



Eastern Washington County Transportation Study Report

Washington County, Utah



Utah Department of Transportation

UDOT Project No. S-R499(50)
PIN 6360

Prepared by
HDR Engineering, Inc.
3995 South 700 East, Suite 100
Salt Lake City, UT 84107

December 2008



1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Overview of the Study Area.....1

1.2 Study Process5

1.3 Vision, Goals, and Objectives5

 1.3.1 Vision.....5

 1.3.2 Goals and Objectives.....6

1.4 Document Organization7

2.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY CORRIDORS 8

2.1 Environmental Setting8

 2.1.1 General Conditions Common to All Corridors9

 2.1.2 Conditions and Resources along SR-912

 2.1.3 Conditions and Resources along SR-1723

 2.1.4 Conditions and Resources along SR-5926

 2.1.5 Population and Employment29

2.2 Roadway Characteristics31

 2.2.1 SR-9 Conditions32

 2.2.2 SR-17 Conditions46

 2.2.3 SR-59 Conditions51

2.3 Transportation Plans That Apply to the Study Area58

 2.3.1 Hurricane City Transportation Master Plan58

 2.3.2 La Verkin City Community Transportation Plan and General Plan59

 2.3.3 Springdale Town Community Transportation Plan, General Plan, and Trail Feasibility Study60

 2.3.4 Toquerville City Transportation Master Plan.....61

 2.3.5 Apple Valley Road Plan.....62

 2.3.6 UDOT Plans: Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)62

 2.3.7 Rural Planning Organization.....62

3.0 FUTURE CONDITIONS IN THE STUDY AREA 63

3.1 SR-963

3.2 SR-1764

3.3 SR-5966

4.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT 68

4.1 General Public Involvement Strategy.....68

4.2 Public Involvement Goals and Objectives.....69

 4.2.1 Public Involvement Goals.....69

 4.2.2 Public Involvement Objectives70

4.3 Stakeholder and Agency Interaction70

4.4 Public Outreach.....71

 4.4.1 St. George Transportation Expo – February 4, 2008.....71

 4.4.2 Public Open House – May 28, 2008.....71



4.5	Public Involvement Tools/Mailings and Media.....	72
4.5.1	Initial Postcard	72
4.5.2	May 28, 2008, Print Advertisement	73
4.5.3	Informational Postcard	74
5.0	PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
5.1	Project Identification Methodology	75
5.2	Project Lists	76
5.3	City Plans	96
5.4	Access-Management Recommendations.....	99
5.4.1	SR-9	101
5.4.2	SR-17	102
5.4.3	SR-59	103
6.0	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND COST ESTIMATES	104
6.1	Implementation.....	104
6.2	Cost Estimates.....	109
7.0	REFERENCES.....	124

Tables

Table 2-1. Expected Archaeological Resource Sites along the Study Highway Segments	9
Table 2-2. Special-Status Soils along the Study Highway Segments	11
Table 2-3. Land Ownership along SR-9	12
Table 2-4. Land Ownership along SR-17	24
Table 2-5. Land Ownership along SR-59	27
Table 2-6. Recent Population Growth in Washington County (2000–2007)	29
Table 2-7. Population Projections for Washington County (2010–2035).....	30
Table 2-8. City and Town Population Projections (2010–2040)	30
Table 2-9. Washington County Employment (2008 and 2035)	31
Table 2-10. Average Right-of-Way Width by Segment of SR-9	34
Table 2-11. Pavement Ratings and Ranges.....	35
Table 2-12. Skid Numbers and Rut Depths on SR-9	36
Table 2-13. Bridges along SR-9.....	37
Table 2-14. Existing (2006) Levels of Service on SR-9	39
Table 2-15. Access-Management Standards for State Highways	43
Table 2-16. Access-Management Categories for SR-9 in the Study Area.....	44
Table 2-17. Skid Numbers and Rut Depths on SR-17	47
Table 2-18. Bridges along SR-17.....	48
Table 2-19. Existing (2006) Levels of Service on SR-17	48
Table 2-20. Average Right-of-Way Width by Segment of SR-59	52
Table 2-21. Skid Numbers and Rut Depths on SR-59	53



Table 2-22. Bridges along SR-59..... 54

Table 2-23. Existing (2006) Levels of Service on SR-59 54

Table 2-24. Access-Management Categories for SR-59 in the Study Area 55

Table 3-1. Future (2035) Levels of Service on SR-9 63

Table 3-2. Future (2035) Levels of Service on SR-17 65

Table 3-3. Future (2035) Levels of Service on SR-59 66

Table 4-1. Public Involvement Support Tools 68

Table 4-2. Public Involvement Timeline 69

Table 5-1. EWCTS Recommended Improvement Projects 78

Table 5-2. EWCTS Recommended Coordination Agreements and Programs..... 91

Table 5-3. Initial Project Ranking Example..... 94

Table 5-4. Weighted Project Ranking Example..... 95

Table 5-5. Segment Summary 95

Table 5-6. Ranking Summary 95

Table 5-7. Community Transportation Plan Recommendations 97

Table 6-1. EWCTS Project Implementation Strategy..... 105

Table 6-2. Planning-Level Cost Estimates for the Eastern Washington County
Transportation Study 109

Table 6-3. Project 9-C: Install Two-Way Left-Turn Lanes on SR-9 111

Table 6-4. Project 9-D: Add Second Traffic Lane To Improve Intersection of
SR-9 and SR-17 112

Table 6-5. Project 9-I: Add Left-Turn Lanes on SR-9..... 113

Table 6-6. Project 9-O: Improve Intersection of SR-9 and Kolob Reservoir Road 114

Table 6-7. Project 17-D: Add Two-Way Left-Turn Lanes on SR-17 115

Table 6-8. Project 17-G: Improve Curve Safety at MP 1.2 on SR-17 116

Table 6-9. Project 17-J: Construct Passing Lanes on SR-17..... 117

Table 6-10. Project 59-A: Improve Intersection of SR-59 and SR-9 in Hurricane..... 118

Table 6-11. Project 59-D: Construct Two-Way Left Turn Lanes on SR-59 119

Table 6-12. Project 59-F: Construct Right- and Left-Turn Lanes on SR-59 120

Table 6-13. Toquerville Bypass Preferred Alignment 121

Table 6-14. Toquerville Bypass Option 1A: Grassy Lane Alignment..... 122

Table 6-15. Toquerville Bypass Option 3A: La Verkin Alignment..... 123

Table A-1. Summary of Stakeholder and Agency Interviews 127

Table B-1. Summary of Public Comments from the February 4, 2008,
St. George Transportation Expo 135

Table B-2. Summary of Public Comments from the May 28, 2008, Open House..... 137



Figures

Figure 1. Study Area.....	3
Figure 2. Land Ownership	13
Figure 3. Waterway Crossings.....	17
Figure 4. Natural Resource Considerations	21
Figure 5. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) for 2006 and 2035	41
Figure 6. SR-9 Recommended Projects (1 of 2)	85
Figure 7. SR-9 Recommended Projects (2 of 2)	86
Figure 8. SR-17 Recommended Projects (1 of 2)	87
Figure 9. SR-17 Recommended Projects (2 of 2)	88
Figure 10. SR-59 Recommended Projects (1 of 2)	89
Figure 11. SR-59 Recommended Projects (2 of 2)	90

Appendices

APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER AND AGENCY INTERVIEWS.....	127
APPENDIX B. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	135
APPENDIX C. SR-9 COOPERATIVE CORRIDOR PRESERVATION AGREEMENT	139