Appendix B:
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

1.0 Introduction

This Salt Lake County East-West Transportation Planning Study responds to a bill the Utah State Legislature passed to fund transportation planning studies that address growing mobility challenges throughout Utah due to continued population growth and a strong economy.

The study will identify east-west roadway and transit needs, issues and potential challenges on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley. It will also evaluate possible improvements and suggest an implementation timeline that coordinates with other planned transportation plans included in the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The study area runs from the Salt Lake County/Utah County line north to the SR 201 (2100 South) freeway, and from SR 111 (Bacchus Highway) east to the I-15 corridor.

The public involvement goals throughout the study are to increase understanding of the process required for improvements, educate stakeholders and the public of existing and planned transportation improvements in the study area, facilitate informed stakeholder dialogue focused on the greatest good for the community, increase understanding of the impacts related to East-West transportation system improvements and facilitate local ownership of the study process.

2.0 Purpose of Public Involvement Report

The purpose of the public involvement report is to provide a detailed summary of all public involvement activities. It includes all stakeholder and public dialogue and is meant to be a resource for future decision makers.

3.0 Summary of Public Involvement Activities

The first part of the study was dedicated to identifying the transportation needs within the study area. The study team initiated a range of activities designed to proactively gain feedback from interested stakeholders, jurisdictions and public agencies. Information gathering activities targeted study-area mayors, engineers, community and economic development staff, planners, transportation officials and other specialized city staff.

The study team also provided opportunities for interested members of the public to voice their comments and ask questions through the study website, phone number and e-mail address. The public involvement team responded to these comments and created a contact database to discuss in team meetings.

The study team solicited feedback at Stakeholder Working Group meetings, city council meetings and other meetings with organizations and community groups.

The public involvement team also put together a media relations package and provided two sessions of media training for the UDOT project manager.

In Phase II and III of the study, the study team educated the public about its findings including a set of potential long-term improvements and a set of potential near-term improvements. To gain

a feel for the public reaction to the improvements (Alternative 4 and Alternative 5) the study team held two focus groups. After the focus group the study and consultant project managers narrowed the study to one set of potential improvements and presented it to study-area city councils and other organizations and introduced the Public Comment Period (June 3—July 18). The PI team posted an interactive map with the set of potential improvements on the study website and advertised that people could comment by website, email, phone, fax or mail.

Comments from the general public, Stakeholder Working Group and city council presentations are in the body of the report. All comment contact information can be requested from Brandon Weston, UDOT project manager.

4.0 Development of a Public Involvement Plan

The public involvement team developed a logo and public involvement plan for the project.

4.1 Developed Key Messages

Phase II and III Key Messages

- The study has been yearlong look at east-west transportation options in Salt Lake County as a result of H.B. 108.
- This is a high level planning study that looked beyond the existing Wasatch Front Regional Council's 2030 transportation plan.
- We looked at the entire transportation system, including roads and transit.
- The result was a set of 21 potential improvements that include the following:
  - Widening roads
  - Enhancing transit
  - Providing innovative solutions like reversible lanes
- A Public Review Period for the set of potential improvements runs from June 3 to July 18.
- A map of the potential improvements and other information is available at udot.utah.gov/slcountyeastwest.

Overall Key Messages

1) **The Utah Department of Transportation is conducting a transportation planning study in western Salt Lake County.**
   a) The 2007 state Legislature funded east-west transportation planning studies to address growing transportation challenges throughout Utah due to continued population growth and a strong economy.
   b) The study area runs from the Salt Lake County/Utah County line north to the SR 201 (2100 South) freeway, and from SR 111 east to the I-15 corridor.
   c) Project partners include UTA and the Wasatch Front Regional Council.

d) The study will take 1.5 years (May 2007—August 2008) to complete and is divided into three phases. Phase II began October 2007.

e) UDOT will conduct similar transportation planning studies in Davis, Weber, Utah and Washington Counties.

2) **The study will identify potential improvements that will address regional east-west transportation challenges.**

a) The study will identify east-west transportation needs, issues, and potential challenges.

b) The study will evaluate possible improvements to the east-west roadway and transit system.

c) The study team will identify three system alternatives by Spring 2008.

d) UDOT will suggest a final system alternative in August 2008.

e) The study team will create a timeline to implement the suggested east-west transportation improvements that will coordinate with other planned transportation improvements.

f) The Legislature and communities will determine funding sources for implementation of any improvement included in the suggested system alternative.

g) Improvements need to be approved by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and included in its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

3) **A Stakeholder Working Group of study area city officials and staff is working with the study team to discuss transportation needs, issues and obstacles.**

a) The study team has held five meetings with the Stakeholder Working Group and the last meeting will be June 12, 2008.

b) The Stakeholder Working Group helps refine and prioritize information that the study team has gathered.

c) The Stakeholder Working Group helps develop an understanding of possible east-west transportation improvements and their system-wide impacts.

d) Envision Utah, a public-private partnership that promotes quality growth, will facilitate the dialogue among the Stakeholder Working Group and the study team relating to transportation and land-use planning.

4) **In Phase I of the study the study team made population growth and travel time projections for the year 2030 and beyond 2030 to identify future transportation needs.**

a) Travel times in most of the study area will almost double by the year 2030 under current transportation plans. The travel-time increase is minimal beyond 2030 because most development within the study area and west of SR 111 will be complete by 2030.

b) Population within the study area and west of SR 111 is expected to almost double by 2030 and beyond 2030. It is anticipated that most of that growth will be west of SR 111 due to the availability of undeveloped land.

c) To project future transportation conditions the study team collected and analyzed existing socioeconomic conditions, population data, mobility conditions and travel pattern information.

d) The study team used the WFRC's traffic modeling program to test possible transportation improvements beyond what is already planned in its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

e) The study team measured the effectiveness of possible transportation improvements by the time it takes to get from point A to point B, the cars on the road to road capacity ratio, the number of miles vehicles travel per day, the amount of time people are on the road each day and the number of people that use each mode of transportation.

f) The study team conducted four meetings with the Stakeholder Working Group to discuss transportation needs, issues and obstacles in each jurisdiction in the study area. The Stakeholder Working Group also helped the study team develop demographic projections and transportation conditions west of the study area.

g) The study team visited every city and town council in and west of the study area, the Salt Lake County Council, the Association of Community Councils, Chamber West and the Wasatch Front Regional Council to present the study approach and goals and ask for input.

