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Vice Chair Dennis Marker welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Approved the meeting minutes for September 23, 2013
Jeremy Lapin moved to approve the September 23, 2013, minutes. Mark Christenson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Functional Classification - Shawn Eliot
Federal law requires each state to have a Functionally Classified Highway Network. This network shows all highways of statewide significance. Additions and changes to the network can occur annually, but usually with the release of the decennial census, updates happen every 10 years. MPO staff has been working with UDOT over the last year to update the map with the proposed corridors that the MPO TAC Committee reviewed in Oct 2012. During this time a change to the rules of allowing minor collectors in urban areas was discovered. Prior to this process, minor collectors were only allowed in the rural areas of the state (basically none in Utah County). The new proposed map has on it proposed minor collectors that were added to the county.

Shawn Eliot asked the TAC Committee to review the current map and make suggestions of additions and changes. Only highways on this system are eligible for federal transportation funds. The Committee wanted more time to review the map and make needed changes before it is turned into UDOT for final review. It was agreed upon that the cities would have a week to turn in any changes they felt were needed. Appropriate roads will be added and a copy of the updated map will be sent to the city. UDOT will review the TAC Committees suggested changes to certify they meet federal guidelines and FHWA will approve of the final map submitted by UDOT.

Andy Spencer moved that the MPO Technical Advisory Committee approve the changes and additions to the Functionally Classified Highway Network Map and allow cities one week to contact MAG staff and petition for any needed changes. Richard Nielson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
**TIP Project Selection Process - Shawn Eliot**

The proposed joint project selection process is a process that will join the MPO, UDOT, and UTA project priority and selection processes together so that all projects (except for maintenance, safety, bridge, and other smaller UDOT projects) will be prioritized at the MPO level before funding is programmed. The new ranking matrix is being brought to the MPO committees to educate and receive input. The new matrix is more technical, using more qualitative questions. It is more in line with the UDOT mission priorities (Optimize Mobility, Strengthen the Economy, Zero Fatalities, Preservation), as well as magnitude, cost. Another main purpose of the matrix is to rank different project types together. To accomplish this, smaller, non-highway projects can have different points applied that allow them to compete with larger highway projects.

The possible risk and benefits of using the new matrix where reviewed. The TAC Committee discussed concerns regarding how transparent the new ranking process will be. Also discussed was the concern that smaller cities might be overwhelmed with the concept report process and the fear that trail projects will rank low and may not receive the needed funding using the new matrix system. MPO staff asked that the committee move forward using the new process for the next round of project selection. Once through the process, we would suggest that any needed adjustments to the proposed process be made prior to any final adoption.

*Mark Christensen moved that MPO staff work with UDOT and UTA to use the proposed Joint Project Priority Process for the upcoming project selection process. The MPO TAC Committee understands that this is a trial process and that adjustments can be made before it is formally adopted after the project selection process is completed. Paul Goodrich seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.*

**Third Quarter Cent Legislation Easing the Silos - Shawn Seager**

The Third Quarter Cent Sales Tax was authorized around 2009. Utah County uses the tax to fund transportation projects. The funding has silos that restrict how the revenue is spent. The current break down of the funding is 40% State Roads, 40% Regional Roads, and 20% ROW. We are proposing to eliminate those silos and allow the revenue to be used for any permissible use of class B & C funds. This will make using the funds for prioritized projects much easier. Addition projects shall be recommended by the Metropolitan Planning Organization for funding.

Some of the committee had questions concerning how the Corridor Preservation Fund would be funded without the silos. Shawn said that the Utah County Vehicle Registration Fee is a funding source for the Corridor Preservation Fund.
Dennis Marker moved that the MPO Technical Advisory Committee support the proposed motion. Richard Nielson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

County Option Gas Tax Legislation Proposal - Shawn Seager
A Utah legislative proposal to allow counties to enact a local option gas sales tax is currently being discussed by many Utah transportation related organizations and at the Legislative Transportation Interim Committee. The TAC Committee is being asked to support this proposal.

