



Regional Transportation Planning

Memo

Date: August 11, 2016

To: Summit County Council

From: Tom Fisher - Summit County Manager
Caroline Ferris - Regional Transportation Planning Director
Derrick Radke, PE – Public Works Director

Re: Transportation Funding Initiative - Request to place Initiatives on the November Ballot

Summit County and its partners have been working to identify potential funding mechanisms that will allow us to address current and future transportation funding shortfalls and mitigate adverse traffic impacts in an effective and cost efficient manner. Today we ask and recommend the County Council consider placing two (2) resolutions on the November 2016 ballot for voter consideration. Specifically, 1) a County Option Sales and Use Tax for Transportation (UCA 59-12-2217), and 2) an Additional Mass Transit Sales and Use Tax (UCA 59-12-2214). Both attached for review and consideration.

We offer the following written background and explanation of the problems the County is seeking to address through transportation and transit projects. This memo also offers what voters could ultimately expect to get if the initiatives are offered on the ballot and if they are successful.

Background

During the past year, staff has been speaking to Council(s) and our community about traffic congestion along key corridors throughout our area. Our strong economy and desirable location has led to astronomical growth in both jobs and visitors. Over the last decade, the number of jobs available in Summit County have increased greatly, by at least 40 percent. For comparison, the number of jobs statewide (recognizing Utah as the fastest growing job market in the nation) has increased by 15 percent. Because we lack available housing stock to meet the needs of our workers, more and more people are commuting to Summit County from points outside. We know from both anecdotal evidence and Census data that significantly more people work in Summit County, but live outside the County and vice versa, than both live *and* work in Summit County. The same is true for Park City, but by a more significant split.

In addition to the job growth, the number of daily and overnight visitors to our region continues to increase. During the previous winter season, these visitors more than doubled the population of Park City at any given time. Even during the “shoulder season,” (April -



Regional Transportation Planning

June and September – December), visitors account for more than 40 percent of the total population.

Between 2010 and 2015, daily vehicles trips on SR-224 and SR-248 increased by an average of 10.5 percent, or nine percent and 12 percent respectively. On I-80 between Parley’s Summit and Jeremy Ranch, the primary interstate connecting to SR-224 at Kimball Junction, UDOT estimates that traffic during those same years has increased by 15 percent. And finally, at SR-248 between Kamas and Quinn’s Junction, traffic has increased by 12 percent.

Projections indicate these trends will continue on an even stronger upward path. Failure to address our congestion now, whether through lack of appropriate investment, deferred maintenance, or apathy, will lead to compounded problems in the future. Growing problems such as 15 to 20 minute travel times along SR-248 that should take five to seven minutes; travel times from Kimball Junction to Park City that take over 40 minutes when it should be an easy 15 to 20 minutes. This congestion occurs because the every day peak hourly volumes of nearly 1,200 (SR-248) and 1,800 (SR-224) vehicles per hour on roads exceeds the maximum carrying capacity of 1,400 and 2,200, respectively.

In direct response to the growing congestion along SR-248 between the Kamas Valley and the Basin, the City of Kamas and Summit County have expressed interest in a direct, public transit link that would offer affordable and efficient travel options to those commuting along this corridor. In addition to serving the South Summit area, residents of north Wasatch County, in the communities along SR-248, would also benefit from this service.

Countywide, another area of concern is the lack of available funds for municipalities to address road maintenance, which directly affects the efficiency of our transportation network.

Our Councils and citizenry have expressed a clear desire to seek solutions that do not involve “adding more pavement” to our network and that allow us to take matters into our local governments hands to solve the problems the way we want them solved.

In that regard, staff offers the following strategy.

Proven Planning Approach

Our combined “transportation team” has been working hard to implement a regional approach to transportation planning; one that centers on the County and its municipalities molding our own future through programs that are appropriate for our rural community with urban demands. This comprehensive, regional approach involves presenting a combination of programs, projects, and infrastructure that work in unison to build a more effective transportation network.



Regional Transportation Planning

Identifying Solutions

Summit County, Park City, and the local Council of Governments (COG) are committed to on-going collaboration and finding effective solutions to current and future traffic congestion.

