1.0 | Project Summary Information

1.1 Project Name (35 letters max) Provo TIGER Match - Rail Ped Bridge

1.2 Project Type Bridge - New Construction

1.3 Limits (descriptions should be identifiable. i.e: intersections, place names, landmarks, 35 characters max) 100 W 600 South to FR Intermodal

1.4 Project Description (summary of project) The TIGER grant awarded for the Wasatch Front provides $20,000,000 to help construct many of the projects that were identified in the First/Last mile study. This is a regional effort, and was led for Utah County by MAG. Match is needed for these DOT TIGER funds. Because UTA is leading the TIGER project grant and coordination MAG, Provo and UTA agreed that UTA should be the applicant for this match. Programing the match required for this pedestrian bridge will ensure that this specific project is done, and will also help ensure that the whole program being competed with the TIGER funds will move ahead. If this request is not funded and other matching sources cannot be found, the project would likely be removed from the TIGER program. Other projects along the Wasatch front may be able to fill the gap to use the TIGER funds; though if not enough are able to be cleared it could negatively impact the TIGER program and award. These first/last mile projects greatly increase our region’s non-motorized transportation network, and merge that network with a robust transit network for unprecedented synergy in alternative transportation. This bridge spans four freight and passenger tracks that pedestrians otherwise have to cross at grade at Freedom Blvd., making major safety and convenience improvements. It connects the redeveloping south side of Provo’s downtown to the Wasatch Front regional transportation network.

1.5 Sponsor (jurisdiction, agency name) Utah Transit Authority

1.6 Contact Information
- Project Manager Richard Miller
- Office Phone 801-236-4728
- Cell Phone 801-231-6515
1.7 Cost Estimate

- **Total Project Cost** (include matches, pledged funds, etc.) $4,337,804
- **MPO funding request** (include any match) $1,198,957 needed, no match included
  - **PE Cost** 0 - already completed
  - **ROW Cost** None anticipated
  - **Construction Cost** $3,379,559
  - **Soft Match proposed for project** None

1.8 Project Rank (rank this project compared to your other submittals)

1

1.9 Air Quality Benefit (summarize CM/AQ Report, NA for non-CM/AQ eligible projects)

This pedestrian bridge is a key link in the regional active transportation network, connecting Provo City's center with the FrontRunner Intermodal Center. By linking FrontRunner with the town center, this improvement will support commuting bike and walking trips. A robust pedestrian network, especially one connected to transit infrastructure like the TIGER program is constructing, attracts more users away from their single occupancy vehicles, resulting in air quality improvements.
2.0 | Project Scope

Always enter “NA” rather than leave an answer blank...

2.1 Describe purpose and need of project.
The purpose of this project is to provide a robust regional active transportation network of walkways and bike facilities that will attract commuters and other users away from single occupant vehicles. The specific need at this site is for a safer way to cross the rail yard separating the Provo Intermodal Center for downtown Provo. Most of the funding has been secured for this project with TIGER grant funds paying for $3,254,389 and UDOT programed rail safety crossing funds contributing $454,545. To be able to get those TIGER and UDOT funds, $1,198,957 is needed in funds programmed by MAG.

2.2 Describe existing service/conditions
Currently, pedestrians and bikers need to cross four tracks at freedom Blvd to get between the transit station and downtown Provo. This crossing is often blocked by freight trains using the Provo switching yard, making pedestrian passage impossible. Though the current crossing is built to required safety standards, this crossing of such a high volume rail area does compromise the safety of trail users.