Background:
Adequately funding transportation needs are one of the most significant and pressing challenges facing cities and counties across the state of Utah. Utah’s population is projected to nearly double in the next 30 years. In order to accommodate that growth in a way that enhances our economy, protects our air quality, and preserves our quality of life, policymakers will need to take a balanced, multi-modal approach to investing in transportation infrastructure. Utah’s Unified Transportation Plan: 2011–2040 identifies additional state and local road and transit capacity that will be needed, along with active transportation options, such as bike and pedestrian pathways. Equally important is the need to maintain and operate Utah’s transportation system. While specific needs vary by community, this balanced approach is needed in all of our communities going forward. An effective and comprehensive approach to local transportation funding should address all of these areas, while providing flexibility to meet individual community needs. This local transportation funding proposal attempts to address multiple elements identified in the Unified Transportation Plan.

Historically, the state fuel tax has been the primary source of revenue to fund local roads. In recent years, however, a combination of rapid population growth, increased road construction and maintenance costs, and decreased buying power of the fuel tax has resulted in local governments having to rely heavily on their general funds to pay for critical transportation needs in their communities (statewide, approximately two-thirds of local road costs are now being covered with general funds). Routine maintenance needs are in many cases being deferred, leading to even higher capital costs, while regionally significant projects needed to serve growing mobility demands are being delayed. Without additional revenue, the transportation funding shortfall for cities and counties will grow, with serious implications for the safety and economic well being of Utah’s communities and residents.

Because the existing fuel tax is paid per gallon and is not indexed to inflation, it steadily loses buying power over time. The fuel tax currently comprises a smaller percentage of household income (0.4%) than at any time in the 90-year history of the tax in Utah. In addition, as vehicles become more fuel efficient and as alternative fuel and electric vehicles increase market share,
users pump less fuel, further eroding revenues. The last time the state fuel tax was raised was in 1997 (from 19.5 cents per gallon to 24.5 cents per gallon), when the cost of a gallon of gas was just over $1. In the intervening years, the buying power of the fuel tax has declined approximately 40%, and is now equivalent to approximately 16.8 cents per gallon. This decline in buying power, coupled with increasing transportation costs, has resulted in a severe funding gap for Utah’s local communities. Bridging that gap with general fund monies in our local communities is not good public policy and is not sustainable in the long-term. Funding the construction and maintenance of roads out of fuel taxes makes sense because the tax is a user-based fee – individuals who put the most wear and tear on the roads pay proportionately more tax at the pump.

Proposal:

**Funding for local roads:** The state should take legislative action authorizing counties to impose a 3% local option fuel user fee. The local option fuel user fee would have to be approved by the legislative body of a county prior to being levied in that county. County governments would have two opportunities to authorize the full 3% fee: if the authorization action was taken by June 30, 2014, the user fee would take effect on January 1, 2015; if the authorization action was taken by June 30, 2015, the user fee would take effect on January 1, 2016.

100% of the proceeds of the local option fuel user fee would flow to local governments.

However, counties that do not opt in (and cities within those counties) would not receive any revenues from the local option fuel user fee. Revenues from opt-in counties would be allocated as follows:

- 50% of the local option fuel user fee revenues collected in a county would be pooled with revenues from other opt-in counties around the state and then allocated among and within those counties in accordance with the existing Class B & C road fund formulas.

- 50% of the local option fuel user fee revenues collected in a county would remain in that county and be allocated as follows:
  
  - In counties of the first and second classes, the county legislative body, in consultation with constituent municipalities, would allocate funds for selected projects within the county, including regionally significant projects identified in the Unified Transportation Plan / long range regional transportation plan adopted by the local metropolitan planning organization (MPO). The legislation would provide that these revenues flow to the levying county but not specify any local decision-making process for allocation, as that process should be flexible and locally driven and may vary from county to county.
In counties of the third through sixth classes, 50% of the funds would be allocated by the legislative body of the county and the other 50% would be allocated within the county in accordance with the existing Class B & C road fund formulas.

Andy Spencer moved that the MAG TAC support the concept of a County Option Gas Sales Tax. Jeremy Lapin seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

A second motion was made on this agenda item-

Andy Spencer moved to make a recommendation to our Regional Planning Committee that if the bill is approved one hundred percent of the funds be allocated to the cities per the B & C formulas. Hugh Van Wagenen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business-

FHWA - Steve Call

The Federal Highway Administration has a new Division Administrator. Ivan Marrero will be replacing James Christian in the spring. For now Arlene Kocher is the Acting Division Administrator in Utah.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 25, 2013.

Richard Nielson moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:20 p.m.. Jeremy Lapin seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

*Meeting minutes are digitally recorded. A hard copy of the attendees, a brief summary, and all motions made during a meeting will be approved at the next meeting. A CD of the entire meeting is available upon requested.*