5) **The study team will hold a Public Review Period on the suggested system alternative to continue the transparent nature of the study.**

a) The Public Review Period will run from June 3—July 18.

b) The review period will give the public an opportunity to share what it thinks of the suggested alternative.

c) The suggested system alternative will be available online.

d) People will be able to comment via the study website, e-mail, phone, fax or mail.

e) The study team will provide a summary of comments in a final report for the Legislature.

f) Cities and UDOT officials may also use these comments as they make future transportation plans.

g) Transportation improvements included in the suggested system alternative will not receive federal funds until they are approved by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and included in its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

4.2 Formed a Project Public Involvement Team

The public involvement team members met five times to provide strategic direction for all public involvement efforts of the project.

Meetings held:

- May 23, 2007
- June 20, 2007
- February 12, 2008

- February 27, 2008
- May 12, 2008

Members of the public involvement team:
- Brandon Weston, Project Manager
- Nile Easton, Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Communications Office
- Catherine Higgins, Region 2 Public Involvement Manager
- Chris Chesnut, UTA Representative
- Sam Klemm, Wasatch Front Regional Council Representative
- Andrew Gemperline, Consultant Project Manager
- Dave Smith, Consultant Public Involvement
- Julene Thompson, Consultant Public Involvement

4.3 Coordinated Public Involvement with the Project Management Team

The PI team discussed public involvement activities at bi-weekly study team meetings, and coordinated with the team throughout the project.

4.4 Assembled Stakeholder Working Group

The study team sent out letters from Region 2 Director Randy Park to request representatives from each affected jurisdiction, Kennecott Land, The Wasatch Front Regional Council, the Utah Transportation Commission, Utah Transit Authority and UDOT to create a Stakeholder Working Group (SWG). Team members and the project manager made personal visits to explain study details and ask for support.

The Stakeholder Working Group convened six times with study area city officials and staff:

- Kick-off meeting, June 5, 2007
- Charting the Course Workshop, June 28, 2007
- Quarterly Meeting, Oct. 4 2007
- Quarterly Meeting, January 15, 2008
- Quarterly Meeting, April 17, 2008
- Quarterly Meeting, June 12, 2008

THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION facilitated the dialogue among the SWG relating to transportation and land-use planning. The SWG promoted local ownership of the study process and system improvements helped refine and prioritize information gathered by the study team and developed a better understanding of possible east-west transportation improvements and their system-wide impacts.

At the Charting the Course meeting the SWG concluded their values, goals, and accompanying barriers listed below:

Financial

- Goals
  - Be proactive in corridor preservation (minimize public expense)
  - Keep up with maintenance
  - Stimulate economic growth
  - Keep community tax base and commerce in mind when considering options.
  - Define fiscal cycles and priorities
- Barriers
  - Funding—There are limited resources so we need to prioritize. Some ideas are good but the cost is too high.
  - Planning and funding cycles are divergent.
  - Opportunity Costs (What are the benefits vs. the value?)
  - Long-term costs (maintenance)
  - Construction costs now vs. later. The later you wait the higher the costs
  - Re-allocation of funds—The legislature is taking funds away from local economies.
  - Sales tax model

Mobility

- Goals
  - Provide regional accessibility to specific activity centers not just downtown Salt Lake.
  - Reduce travel time during peak times. Reduce congestion.
  - Provide alternative routes, more connectivity of roads, complete streets (no dead ends) Provide alternative routes but no redundancy.
  - Reduce frustration
  - Provide access to employment centers and new transportation improvements. Central Business District shift
  - Increase east-west movement.
  - Increase traffic flow—number of cars per hour
  - Balance access with mobility
- Barriers
  - New and expanded roadways may impact local roads.

- Congestion on local streets

Public Health and Safety

- Goals
  - Consider air quality. Think about future changes in standards and vehicles.
  - Reduce noise.
  - Prevent accidents—safety in design (roadways, turning lanes etc.)
  - Reduce pedestrian accidents (pedestrian crossing, changing tire at side of road)
  - Reduce frustration.
  - Maintain cleanliness.
  - Reduce emergency response time.
  - Use improvements that won't be barriers to walkability.
  - Reduce barriers to walkability.

Choice

- Goals
  - Affordability to the user
  - Must have non-motorized choices to support other modes
  - Make sure the different transportation modes connect.
  - Connectivity—Look at how the different modes of transportation interact as a complete system including bikes, pedestrians, transit and roads—not just roads.
  - Variety of modes—We need options for roads, trucks, cars, bikes, transit and walking.
  - The different modes should be easy to use and something everyone can use.

The Regional Look/Collaboration

- Goals
  - Raise the bar—Look for the best long-term options. Look outside the norm for solutions.
  - Overall system design—Combine regional solutions with individual city needs.
  - Learn lessons from the east side because their transportation system is more established. They have a grid system.
  - Consider Kennecott's plans in the decision. What are the impacts and benefits?
- Barriers
  - Long trips/short trips—(need facilities to serve various trip purposes.)
  - Lack of regional collaboration and agreement
  - Transportation improvements will run through several different communities with different cultures.

- Southwest valley growth
- Lack of an overall system design
- THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION and local officials may not have the same idea of efficiency.