At the direction of the Council, staff has identified a mix of potential funding sources that included various taxing options, as well a possible parking management scenarios, inclusive of paid parking. From the list of eight latent funding mechanisms available to Park City, Summit County, or both, a Council sub-committee ultimately determined that two separate taxes, each limited to specific uses, employed together, would be most effective in meeting our transportation funding needs. Both the Additional Mass Transit Tax and the County Option for Transportation require an affirmative ballot initiative.

The **Additional Mass Transit Tax (UCA 59-12-2214)** is a countywide sales and use tax available to be used for transit operations, only. The 0.25% sales tax, or equivalent to one cent for every four dollars spent, does not apply to food items or gas and is estimated to generate approximately \$4.1 million annually. Based on the Council subcommittees' list of priority projects, the Additional Mass Transit Tax could remove approximately 1,500 individual vehicles from our primary corridors, per day, or 570,000 vehicles annually.

ADDITIONAL MASS TRANSIT SALES TAX PROJECT LIST 2017 to 2022

Project Description	Project Cost	"Cars Off the Road" (per year)*
Increased Bus Frequency/Service		
SR-224 Express (to Jeremy 2018)	\$ 2,010,000	166075
SLC/PC/SC Connect	\$ -	36500
Park City (Internal)	\$ 760,000	18250**
Kimball Junction Circulator	\$ 600,000	33215
Kamas to PC	\$ 280,000	13870
SR-248 Express	\$ 450,000	292000
Neighborhood Transit Connections	\$ -	7300**
	\$ 4,100,000	570,000

*Per Draft Park City and Summit County Short Range Transit Development Plan prepared by KFH Group

**Estimated

Use of funds generated through the Additional Mass Transit Tax is proposed to be governed by a Memorandum of Understand (MOU) between Park City and Summit County that staff is currently refining, outlining regionally significant projects and how funds from this source would be applied to future transit projects after the listed projects are in place through 2019.



Regional Transportation Planning

The **County Option for Transportation (UCA 59-12-2217)** is a countywide sales and use tax that can be used to fund transportation infrastructure improvements, only. The 0.25% sales tax, or equivalent to one cent for every four dollars spent, does not apply to food items or gas and is similarly estimated to generate approximately \$4.1 million annually. Projects under this funding program must be included on a COG-approved transportation plan.

TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX PROJECT LIST 2017 to 2022

Project Description	Project Cost	"Cars Off the Road" (per year)*
Transit Priority Infrastructure & Remote Parking		
Jeremy/Ecker Remote Parking #1 (250 sp)	\$ 1,830,000	91250
Jeremy Interchange/Intersection Imp	\$ 3,350,000	
Kilby Road Widening (Ecker to Jeremy Interchange)	\$ 4,210,000	
Transportation Demand Management (Bike Share, Parking Management, Wayfinding, Incentives)	\$ 500,000	18250
SR-248 HOV & Safety Project	\$ 12,000,000	292000
US 40 Park and Ride	\$ 2,730,000	
Jeremy/Ecker Remote Parking #2 (250 sp)	\$ 5,600,000	91250
Jeremy/Ecker Remote Parking #3 (300 sp)	\$ 2,350,000	109500
Small Cities Grant Program	\$ 250,000	
	\$ 32,820,000	600,000 **

*Based on maximum available remote parking spaces developed

**Amount to be Bonded for over 10 to 15 years

Based on the Council subcommittees' list of projects, the County Option for Transportation could allow us to move forward with a host of priority projects, removing approximately 1,650 individual vehicles from our roads, per day, or nearly an additional 600,000 annually.

In addition to the infrastructure improvements funded under this option, and in an effort to address the lack of available maintenance funds in smaller areas, staff is developing the Summit County Small Municipality Transportation Improvement Fund Grant Program (TIFGP), which would provide up to \$250,000 (could be up to 80 percent of project cost) annually to the County's small municipalities for transportation construction projects. The TIFGP would be administered by the COG and based on a criteria-based project selection process. The final program cost share will also be determined by the COG.

As previously indicated, neither the Additional Mass Transit tax nor the County Option for Transportation applies to food purchased for home preparation or gasoline. Further, historical sales tax data reveal that visitors to Summit County pay 51 percent of all sales tax receipts. Within Park City, the visitor share of sales tax is 90 percent.



