

# APPENDIX A

CMPO 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan

---

---

Technical Memorandum #1 - Financial Plan Element (2000)

# TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #1

## Cache Valley Corridor

### CMPO 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan **FINANCIAL PLAN ELEMENT**

Project No. SP-LC05(1)

Prepared By:



UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

February 2000

---

Submitted By:



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** ..... i

**INTRODUCTION** ..... -1-

**I. PROJECTED REVENUES** ..... -1-

**A. HIGHWAY SOURCES** ..... -1-

**A.1. UDOT Revenues** ..... -1-

**A.2. Local Revenues** ..... -3-

**A.3. Summary of Highway Revenues** ..... -4-

**B. TRANSIT SOURCES** ..... -5-

**B.1. Federal Funds** ..... -5-

**B.2. Local Funding** ..... -6-

**B.3. Summary of Transit Revenues** ..... -7-

**C. FLEXIBLE FUNDING** ..... -7-

**II. PROJECTED COSTS** ..... -8-

**A. HIGHWAY COST ESTIMATES** ..... -8-

**A.1. Administration** ..... -8-

**A.2. Maintenance** ..... -8-

**A.3. Pavement Preservation** ..... -8-

**A.4. Structure Preservation** ..... -9-

**A.5. Safety/Traffic Operations** ..... -9-

**A.6. Enhancements** ..... -9-

A.7.	Other Costs .....	-9-
A.8.	New Capacity .....	-9-
A.9.	Summary of Projected Highway Costs .....	-9-
<b>B.</b>	<b>TRANSIT COST ESTIMATES .....</b>	<b>-11-</b>
B.1.	Bus Operating and Maintenance Costs .....	-11-
B.2.	Bus Capital Costs .....	-11-
B.3.	Other Capital .....	-11-
B.4.	Summary of Projected Transit Costs .....	-11-
<b>III.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>-12-</b>

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE 1 - PROJECTED HIGHWAY REVENUES.....</b>	<b>-5-</b>
<b>TABLE 2 - PROJECTED TRANSIT REVENUES.....</b>	<b>-7-</b>
<b>TABLE 3 - PROJECTED HIGHWAY COSTS.....</b>	<b>-10-</b>
<b>TABLE 4 - PROJECTED TRANSIT COSTS.....</b>	<b>-12-</b>

<b><u>APPENDIX</u> .....</b>	<b>-13-</b>
<b>REVENUE FUND SOURCES FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>-13-</b>
<b>FEDERAL SOURCES .....</b>	<b>-13-</b>
<b>STATE SOURCES .....</b>	<b>-15-</b>
<b>LOCAL SOURCES .....</b>	<b>-16-</b>
<b>PRIVATE SOURCES .....</b>	<b>-16-</b>
<b>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>-17-</b>
<b>CMPO FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS 1998-2025 .....</b>	<b>-21-</b>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
CMPO LRP FINANCIAL PLAN ELEMENT**

The Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, is responsible for the Long Range Transportation Plan for the Logan Urbanized Area. The CMPO Executive Council is the governing and final decision-making body of the organization. It is comprised exclusively of Mayors, County Council members from Cache County, Utah, and a representative of the City of Logan Transit Department (known as the Logan Transit District).

The charge of the CMPO Executive Council and MPO staff is to plan and provide for transportation services and facilities that serve the needs and values of the community. Their community impacts are analyzed to assure that the facilities and services provided are in keeping with local values and goals. The development of this Long Range Transportation document is but one element toward achieving a complete analysis of social and psychological, environmental, economic conditions, visual, land use, physical and mobility/access implications of the chosen modes which can facilitate design and location of transportation infrastructure. Furthermore, in order to achieve the community values and goals, the CMPO is guided by the federal mandate outlined in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). TEA-21 requires that MPO's plan and program federal funds within their region. This document fulfills that portion of TEA-21 in relation of the need to address the planning process and develop a Long Range Transportation Plan.

The staff of the CMPO, Logan Transit District, the Utah Department of Transportation, and a leading engineering firm have cooperatively joined to produce this document. The vision by which they operated was to produce a twenty-five year fiscal guideline for future transportation needs for the Logan Urbanized Area. The needs analysis demonstrates that the transportation demand clearly outweighs the fiscal revenues associated with the Logan Urbanized Area. This document assesses the twenty-five year transportation fiscal estimate for the CMPO.

The fiscal review estimate first began with an analysis of the federal, state and local revenues for the State of Utah and the Logan Urbanized Area. A trend analysis was conducted to determine past rates of revenue and calculate future rates of revenue. A review of the growth rates and assumptions can be found in the Appendix.

Total Federal, State, and Local highway transportation revenues for the Logan Urbanized Area from 1998-2025 have been calculated as approximately, \$531,355,00. Of this total Local revenues, B and C Funds are approximately \$336,002,000. State revenues, comprised of UDOT revenues and fees, are approximately \$147,611,000. Federal Funds are approximately \$47,743,000. The CMPO should have the responsibility of programming a Long Range Transportation Plan with estimated Federal revenues available of \$47,743,000. This total includes the currently earmarked \$8,250,000 in Federal High Priority Funds (HPF).

**PROJECTED REVENUES 1998-2025**

	<b>Highway</b>	<b>Transit</b>
Federal Funds	\$ 47,743,000	\$ 21,667,900
State Funds	\$147,611,000	
Local B (County) and C (City) Funds	\$336,002,000	
1/4 Cent Local Transit Sales Tax		\$ 78,593,100
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$531,355,000</b>	<b>\$100,261,000</b>

Federal Transit funds for the region have also been estimated for the same period, 1998-2025. Approximately \$100,261,000 is expected to be available for Transit activities, with \$78,593,100 generated from a dedicated sales tax. The remaining \$21,667,900 is comprised of Federal funds. These totals assume the passage of a 1/4 cent sales tax beyond the existing LTD service area, and creation of the Cache Valley Transit District.

## **CMPO LRP FINANCIAL PLAN ELEMENT**

### **INTRODUCTION:**

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, passed in 1997, (TEA-21) require that a financial plan be part of the overall transportation plan for an urbanized area. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the recommended improvements included in the plan can be implemented and that the plan is realistic.

