

UTA Future of Light Rail Study

C5525.02

Subject: Future of Light Rail Scenarios Development Workshop Summary and Next Steps
Meeting Date: August 31, 2021
Location: UTA Headquarters, Promontory Summit Room
Meeting Purpose: Develop Future of Light Rail Study Phase 2 scenarios for additional analysis

Attendees

| Name | Organization/Department |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| Zac Smallwood | Murray |
| Jon Larsen | Salt Lake City |
| Julianne Sabula | Salt Lake City |
| Helen Peters | Salt Lake County |
| Toby Lowry | Salt Lake County |
| Britney Ward | Sandy |
| Brian McCuisition | Sandy |
| Dennis Pay | South Salt Lake City |
| Sean Lewis | South Salt Lake City |
| Jay Aguilar | UDOT |
| Matt Luker | UDOT |
| Grant Farnsworth | UDOT |
| Jim Webb | UDOT |
| Andrew King | University of Utah |
| Megan Waters | UTA Community Engagement |
| Olivia Perez | UTA Customer Communications |
| Patti Garver | UTA Environmental & Grant Services |
| David Steadman | UTA Light Rail Service |
| Sharanjit Saini | UTA Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance |
| Kyle Bogue | UTA Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance |
| Robert Harper | UTA Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance |
| Alex Beim | UTA Planning |
| Kerry Doane | UTA Planning |
| Brad Parkin | UTA Public Relations and Marketing |
| George Angerbauer | UTA Public Relations and Marketing |
| Jenna Simkins | UTA Service Planning |
| Jordan Swain | UTA Transit Oriented Development |

| Name | Organization/Department |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Sean Murphy | UTA Transit Oriented Development |
| Jory Johner | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| Julie Bjornstad | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| Mikala Jordan | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| Burt Granberg | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| Hugh Van Wagenen | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| Bill Baranowski | West Jordan |
| Steve Pastorik | West Valley City |
| Maria Vyas | Consultant Team (Fehr & Peers) |
| Bill Lipfert | Consultant Team (Hatch LTK) |

Discussion

The workshop started with all participants identifying themselves, their organization and their interest in light rail transit. UTA Project Manager Kerry Doane provided a brief overview of the study and its goals, noting that the workshop represents the start of the second phase of the study. Many of the workshop participants attended the virtual TAC meetings during the first phase of the study. For the first activity in the workshop, participants were seated at assigned tables, with table-specific professional backgrounds such as engineering, planning and UTA operations, with some exceptions.



Group report-out after Activity 1 with dynamic scoring spreadsheet in background.



Activity 1 break-out session with facilitators and roving consultant team members.



Activity 2 break-out session with facilitator.

Consultant Project Manager Bill Lipfert then outlined the goals of the workshop, noting that its purpose was to both identify the highest priority regional benefits of TRAX improvements and to create four contrasting scenarios that work towards achieving the four highest-ranked benefits priorities. Bill presented the eight benefits categories identified by UTA and its consultant team and shown in Table 1 below, referring participants to the informational packets on each table.

The distinctions between benefits such as Economic Development, More Access to Jobs Services & Housing, and Serves New Markets benefits were discussed by the group. The group concluded that there is significant overlap across these three benefits categories. In addition, most groups also felt there was overlap between Improved Frequency and Improved Travel Time, both of which ended up as shared high priorities among groups.

Each group reported out at the conclusion of Activity #1. Table 1 shows the ranked order of each group’s top four benefits selections with the table containing a placeholder value of 5 where a given benefit was not selected by a group. The most desirable benefits are represented by the lowest scores in the table and are also highlighted in yellow.

Table 1
Activity #1 - Benefits Focus of Scenarios (Lowest Score Most Important)

| | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Total |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Economic Development | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 19 |
| Improved Frequency | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Improved Travel Time | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| More Access to Jobs, Services & Housing | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Greater Service Span | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| Improved Reliability | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 19 |
| Increased Efficiency | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Serves New Markets | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 |

For Activity #2, the workshop participants formed new groups that intended to have a mix of professional backgrounds and were assigned one of the selected benefit categories from Activity #1 to focus on. Bill presented the specific improvements identified and analyzed at a concept level in the first phase of the study and shown in Table 2 below. Each table was instructed to develop a future light rail scenario that achieved the benefits assigned to their table, and Bill suggested that secondary benefits should be considered as well. He noted that each improvement has a dollar sign cost value and that the groups should stick to a budget of no more than 15 dollars. During the course of the exercise, it was determined that it would be beneficial in the analysis if the groups could prioritize their “purchases” in descending order in case the budget had been lower.

