



Provo/Orem Rapid Transit Corridor

Final Report



MOUNTAINLAND
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
Serving Summit, Utah and Wasatch Cities & Counties

Alternatives Analysis

Carter::Burgess

April 2005

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Executive Summary	1-1
1.1 Project Background.....	1-1
1.2 Transportation Problem.....	1-2
1.3 Project Goals.....	1-3
1.4 Evaluation Measures.....	1-4
1.5 Agency Process	1-5
1.6 Public Involvement Process	1-5
1.7 Alternatives Considered	1-6
1.8 Alternatives Refinement.....	1-11
1.9 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)	1-11
Chapter 2 Study Overview.....	2-1
2.1 Project Background.....	2-1
2.2 Previous Findings.....	2-2
2.3 Alternatives Analysis Definition	2-4
2.4 Study Goals and Objectives.....	2-5
2.5 Project Process	2-5
2.6 Study Area	2-7
2.7 Report Organization	2-7
Chapter 3 Purpose and Need Evaluation Criteria	3-1
3.1 Trends	3-1
3.2 Transportation Facilities	3-1
3.3 Land Use and Growth	3-3
3.4 Mobility Needs.....	3-7
3.5 Traffic Forecasts/Congestion	3-8
3.6 Study Goals & Objectives	3-13
3.7 Evaluation Criteria.....	3-13
Chapter 4 Public and Agency Involvement	4-1
4.1 Public Outreach Plan	4-1
4.2 Community and Agency Partnering	4-1
4.3 Education and Community Communication	4-2
Chapter 5 – Alternatives Development	5-1
5.1 Technology Screening	5-1
5.2 Bus Rapid Transit Definition.....	5-4
5.3 Alternatives Screening Methodology.....	5-6
5.4 Initial Alignments.....	5-6
5.5 Detailed Screening	5-16
5.6 Stations	5-25

Provo/Orem Alternatives Analysis

Chapter 6 Alternatives Refinement	6-1
6.1 Further Assessment of Operating Plans	6-1
6.2 LRT and BRT Findings.....	6-1
6.3 Station Refinement.....	6-3
6.4 Running-way Options.....	6-3
6.5 Intersection Treatments	6-12
Chapter 7 Locally Preferred Alternative.....	7-1
7.1 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).....	7-1
7.2 Next Steps.....	7-4
7.3 Issues to be addressed in Subsequent NEPA Process	7-4

- Appendix A: Public Outreach Plan**
- Appendix B: Stakeholder Interviews**
- Appendix C: Media Plan**
- Appendix D: Public Comment**
- Appendix E: Capital Costs**
- Appendix F: O&M Costs**

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Study Area Map	1-3
Figure 1-2 Preliminary Stakeholder Alignments	1-7
Figure 1-3 Transit Alternatives	1-8
Figure 1-4 Evaluation Process	1-9
Figure 1-5 Bus Rapid Transit Recommendation	1-11
Figure 2-1 Plan IRCAA Recommendations	2-1
Figure 2-2 Work Plan	2-6
Figure 2-3 Study Area Map	8
Figure 3-1 UTA Provo/Orem Routes and Ridership	3-4
Figure 3-2 2030 Employment Density	3-5
Figure 3-3 2030 Population Density	3-6
Figure 3-4 Congestion and Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	3-10
Figure 3-5 BYU Trip Origins	3-11
Figure 3-6 UVSC Trip Origins	3-12
Figure 5-1 Preliminary Transit Segments	7
Figure 5-2 University Parkway Subarea Options – 1	8
Figure 5-3 University Parkway Subarea Options – 2	9
Figure 5-4 BYU Subarea Options – 1	11
Figure 5-5 BYU Subarea Options – 2	12
Figure 5-6 University Avenue Subarea Options	13
Figure 5-7 Year 2030 Background Bus Network	17
Figure 5-8 Preliminary Transit Alternatives	18
Figure 5-9 Detailed Screening BRT Alternative 1	19
Figure 5-10 Detailed Screening BRT Alternative 2	20
Figure 5-11 Detailed Screening BRT Alternative 3	21
Figure 5-12 Detailed Screening BRT Alternative 4	22
Figure 5-13 Modeling Process and Findings	24
Figure 5-14 Year 2030 BRT and Auto Travel Times	26
Figure 5-15 Preliminary Station Locations – UVSC Area	27
Figure 5-16 Preliminary Station Locations – University Mall Area	28
Figure 5-17 Preliminary Station Locations – BYU Area	30
Figure 5-18 Preliminary Station Locations – Downtown Provo & Towne Centre Mall ...	31
Figure 6-1 BRT Station Spacing	6-4
Figure 6-2 Recommended Station Locations	6-5
Figure 6-3 Farside Curb BRT Station	6-6
Figure 6-4 Nearside Curb BRT Station	6-7
Figure 6-5 Median Mid-Block BRT Station	6-8
Figure 6-6 Median BRT Station Near Intersection	6-9
Figure 6-7 Running Ways: Curb Bus Lanes	6-10
Figure 6-8 Running Ways: Median Bus Lanes	6-11
Figure 6-9 Intersection Treatments: Traffic Signal Priority	6-13

