Unfunded Highway Maintenance Projects (Need Pavement, geometric or operational improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>2010 Cost</th>
<th>Inflated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2400 West, Amalga</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab, Shoulder</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>600 East, Hyrum</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab, Shoulder, Intersections</td>
<td>2 Lanes, Median</td>
<td>$808,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization
Figure 11: 2035 Estimated Peak Hour Traffic Congestion (with Highway Vision Plan Projects)
TRANSIT VISION PLAN

With steady population growth in Cache County and increasing levels of projected traffic congestion, demand for public transit service is expected to increase. To accommodate this expected demand for additional service, the following elements of service expansion are included as part of the CMPO’s Transit Vision Plan (see figure 12).

YEARS 2011 TO 2020

This period is marked by substantial expansion in the levels of service offered mostly to the existing service areas. This would include:

- Increased bus frequency for all CVTD routes during peak times.
- Expand Countywide Para-transit
- Extended service hours
- Additional major destination route
- Study the appropriate bus service on Sundays
- Main Street Service (e.g. bus trolley connecting Logan downtown with Utah State University)
- Construction of a new transit maintenance and operations service center
- Add Automated Vehicle Location service for all routes (e.g. real time texting of bus arrival time)

YEARS 2021 TO 2035

This period is characterized by internal expansion as well as making external transit connections to include:

- All-day express connector service to Brigham City/Ogden (UTA Frontrunner)
- Introduce bus “circulator” shuttles to Smithfield, North Logan & Hyrum.
- Introduce elements of Bus Rapid Transit

BEYOND 2035

BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a premium form of rapid transit that provides similar levels of service as traditional light rail. However, for most applications, BRT can be implemented much cheaper than traditional light rail. BRT also allows for more flexibility in terms of the operational design. Some characteristics of optimal BRT include:

- Separated (bus only) right-of-way lanes (can operate portions in mixed traffic if needed)
- Rapid boarding from enhanced loading platforms
- Special branded or “styilized” bus vehicles
- Fast, frequent and reliable (bus frequency less than every ½ hour)

BRT is proposed as part of the Cache Transit Vision Plan (See Figure 12) roughly on the main street corridor from Hyrum to Smithfield along with a spur to Utah State University. The largely “linear” north-south development pattern of Cache County makes BRT attractive as a possible enhanced transit solution. Planning and right-of-way preservation activities for BRT should begin now in Cache County. Because specific funding has not been identified, BRT was not used for any of the traffic analysis or air quality conformity modeling in this plan. BRT is presented for planning purposes only. However, since the technology can be implemented incrementally (fixed route bus change to express bus and eventually bus rapid transit), elements of BRT may begin during the life of this plan.

CACHE COUNTY PASSENGER RAIL

As a longer term option, “heavy rail” or commuter passenger rail for Cache County should be explored. This likely would include evaluating options for future rail construction adjacent to the current Union Pacific Cache Valley rail spur to connect to Union Pacific’s main line. It is not at all clear when or if this type of transportation facility would be justified in terms of ridership or cost effectiveness. However, in order to potentially preserve opportunities and to reduce future right-of-way or construction costs, the region should begin to explore the feasibility and cost effectiveness of this type of service and begin to plan accordingly.
ROADWAY “BUILDOUT” VISION PLAN (BEYOND 2035)

In the long term (beyond 2035), additional roadway improvements will be needed to accommodate Cache County’s growth. The Cache Buildout Roadway Vision Plan (See Figure 13) assumes a rough “buildout” of the current land use plans for all communities in the valley. It proposes a version of the future roadway network that will be needed.

This plan is for illustrative purposes only. Improvements identified have not been financially constrained nor have they been evaluated for air quality conformity purposes.

This plan attempts to incorporate the longer term transportation master plans of communities to the extent possible. The plan should be used as a joint tool used by the CMPO and local communities and Cache County to ensure planning consistency. Local officials should exercise caution when using the plan to require right-of-way dedications. In many cases, the alignments listed might need more detailed attention and study before they are incorporated into local planning documents.