2.3 Highway Project Information (for non-highway projects go to 2.4)

2.3.1 State Route # or Federal Aid Route #
N/A

2.3.2 Beginning Mile Post
N/A

2.3.3 End Mile Post
N/A

2.3.4 Length of project
N/A

2.3.5 Existing and proposed number of Travel Lanes
N/A

2.3.6 Current and proposed width of facility (detail ROW, lanes, shoulders, ped/planter).
N/A

2.3.7 Facility surface type.
N/A

2.3.8 Describe how project is consistent with local or agency plans.
N/A
2.3.9  Describe how project incorporates ITS needs.
N/A

2.3.10 If phased or segmented, describe how the phase has logical termini and what will future phases consist of.
N/A

2.3.11 Is project being coordinated with or constructed with a larger project?
N/A

2.3.12 Describe how project will alleviate congestion on this or other facilities.
N/A

2.3.13 Describe any traffic improvements. (i.e lanes, signal coordination, ITS, turn lanes, bus pullouts, etc.)
N/A

2.3.14 Describe any safety improvements for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. (i.e. raised median, channelization of turn movements, barriers, parkway strips, etc.)
N/A

2.3.15 How are complete streets addressed with this project? (plan for pedestrians, bikes, transit, trails, ITS)
N/A

2.3.16 Describe traffic control changes at intersections. (include info to warrant changes)
N/A

2.3.17 What right-of-way is already secured?
N/A

2.3.18 What additional right-of-way is needed?
N/A

2.3.19 Describe utility work to be performed and indicate who will do the work.
N/A

2.3.20 What type of environmental work will most likely be needed?
Choose an item.

2.4 Non-Highway Projects (Transit / ITS / Active Transportation, Park and Ride, etc.)

2.4.1 Transit Route #
FrontRunner and all bus routes serving the Provo Intermodal
2.4.2 **Length of project**
Approx 170’ bridge with elevators on either end.

2.4.3 **What is the expected use of the facility or program?**
Ridership at the Intermodal is high for FrontRunner and buses. Access for these riders to the south side of downtown Provo will improve with this bridge. Usage is expected to be significant.

2.4.4 **What services are provided in the operating of this project?**
This is a capital project, no funds are requested for any operations.

2.4.5 **Describe any equipment to be purchased** (buses, ITS, etc.).
The capital improvements for the grade separated crossing only.

2.4.6 **Describe how project is consistent with local or agency plans.**
This project is on the TIP, and is in the MAG long range trail network plans. It is also consistent with Provo's transporation plans.

2.4.7 **Describe how project incorporates ITS needs.**
N/A

2.4.8 **If phased or segmented, describe how the phase has logical termini and what will future phases consist of.**
The project is not phased, it will all be constructed at once in 2020. One could consider this a critical connecting phase for the regional trail system that has already been constructed in the area. It greatly enhances investments already made in the Lehi Rail Trail and the Murdock Canal Trail.

2.4.9 **Is project being coordinated with or constructed with a larger project?**
The placement of the trail and bridge ties in with the completed FrontRunner and Intermodal construction, as well as with the BRT project under construction.

2.4.10 **Describe how project will alleviate congestion on this or other facilities.**
Making pedestrian and biking more attractive by improving connections can reduce the number of SOV trips made in an area.

2.4.11 **Describe any traffic improvements.** (i.e lanes, signal coordination, ITS, turn lanes, bus pullouts, etc.)
Pedestrian/Bike Bridge

2.4.12 **Describe any safety improvements for transit and pedestrian traffic.** (i.e. raised median, channelization of turn movements, barriers, parkway strips, bridges, etc.)
The grade separated crossing will dramatically reduce the potential for train and pedestrian conflicts, greatly increasing the safety of the rail crossing.
2.4.13 **How are complete streets addressed with this project?** (plan for pedestrians, bikes, transit, trails, ITS)

See 2.4.12 answer

2.4.14 **What right-of-way is already secured?**

Likely all of the needed ROW is secured, Provo owns the street ROW s, and UTA owns the rail corridor.

2.4.15 **What additional right-of-way is needed?**

Sliver parcels could be needed, but this is not very likely.

2.4.16 **Describe utility work to be performed and indicate who will do the work.**

Light poles in the immediate vicinity may need to be relocated to accommodate the Project. No other utilities are expected to be impacted by the Project. UTA will coordinate the work with the selected contractor and Provo Power.

