

## Reports to the Transportation Interim Committee Required by Statute

### Written Response provided by the Utah Department of Transportation and the Utah Transportation Commission

Report	Presented By	Recommendation
<p>The findings of an evaluation of the results and impacts of increasing a speed limit if the Department of Transportation establishes a <b>posted speed limit that exceeds 75 miles per hour</b> (41-6a-602(3)(b))</p>	<p>Department of Transportation</p>	<p><b>Eliminate report.</b> Originally enacted in 2008, the reporting requirement was adopted to ensure that a formal mechanism existed to report the results of posting speed limits above 75 miles per hour since a higher speed limit was previously untested. In the intervening seven years, UDOT has largely completed review of the interstate system to determine those areas in which a higher speed limit will be posted and completed follow-up studies of certain areas to evaluate results. Additionally, UDOT has implemented processes to monitor and evaluate crashes on the interstate system on an on-going basis, specifically crashes in which speed is a contributing factor, with the goal to ensure that appropriate speed limits are set. As such, a formal mechanism to report results is no longer needed, but may be provided to policy makers on an as-requested basis.</p>
<p>Issues related to an <b>HOV lane</b> established by a highway authority (41-6a-702-(4)(c))</p>	<p>Department of Transportation</p>	<p><b>Eliminate report.</b> UDOT was originally authorized to establish High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes in 1996 (H.B. 318 Traffic Control Measures, 1996 General Session). The first HOV lanes on the state highway system opened in 2001 upon completion of the I-15 reconstruction project in Salt Lake County. The HOV lane reporting requirement was added to state code in 2010 (S.B. 38, Restrictions on High Occupancy Vehicle Lane, 2010 General Session) during the timeframe when the HOV lane was converting to an electronic fee</p>

		collection system for single occupant vehicles (SOV) in the HOV lane. Now that the system is mature with operation of the HOV lane for 14 years and an electronic fee system for SOV in use for more than five years, UDOT recommends eliminating the annual reporting requirement.
The results of a <b>connected vehicle</b> technology testing program (41-6a-711(3))	Department of Transportation	<b>Keep report.</b> This reporting requirement was adopted in the 2015 General Session under H.B. 373, Connected Vehicle Testing. UDOT is still in discussions with a private firm to test connected vehicle technology.
<b>Operations and maintenance needs</b> for highways (72-1-201)(i)(i))	Department of Transportation	<b>Retain an amended version of report.</b> With a current value of \$35 billion, the state highway system represents a very significant infrastructure investment. Optimal performance of the highway system is a critical element of the state's continued economic growth and development and our quality of life. UDOT recommends modifying this report beyond operations and maintenance to include an annual report on the condition, safety, and mobility of the state transportation system in order to proactively identify any current or emerging issues that may require legislative action.
<b>Transfer of funds</b> between transportation-related funds (72-1-201(i)(ii))	Department of Transportation	<b>Eliminate report.</b> This language was intended to address cash flow needs associated with debt service and project payments for projects programmed under the Centennial Highway Fund, the Critical Highway Needs Fund, and the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). However, S.B. 225, Transportation Revisions sponsored by Sen. Stuart Adams and adopted in the 2012 General Session, redirected taxes and fees deposited in those separate funds and instead deposited those funds exclusively into the TIF. The bill also provided that principal, interest, and issuance costs of all highway general obligation bonds be paid only from the TIF. Consequently, the transfer provision under the subsection is no longer needed.

<p>A funding plan and highway construction <b>program beyond the normal four year programming horizon</b> (72-2-124(7))</p>	<p>Transportation Commission</p>	<p><b>Eliminate report.</b> The Transportation Commission has fulfilled the requirements for a highway construction plan and program and made a report to the Transportation Interim Committee as required under H.B. 420, Revisions to Transportation Funding, adopted in the 2015 General Session.</p>
<p>No later than <b>June 30</b> each year, report any proposed <b>addition to or deletion from the state highway system.</b> (72-4-102(4)(a))</p>	<p>Department of Transportation</p>	<p><b>Eliminate report.</b> This reporting requirement was added in 2006 as part of a bill recommended by the Highway Jurisdictional Transfer Task Force, S.B. 17, Highway Transfer Process Amendments, adopted in the 2006 General Session. Since that time, the highway jurisdictional transfer process has matured and the need for two annual reports is probably no longer needed.</p>
<p>On or before <b>November 1</b> each year, (1) the list of highways that are recommended for <b>addition to or deletion from the state highway system</b>, (2) jurisdictional transfers still under discussion, and (3) transfers that were proposed but not agreed to by affected highway authorities. (72-4-102(4)(b))</p>	<p>Transportation Commission</p>	<p><b>Modify reporting requirement.</b> Retain requirement for the report which is used by the Transportation Interim Committee to develop the annual highway jurisdictional transfer bill, but modify requirement so that report may be made by either the Department of Transportation or the Transportation Commission. Historically, this report has been made by the Department of Transportation on behalf of the commission.</p>
<p>Status and progress of a tollway subject to a <b>tollway development agreement</b> under Section 72-6-203 (72-6-206(3))</p>	<p>Department of Transportation</p>	<p><b>Retain report.</b> Tollway development agreements were originally authorized in 2006 under S.B. 80, Public-Private Partnerships for Tollway Facilities, adopted in the 2006 General Session. Although the state has not entered into a tollway development agreement, a requirement for reporting to the legislature should be retained.</p>