During the course of Activity #2, some groups felt that EXT-1 (400 South light rail extension) was duplicative with SVC-4, SVC-5 and potentially other improvements. The UTA and consultant project managers agreed, noting that EXT-1 should be removed from consideration.



Activity 2 break-out session with facilitator.



Group report-out following Activity 2 break-out session.

Table 2
Activity #2 - All Selected Improvements Shown in Ranked Order (Lowest-Ranking Scores Removed)

| | Scenario 1 - New Group 1 (Improved Frequency) | Scenario 2 - New Group 2 (Span of Service) | Scenario 3 - New Group 3 (More Access) | Scenario 4 - New Group 4 (Improved Travel Time) |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| CAP-1 Trunk Line Curve Speed Improvements | | 3 | | 1 |
| SVC-1 All-night Green Line Service to Airport | | 2 | 2 | |
| SVC-2 Granary District Along 400 West to 900 South | | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| SVC-3 Improve Branch Headways from 15 Minutes to 12 Minutes | 2 | | 6 | |
| SVC-4 New Direct Service, University to Salt Lake Central | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| SVC-5 New Direct Service, University to Salt Lake City International Airport | 3 | 5 | | |
| INT-1 Intersection Priorities - Modest Improvements | | | | |
| INT-2 Intersection Priorities - Medium Improvements | | 6 | | |
| INT-3 Intersection Priorities - Extensive Improvements | 5 | | | 2 |
| EXT-1 Connection to Depot / Salt Lake Central | | | | |
| EXT-2 Granary District Along 400 West to 900 South | 1 | | 4 | 4 |
| EXT-3 Millcreek Streetcar / “Local Link” | | | | |
| EXT-4 Red Line Connection – 1100 East to 900 East Station | | | | |
| EXT-5 Downtown-University Streetcar – on 100 or 200 South | | | | 3 |
| EXT-6 Extension to Research Park from South Campus Drive | 4 | | 1 | |

The resultant scenarios are summarized in Table 3 and the four schematics shown on the following pages. Commuter rail (purple line) is shown on the schematics for context and consistent for all scenarios but not counted in the scenario characteristics.

Table 3
Future of Light Rail Scenario Attributes

| | Scenario 1 - Improved Frequency | Scenario 2 – Improved Span of Service | Scenario 3 - More Access | Scenario 4 - Improved Travel Time |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Number of Light Rail Services | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |

**Table 3
Future of Light Rail Scenario Attributes**

| | Scenario 1 - Improved Frequency | Scenario 2 – Improved Span of Service | Scenario 3 - More Access | Scenario 4 - Improved Travel Time |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Number of Streetcar Services | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Number of Main St Services | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Span of Service | Existing | All Night (West Valley, Airport) | All Night (West Valley, Airport, University) | Earlier/Later Service |
| Frequency of Service | Improved | Existing | Improved | Existing |
| Trunk Line Speed Improvements | | ● | | ● |
| Main Street/400 South Operations | 2 Turning, 1 Straight Service | 1 Turning, 2 Straight Crossing 1 Straight Service | 2 Straight Crossing 2 Straight Services | 1 Turning, 1 Straight Service |
| Salt Lake Central Station Operations | Terminus Only | Interleaved Terminus and Run-through | Run-through (Interlined) Only | Terminus Only |
| Direct Service, SLC to University | | ● (Light Rail) | ● (Light Rail) | ● (Streetcar) |
| Direct Service, Airport to University | ● | ● | | |
| Direct Service, Airport to Downtown | ● | ● | ● | |
| Direct Service, Airport to SLC | | ● | | |
| Direct Service, Airport to Granary | | ● | | ● |
| Intersection Priorities | Extensive Improvements | Medium Improvements | Existing | Extensive Improvements |
| 400 South Extension | | ● | ● | |
| Ballpark Spur/400 West Granary District Extension | ● | | ● | ● |
| SLC-Downtown-University Streetcar | | | | ● |
| Research Park Extension | ● | | ● | |

Scenario 1 (Improved Frequency)



**Improved Branch Headways
(15 Min. → 12 Min.)
Throughout**

**Extensive Intersection
Priority Improvements
Throughout**

 **New Infrastructure**