Context Sensitivity/Land Use

- Goals
  - Provide access to both current and projected activity centers.
  - Consider community desires when looking at expansion.
  - Work with each community to consider current and future master plans and try to find solutions that fit those plans.
  - Distribute employment centers across the valley.
  - Mixed-use developments—Reduce trips by design. Keep people working, shopping etc. near where they live. Consider job/housing balance. Make travel triangle smaller.
  - Make sure appearance fits in each community. Look at the existing natural and built environment.
  - Be proactive in corridor preservation.
  - Collaborate with affected communities—Stakeholder Working Group meetings
  - Minimize impacts to existing lands.
  - Look at the long-term when considering alternatives.
  - Build-out communities vs. growing communities
  - Access to employment centers—existing and future
  - Look at the long-term when making decisions.
  - Don’t just look at major corridors but look at making local streets more efficient.
  - Make solutions visually appealing so people are more likely to accept them.
- Barriers
  - Displacement—Lack of land, need to use the land we have in the most efficient way.
  - Socio-economic
  - Physical barriers in a community
  - Chicken egg land use—Infrastructure before the build-out
  - Avoid creating barriers (Bisecting Community)
  - Transitions to other infrastructure
  - Changing technology

- It's hard to create businesses on the west side because there are not as many modes of transportation to get people to the businesses. (Riverton planned business areas but businesses wouldn't move in.)
- Near-term solutions to long-term needs and challenges
- Quality infrastructure vs. valve engineering
- Impacts to existing sensitive lands

June 28, 2007 Charting the Course Meeting Comments

- Will we be using information from Wasatch Choices 2040?
- Why the 2030 timeframe? Why not 2010?
- Do we need to consider financial restraints as we look into alternatives?
- Is this study only for roads?
- Will the 2100 South freeway be considered in this study?
- Where do you get retail numbers in your plan?
- Is the Midvale City area without a TAZ combined with Murray or somewhere else?
- What about areas that don't have TAZ numbers?
- Kennecott is outside of the study area but impacts it. Will Kennecott be involved?

October 22, 2007 Meeting Comments

- SR 201 from SR 111 to I-80—Limited access highway, system connectivity
- SR 111 from SR 201 to 12600 S—Widen to 6 lanes and bypass Magna west of the rail line
- 6200 South—Improvements to provide adequate connection to the ski resort proposed by Kennecott Land
- 6200 South—Limited access highway
- 6200 S, I-215, Mt. View Corridor and SR 201—Create a western highway loop
- 5400 South—Limited access highway
- I-215 and Mt. View Interchanges—assure that there is adequate coordination at these interchanges with any east/west improvements
- Bangerter—potential improvements to create a limited access highway in its entirety
- Magna Main Street—Continue through to Little Valley
- E/W Arterial Improvements between I-215 and Bangerter within the northern sub unit.
- 3500 South to 10200—Need for transit improvements
- Transit improvement (LRT or BRT)—3500 South connecting at 2700 West (intermodal hub) to 4700 South and then west to 5600 West to Mt. View Transit line with one spur on existing rail into Magna and another to Kennecott transit rail line.

- Create a "Transit Boulevard" west of SR 111—Kennecott land plan; connecting to airport line and with connections at 3500 South or 4100 South.
- Consider the development of a West Valley transit city center
- 3500 South—Do not create a freeway in this corridor
- Do not impact the Kearns Monument at 5400 South and 4000 West
- Preserve Magna's Main street corridor
- High priority interchange consideration—6200 South and I-215; Bangerter and SR 201; 3500 South and I-215
- Salt Lake City North West Quad Plan—During alternative development take into consideration the plan and how it may impact the transportation system
- Need to preserve ROW now in order to avoid future impacts
- There are very few parcels left to influence land use, however, the type of transportation improvements will influence land use.
- Improve east/west mobility at major north/south barriers (e.g., Bangerter and Redwood Rd.).
- 10400 South—Improve to five (5) lanes
- 11400 South—Improve to five (5) lanes
- SR 111—Improve capacity to five (5) lanes
- I-15 Interchanges—improve interchanges to accommodate east/west traffic volumes (particularly at 9000 South).
- 7800 South—provide connectivity to the 7000 South interchange east of Redwood Rd.
- I-15 and 5400 South—provide a connection
- Mt. View Corridor—Long interchange spacing between 9000 South to 10400 South. Add interchange or overpass at old Bingham.
- Improvements at interchanges along Bangerter
- I-15—Provide another freeway access between 9000 South and 106 South for traffic relief.
- Old Bingham highway—alignment for potential improvements
- 5600 West—Transit corridor preservation
- Old Bingham and Mt. View corridor area—Intermodal connectivity with transit and auto.
- 9000 South—proved major east/west facility
- New Bingham—Maintain major high-speed arterial connection to Copperton
- No. 2 Airport—Major land barrier for east/west facility
- Reduce impacts to residents associated from east/west transportation improvements
- Concerns regarding increased traffic near schools
- This sub units is already heavily developed so there are not many obvious locations for transportation improvements, potential areas include 9000 South

- There is a concern regarding the amount of current and potential truck traffic in residential areas.
- Any limited access option would likely impact business access.
- Focus on east/west improvements while taking into consideration north/south mobility
- 9800 South between Bangerter and 2700 West—roadway improvements are being stifled by ongoing litigation.
- 11800 South from Mt. View corridor to Kennecott—major arterial 11800 South East of Mt. View corridor run along 11400 South
- System to System Interchange—Between Mt. View and Bangerter (need to maintain access along 13400 South)
- Porter Rockwell arterial—assume it will be developed and that it could potentially serve as a limited access highway
- 12600 South from Jordan River Bottoms to I-15—consider roadway improvements in this area.
- 14600 South from I-15 to Mt. View corridor—Consider widening this corridor.
- Between I-15 and Mt. View (near County line)—Consider limited access highway.
- Bangerter—consider as a limited access highway
- Consider extending the Mid Jordan LTR to MT. View Corridor and to 13400 South
- Consider extending transit service from Mt. View corridor and 13400 South to Commuter Rail at I-15 (without impacting Riverton).
- Connect Harriman mixed use development by transit to commuter rail station
- Connect Bluffdale mixed use development by transit to commuter rail station
- Connect commuter rail in Draper with future development centers west of I-15
- Consider extending LTR west at 11400 South to Kennecott and then rail to airport.
- County Land could be incorporated into Herriman during alternative development.
- 13400 South; between Redwood Road and I-15, avoid extension of the roadway
- 11800 South east of Redwood Road —Avoid this extension of the roadway
- 11800 South Between Bangerter and Mt. View—Avoid expanded capacity at this location.
- Prior to model runs review the model coding of 13400 South between Mt. View and Bangerter.
- Align Mt. View and Bangerter system-to-system interchange along existing utility corridor.
- 2700 West and Bangerter—Consider connectivity at this intersection
- Consider that destination areas could be developed at Mt. View and 13400 South, by Herriman and Riverton
- Consider that destination locations could potentially be developed in Draper at the interchanges of I-15 and Commuter rail.