2.4.17 **What type of environmental work will most likely be needed?**

Categorical Exclusion

### Facility Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Conditions</th>
<th>Design Year 2020</th>
<th>Design Year w/o Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Accident Rate</em></td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ridership</td>
<td>FrontRunner at Provo station has 1,310 average daily boardings</td>
<td>1,336 - The TIGER application predicted a 2% increase from all projects</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped/Trail Usage</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Usage</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
<td>Enter Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter Text

Enter Text

Enter Text
3.0 | Project Ranking

The following categories will be used by MPO staff to score each project. The points associated with each category show what total points MPO staff can give. MPO staff’s recommendations will be made available to the MPO TAC Committee for their use in making final project selection recommendations. MPO staff ranking is a tool to aid the MPO TAC Committee in their final selection. The committee is not required to pick projects solely on MPO staff ranks. Please note, if questions pertinent to the project are not answered, zero points will be given.

3.1 Congestion Relief (25 Points)

   Explain if the project...

a) Provides an alternate transportation facility that corrects an identified congested problem?
   Provides a grade separated crossing of the Provo rail yard, reducing the number of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the tracks at Freedom Blvd. All active transportation trips encouraged by better connections help alleviate congestions problems in the area.

b) Reduces congestion by reducing the number of vehicles.
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

c) Reduces the need for additional highway lanes for peak hour capacity.
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

d) Increases the efficiency of transportation system through traffic management measures.
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

e) Adds turning movements to relieve a congested intersection.
   N/A

3.2 Mode Choice (25 Points)

   Explain if the project...

a) Benefits multiple transportation systems (transit and highway, pedestrian and transit). Benefits pedestrians and cyclists by installing the pedestrian bridge. This connects more areas directly to the Provo FrontRunner station. This bridge also directly benefits passenger and freight rail operations by reducing the number of at grade pedestrian crossings.

b) Promotes alternative transportation solution to SOV use.
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.
c) Creates or improves linkages between transportation modes. 
   See response to a. above.

d) Reduces physical, psychological, or economic barriers to carpool, bike, walk, or transit use. 
   Crossing of rail lines is a barrier, both physically and psychologically, to alternative 
   transportation users. This eliminates a major barrier on the regional active transportation 
   network.

e) Provides incentives to carpool, bike, walk, or transit use. 
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative 
   transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

3.3 Environmental Quality (15 points)
Explain if the project...

a) Provides cost effective emission reductions (air quality score). 
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative 
   transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

b) Minimizes environmental impacts or reduces existing impacts (e.g. air/water/noise pollution). 
   Improving the active transportation rail network connections encourages alternative 
   transportation use, which reduces the number of SOV’s on our road networks.

c) Enhances the natural, cultural, or historic environment. 
   N/A

d) Mitigates invasive impacts to existing neighborhoods/commercial areas (minimal relocations). 
   N/A

3.4 Safety (20 points)
Explain if the project...

a) Corrects/improves a verified or potential safety or accident problem. 
   Greatly reduces train and pedestrian/cyclist interactions on a major rail crossing.

b) Improves information/communications for traffic operations and emergency responders. 
   N/A

c) Reduces severity of crashes. 
   Train/Pedestrian crashes are very severe for the pedestrians that are hit. This reduces the 
   potential for those types of crashes.

d) Enhances safe movement of pedestrian, bicycle traffic. 
   Greatly reduces train and pedestrian/cyclist interactions on a major at grade crossing.
e) Provides an intermodal safety improvement (e.g. separation of vehicles-trains, vehicles-pedestrian).
   By installing a grade separated ped crossing

3.5 Other Considerations (15 points)
Explain if the project...

a) Effectively distributes funding throughout the MPO area.
   N/A

b) Phases project in a manner that the MPO can use limited funds efficiently.
   N/A

c) Additional funding above required match is pledged toward project (including any soft match).
   Only $1,198,957 of funding is being requested on a $4.3+ million dollar project. This investment
   leverages TIGER and UDOT funds pledged to the project.

d) Project sponsor ranking of project.
   1

e) Project is numbered project within the current RTP.
   T14
4.0 | Air Quality Report
All projects that are eligible for CM/AQ and CM/AQ-PM2.5 funds must complete this report. These funds are eligible for projects and programs countywide. Contact Susan Hardy at Mountainland AOG if you need help completing 4.4 Quantitative Analysis below, 801/229-3842 or shardy@mountainland.org.