Regional Transportation Planning

Community Outreach and Feedback

Engaging community stakeholders in decision-making is critical for any public entity to successfully meet its goals and provide the best project and/or services to the public. Summit County and Park City have been engaging with the community for nearly six months - meeting with community groups and organizations about a regional transportation approach.

In mid-May, the County hired Wilkinson Ferrari & Co. to assist in a formal public engagement program to seek input and share information about the future of transportation for the County. The firm teamed up with Y2 Analytics and Strategies 360 to develop and implement an outreach program for Summit County's Comprehensive Transportation Initiative.

The three-pronged approach includes:

- Interviews with business and community leaders
- Countywide public opinion research
- Web-based questionnaire

The goal has been to educate about a regional and comprehensive approach; to understand current attitudes and opinions about transportation issues and their impact on quality of life; to determine attitudes towards specific elements of the plan; and to measure the public's willingness to invest in road improvements and transit enhancements.

Stakeholder interviews

The team has interviewed more than a dozen community leaders including members of the press, business leaders, resort representatives, members of the community-at-large, and the Mayors and City Councils across the County. Key findings from stakeholders were as follows:

- Transportation is a top-of-mind issue for every stakeholder interviewed
- Stakeholders are looking to the County and Park City for cooperation and solutions. They have above-average trust that the two entities can and should work together to address the growing issue of traffic and transportation. Demonstration of future coordination is critical.
- Stakeholders generally believe that the transportation problem is not a "visitor" problem, but rather a result of growth and more commuters traveling both in and out of the County each day.
- While most stakeholders were quick to cite SR-224 and SR-248 as major problems, they are more holistic in their description of possible solutions. Solutions offered most frequently include:
 - More remote parking for transit
 - Congestion "fixes" at key points (such as Kimball Junction interchange)
 - Expanded and more frequent transit
 - Coordination with resorts and other large employers



Regional Transportation Planning

Opinion Survey

On request from Summit County, Y2 Analytics conducted a public opinion survey about regional transportation issues and potential solutions. This survey included 500 likely voters from the County list of registered voters and was fielded June 1-4, 2014 by live interviewers over the phone. The poll carries a margin of error of plus or minus 4.3 percentage points. Here are the basic findings according to Y2 Analytics:

1. Voters are generally pleased with the overall direction of Summit County. We asked respondents, "Do you feel things in Summit County are going in the right direction or the wrong direction?" A strong majority of voters chose right direction (56%) despite a common sentiment of pessimism about government effectiveness nationally. Residents of Park City and the Snyderville Basin were even more complimentary with 66% saying the County was on the right track.
2. Voters see growth and traffic problems as primary challenges for the future. When asked to name the most important issues facing the County, survey respondents overwhelmingly cited growth and traffic issues as their top priorities. 43% of likely voters mentioned growth, development, and planning issues while another 23% pointed to traffic and transportation issues. All in all, over 60% of primary concerns from voters were related to growth or traffic. One respondent said, "Traffic - it's a resort, so in the winter time there's no way to move cars." Another feared, "I don't think we can actually deal with the rapid influx of people."
3. County voters signaled willingness to invest in solutions to these issues. Our interviewers presented two potential solutions for traffic issues to respondents, both in the form of ballot propositions: one for road improvements and another for transit improvements. Both measures received majority support. 67% of likely voters supported roads investment and 58% of likely voters supported transit investment.

Web-based Questionnaire

The consultant has created an online questionnaire to give the broader community a chance to weigh in on transportation issues. The site asks four simple questions:

- How important is it that we improve our transportation system in Summit County?
- How important is the role that bus service plays in our transportation plan?
- Do you prefer expanding our roads or making better use of the roads we have?
- In your opinion, what is the single greatest transportation need in Summit County?

The consultant team will continue to collect and compile community input to assist our transportation planning efforts. If the County Council decides to place a transportation measure on the ballot, the team will go back out to the public to ensure that our residents have the information they need to make a decision.