Provo/Orem Alternatives Analysis

Figure 6-10 Intersection Treatments: Arterial Bus Lanes with Signal Priority 6-14
Figure 6-11 Intersection Treatments: Turn Lane Exceptions for Buses..... 6-15
Figure 6-12 Intersection Treatments: Exclusive Bus Lanes at Intersections 6-16
Figure 7-1 Bus Rapid Transit Recommendation..... 7-2
Figure 7-2 Issues for Consideration in Project Development..... 7-4

List of Tables

Table 3-1 Trends.....	3-2
Table 3-2: Service Characteristics of Bus Routes within the Study Area.....	3-2
Table 5-1 Transit Technology Characteristics.....	5-3
Table 5-2 Technology Screening	5-5
Table 5-3 Results of Preliminary Screening, University Parkway Alignment Options	5-14
Table 5-4 Results of Preliminary Screening, BYU Alignment Options.....	5-14
Table 5-5 Results of Preliminary Screening, University Avenue Alignment Options	5-15
Table 6-1 Operating Scenarios	6-1
Table 6-2 BRT & LRT Comparison	6-2

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

1.1 Project Background

In 1999, the Mountainland Association of Governments, (MAG) Wasatch Front Regional Council, (WFRC) the Utah Transit Authority, (UTA) the Utah Department of Transportation, (UDOT) and the Mountainland Association of Governments, (MAG) initiated the Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis (IRCAA). The study was a collaborative effort to develop a comprehensive plan for the best mix of transportation solutions to meet long-term (30 year) inter-regional mobility needs. The IRCAA study covered a 120-mile corridor between Brigham City on the north and Payson on the southern end. The Locally Preferred Alternative resulting from this study included:

- ◆ 80 miles of commuter rail service from Ogden to Provo, generally paralleling I-15 along railroad right-of-way.
- ◆ Bus rapid transit in Utah County between Orem and Provo to serve local transportation needs and provide circulation/distribution between two intermodal commuter rail stations;
- ◆ High Occupancy Vehicle lanes along I-15 from Sandy to Provo; and
- ◆ Widening of I-15 and US 89 in selected sections in both the northern and southern portions of the corridor.

Since completion of the IRCAA study, local agencies have taken steps toward implementing the LPA. These include:

- ◆ WFRC and MAG incorporated the LPA into their long-range transportation plans.
- ◆ UTA purchased 175 miles of rail corridor from Brigham City to Payson. The purchase preserves rail corridors for decades of transit projects along the Wasatch Front.
- ◆ UTA initiated an Environmental Impact Statement and preliminary engineering for a commuter rail line between Salt Lake City and Weber County to the north.
- ◆ UDOT initiated an Environmental Impact Statement for I-15 in Utah County which is considering both roadway and commuter rail options.
- ◆ MAG and UTA initiated the Provo/Orem Alternatives Analysis. Because the prior IRCAA study focused on inter-regional trips, both MAG and UTA determined that further analysis was required to obtain community input on technology, alignment and operational options, and conduct a more comprehensive assessment of potential impacts.

