

**Bill: 2nd substitute SB 242 - Transportation Amendments**

Sponsor: Senator Harper

Floor Sponsor: Representative Christofferson

**UASD Position: TBD**

This Bill amends provisions related to transportation, including road usage charge, towing dispatch, and local option sales tax use.

Discussion: The sponsor stated that the Bill consolidates several transportation-related issues into a single measure and explained that it resulted from extensive discussions with Salt Lake City (“SLC”), the Utah Highway Patrol (“UHP”), business community stakeholders, the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), and the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”).

The Committee adopted a second substitute that incorporates roughly a dozen changes requested by SLC, including limiting reduced road-width standards to Tier 1 and Tier 2 roads, clarifying that Tier 3 and Tier 4 roads are managed by the City, and confirming that no previously installed street improvements in SLC would be removed. The substitute also clarifies that fifth-quarter funds, including the 0.1%, remain in the county of collection and must be used for transit purposes, that the state has no authority over parking fees or regulation on SLC streets, and that towing-license revocation provisions were removed for further interim study while towing fee rules and replacement parking requirements were clarified.

The Bill establishes a framework requiring implementation through agreements between SLC and UDOT, addresses land transfers and regionally significant roads, defines road categories and a “highway reduction strategy”, requires SLC to evaluate and mitigate negative impacts of roadway projects, and outlines UDOT’s disaster-response authority. Additional provisions updates road-usage charges for larger vehicles, allows B and C road funds to be used for park-and-ride facilities, requires annual reporting on Salt Lake City quarter funds, expands allowable uses of TTIF funds for corridor preservation, creates the Utah Trail Network, establishes a pilot program for rural transit bus replacement using one-time funds, expands UDOT’s authority regarding transit and railroads, clarifying that railroad-restricted accounts may be used on state-owned rail lines, and updates dispatch fees.

Senator Harper emphasized that the Bill does not amount to a state takeover of city roads, does not require removal of medians or recent improvements, and came about after months of coordination with SLC. The sponsor added that, under the Bill, any improvements installed in Salt Lake City within the last several years cannot be modified. He responded to claims that the City had been kept in the dark by noting that meetings with SLC have occurred since August. In response to questions, the sponsor clarified that county transit funds remain local, that the Bill creates a collaborative framework rather than merely a study, and that it does not require removal of bike lanes.

Representative Kwan asked about language that appeared to shift county funds into TTIF, and the sponsor responded that stakeholders had requested that those funds remain in the county where they are collected for local transit needs, which the substitute reflects. Representative Winterton asked whether the Bill simply brings UDOT into discussions with Salt Lake City. The sponsor replied that it establishes a framework requiring the two entities to work together to determine outcomes for affected roadways. Representative Riebe cited emails expressing concern that the Bill could reduce bike lanes or prioritize motor vehicle capacity over biking. The sponsor responded that nothing in the Bill requires removal of bike lanes, and that Salt Lake City may work with UDOT to expand bike lane infrastructure following completed studies.

Cycling Utah, Sweet Streets SLC, a member of the Salt Lake City Transportation Advisory Board, a representative of the Jordan River Commission speaking on their own behalf, and eighteen members of the public opposed the Bill, citing concerns about state overreach and bicycle safety. The Chair of the Salt Lake City Council spoke in support, saying the Bill would improve coordination and analysis of major transportation projects.

Yeas: 4

Nays: 2

N/V: 2

**Outcome: 2nd substitute SB 242 passed out of the Committee with a favorable recommendation.**