Whenever proposing solutions that are more than 30 years in the future it should be noted that many of the assumptions used will likely change. Assumptions that are subject to long term change include things like car ownership rates, vehicle fleet characteristics, fuel prices, changes in land use patterns and shifts in Cache County’s employment types. Nonetheless, it is important to attempt to evaluate and plan for longer term transportation facilities to ensure preservation of rights of way and evaluate possible impacts. Over time, this plan will need continual adjustment and refinement as land use policies and development trends change.
Figure 12: Cache 2035 Transit Vision Plan
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Figure 13: Cache “Buildout” Roadway Vision Plan (2035 and Beyond)
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN VISION PLAN

This section is intended to identify short and long term bicycle and pedestrian needs and appropriate solutions to increase transportation choice in Cache County. The plan focuses primarily on the needs of these modes as they relate to transportation. This means not only the commuter, but also the student or shopper, or anyone who makes a trip by walking or cycling instead of by automobile. These two modes do overlap into recreation and the proposed solutions will certainly be a benefit to the recreational cyclist and walker.

TRAILS, PATHWAYS AND BIKE ROUTES

Communities in Cache County have proposed over 240 miles of new trails and pathways. Another 196 miles have been proposed in the unincorporated portions of the county (See Figure 14). In some cases these identified pathways might be recreational single track (unpaved) trails or urban (paved) shared use paths (at least 10 feet wide paths to accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclist) or in some cases sidewalks (at least 10 feet wide). The proposed plan is largely a mapped assemblage of the trail plans of most of the communities in Cache County. Some added consideration was given for providing regional linkages were necessary.

Figure 15 shows the proposed “on-road” Bike Route Vision Plan for Cache County. These routes are generally located on existing roads (shoulders or mixed traffic) and usually distinguished by road signage (and in some cases pavement markings). A portion of the proposed regional bike route has been completed with signage (shown in blue).

This plan makes no attempt to prioritize implementation or construction scheduling for the trails, pathways or bike routes identified. With the uncertainty of funding (allocated largely through competitive grants) and the difficulty of assigning costs to projects (each project is unique with vastly different right-of-way and construction costs) no attempt was made to constrain the plan financially. However, future efforts should be directed toward prioritizing trail and pathway projects and linkages.

Priorities should be based on a project’s ability to serve the largest population, provide safe linkages to high use activity centers and its ability to accommodate the needs of a concentrated special needs populations (e.g. children or those without a car). Also, since trips on public transit often begins and ends via walking or biking, priority should be given to those projects that are positioned to support transit stops and connections. Priorities should also be given to facilities that support schools (Safe Routes to School) or other educational institutions.

ADDITIONAL 2035 BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

In addition to the trails, pathways and bike routes identified in figures 14 & 15, the following bicycle and pedestrian related projects or programs have been identified through public involvement and the CMPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

- Upper Boulevard Trail Completion- (Short Dugway aka 600 East, Logan): roadway crossing solution (e.g. overpass)
- Close Gaps in Sidewalk Connectivity - (all urban or urbanizing communities): identify network gaps and install sidewalks as necessary
- Accelerate Repair/Replacements of Deteriorated Sidewalks- (all urban or urbanizing communities)
- Lower Boulevard Trail Bicycle/Pedestrian Underpass crossings- (Center Street and 200 East, Logan near Merlin Olsen Park): Construct street crossing underpasses (both are included as part of 200 East roadway improvement project Environmental Assessment)
- South Logan Highway 89/91 Crossing- (near “Y” Intersection, Logan): enhanced roadway pedestrian & bicycle crossing solution (e.g. underpass)
- Install High Visibility Pedestrian Flags - (appropriate high pedestrian use non-signalized intersections in all communities)
- Non-signalized Crosswalk Enhancements- (200 North between 100 W. & 600 W. & Logan Downtown mid-block “store back” walkway from 300 North to 100 South and other busy roads that have heavy foot crossing traffic based on an inventory): provide pavement markings, traffic calming and adequate lighting
- Create Trail, Pathway and Bikeway User Map- (countywide): Hardcopy and web based version
- On-street Pavement Markings- (Countywide where appropriate): Provide shared lane “sharrow” or bike lane striping
Figure 14: Cache Bicycle and Pedestrian Vision Plan (Trails and Shared Use Pathways)
Figure 15: Cache “On-road” Bike Routes Vision Plan
CHAPTER 6-IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Implementation of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan will need to be a cooperative effort. As an organization, the CMPO will coordinate future planning and implementation activities with local, state and federal officials.