This document provides the Financial Plan for the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) Long Range Transportation Plan. Potential revenue sources are summarized. Estimates of future revenues from these sources are made. The costs to meet the projected needs of the Transportation Plan for the area through the year 2025 are estimated. These costs include those required to meet the needs identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan as well as the costs required for general administration and the operation and maintenance of the existing transportation system. Finally, the overall Financial Plan of the Long Range Transportation Plan is summarized.

### **I. PROJECTED REVENUES**

The CMPO worked with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and the City of Logan Transit Department, known as the Logan Transit District (LTD), to develop projections of revenues that will be available for transportation improvements through the year 2025. Included were federal, state, and local sources for highway and transit improvements. Assumptions were made concerning revenue growth and new or increased sources of funds. The projections and assumptions used are discussed in the rest of this section. A more detailed description of potential sources is included in the Appendix, Revenue Fund Sources for Transportation Projects.

#### **A. HIGHWAY SOURCES**

Federal, state, and local government revenues will be available for highway improvements in the Logan Urbanized Area. These revenues were estimated for the years 1998 through 2025. Actual revenues from 1998 were used as the basis year for the estimation. Separate efforts were made to estimate funds that will be available to UDOT and funds that will be available for local jurisdictions. These efforts and the assumptions used to develop these estimates are discussed below.

##### **A.1. UDOT Revenues**

The UDOT Urban Planning Division developed estimates of the projected revenues that will be available to UDOT through the year 2025. These revenues come from federal funds, state highway user revenues, state general funds, and other innovative sources, as discussed below. Details of these projections are included in the Appendix. Please reference the 1998 UDOT Annual Statistical Summary for a more complete understanding of State Highway revenues.

### **A.1.1. Federal Funds**

ISTEA established several spending programs for federal funds for highway improvements, which UDOT and the State Transportation Commission program. TEA-21 continued these programs with some programs receiving increased funding. These programs include the Interstate Maintenance, the National Highway System, the Any Area Surface Transportation Program (STP), the STP Safety and Enhancement Programs, and the Bridge Replacement Programs. For projecting future revenues, TEA-21 authorized amounts were assumed to be available for these programs in 1999 through 2003. A conservative growth of one percent per year for each program was then assumed for the period between 2004 and 2025.

As part of TEA-21, Congress programmed approximately \$80,000,000 in High Priority Fund (HPF) projects throughout the state. Currently, \$8,250,000 in HPF money is programmed in the Logan Urbanized Area. This federal monies projection through 2025 did not assume any additional or continuance of these federal discretionary highway funds in the Logan Urbanized Area since the HPF are a one time earmark. UDOT also receives other federal funds which are distributed throughout the State based on programmed needs. A listing of all the fund categories may be found in the Appendix. The total of the other federal funds (excluding urban area STP and HPF) available for the CMPO amount to approximately \$10,868,000.

### **A.1.2. State Funds**

State of Utah revenues for highway transportation are primarily generated through highway user fees. The user fees include motor fuel taxes, special fuel taxes, license and other registration fees, a tax on rental cars for corridor preservation, and sales taxes. In addition, the State Legislature has programmed state general funds to support UDOT projects. The UDOT has used historical growth rates for each of these sources to project future revenues. Overall, motor fuel consumption grew at a rate of about 2.5 percent per year from 1985 to present. Growth rates of 2.0% and 3.0% for auto fuel and special (diesel) fuel respectively were used. Other State revenue sources have grown at rates of three to five percent.

UDOT's revenue projections also assume future increases in the state motor fuel tax. The state motor fuel tax has increased from seven cents per gallon to twenty-four and one-half cents per gallon over the last eighteen years. The latest increase was a five cents per gallon increase approved in 1997. This trend would indicate that it is reasonable to expect that the state motor fuel tax should be raised by four to five cents per gallon every five years or so. Based on the past trends, a conservative estimate of the motor fuel tax assumed an increase of five cents per gallon every six years, beginning in the year 2003, and thereafter in 2009 and 2015. Additional tax increase was not projected past 2021 to 2025. This will result in a total tax increase of \$0.20 by 2025.

Finally, in establishing a Centennial Highway Endowment Fund (CHEF) in 1996, the Legislature greatly increased the amount of state general fund revenue going to UDOT. The amount of general funds going to UDOT is expected to increase from \$78,000,000 in 1998 to \$125,000,000 in 2007. After 2007, however, the level of funding is assumed to fall to \$20,000,000 a year due to the non-perpetual funding design of the CHEF. Future Centennial

Funds were estimated statewide, however, the Centennial Funds were not included in the CMPO forecast since the CHEF funds have been traditionally designated for facilities along the Wasatch Front Region. CHEF funds will have to be lobbied for on a project need basis for the Logan Urbanized Area as well as the remainder of the State.

### **A.1.3 Innovative Sources**

UDOT is considering placing tolls on several highways throughout the state. In addition, developers are a potential source for funding for major projects which benefit their development. UDOT expects that these and other innovative sources will provide funding over the next 25 years for highway projects. No total was assumed as contributions will be on an individual project basis. Currently no toll facilities are envisioned in the Logan Urbanized Area.

### **A.1.4 Transfers**

Not all of the highway user revenues are available to UDOT. The highway user fees are split among other agencies, UDOT, and the Class B and C roadway funds, which go to counties and cities. In the past, approximately 8 percent of these funds have been diverted to other agencies, such as the Highway Patrol and State Tax Commission. Further explanation of the diverted funds can be found in the 1998 UDOT Annual Statistical Summary. The remaining funds are allocated 75 % to UDOT and 25 % to local governments. UDOT estimated the future amount of diversions to other agencies. The allocation of the highway user fees between state and local agencies was held constant for the future estimations.

## **A.2. Local Revenues**

There are three main sources of local revenues for transportation projects--federal funds from the CMPO Surface Transportation Program, Class B and C Funds from state highway user revenues for Counties and Cities, and local general funds. In addition, other innovative sources will need to be used in the future. Each of these is discussed below. More detail is provided in the Appendix.