- Collect existing preservation efforts from all jurisdictions, in some instances there has been land preserved for transportation improvements, particularly where interchanges are needed or planned for.

23-Jan-08, Russ Willardson, West Valley City Public Works Director

Will Transportation System Management (TSM) improvements be part of the study? We talked a lot about large new facilities and expanding capacity of existing arterials. Undoubtedly these will be needed. I was also hoping to see some recommendations for less-costly and shorter-term improvements such as signal coordination, changing lane configurations, etc. I didn't see reversible lanes included as possible solutions in any of the alternatives. Will this study get down to that level of detail?

25-Jan-08, Joseph Moore, West Valley City Community and Economic Development Director

Although you listed the alternative of reversible lanes for AM and PM traffic, there were not real options discussed for various east west roads. We should review POW options in several east west roadway corridors. We believe that using the concept of the I-215 frontage roads to decrease east west impact on intersections and interchanges along the corridor would be very beneficial. Currently UDOT Region II is using modeling techniques to examine this concept along the I-215 corridor from 2100 South to Redwood Road. You will want to coordinate with them as soon as possible. Eric Rasband is coordinating the modeling efforts.

25-Jan-08, Jon Osier, Kennecott Land Company, Transportation Planner

The following list represents the alternatives that KLC prefers and found to be most effective within the study area. Additional comments have been included that may benefit the alternatives.

1. A2b—Magna Bypass/SR 111: Magna Bypass from 4100 South to SR 201, straighten SR 111 alignment along 7200 West alignment from approximately 10200 South to 13400 South and convert to a 6-lane expressway along the entire alignment.
2. A4—Transit Corridor/5600 West: Extend to 13400 South.
3. N1—SR 201: Extend to Magna Bypass intersection
4. N3b—3100/3500 South: Extend to Magna Bypass.
5. N5—4100 South: Extend to Magna Bypass.
6. N7a—5400/6200 South: 6200 South is preferred.
7. C7—10200/10400 South: Extend to SR 111
8. C8—11400 South: Extend to SR 111

Note: 10400 South alignment turns to the southwest near 4800 West rather than connecting with 10200 South as indicated on the alternative maps.

29-Jan-08, Jeff Hawker, Riverton City

An item of general concern has to do with the "Stakeholder Working Group Priorities" worksheet from November of 2007. Item "S1," "Consider a system-to-system connector between the Mountain View Corridor and Bangerter Highway while maintaining 13400 South," does not seem to us to be adequately represented in the most recent Alternative maps (1, 2, or 3). Alternative S3, which reads "13400 South: Provide local access from Mountain View Corridor to Bangerter Hwy (In addition to regional transportation plan freeway improvement)" seems to come the closest to conveying the idea, but we don't think the description in this alternative adequately protects access and frontage on 13400 South Street. Nor does S3 communicate Riverton City's strong opinion that the system-to-system facility SHOULD NOT be placed on 13400 South Street or 12600 South Street, but should be located in this vicinity while not interfering with the local access or frontage of these streets. An example of what S3 would allow, but which alternative is unacceptable to Riverton City, is a system-to-system connection laid on top of 13400 South Street, with an accompanying CD system or Texas U-turn system provided to accommodate local access.

In order to avoid modifying Alternative designations that other stakeholders have already voted on, we propose the creation of a new Alternative "S3a" with this description: "A system-to-system connection between Mountain View Corridor and Bangerter Highway that would not be placed substantially on 12600 South Street or 13400 South Street, and would not materially diminish frontage or local access on these streets." For purposes of the study's "dot" analysis, Riverton City places 4 of its green dots on the new Alternative S3a.

Our second comment has to do with Alternative S7, which is a BRT line proposed to connect commuter rail to the Mid-Jordan Trax line along 12600 South Street. While we are fundamentally supportive of this concept, we believe a slightly different alignment would be more suitable to Riverton's needs. Accordingly, we propose a new Alternative designation, "S7a." In this proposal the BRT leaves Draper on 12300 South Street and continues on 12600 to 3600 West Street (as currently proposed in S7). However, at 3600 West Street, the BRT turns south to 13400 South Street and then west to the terminal station of the Mid-Jordan line. We believe this alternative would generate much greater ridership and benefit, because it will better serve planned major regional commercial development and the bulk of Riverton City's new population growth. For purposes of the study's "dot" analysis, Riverton City places 1 of its green dots on the new Alternative S7a.

With regard to red dots, Riverton City would like to place 3 dots on Alternative S3 and 1 on Alternative S7 (both discussed above). Our final red dot would be placed on Alternative A1b. Although we strongly support the idea of retrofitting Bangerter intersection to be grade separated, we do not support the idea (at least in Riverton) of any attendant CD systems, frontage roads, or Texas U-turns.

April 17, 2008 Meeting Comments

Ryan Kump, Sandy City Transportation Planner

Incorporate new interchange at 90th and I-15 with the plans—this will have to be a flyover system to work properly and should be shown on the Alternatives because of the scope. I am in favor of C5 and encourage it remain on the Alternatives list.

Keith Snarr, Taylorsville Economic Development Director

Each of the below transportation improvements are needed to serve the basic East-West travel demands within the study corridor.