Regional Transportation Planning

Next Steps

To move forward with the current initiative, the following actions are required:

- **Now: County Council members consider the adoption of the attached resolutions to place the two funding resolutions on the upcoming ballot**
- Ongoing: Staff level planning meetings; Council discussions
- Ongoing: Public information and education campaign to ensure effective decision making and transparency
- August 11: Park City Council resolves to support initiatives
- August 16: COG meeting with in-depth discussion of the initiatives
- August 17: First consideration of County Council to add ballot initiative(s)
- August 24: County Council continues its consideration to add ballot initiative(s)
- August 31: Last meeting available for County Council to consider adding ballot initiatives
- September/October: Public information meetings and voter information mailings
- September 2: County Council resolution received by State of Utah
- September 6: Last day that those wanting to provide pro- and anti- statements or rebuttals in the voter information mailings can file to do so with the County Clerk
- September 9: Ballot language received by County Clerk
- November 8: Election

**RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO UCA §59-12-2217 SUBMITTING PROPOSITION
TO IMPOSE A COUNTY OPTION SALES AND USE TAX FOR TRANSPORTATION
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH**

WHEREAS, UCA §59-12-2217(1) provides that the Summit County Council (the “Council”) may impose a sales and use tax of up to .25% within Summit County, including within its cities and towns (the “County Option Sales and Use Tax for Transportation” or “County Option Sales Tax”); and,

WHEREAS, the revenues collected from the County Option Sales Tax may be utilized for all of the purposes set forth in UCA §59-12-2217(2), including a regionally significant transportation facility (principal arterial highway, minor arterial highway, major collector highway, minor collector road, or airport of regional significance); and,

WHEREAS, prior to the imposition of the County Option Sales Tax, the Council shall “submit an opinion question to the county’s . . . registered voters voting on the imposition of the sales and use tax so that each registered voter has the opportunity to express the registered voter’s opinion on whether a sales and use tax should be imposed . . . ;” and,

WHEREAS, the Council finds that it is in the best interests of Summit County to place an opinion question before the electorate to seek permission to impose a County Option Sales Tax;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the County Council, Summit County, Utah, that the following opinion question in the form of a Proposition shall be placed on the ballot for

consideration by the electorate at a regular general election to be held on November 8, 2016:

SUMMIT COUNTY PROPOSITION “B” – ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Shall Summit County, Utah, be authorized to impose a one quarter of one percent (0.25%) – or the equivalent of one penny for every four dollars spent – sales and use tax (not applicable to groceries and gas) for the purpose of road improvements, maintenance, and safety features for the County and its cities?

NOTICE: The passage of this Proposition will not increase Summit County property taxes or rates.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of August, 2016.

SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

ATTEST:

By: _____
Roger Armstrong, Chair

Kent Jones
County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

David L. Thomas
Chief Civil Deputy

**RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO UCA §59-12-2214 SUBMITTING PROPOSITION
TO IMPOSE A COUNTY OPTION SALES AND USE TAX TO FUND A
SYSTEM FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH**

WHEREAS, UCA §59-12-2214(1) provides that the Summit County Council (the “Council”) may impose a sales and use tax of .25% within Summit County, including within its cities and towns (the “County Option Sales and Use Tax for Public Transit” or “County Option Sales Tax”); and,

WHEREAS, the revenues collected from the County Option Sales Tax may be utilized for all of the purposes set forth in UCA §59-12-2214(2)(a), including the funding of a system for public transit; and,

WHEREAS, prior to the imposition of the County Option Sales Tax, the Council shall “submit an opinion question to the county’s . . . registered voters voting on the imposition of the sales and use tax so that each registered voter has the opportunity to express the registered voter’s opinion on whether a sales and use tax should be imposed . . . ;” and,

WHEREAS, the Council finds that it is in the best interests of Summit County to place an opinion question before the electorate to seek permission to impose a County Option Sales Tax;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the County Council, Summit County, Utah, that the following opinion question in the form of a Proposition shall be placed on the ballot for consideration by the electorate at a regular general election to be held on November 8, 2016:

SUMMIT COUNTY PROPOSITION “A” – TRANSIT EXPANSION

Shall Summit County, Utah, be authorized to impose a one quarter of one percent (0.25%) – or the equivalent of one penny for every four dollars spent – sales and use tax (not applicable to groceries and gas) for the purpose of transit improvements including express transit service, more frequent transit service, and additional transit routes into neighborhoods?

NOTICE: The passage of this Proposition will not increase Summit County property taxes or rates.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of August, 2016.

SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

ATTEST:

By: _____
Roger Armstrong, Chair

Kent Jones
County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

David L. Thomas
Chief Civil Deputy