### **A.2.1. Federal Funds**

ISTEA established several spending programs for federal funds for highway improvements in urban areas, which the Cache MPO Executive Council programs. TEA-21 continued these programs with generally higher funding levels from the ISTEA. The primary program is the Surface Transportation Program (STP), of which in the Logan Urbanized Area approximately \$4,307,000 is authorized under the life of TEA-21 until 2003. As with the state federal revenues, and based on TEA-21 authorizations a modest growth rate of two percent per year was then assumed for the period between 2004 and 2025. The total 1998-2025 estimate of authorized STP urban area funds available for the CMPO is \$25,736,000. Other federal funds as noted in the above Federal section available for the CMPO amount to \$10,868,000 during the same period. Also, an additional \$2,889,000 in urban area Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds was rolled over from ISTEA as unprogrammed funds. Additionally, \$8,250,000

in Federal High Priority Funds is currently programmed for the CMPO region during 1999 through 2003. The total federal funds available estimate from 1998-2025 is \$47,743,000.

These funds can be used for projects on the state highway system, as well as on classified local roadways. The CMPO annually receives approximately 3.8 % of the state portion of the STP urban area funds. This funding level is determined by the population of the urban areas of the state. According to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, the population for the Logan Urbanized Area is not expected to deviate or significantly change from the current, 2% per year growth, through the future year estimation.

#### **A.2.2. Class B and C Funds**

The Class B and C roadway funds are allocated from the highway user fees revenues on a ratio of population and road miles for counties and cities in the state. Based on the current allocation formula, the Logan Urbanized Area receives approximately 2.9 % of the total Class B and C funds. These percentages were maintained for the future projections of funds. Approximately \$336,002,000 will be generated from 1998 to 2025 and available in B & C Funds for transportation projects in the Logan Urbanized Area.

#### **A.2.3. General Funds**

Cities and counties program a significant local general fund amount for highway maintenance and improvement. Current and past general fund spending on highways by counties and cities varies by municipality and project need annually. Municipalities use general funds as match money for federal and for State improvement projects, however, funds set aside for transportation activities is dependent on need and programming. Local expenditures are projected to grow by 3% a year through 2025. The local governments in the CMPO Area are estimated to generate approximately \$20,382,000 exclusive of B & C Funds in 1998.

#### **A.2.4. Innovative Sources**

Local governments will need to consider several innovative highways funding programs in the future. Many already levy transportation impact fees on new development. In addition, developers are a source for funding for major projects which benefit their development. These and other innovative sources will provide funding over the next 25 years for local highway projects. No total was assumed as contributions will be considered on an individual project basis.

### **A.3. Summary of Highway Revenues**

Table 1 summarizes the revenue amount projected to be available Statewide and for the Logan Urbanized Area over the next twenty-five years.

**TABLE 1 - PROJECTED HIGHWAY REVENUES**  
**Projected Revenues (1998-2025)**

**Statewide Funds**

<b>Federal Funds - Highway Trust Fund</b>	\$ 5,058,243,000
<b>State Funds - Highway User Revenue (less diversions)</b> (Includes B&C)	<u>\$17,495,498,000</u>
<b>Total Statewide Revenue</b>	<b>\$22,553,741,000</b>

**CMPO Funds**

<b>Federal Funds</b>	\$ 47,743,000*
<b>State Funds</b>	\$147,611,000
<b>Class B&amp;C Funds</b>	<u>\$336,002,000</u>
<b>Total Federal / State/ Local Revenue</b>	<b>\$531,355,000</b>

\* Includes \$2,889,000 in ISTEA Funds roll-over and \$8,250,000 in federal High Priority Funds one-time

**B. TRANSIT SOURCES**

Revenues for transit service and improvements are typically available from several sources including federal funds, a local sales tax, fares, and others. However, due to local policies this plan assumes no fares or advertising revenues. Projections of future transit revenues are discussed below.

**B.1. Federal Funds**

Federal funds for transit capital and planning assistance are made available through the Federal Transit Administration. These funding programs are financed through the federal gasoline tax currently going to the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund as well as from general fund reserves. These are discussed below.

**B.1.1. Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program Funds**

This program provides a block grant to transit agencies within urbanized areas for capital improvements. The Logan Transit District (LTD) is the sole public transit service provider in the Logan Urbanized Area. These funds can also be used to support preventive maintenance and planning activities. Funding is distributed annually to the Logan Urbanized Area by a formula based on population, population density, and bus revenue miles of service. The federal share for these grants is 80 %. For projecting future revenues, TEA-21 authorized amounts were assumed to be available for these programs through 2003. A modest growth of 1.0 % per

year for each program was then assumed for the period between 2004 and 2025. Approximately, \$15,667,900 will be made available for the future period.

### **B.1.2. Section 5309 Capital Discretionary Grants**

This program provides discretionary funding for capital improvement projects such as the purchase of buses or the construction of operating and maintenance facilities. These funds are allocated by FTA throughout the country on the basis of need, though Congressional earmarking of Section 5309 funding is typical. The federal share of these projects is 80 %. Because of their discretionary nature, Section 5309 funding for area transit projects varies from year to year. Current earmarks include \$4,000,000 through 1999. For this Long Range Transportation Plan analysis, the CMPO assumed that the LTD gains earmarks for these funds for capital acquisition of buses for \$1,000,000 in 2006 and \$1,000,000 again in 2016. Approximately, \$6,000,000 will be made available for the future period.

### **B.1.3. Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds**

This program provides funds for planning studies by local agencies. The funds are allocated by FTA through the UDOT. The federal share of the funds is 80 %. Currently, the CMPO receives \$10,000 annually for this activity. The CMPO desires to lobby for establishment of a funding level of \$20,000 annually. The Long Range Transportation Plan fiscal analysis assumed \$20,000 beginning 2004. The total of planning funds estimated would be \$500,000 through 2025.

## **B.2. Local Funding**

LTD currently receives revenue from a quarter of 1% sales and use tax collected in Logan City. These revenues were projected to increase by 3.0 % per year. The rate was established from information supplied from the Utah Tax Commission. The LTD will receive approximately \$1,317,000 in 1999 from the transit sales and use tax. Approximately \$54,894,000 is estimated to be generated through 2025.