Transit:

- 4700 South Trolley Transit (From SLCC to Sorenson Research Park to the multi-modal hub at Intermountain Medical Center)
- BRT—Bus Rapid Transit (Via 5400 South from multi-modal hub at Intermountain Medical Center west to Bangerter Highway and the Mountain View Corridor Freeway)

Roads:

- 6200 South Expressway/Freeway
- Intersection Improvements: 4700 S. Redwood Road, 6200 S. Redwood Road
- Bangerter Highway Grade Separation/SPUI: 4700 S., 5400 S., 6200 S.
- I-215 at 5400 South /Full Diamond (SPUI) Interchange
- 4700 South Expressway/Freeway (I-15 to I-215)
- 6200 South "Flyover" Interchange to I-215

Erik Brondum, West Valley City Transportation Engineer

- N1—SR 201: Widen to 10 lanes from I-15 to MVC.
  Widening SR 201 to 10 lanes will eliminate the existing frontage roads and have a major impact on the trucking industry. This corridor is a major hub for trucking in the western US. Protection of the frontage road system is vital to gain support for this alternative from West Valley City.
- N2—I-215: Upgrade to provide frontage roads/Texas U-turns from SR 201 to Redwood Rd. Needs further study but should remain as a future alternative.
- N3b—3100 South: Convert to serve peak directional flow with unbalanced lanes from SR 111 to Redwood Rd.
- N3d—4100 South: Convert to serve peak directional flow with unbalanced lanes from SR 111 to Redwood Rd.
- Based on current data and recommended practice for unbalanced/reversible lanes, neither 3100 S or 4100 S are good candidates for this proposal. There is not enough of a directional split in peak traffic volumes to justify. Further study is needed.
- N11a—4100 South: Convert to a freeway from I-15 to I-215 and expressway from I-215 to MVC (interchanges at I-215 and Bangerter).
- An interchange at 4100 S/I-215 needs to be pursued in the short term. The freeway section could be at 4100 S or 4700 S. The expressway from I-215 to MVC and a grade separated interchange at Bangerter should be a longer-term priority.
- A1c—Bangerter Hwy: Convert to a freeway from 13400 South to SR 201. Short term: at grade high capacity intersection improvements. Long term: grade separated interchanges.

- A3—BRT/Redwood Rd: Add BRT from SR 201 to 14400 South.
  Dedicated BRT lanes would have significant ROW impacts to businesses along Redwood Rd in WVC. Recommend transit priority at signals; non-dedicated lanes.

South Jordan

- Alternative 5
  - 9800 S.—C5—Not necessary, especially if it doesn't connect with Bangerter.
  - Bangerter Highway—A1a Highest Priority

Taylorsville

- Alternative 5
  - Concern—4100 S.—N11a
  - Priority—I 215—N8
  - Priority—6200 South N7a
  - Priority—BRT/5400 S.—N6a
  - Priority—4700 South
  - Priority—Bangerter Highway—A1a
  - Priority—I-215—N2

Riverton City

- Alternative 5
  - 13400 S.—S3—Building MVC—don't need freeway connection.
    Important—13400 S.—S4—We will have built in the next 3 years: 1. 13400 South going west to Bangerter with 7 lanes; 2. 13400 South from 2700 West to Bangerter is now 5 lanes; 3. 13400 South from Redwood Road to 2700 West is 3 lanes. Enough.
  - BRT/14400 S.—S7b—Keep Trax line by the MVC past 11800 S.
  - Bangerter Highway—A1a—New Interchange at Bangerter is critical for Riverton.
  - Light Rail Line/Mid Jordan Line—S1b—Extend light rail to 13400 South to better serve Riverton and Herriman.

City of West Jordan

- Alternative 5
  - 7000/7800 S. C2c—Concerns regarding 7000 S. and 7800 S. traffic at Bangerter
  - 6200 S. needs to be tied into I-215
  - Interchange/partial interchange needed at 7800 S. on I-15—SB off—NB on.
  - Priority—Bangerter Highway—A1a Interchanges on Bangerter Highway.
  - Important—9000 S./Old Bingham Hwy.—C1b (This comment needs clarification. Response: "C1A" was written over C1b on the map, assume comment implies support for an elevated structure in this location.

- Priority—6200 S.—N7a
- Mountain View Corridor Now!
- I-215—N8—Now

Herriman

- Alternative 5
  - BRT/Mountain View Corridor—S2b—Only need 1 transit connection to Bluffdale—preferably light rail alignment is not along the MVC.
  - Important—BRT/14400 S.—S7b -Transit to Herriman
  - BRT/Mountain View Corridor—S2b—Transit from Herriman to the station at 14600 S. in Bluffdale

Salt Lake County

- Alternative 4
  - Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b—SR 111 needs to be made into an expressway
  - BRT/3500 South—N4—3500 South upgrades would alleviate the current choke point issue that exists from 5600 West to SR 111.
  - BRT/5400 South—N6a—Putting BRT on 5400 South would be consistent with UTA plan.
  - 3100 South—13b Upgrading 3100 South before 3500 would reduce traffic issues when 3500 is expanded to Magna.
  - Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b—Concern is that taking SR 111 into Magna to 7500 doesn't solve traffic issues. Moving the road west from 4700 South to the Magna Bypass, (per Kennecott) would create a solution.
- Alternative 5
  - 6200 S. (N7a) is currently a problem area. The sooner we can affect change the better.
  - BRT/3500 S.—N4—Existing development does exist currently pass 5600 W. BRT will benefit now.
  - Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b—Concern SR 111 will drop on the priority list because of Kennecott announcement. It is still a priority.
  - 4100 S.—N11a—4100 S. separates the city when as an expressway.

Draper

- Alternative 5
  - Priority—11400 S.—C8
  - Priority—BRT/14400 S.—S7b

Sandy

- Alternative 5

- 9000 S./Old Bingham Hwy.—C1b—Better East/West commute on limited access
- 9800 S.—C5—Increased traffic expected on 9800 South/10000 South as Sandy's Center develops (mixed use projects near City Hall)
- Bangerter Highway—A1a—Grade separation on Bangerter as far as possible will ease congestion at intersections.