4.1 Eligibility
CM/AQ funds can only be used for projects and programs that a direct benefit to air quality can be demonstrated. Highway expansion, such as new single occupancy vehicle lanes, is not eligible. Turn lanes at congested intersections, transit programs, pedestrian and trail projects, signal modernization, ITS, and IM programs are typical eligible CM/AQ projects.

4.2 CM/AQ Program
The purpose of the CM/AQ program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in Ozone (O₃), Carbon monoxide (CO), Particulate Matter – 10 microns (PM₁₀), and PM₂.₅ non-attainment and maintenance areas. The city of Provo is a maintenance area for CO and Utah County is a non-attainment area for PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅.

4.3 Completing this Report
All projects eligible for CM/AQ funds must complete this report. Completing this report can be quite technical, Susan Hardy, Air Quality Coordinator at Mountainland, can help with filling out this report. Contact her at 801/229-3842 or shardy@mountainland.org

4.4 Quantitative Analyses
A quantitative assessment of how a proposed project or program is expected to reduce emissions is important to assist in selecting the most effective use of this fund. List below all travel benefits directly related to this project. Air quality benefit calculations must utilize Mobile 6. The air quality analysis should include assessing emission reductions of transit, traffic flow improvements, ITS projects and programs, ridesharing, bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Complete at least one of the sections below. If quantitative analyses cannot be done, do a qualitative assessment in 4.3.

a) Vehicle Miles Traveled
Number of Vehicle Miles Traveled reduced (VMT): If this and all other TIGER projects results in a 2% ridership increase as was forecast in the TIGER application, a conservative total of 26 new boardings at this station would result. At an average trip distance of 7.5 miles (the average trip length in the region, though commuter rail passengers trips would often exceed this) and an average vehicle occupancy of 1.2 per car, 131 VMT would be reduced daily.
Average distance of trips reduced: 7.5 - see above
Emission reduction per average weekday: The above calculations result in the following emissions reductions. These figures are very conservative:

PM2.5 - 0.77 kg/year
CO - 183.15 kg/year
NOx - 9.63 kg/year
VOC - 11.8 kg/year
PM10 - 2.69 kg/year
b) Idling Time
Average idling time per vehicle reduced: N/A
Number of vehicles with reduced idling time: N/A
Emission reduction per average weekday: N/A

C) Vehicle Speed
Average change in vehicle speed (speed before and after): N/A
Number of vehicles affected: N/A
Emission reduction per average workday: N/A

4.5 Qualitative Assessment
Although a quantitative analyses of air quality impacts is required whenever possible, some improvements may not lend themselves to rigorous quantitative analysis, because of the projects characteristics or because practical experience is lacking to adequately analyze the project. In these cases, a qualitative assessment based on a reason and logical examination of how the project or program will decrease emissions and contribute to attainment or maintenance of a NAAQS is appropriate.

This pedestrian bridge is a key link in the regional active transportation network, connecting downtown Provo to the Provo Intermodal Center. This makes more of Provo accessible to pedestrians and cyclists, even when the at grade crossings are blocked by freight trains. With proximity to Provo work and residential centers, this improvement will support commuting bike and walking trips. A robust active transportation network, especially one connected to transit infrastructure like the TIGER program is constructing, attracts more users away from their single occupancy vehicles, resulting in air quality improvements.
5.0 | Project Cost Estimate

To develop a project cost estimate, please supply a detailed cost breakdown of your unit costs, inflation, equipment, right-of-way, contingency, etc. To do so, use the Concept Costs Estimate Excel form provided by UDOT (available on Mountainland.org website). Non-construction projects such as equipment purchases, operations, administration programs, studies, etc. can use other methods to show their estimated costs. All sheets or methods used should be submitted as part of the Supplemental Information accompanying the Concept Report.