The CMPO anticipates, through a November 2000 public referendum, establishment of the Cache Valley Transit District which will serve all jurisdictions within the Logan Urbanized Area as well as the cities of Richmond and Hyrum. Several municipalities have already stated their support for the expanded LTD service area. Accordingly, the CMPO also anticipates establishment of a one quarter of one percent sales and use tax within the expanded district. Assuming the referendum passes, approximately \$23,698,500 could be generated from 2001 through 2025. The total available revenue generated by the local sales tax would then be \$78,593,100 through 2025.

### **B.2.1 Users Fees - Bus Fare Revenue**

LTD does not charge a ride fare and thus generates no fare box revenue. LTD has no plans to institute a ride fare in the future.

### B.2.2. Other Revenues

LTD receives no revenues from other sources. No revenue is received from advertising or joint partnership agreements. The CMPO made no future assumptions for these sources.

### B.3. Summary of Transit Revenues

Table 2 summarizes the amount of revenue projected to be available for transit improvements in the Logan Urbanized Area between 1998 and 2025. Approximately \$76,562,500 in the Logan Urbanized Area is projected to be available during this period. Pending a proposed referendum for an expanded service area and creation of the Cache Valley Transit District, approximately \$101,260,000 could be generated in revenue.

---

**TABLE 2 - PROJECTED TRANSIT REVENUES**  
**Projected Revenues (1998-2025)**

#### **Transit Revenues Logan Urbanized Area**

	<b>Existing LTD Service Area</b>	<b>Expanded CVTD Service Area *</b>
<b>Federal Revenues</b>		
Formula Funds FTA 5307	\$15,667,900	\$ 15,667,900
Discretionary Funds FTA 5309	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
Local Sales Tax Revenue	\$54,894,600	\$ 78,593,100
Fare Revenue	\$ 0	\$ 0
Other revenue	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$76,562,500</b>	<b>\$101,261,000</b>

\* Pending referendum

---

### C. FLEXIBLE FUNDING

While the funds discussed above have been identified with either highways or transit, there is some flexibility in the use of many of these funds. Most of the federal funds can be used for either highways or transit under certain conditions. Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, and Surface Transportation Program funds can all be used for transit capital projects. FTA Section 5307 Funds can be used for highway improvements if Americans with Disabilities Act requirements are met.

State highway user revenues, including Class B and C funds, must be used for highway improvements. However, eligible uses would include construction of bus turnouts along arterial

streets and construction of joint use park-and-ride lots which can also serve transit riders. State and local general fund revenues that are currently dedicated to highway improvements could possibly be used to support transit's capital or operating expenses, with approval of local governing bodies. The local sales tax for transit is restricted to transit uses.

This Plan does not anticipate a significant transfer of funds between highways and transit, since the projected funds for each will not meet all the future needs. The planning process will continue to consider the need for similar transfers in the future.

## **II. PROJECTED COSTS**

The costs for making the needed improvements for both highways and transit as identified by the Long Range Plan were estimated. These estimates are discussed below.

### **A. HIGHWAY COST ESTIMATES**

The CMPO estimated the cost to meet the needs for highway improvements over the next 25 years. Eight cost categories were estimated, including administration, maintenance, pavement preservation, structure preservation, safety and traffic operations, enhancements, new capacity, and other miscellaneous costs. The assumptions used and the total costs estimated for the various types of costs are discussed below. These assumptions are based on UDOT's experience and a survey of UDOT and local agencies concerning their expenses.

#### **A.1. Administration**

Administration costs are the costs associated with administering transportation agencies and transportation sections of larger public works departments. These costs include such expenditures as UDOT staff, local staff, planning and preliminary engineering costs, and so on. UDOT estimated their administrative costs based on their past budgets and project load. The CMPO's share of these costs was thus assumed to be approximately 9.2 % of revenues or \$48,727,000 for the future period.

#### **A.2. Maintenance**

Maintenance activities include snow removal, sweeping, weed control, crack sealing and pothole patching. UDOT estimated their costs for these activities. The CMPO's share of these costs was estimated based on the percent of past expenditures and programmed projects in the region. The CMPO's share of these costs was assumed to be approximately 25.2 % of revenues or \$133,714,000 for the future period.

#### **A.3. Pavement Preservation**

Pavement preservation actions are treatments for streets and highways which are more intensive than maintenance. These treatments range from a chip seal up to a full reconstruction. UDOT

estimated their costs for these activities. The CMPO's share of these costs was estimated based on the percent of past expenditures and programmed projects for the region. The CMPO's share of these costs was assumed to be approximately 29.2% of revenues or \$154,967,000 for the future period.

#### **A.4. Structure Preservation**

Structure preservation includes bridge replacement and rehabilitation. UDOT estimated their costs for these activities. The CMPO Region's share of these costs was estimated based on the percent of state structures in the region, or 5 %. Local costs were estimated to be \$26,743,000 for the future period.

#### **A.5. Safety/Traffic Operations**

Safety improvements include hazard elimination, intersection upgrades, railroad crossing improvements, and other projects. Traffic operations activity includes signing, marking, and signal installation and maintenance. UDOT and local costs for these activities are estimated to be approximately 9.7 % of revenues or \$51,656,000 through 2025.

#### **A.6. Enhancements**

Enhancements include development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, landscaping projects, etc. UDOT and local costs for these activities were included as currently programmed, however, as projects compete statewide for funding, no guarantee can be made for continued funding over the years.

#### **A.7. Other Costs**

UDOT will incur some other costs not in the other categories. These include noise wall construction, interest payments on borrowing, and others. These costs should amount to approximately 5.2 % of revenues or \$27,475,000 in the CMPO Region through 2025.

#### **A.8. New Capacity**

The Long Range Plan estimates the cost to provide new capacity for collector and arterial streets that will be needed to meet the transportation demands in 2025. These total costs are almost 16.6 % of revenues or approximately \$88,073,000 in the Logan Urbanized Area. The estimation of funds for new capacity includes STP urban area funds for the CMPO. The cost for local street construction is not included in these estimates. It is assumed that these streets will be built by the local entity and/or private development.