Bluffdale

- Alternative 5
  - Transit Corridor/ 5600 West—A4—Concerned how to connect A4 to S2a or S2b
  - Priority—Redwood Road—S6—Widen Redwood Road
  - Priority—BRT/Mountain View Corridor—S2b—Connect A4 to S2b or S2a

Midvale

- Alternative 5
  - Concern—7000/7800 S. C2c—Move 7800 S. and 7000 S. connectors to Bingham Junction Blvd.
  - Priority—9000 S./Old Bingham Hwy.—C1b -Poor East/West flow in this area (9000 S.)
  - Priority—7000/7800 S. C2c—Immediate growth currently at failure
  - 10200/10400 S.—C7—Immediate need with Daybreak
  - Priority—BRT/14400 S.—S7b—S7b Enhance to handle additional flow from Daybreak.

Magna, Kearns, Copperton

- Alternative 4
  - General comment: 1—Use Alt. #4, think transit and connectivity as the alternatives are refined. 2—Keep the broad picture in mind (trails, pedestrians, bikes, etc.). 3—Alt. #5 focuses too much on road construction. We have to be creative with multi-modal thinking. We know what happens when we simply build a road.
  - Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b—Truly bypass Magna with expressway farther south than 35th. (maybe 41st or maintain northwest movement of SR 111)
  - BRT/6200 South—N6b—Re-think BRT and LRT on 5400 South. Residual imports are too great.
  - 4100 South—N3d and 3100 South—N3b. More study required on 3100 South to 4100 South issues with regard to N3b and N3d.
  - 7000 South—C2b—Don't widen 7000 South beyond 6 lanes.
  - BRT/6200 South—N6b—Preference for transit corridor on 5400 South. (54th or 62nd—maybe keep 62nd in mind)
  - BRT/3500 South—N4—Transit corridor and transportation network for future Kennecott Property Development.

- Bangerter Highway—A1c—Like grade separated on Bangerter south of 5400 South.
- 9000 South—C1a—Elevate 900, 9000 South—C1a

- Alternative 5
  - Not important—4100 S.—N11a—Interchange with I-15 may make spacing on I-15 an issue.

Riverton City

- Alternative 4
  - Alternative S4 should be removed because the subject widening on 13400 S. Street will have been accomplished prior to 2030. Response: The Long Range Plan (LRP) Financial plan indicates that 13400 S. will widen from 2-4 lanes between MVC and Bangerter. The LRP does not identify this widening between Bangerter and Redwood. For the purposes of our study, we will remove the blue line between MVC and Bangerter on "S4" (13400 S) roadway. We will leave in the "S4" improvement portion from Bangerter to Redwood, because the 2030 LRP did not identify it. It is great to know Riverton is making it happen prior to 2030. By keeping this improvement in our study, it assures the model network includes this capacity in its analysis, where otherwise it had not been included previously.
  - Transit Corridor/5600 West—A4—Realign A4 at 11400 S. to remain close to MVC to better serve Riverton and Herriman with transit infrastructure. Response: We concur with the observation and will make this change.
- Alternative 5
  - Alternative S4 should be removed because the subject widening on 13400 S. Street will have been accomplished prior to 2030. Response: For the purposes of our study, we will remove the blue line between MVC and Bangerter on "S4" (13400 S) roadway.
  - Alternative S3 should be removed between the Mountain View Corridor and the Bangerter Highway. The highway is and will remain a Riverton City Street and Riverton will determine access. Response: A freeway "Connector" and the above mentioned 13400 S. widening is included in the 2030 LRP Financial Plan. We will assure the model network provides for these movements and remove "S3" from the maps as it is considered included in the 2030 LRP.

Taylorsville City

- Alternative 4
  - 4100 South—N3d—Not in favor of 4100 South for this option. 4500 South should serve peak direction flow from SR 111 to Redwood Road.
  - BRT/6200 South—N6b—We are not in favor of BRT on 6200. It should be 5400 South.
  - I-215—N8—We would like to see initially a half-diamond interchange at 5400 south and I-215 with a full interchange planned later.
- Alternative 5

- BRT/5400 S.—N6a—We are in favor of BRT on 5400 South and would like to see a tie into the regional system at I-15 and 5400 S.
  6200 S.—N7a—We are in favor
- I-215—N8—We are in favor of a half-diamond interchange for current plan and a full interchange in the future
  4100 S.—N11a—We would like this option at 4700 S. in place of 4100 S.
- Bangerter Highway—A1a—Interested in grade separated interchanges or improvements to Bangerter and 35th, 41st, 47th, 54th, 62nd and 78th intersections. Please coordinate work on these interchanges with the corresponding interchanges on Redwood Road.

West Valley City

- Alternative 4
  - 3100 South—N3b—More study on reversible or unbalanced lanes.
    SR 201—N1—Impact on frontage roads from SR 201 Expansion.
    Bangerter Highway—A1c—Interchanges at Bangerter.
  - I-215—N2 4100 South—N3d—4100 South between I-15 and I-215 including I-215 interchange.
    BRT/5400 South—N6a (Alternative 5)—BRT at 5400 South to Kennecott
    BRT/3500 South—N4—BRT on 3500 South
  - 6200 South—N7a—6200 South between 5600 West and SR 111. Response: Comment is assumed to apply to roadway, not BRT
  - SR 201—N1—Widening SR 201 to 10 lanes will eliminate the existing frontage roads and have a significant impact on the trucking industry, which is vital to West Valley City
  - I-215—N2—Upgrade to provide frontage roads/Texas U-turns from SR 201 to Redwood Rd. Needs further study but should remain an alternative.
  - 3100 South—N3b—Based on current data and recommended practice for unbalanced/reversible lanes, neither 3100 S or 4100 S are good candidates for this proposal. The directional split in peak traffic volumes does not justify this. Further study is needed.
  - 4100 South—N3d—Based on current data and recommended practice for unbalanced/reversible lanes, neither 3100 S or 4100 S are good candidates for this proposal. The directional split in peak traffic volumes does not justify this. Further study is needed.
  - Bangerter Highway—A1c—Short term: at grade high capacity intersection improvements. Long term: grade separated interchanges.
  - BRT/Redwood Road—A3—Add BRT from SR 201 to 14400 South. Dedicated BRT lanes would have significant ROW impacts to businesses along Redwood Rd in WVC. Recommend transit priority at signals; non-dedicated lanes.
- Alternative 5
  - 4100 S.—N11a—Convert to a freeway from I-15 to I-215 and expressway from I-215 to MVC (interchanges at I-215 and Bangerter). An interchange at 4100 S/I-215 needs to

be pursued in the short term. The freeway section could be at 4100 S or 4700 S. The expressway from I-215 to MVC and a grade separated interchange at Bangerter should be a longer-term priority.