5.1 Cost Summary

Summarize the information from the Costs Estimate Excel form or other method. Enter NA for items that do not apply to the project.

a) Preliminary Engineering 0 - already done. Full Design is $300,019
b) Environmental Work 0 - already done
c) Construction $3,379,599
d) UDOT Review (project cost <$500k = $5k, >500K = $10k) 0 - all review incl. in design
e) Construction Engineering $300,019
f) Subtotal (in today’s dollars) $4,337,804
g) Inflated Cost Factor (inflate to 2022) $4,337,804, numbers above are at 2020 construction year
h) Total 2022 Cost $4,337,804
i) Non-MPO Funds Available to Project $3,138,847
j) MPO Funding Request (includes 6.77% local match) $1,198,957 (DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY MATCH)

6.0 | Supplemental Information

Please submit any supporting documentation including maps, diagrams, charts, cost estimates, etc. that will allow MPO and UDOT staff and any Technical Advisory Committee to make an informed decision regarding the proposed project. Keep Supplemental Information submittals to 8 pages total.

6.1 Concept Report Submittal

In order to facilitate the distribution of the Concept Reports and any supplemental information, all Concept Reports shall be combined with any supplemental information and saved in PDF format as one document. Please note that this might create a large data file that might be too large to emailed. Plan accordingly to submit your report in electronic format (CD, DVD, Flash Drive) by the required due date. Concept Reports are due by March 8, 2018 at 6pm.

6.2 Contacts, Questions

For help with the Concept Report or questions, please contact:

Bob Allen
801/229-3813
rallen@mountainland.org
Shawn Eliot, AICP
801/229-3841
seliot@mountainland.org
December 18, 2017

Mr. Jerry Benson
General Manager
Utah Transit Authority
669 West 200 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Re: Categorical Exclusion Approval for TIGER First Last Mile Project:
Pedestrian Bridge at the Provo Intermodal Center

Dear Mr. Benson:

Thank you for the environmental documentation your staff has provided related to the proposed construction of the Provo Intermodal Center Pedestrian Bridge over the railroad tracks at 600 South and 100 West in Provo, Utah. This project is a component of the larger proposed TIGER First Last Mile Project.

The location of the bridge is at approximately 600 South 100 West, adjacent to the Utah Transit Authority’s Provo Intermodal Center. The bridge will span the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and the FrontRunner North tracks on 600 South at 100 West. It will improve the safety of transit patrons in accessing the Intermodal Center from the neighborhoods to the north. A 14-foot wide, 170-foot long single span, steel truss bridge will be constructed, along with two ADA-compliant elevator towers (one at each end of the structure). The elevator towers will stand approximately 23.5 feet from top of roadway to top of pedestrian walkway. The excavation and construction work will all occur within the City and UTA owned right of way. UTA will partner with the City to secure required easements needed prior to initiating construction. Best management practices will be followed during construction, including safe handling of potentially contaminated soils.

After reviewing the documentation provided by UTA, the Federal Transit Administration finds that this project as proposed meets the definition of a Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR §771.118(c)(2). If the project scope changes, please contact us to discuss as FTA may need to reevaluate the project to determine consistency with the CE and that there are no new or additional environmental impacts.

If you have any questions regarding this finding, please contact Kristin Kenyon at (303) 362-2391.

Sincerely,

Cindy Terwilliger
Regional Administrator

cc: Richard Miller, UTA
    Buffie Chournos, UTA
Provo Intermodal Center Existing Conditions