#### **A.9. Summary of Projected Highway Costs**

Table 3, on page 9, summarizes the estimated costs to meet the needs for maintaining, preserving, and expanding the highway system through the year 2025.

**TABLE 3. PROJECTED HIGHWAY COSTS**  
**Projected Costs (1998-2025)**

**Forecast Highway Costs Logan Urbanized Area**

	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Administration	9.17	\$ 48,727,000
Maintenance	25.17	\$133,714,000
Pavement Preservation	29.17	\$154,967,000
Structure Preservation	5.03	\$ 26,743,000
Safety/Traffic Operations	9.72	\$ 51,656,000
Other	5.17	\$ 27,475,000
Long Range Capacity	<u>16.57</u>	<u>\$ 88,073,000*</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>\$531,355,000</b>

\* Includes \$2,889,000 ISTEA Fund roll-over and \$8,250,000 State Centennial Funds

## **B. TRANSIT COST ESTIMATES**

The CMPO worked with the LTD to estimate the costs to implement the recommended transit improvements in the CMPO Transportation Plan. Included in these costs are the costs to operate and maintain existing service, as well as the capital and operating costs to increase transit service and capacity. Major capital investment will need to be made to support the expanded bus and paratransit services and the proposed fixed-guideway system. Major capital costs include the purchase of replacement and expansion vehicles for regular bus and paratransit services, operating and maintenance facilities, and other items.

These cost estimates are discussed below.

### **B.1. Bus Operating and Maintenance Costs**

Operating and maintenance costs are the total non-capital costs associated with regular bus service and shuttle service to Utah State University. These costs are assumed to be a function of the revenue hours of service for each type of service, and fixed costs (facility maintenance, staff wages, utilities, etc.).

Revenue hours of regular bus service and shuttle bus service are recommended to grow incrementally by the year 2025. Between the years 1998 and 2025, revenue hours were assumed to grow at a straight-line rate to the recommended totals. Costs per hour of service are estimated to grow at 3 % a year.

### **B.2. Bus Capital Costs**

LTD will need to expand its bus fleet to provide the recommended levels of service in the year 2025. An additional 8 new buses will be needed for expansion in the region. In addition, 53 buses will need to be replaced.

### **B.3. Other Capital**

Other capital costs include construction of operating and maintenance facilities, expenditures on support vehicles; bus stop improvements, including park-and-ride lots; ride share vans; office, communications, and computer equipment, and other miscellaneous costs.

### **B.4. Summary of Projected Transit Costs**

Table 4, summarizes the capital and operating costs that will be needed over the next twenty-five years to expand the transit system. Total estimated costs are shown for the existing LTD service area and with the proposed expanded service area.

**TABLE 4. PROJECTED TRANSIT COSTS**  
**Projected Costs (1998-2025)**

**Forecast Transit Costs Logan Urbanized Area**

	<b>Existing Service Area</b>		<b>Expanded Service Area (CVTD) *</b>	
	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Bus Operating Costs	71.30	\$ 53,825,100	76.90	\$ 72,054,800
Bus Capital Costs	<u>28.70</u>	<u>\$ 21,667,900</u>	<u>23.10</u>	<u>\$ 21,667,900</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>\$ 75,493,000</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>\$93,722,700</b>

\* Pending referendum

**III. CONCLUSION**

This Financial Plan for the Logan Urbanized Area Long Range Transportation Plan demonstrates that a fiscal constrained Plan can provide adequate revenues to operate and maintain the existing highway and transit systems into the future. Understanding the assumptions of this estimation, the recommendations of the 2025 Long Range Plans will be able to be implemented.

## APPENDIX

### **REVENUE FUND SOURCES FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS**

Funding sources for transportation improvement projects in the Salt Lake Area are available from federal, state, and local governments as well as from private developers. The following section briefly outlines the available funding and programs and what they may be used for. The table included in this chapter provides a summary of the specific federal, state, and local programs available to fund transportation projects.

#### **FEDERAL SOURCES**

The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration provide the major source of funds from the federal government for transportation improvements. The current federal highway and transit bill (the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, (TEA-21)) increased funding levels and the flexibility of federal highway and transit programs. In addition to these programs, funds are also available from several other federal agencies. All are discussed below.

##### **Federal Highway Administration**

The FHWA administers the highway programs of the federal government. Included are programs for improvements to the Federal-Aid Interstate System, for improvements to other highways in rural and urban areas, and for safety related improvements.

Funding for these programs comes from the twelve cents per gallon of the federal gasoline tax currently dedicated to the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund enacted October 1, 1995. A brief description of each of these programs follows:

**Federal-Aid Interstate Maintenance Program** - These funds can be used for resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of the Interstate Highway System. Since the Interstate System is complete in Utah, this program will increase in importance as the emphasis will shift from construction of the System to maintaining the System. The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and the State Transportation Commission program these funds. The federal share of these projects is approximately 93 %.

**National Highway System (NHS)** This category of highways includes all interstate and other major U.S. routes and state highways. The final national system must be approved by Congress by September of 1995. Until then, any highway classified as a principal arterial is eligible to receive NHS funds. The federal share for this program is approximately 93%. Projects such as commuter parking lots and new interchanges are also eligible to receive NHS funds.

**Surface Transportation Program (STP)** The funds from this program may be spent on any road that is functionally classified as a collector or arterial for urban streets or as a major collector or arterial for rural areas. The type of projects may range from rehabilitation to new construction. These funds may also be used for transit projects.

Fifty percent of a state's STP funds are allocated to urban and rural areas of the state based on population. Thirty percent can be used in any area of the state at the discretion of the State Transportation Commission. For the remaining 20 % of the funds, 10% must be spent on highway safety projects, and 10 % must be spent on Transportation Enhancements. Enhancement projects can range from historic preservation and bicycle and pedestrian facilities to landscaping and water runoff mitigation. Safety projects include Hazard Elimination, Railroad Crossing, and Railroad Protective Devices projects.

**Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ)** - This program provides federal-aid to projects which can be proven to reduce traffic congestion and/or improve air quality in non-attainment areas. Examples of CMAQ projects are signal coordination, park and ride lots, ridesharing, and alternative transportation modes.