Kennecott Land Company

- Alternative 4
  - A1c—Good as is. Bangerter Highway
  - BRT/10200 South—C6—10400 South alignment appears to be incorrect. Proposed MVC interchanges are on 10400 South along the alignment indicated in the previous bullet point. There is also a proposed future interchange at Old Bingham/ 10200 South.
  - S1c—Good as is. Light Rail Line/ Mid-Jordan Line
  - S2a—Good as is. Light Rail Line/ Herriman
  - Extend to SR 111 along 12600 South alignment. BRT/ 12600 South—S7a
- Alternative 5
  - Magna Bypass/ SR 111—A2b—Straighten SR 111 alignment along 7200 West alignment from approximately 10200 S. to 13400 S.
  - Transit Corridor/ 5600 West—A4. Good as is.
  - 9000 S./ Old Bingham Hwy—C1b—Add interchange at intersection of Old Bingham and MVC.
    Light Rail/ Mid—Jordan Line—C4—Please include C4(shown in previous alternatives) into Alternatives 4 and 5.
    10200/ 10400 S.—C7—Extend to SR 111.
  - 11400 S.—C8—Extend to SR 111.
  - SR 201—N1—Extend to Magna Bypass.
  - 3100/3500 S.—N3b—Extend to Magna Bypass.
  - 4100 S.—N11a—Extend to Magna Bypass.
  - BRT 3500 S.—N4—Good as is.
  - BRT 5400 S.—N6a—Good as is.
  - 6200 S.—N7a—Good as is.
  - 13400 S.—S4—Good as is.
  - BRT/ 11400 S.—S7b—Good as is. S7b's map alignment does not match the text.

UTA

- Alternative 4
  - Concern—N3b—3100 South

- Concern—4100 South—N3d
- Concern—Bangerter Highway—A1c
- Concern—Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b
- Priority—Transit Corridor/5600 West—A4
- Priority—BRT/6200 South—N6b/N7a? Response: Unsure which alternative is intended, most likely BRT.
- Priority—BRT/3500 South—N4

Wasatch Front Regional Council

- Alternative 4
  - Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b (This comment needs verification.)
  - S7a? (Requires Clarification)
  - Priority—13400 South—S4
  - Priority—Bangerter Highway—A1c
  - Priority—Magna Bypass/SR 111—A2b
  - Priority—I-215—N2
  - Priority—9000 South—C1a
  - Priority—BRT/6200 South—N6b/N7a? (Not sure which alternative is being referenced)

Jeff Hawker, Economic Development Director, 22-Apr-08

As you know, Mayor Applegarth attended your meeting and made several comments. For your convenience, the Mayor has asked me to summarize these comments and provide them to you. Please let me know if any of the comments require clarification. Thanks for your work on this project.—Jeff

Alternative 4
1. Item "S4" should be removed because all of the subject widening on 13400 South Street will have been accomplished by Riverton City prior to 2030.
2. Item "A4" should be realigned at 11400 South Street to remain close to the Mountain View Corridor so that both Riverton and Herriman are better served by transit infrastructure.

Alternative 5
1. Item "S4" should be removed (as above).
2. Item "S3" should be removed. 13400 South Street between the Mountain View Corridor and the Bangerter Highway is, and will remain, a Riverton City street. Accordingly, Riverton City will determine local access issues.

Response: Thank you Mr. Hawker for the follow-up comments. I would also like to thank Mayor Applegarth and all of Riverton City for your continued support and involvement with the East-West Study. Riverton is to be commended for your pro-active interest in providing this input, it

has helped us to clarify the communities, WFRC and E/W project team understanding of the network for capacity improvements.

The team has spent some time thinking and researching we have the following responses to your comments:

Alterative 4

1. **Resolution:** The Long Range Plan (LRP) Financial plan indicates that 13400 S. will widen from 2-4 lanes between MVC and Bangerter. The LRP does not identify this widening between Bangerter and Redwood. For the purposes of our study, we will remove the blue line between MVC and Bangerter on "S4" (13400 S) roadway. We will leave in the "S4" improvement portion from Bangerter to Redwood, because the 2030 LRP did not identify it. It is great to know Riverton is making it happen prior to 2030. By keeping this improvement in our study, it assures the model network includes this capacity in its analysis, where otherwise it had not been included previously.
2. **Resolution:** We concur with your observation and will make this change.

Alterative 5. (Please see above.)
Resolution: Upon further review of the 2030 LRP Financial Plan, we see that both a freeway "Connector" and the above mentioned 13400 South widening is included (ID# 44 and 299 on pg 52 of 2030 LRP Financial Plan attached), respectively. We will assure the model network provides for these movements and remove "S3" from the maps as it is considered included in the 2030 LRP by the documentation provided in the attached Financial Plan referenced projects. If you would like clarification or have further comments please let us know. Thank you once again, and I look forward to seeing you at the next Stakeholder meeting.

Jan Wells, Murray Chief of Staff, 22-Apr-08

I would like to look at the maps—I know there wasn't a lot for Murray, but I would like to see where the alternatives are.

Response: No problem. Here is Alternative 4. I'll send Alternative 5 in another e-mail. Let me know if you have any feedback or questions.

Peter Corroon, Salt Lake County Mayor, 2-May-08

Unfortunately, I have been unable to attend the last couple of meetings. Would you be able to provide the two suggested alternatives (or the one final alternative) so that I might be able to comment. I can also talk with my County folks who have been present if that would be easier.