PLAN REFINEMENT & UPDATE

In order to be effective, transportation planning needs to be a continual process. Major updates to this plan will happen a minimum of every 5 years. However, this plan will be amended by the CMPO as new information is available and substantive changes are warranted. New or altered projects can be amended into the plan at any time. However, projects added that meet the air quality definition of “regionally significant” will require a new air quality conformity analysis and determination (see page 6).

IMPLEMENTATION STUDIES

This RTP proposes mostly “concept level” transportation solutions. The projects identified in the various “Vision Plans” in the previous chapter do not represent precise alignments or detailed project characteristics. Rather they identify the type and form of transportation project, its regional connectivity requirement and a rough idea of a possible alignment.

As already noted, for many project funded with federal or state dollars, a project specific environmental review process will ultimately refine the project details and resolve definite alignments (after full evaluation of any alternatives). However, for transportation improvements that are many years away from a full federal or state environmental review (or for some of the locally funded longer term projects), the region would be well served by taking a project beyond concept level planning sooner, rather than later. The reason for this is because development pressure and uninformed incremental decision making today can preclude (or make more expensive) options for tomorrow (when the project finally moves to the environmental or design stage). This is especially true for preservation of needed rights-of-ways.

If forerunner transportation studies are done well (and are sufficiently comprehensive and sensitive to factors that will eventually be more fully considered as part of a future environmental process), these early results can be used to better guide ongoing local decision making (such as what corridor to preserve or which sensitive lands to avoid). In fact, if approached correctly, this early analysis and public involvement effort (and results) can be “handed-off” to a federal or state environmental process (when the time comes) and avoid the need to backtrack on already resolved issues.

With this in mind, the following special project specific planning studies have been identified and should be completed as soon as resources and funding allow:

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Feasibility Study
- Western Arterial Corridor Study
- Logan Main Street One-way Couplet Study
- Logan Upper Boulevard Trail to USU Campus Connectivity Study
- Commuter Rail Feasibility Study (beyond 2035)

In addition, there is a need to have more comprehensive and detailed plans (than what is able to be provided in this RTP) to guide future transit and bicycle and pedestrian investments. Therefore the following plans (eventually to be incorporated into this plan) are needed:

- Cache Valley Short Range Transit Plan
- Cache County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION

The CMPO will work with local community officials in an attempt to ensure general consistency between this RTP and the local transportation master plans of participating jurisdictions. This will need to be an ongoing process as plans and circumstances change.

LAND USE IMPLEMENTATION

Other than education and advocacy, the CMPO has no direct authority over the land use of participating jurisdictions. This authority resides with the local elected and appointed community officials. However, the adequacy of the transportation solutions proposed in this plan are largely predicated on a gradual trend toward local implementation of some of the growth principles described in the Envision Cache Valley plan as it relates to land use. The resulting socio-economic data that was used in the travel models is based on these land use assumptions and form the basis of the needs analysis and transportation project selection in this plan. As communities further embrace and implement the Envision Cache Valley plan, the CMPO will need to adjust the land use (and resulting socio-economic demographies) and re-evaluate the adequacy of the RTP.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

While the CMPO does provide assistance in the form of facilitation, technical assistance and shared staff resources, project implementation activities are largely left to individual communities and participating agencies (such as UDOT). For example, even though a particular highway project might be identified in this RTP it still requires one or more local jurisdictions (city or county) to incorporate the project into their individual jurisdiction’s master planning, preserve the rights-of-ways and provide the administrative oversight and contracting for project design and construction. The responsibility of local governments might vary depending on how the project (highway or bicycle/pedestrian) is funded and who will ultimately own the right of way.