**Bridge Replacement Program** - This program provides funds for the replacement of substandard bridges, both on and off federal-aid systems. Bridges must have a span of 20 feet in order to be eligible to receive these funds. UDOT has evaluated all eligible bridges in the state and given them a rating. All bridges with a rating of less than 50 are eligible to receive funding on a first-come, first-served basis. UDOT re-inventories the bridges every two years. The State Transportation Commission has established a policy that 65 % of these funds will be used for bridges on the state system with the remaining 35 % being used for bridges under local jurisdiction. The federal share for these projects is 80 %.

### **Federal Transit Administration**

Federal funds for transit capital, planning, and operating assistance are made available through the Federal Transit Administration. These funding programs are financed through the two cents of the federal gasoline tax currently going to the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund as well as from general fund reserves. A brief description of the transit assistance programs follows.

**FTA Section 5309 Capital Program Funds** - This program provides discretionary funding for capital improvement projects such as the purchase of buses or the construction of operating and maintenance facilities. These funds are allocated by FTA throughout the country on the basis of need. The Logan Transit District applies directly to FTA to receive approval for these funds. The federal share of these projects is 80 %, with the local share 20 %.

**FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program Funds** - This program provides a block grant to local transit agencies to provide capital and operating assistance. These funds can also be used to support planning activities. Funding is distributed annually to the Logan Urbanized Area by a formula based on population, population density, and bus revenue miles of service. While the funds can be spent for either capital or operating expenses, an upper limit has been placed on the amount spent for operating expenses. As with the FTA Section 5309 Program, the LTD applies directly to FTA for approval of these projects. The federal share for operating assistance is up to 50 %, while for capital and planning assistance it is 80 %.

**FTA Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program Funds** - This program provides funding to private non-profit agencies for capital improvements for the provision of transportation

service to elderly and handicapped persons. ISTEA also made public agencies eligible to receive Section 16 funds. The Utah Department of Transportation has established a committee to review the projects submitted to use these funds. The UDOT applies to FTA for approval of the projects recommended by this committee. The federal share for these projects is 80 %.

**Section 5311 Non-urbanized Area Formula Program Funds** - This program is administered by the UDOT, and provides funding for public transit capital projects outside of urbanized areas.

**Demonstration Funds** - Over the past several years, Congress has authorized funding for specific projects which have been labeled as demonstration projects. Funding for these projects can come from either the Highway Trust Fund or the general fund and is usually over and above the state's allocation of federal funds. Both highway and transit projects can be designated for demonstration funding.

**Other Federal Programs** - Other federal agencies provide funds which can be used for transportation improvements under certain conditions. Two of these are discussed below.

**Community Development Block Grants** - These funds can be used for a wide variety of activities directed toward neighborhood revitalization, economic development, and improved community facilities and services, including the construction or improvement of streets and highways. However, it must be clearly demonstrated that all projects principally benefit low and moderate income persons, aid in the prevention or elimination of slums and blight, or meet other urgent community health and safety needs. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is the sponsor of this program. Municipalities with a population of over 50,000 and counties with a population of over 200,000 are entitlement areas and are allocated CDBG funds on an annual basis. Municipalities with a population under 50,000 must compete for state-administered "small cities" Community Development Block Grant funds. These funds can be used to pay for the entire cost of the project or to provide the local matching funds for other federal funding sources.

**Economic Development Grants** - This is another possible source of federal funding for transportation improvement projects, if the construction or rehabilitation activities have a significant and long-lasting favorable impact on an economically distressed area. These funds are available from the Economic Development Administration. EDA funds should be considered if a project is to be constructed in an area of high unemployment or will assist in the creation of long term employment opportunities. In order to be eligible to make application for EDA funds, entities must be within an Economic Development District and the proposed project must be a part of the District's Overall Economic Development Program.

## **STATE SOURCES**

The State of Utah makes funds available from several sources for highway improvement projects. The major revenue sources are highway user fees, which include motor fuel taxes, special fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, and drivers license fees. 75 % of these funds are kept by the Utah Department of Transportation for their construction and maintenance program. The remaining 25 % are made available to the cities and counties in the state through the **Class B and C Program**.

Class B and C funds are allocated to each city and county by a formula based on population, road mileage, and land area.

A **Safe Sidewalks Program** has also been established by the legislature to fund the construction of sidewalks on roads on the state system. The money is distributed on a formula basis partially based on miles of state road per UDOT Region. One million dollars have been appropriated for the past two years. Each county located in the district submits projects to the district, which then prioritizes them. A statewide representative committee then makes the final selection for each county.

Over the past decade, the state has also used general funds for specific highway projects. In some cases, funds are appropriated for specific projects. In others, the general fund revenues are used to pay off bonds issued by the state for highway and other capital improvements.

### **LOCAL SOURCES**

Local government agencies have a variety of funding sources available to them for transportation improvements. The primary source is from the general fund of the cities and counties. These general funds can be used for construction of new roads or the upgrading or maintenance of existing ones. Transportation projects, however, must compete with the other needs of the city or county for the use of these funds.

Local governments have several other options for improving their transportation systems. Most of these options involve some kind of bonding arrangement, either through the creation of a redevelopment district, a more traditional special improvement district organized for a specific project benefitting an identifiable group of properties, or through general obligation bonding arrangements for projects felt to be beneficial to the entire entity issuing the bonds.

Finally, local funding for transit improvements and service is provided through a 1/4 % sales tax in Cache County urbanized area.

### **PRIVATE SOURCES**

Private interests often provide sources of funding for transportation improvements. Developers construct the local streets within subdivisions and often dedicate right-of-way for and participate in the construction of collector and arterial streets adjacent to their developments. Developers should also be considered as a possible source of funds for projects needed because of the impacts of the development, such as the need for traffic signals or arterial street widening.