FEDERALLY FUNDED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

In the case of a local road improvement project (non-UDOT) that is supported with federal transportation funding (allocated and programmed by the CMPO), UDOT is required to assist the local jurisdiction with environmental approvals, design and construction. This does not mean the project is a “UDOT” project. It’s still a local government project for which UDOT is required to provide assistance and administrative oversight. This is because UDOT has the experience and technical capacity to make sure the project is done according to federal guidelines (which can be rather onerous and difficult). Nonetheless, the local government is the ultimate contracting authority and has the main responsibility to see the project through to completion. The local governments also have the responsibility of funding any ineligible project costs as well as those costs in excess of the federal share and providing the required local match (usually at a minimum of about 7%).

LOCALLY FUNDED PROJECTS

All aspects of project delivery for those transportation projects (including bicycle and pedestrian projects) funded only with local funds is the responsibility of the participating local governments.

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX

In 2008 countywide voters approved a one-quarter cent increase in sales tax to help fund regionally significant roadway improvements. The revenue from this locally administered tax presently generates about $3 Million annually for highway related projects anywhere in Cache County.

According to state code, the funding resulting from this tax is to be allocated by the Cache County Council based on a recommendation by the Cache County Council of Governments (CCCOG). The CCCOG is made up of mayors from each of the 19 jurisdictions and the Cache County Executive. The CCCOG has established a project application and prioritization scoring process (See appendix 10). One of the policies adopted by the CCCOG specifies that in order to be eligible to apply,
any project located in the CMPO planning area (See figure 1 on page 4) must be included in this RTP.

Once funding is approved by the Cache County Council, project design and delivery is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction(s).

**TRANSIT PROJECTS**

Following the CMPO’s programming of any federal urban transit funds, project delivery becomes the responsibility of the Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD). Most of the federal funding available to the CVTD is programmed toward the purchase of expansion or replacement buses and other capital expenditures. The local funds (collected by CVTD through a dedicated voter approved sales tax) from participating jurisdictions are programmed by the CVTD Board of Trustees. This board is made up of appointed officials from all the participating CVTD communities.

**STATE (UDOT) PROJECTS**

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is responsible for all aspects of project delivery in state owned rights-of-ways. As a matter of practice, UDOT coordinates the project planning and delivery with local community officials and the public. UDOT generally follows a required environmental review process that is largely patterned after its federal counterpart.

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)**

The CMPO works with UDOT, CVTD and local communities through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to program funding for specific RTP projects identified in this plan. The TIP is a six-year capital improvement program for highway, bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects. While the RTP is generally “financially constrained” in the long term under a set of funding assumptions, the TIP is where a project is linked to actual funding sources and amounts. Both the RTP and the TIP must be approved by the CMPO Executive Council. The TIP is generally updated and approve annually and includes opportunity for public comment and involvement.

The CMPO assists the local governments and transit agency providers in the region in implementing projects in the TIP by programming federal funding for the projects. The CMPO administers Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the Region. STP funds may be used for transportation facility improvements ranging from rehabilitation of existing facilities to new construction. Funds may also be used for transit capital improvements and ride share promotion. Programming of the federal funds by the CMPO is competitive. Project sponsors submit their project requests for funding, which are analyzed and ranked according to cost and benefit of the project.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Performance measures are specific follow-up data collection and reporting requirements designed inform the public and decision makers as to the ongoing effectiveness of a plan in terms of its success in meeting selected targeted goals.

When deciding to measure performance it is important to select the right goal(s) to measure and carefully define the appropriate metric. Also, with limited staffing resources, the CMPO has to be very selective in what data to collect and analyze as this can be very labor intensive. Therefore, the staff will work with the Executive Council to define and put in place a performance measure program for the CMPO. Possible measures might include:

- Track vehicle hours of delay growth rate (compared to population growth rate)
- Reductions in mobile source pollutant emissions
- Serious injury and fatal crashes.

The CMPO will work toward identifying and implementing selected performance measures in the next year.
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