Private sources also need to be considered for transit improvements which will provide benefits to them. For example, businesses or developers have supported capital expenses or operating costs for transit services which provide them with special benefits, such as a reduced need for parking or increased accessibility to their development.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

<b>Transportation Program</b>	<b>Funding Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requirements for Use</b>
Surface Transportation Program - Urban	FHWA	For transportation facility improvements ranging from rehabilitation of existing facilities to new construction. May also be used for transit capital improvements and ridesharing promotion.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May be used on any road not functionally classified as local or rural minor collector in the Metropolitan Area.</li> <li>2. Must be consistent with Long Range and Short Range Elements of Transportation Plan, except for minor projects.</li> <li>3. Initiation of projects by local officials through MPO.</li> <li>4. Environmental impact evaluation.</li> </ol>
Surface Transportation Program - Rural	FHWA	Same as above, only for use outside the Urban Area Boundary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can be used for projects within the Metropolitan Area but outside the designated Urbanized Area.</li> </ol>
Surface Transportation Program - Transportation Enhancements	FHWA	A mandatory 10 % of all STP funds to be used for non-traditional uses, ranging from historic preservation to water runoff mitigation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhancement selection are done by a UDOT appointed committee. Projects are solicited statewide. The committee includes UDOT staff and persons from around the state interested in non-traditional transportation projects.</li> </ol>
Surface Transportation Program - Highway Safety	FHWA	For safety improvements to roads, improvements to railroad crossings, including crossing devices.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The funding levels for each category follow 1992 apportionments.</li> </ol>
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	FHWA	For transportation-related projects that significantly reduce emissions in non-attainment areas for ozone and carbon monoxide.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Projects must be proven to reduce emissions.</li> <li>2. Projects that increase capacity for single occupancy vehicles are not allowed.</li> <li>3. Projects in the State Implementation Plan for clean air attainment should receive priority.</li> </ol>
Federal-Aid Interstate Maintenance Program	FHWA	For the resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of the Federal-Aid Interstate System.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limited to Federal-Aid Interstate System.</li> <li>2. Environmental impact evaluation.</li> </ol>
National Highway System	FHWA	For transportation facility improvements ranging from rehabilitation of existing facilities to new construction. May be used for transit oriented projects.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limited to designated National Highway System roads throughout the state. Until that is designated, the funds may be used on all principal arterials.</li> <li>2. Environmental impact evaluation.</li> <li>3. May be used for commuter parking lots and new interchanges.</li> </ol>
Bridge Replacement Program	FHWA	For replacement of substandard bridges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can be used for bridges on all streets, both on and off Federal-Aid Systems.</li> <li>2. Bridges must have a 20-foot span and a rating of less than 50 using bridge evaluation procedures.</li> </ol>

<b>Transportation Program</b>	<b>Funding Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requirements for Use</b>
Section 5309 (Formally Section 3)	FTA	Discretionary grant funds for capital improvements to implement or improve public transit system.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be part of an approved Transit Development Program.</li> <li>2. Must be consistent with long range and short range transportation plan, goals, and objectives.</li> <li>3. Environmental impact evaluation.</li> <li>4. Restricted to capital improvements (purchase of equipment, construction of maintenance facilities, etc.)</li> </ol>
Section 5307 (Formally Section 9)	FTA	Formula grants for public transit capital improvements, operating subsidy, or planning assistance.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funds allocated to urbanized areas based on population, population density, and revenue bus miles.</li> <li>2. May be used for operating subsidy, capital improvements or planning assistance.</li> <li>3. Must be part of an approved Transit Development Program.</li> <li>4. Environmental impact evaluation.</li> </ol>
Section 5310 (Formally Section 16)	FTA	Grants for capital expenditure of private non-profit and public agencies providing transportation service to the elderly and the handicapped.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be used for capital expenditures, including purchase of vans or buses.</li> <li>2. Must be recommended by UDOT review committee.</li> <li>3. Recipients must coordinate service with other service providers in area.</li> </ol>
Community Development Block Grant (Entitlement and Discretionary Grants)	HUD	For acquisition, construction of certain public works facilities and improvements, parking facilities, pedestrian malls and walkways, curb, gutter, sidewalks, signs, lighting, and other transportation appurtenance.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Entitlement grants allocated to cities with populations in excess of 50,000, or counties with population in excess of 200,000 or central cities in SMSA's with populations of under 50,000.</li> <li>2. Discretionary grants (small cities grants) allocated to all counties or units of general local government, except metropolitan cities and urban counties.</li> <li>3. Projects must be shown to principally benefit persons of low and moderate income, meet an urgent public health or safety need, and eliminate slum or blight.</li> <li>4. Highway expenditures have to be in support of broader community development programs.</li> </ol>
Economic Development Grants	EDA	For public facilities such as access roads to industrial parks, or to other economically significant locations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must fulfill a pressing need of the area and tend to improve opportunity for successfully establishing or expanding industrial or commercial plants or facilities.</li> <li>2. Must assist in creation of long term employment opportunities.</li> <li>3. Must benefit long term unemployed, members of low income families or further the objectives of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.</li> </ol>

<b>Transportation Program</b>	<b>Funding Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requirements for Use</b>
State Motor Vehicle, Motor Fuel, Other Taxes	State	For construction, improvement, or maintenance of state highway system.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May be used throughout the State.</li> <li>2. Projects are selected at the discretion of the State.</li> <li>3. Must be approved by the Utah State Transportation Commission.</li> </ol>
Class B&C Program	State	For road improvement projects including construction, improvement or maintenance of city or county streets and highways.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocation by formula to cities and counties throughout the State.</li> <li>2. Projects are selected at the discretion of the city or county.</li> <li>3. These monies are used primarily for street maintenance.</li> </ol>
Safe Sidewalks Program	State	For sidewalk construction on roads on the state system.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must only be used on state roads.</li> <li>2. Funds allocated by formula to each county, prioritized by the UDOT District, and selected by a statewide committee.</li> </ol>
General Fund	Counties and Cities	For transportation facility improvements ranging from maintenance to new construction.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major portion of fund is accumulated through property taxes.</li> <li>2. Projects are selected at the discretion of the city or county.</li> <li>3. Funds are generally allocated in conjunction with the capital improvements program needs of the municipality.</li> </ol>
Tax Increment	Cities and Towns	For public facility improvements within or adjacent to redevelopment project areas.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removal of slum and blight with redevelopment project area.</li> <li>2. Must be for public improvements that support the redevelopment effort.</li> <li>3. Establishment of redevelopment agency.</li> <li>4. Identification of a redevelopment project area and a specific redevelopment.</li> </ol>
Special Improvement Districts	Cities and Counties	For permanently improving the roadways, curb, gutter, and sidewalks on any city or county road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must be within a special improvement district as set up by the County Commission or City Council.</li> <li>2. The cost of road improvements in any special road district except the intersection of roads within such districts, shall be assessed upon the lots and lands abutting upon the roads.</li> </ol>

<b>Transportation Program</b>	<b>Funding Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requirements for Use</b>
General Obligation Bonds	Counties, Cities, Towns, and Improvement Districts	For capital improvements to implement or improve transportation facilities or other public facilities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Voter approval is required.</li> <li>2. The taxing power of the jurisdiction is pledged to pay interest upon and retire the debt.</li> <li>3. Limits on the amount of bonded indebtedness a jurisdiction may incur is established by state constitution or statute. Counties are limited to 2 % of the reasonable fair cash value of the taxable property within the county and cities are limited to 4 %.</li> </ol>
Revenue Bonds	Counties, Cities, Towns, and Improvement Districts	For capital improvement projects which generally produce revenues.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revenue bonds may be issued where the revenue generated from the improvement or other specifically pledged revenues are used to finance the bonds.</li> </ol>
Transit Sales Tax	LTD	For support of public transit service in the urbanized area.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can be used to pay for operating and capital costs of transit service.</li> <li>2. Will require legislative and voter approval to be increased.</li> </ol>
Developer Dedications	Private	For transportation facility improvements including dedication of right-of-way and new roads.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Municipal planning commission must review new subdivision plats and conditional plan.</li> </ol>

CACHE MPO  
 FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS  
 LONG RANGE 1998-2025  
 TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Base scenario

03/08/00

	1998 thru 2000	2001 thru 2005	2006 thru 2010	2011 thru 2015	2016 thru 2020	2021 thru 2025	TOTAL
--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------

CACHE MPO  
 HIGHWAY FUNDS ESTIMATE

FEDERAL FUNDS

Total Federal Funds	8,115	11,744	6,123	6,654	7,236	7,872	47,743
(Authorized CMPO UA STP Funds)	2,042	3,651	4,250	4,692	5,181	5,720	25,736
(CMPO UA STP Funds, ISTEAs Balance)	2,889						2,889
(All Other Federal funds)	1,038	1,788	1,873	1,962	2,055	2,152	10,868
(High Priority Funds (HPF))	2,145	6,105					8,250

STATE REVENUE

UDOT Revenues & Fees	4,001	15,708	22,944	29,890	35,251	39,818	147,611
----------------------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------

LOCAL REVENUE

B & C Funds ( % of State)	8,866	28,662	54,671	68,161	83,057	92,685	336,002
---------------------------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------

Total Fed/St/Local Revenues

Logan Urbanized Area	20,882	56,114	83,638	104,705	125,543	140,375	531,355
----------------------	--------	--------	--------	---------	---------	---------	---------

TRANSIT FUNDS ESTIMATE

Total Transit Funds	9,133	13,412	16,367	17,515	20,990	22,843	100,260
Transit Sales Tax (Existing Area)	3,953	7,418	8,559	9,969	11,557	13,358	54,894
Transit Sales Tax (Expanded Area)	0	3,451	4,001	4,638	5,376	6,233	23,699
5307 UA Formula	1,180	2,543	2,767	2,908	3,056	3,212	15,668
5309 Capital Funds	4,000	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	6,000

DISTRIBUTION of HWY FUNDS

Administration	1,368	4,554	7,813	9,572	11,903	13,329	48,539
Maintenance	6,057	15,203	21,522	26,842	32,109	35,881	137,613
Preservation	6,051	16,482	24,908	31,212	37,445	41,876	157,974
Structures	1,211	3,041	4,304	5,368	6,422	7,176	27,523
Traffic Ops/Safety	2,017	5,494	8,303	10,404	12,482	13,959	52,658
Other	1,374	3,275	4,427	5,501	6,567	7,334	28,477
New Capacity	2,904	8,065	12,362	15,506	18,614	20,820	78,271
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,882</b>	<b>56,114</b>	<b>83,638</b>	<b>104,705</b>	<b>125,543</b>	<b>140,375</b>	<b>531,355</b>

# CMPO Long Range Transportation Plan Revenue Assumptions

## REVENUES

revised 02/01/00

### FEDERAL FUNDS

#### Growth Rate of Federal Funds UTAH

- 1.0% All Federal Funds(except MPO)
- 2.0% Cache MPO Urban Area Funds

#### Funds Authorized for Obligation to CMPO

Average %	(Mix based on current STIP Projects)
0.6% Federal Funds	* 80% obligation all federal funds except MPO funds
0.1% Special Programs	* 90 % obligation of urban area MPO funds
0.4% Joint Hwy Committee	
100.0% MPO Urban Area	

### STATE FUNDS

#### Growth Rates

##### Highway Revenues

- Growth of Fuel Revenues & Hwy Fees \* 5 cent / gal. additional every 5 years  
hold increase not to exceed 2015 \$0.20 increase
- 2.0% Auto fuel
- 3.0% Special Fuel
- 4.5% Sales Tax Based
- 3.7% User fee based

### LOCAL FUNDS

#### B & C ROAD FUNDS Estimation

- 25% % of State Highway Revenues for B & C funds
- 4.5% Growth rate for the state 1/16 cent sales tax-B&C, park access, corridor pres

### FTA & LOGAN TRANSIT DISTRICT

- 3.0% Revenue growth rate from 1/4 cent sales tax for transit
- 1.0% FTA 5307 Growth rate for Urban Area formula funds
- \$10,000 Request Additional 5303 funds per year for planning starting 2004
- \$2,000,000 FTA -5309 grant request \$1,000,000 in 2006 and 2016 for bus purchases

## EXPENDITURES

### Assumed % Mix Expenditures

	Admin	Maint	Pres	Struct	Traff Ops	Other	New Cap
Federal		1%	35%	27%	7%	9%	12%
State		10%	25%	30%	5%	10%	15%

\*weighted by fund balances