Response: Thanks for your interest. Here is one of the alternatives and I will attach the other one in another e-mail. Let me know if you have any questions.

John Taylor, Taylorsville City Engineer

The following are comments from the City of Taylorsville regarding the two alternatives presented in the last East West Stakeholders meeting:

Alternative 4:

1. Item N3d—We are not in favor of 4100 south serving peak direction flow from SR 111 to Redwood Road. It should be 4500 South
2. Item N6b—We are not in favor of BRT on 6200. It should be 5400 South.
3. Item N8—We would like to see initially a half-diamond interchange at 5400 south and I-215 with a full interchange planned later.

Alternative 5:

4. Item N6a—We are in favor of BRT on 5400 South; however we would like to see some tie to the regional system at I-15 and 5400 South.
5. Item N7a—We are in favor
6. Item N8—We are in favor of a half-diamond interchange for current plan and would like to see a full interchange in the future
7. Item N11a—We would like this option at 4700 south in place of 4100 south.
8. Bangerter Overpasses—We are interested in grade separated interchanges or improvement to the Bangerter and 35th, 41st, 47th, 54th, 62nd and 78th intersections. With that, we feel work on these interchanges at Bangerter should coincide with the corresponding interchanges at Redwood Road.

Jon Osier, Kennecott Land Transportation Planner

This letter serves as Kennecott Land Company's (KLC) additional comments in response to the April 17, 2008 Stakeholder Working Group meeting.

KLC personnel have further reviewed the alternatives presented at the aforementioned meeting. The following list represents the alternatives that KLC prefers and found to be most effective within the study area. Additional comments have been included that may benefit the alternatives.

Alternative 5 is the preferred option with the below comments and additions from Alternative 4:

- *A1c—Bangerter Highway: Good as is.
- A2b—Magna Bypass/SR 111: Straighten SR 111 alignment along 7200 West alignment from approximately 10200 South to 13400 South.
- A4—Transit Corridor/ 5600 West: Good as is.
- C1b—9000 South/ Old Bingham Hwy: Add interchange at intersection of Old Bingham and MVC. This is a future interchange that is in discussion with UDOT.
- C4—Light Rail/ Mid—Jordan Line: This option has been removed from both alternatives, it was present in the previous three alternatives. Please add C4 into Alternatives 4 and 5.
- *C6—BRT/ 10200 South: 10400 South alignment appears to be incorrect. (See inconsistency notes.)
- C7—10200/ 10400 South: Extend to SR 111.
- C8—11400 South: Extend to SR 111.

- N1—SR 201: Extend to Magna Bypass.
- N3b—3100/3500 South: Extend to Magna Bypass.
- N4—BRT 3500 South: Good as is.
- N6a—BRT 5400 South: Good as is.
- N7a—6200 South: Good as is.
- N11a—4100 South: Extend to Magna Bypass.
- *S1c—Light Rail Line/ Mid-Jordan Line: Good as is.
- *S2a—Light Rail Line/ Herriman: Good as is.
- S4—13400 South: Good as is.
- *S7a—BRT/ 12600 South: Extend to SR 111 along 12600 South alignment.
- S7b—BRT/ 11400 South: Good as is. (see inconsistency notes)

**denotes additions from Alternative 4.*

Inconsistencies:

- 10400 South alignment turns to the southwest near 4800 West rather than connecting with 10200 South as indicated on the alternative maps.
- Proposed MVC interchanges are on 10400 South along the alignment indicated in the previous bullet point. There is also a proposed future interchange at Old Bingham/ 10200 South.
- S7b's map alignment does not seem to match the text.

I would like to thank you for allowing us to participate and to send in additional comments for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jon Osier

cc: Tom Bacus, Kennecott Land Company
Andrew Gemperline, Jacob Carter Burgess

Bryn McCarty, Herriman City Planner

I was unable to attend the meeting, but I had a couple comments and I was hoping you could pass them along to the appropriate person. The Herriman city boundary is incorrect on the map. Let me know if you need me to send a shapefile containing the current city boundaries. Also, we have mentioned several times that a major collector will be built adjacent to the Mountain View Corridor and connect to Redwood road in East Herriman. We feel that this road should be included on the map. I can also get you an alignment of this road if necessary.

Charles Chapple, Executive Director WFRC, 9-Jul-08

Thank you for the opportunity to participate and comment on the proposed transportation system alternatives developed through the East West Transportation Planning Study for Salt

Lake County. The Stakeholder Outreach program developed a wide range of transportation options. As the MPO, our participation both helped clarify the starting point (The Regional Transportation Plan) and gave us a good perspective on the westside's mounting transportation issues.

We understand that the projects identified in the East West Study are in addition to the projects adopted in our 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We will work with UDOT to consider additional project needs identified in the EW Study during development of the next RTP> Should funding be allocated to a project identified in the Study between now and the adoption of a new RTP, in approximately May 2011, the project will be amended into the current RTP 2007-2030. Some lead—time is needed because the RTP amendment process can take up to 90 days.

Again, I wanted to commend your extensive effort in developing the East West Transportation Study proposed transportation system alternatives and look forward to our continued work with you and UDOT.

4.5 Gave Presentations to City Councils, Team Organizations, Community Groups etc.

The study and consultant project managers gave project presentations to local city councils and other key organizations to involve and educate and to identify issues unique to each community and group. They presented July through October 2007 to introduce the study and June through August 2008 to introduce the potential improvements and solicit feedback for the study's Public Review Period. The presenters distributed handouts to help educate.

The study team presented to the following groups:

- Bluffdale City Council
- Chamber West
- Copperton Community Council
- Draper City Council
- Herriman City Council
- Kearns City Council
- Magna Town Council, Community Council and Chamber of Commerce
- Midvale City Council
- Riverton City Council
- Salt Lake County—Association of Community Councils
- South Jordan City Council
- South Salt Lake City Council
- Taylorsville City Council
- Wasatch Front Regional Council Technical Advisory Committee of the Regional Growth Committee
- Western Growth Coalition
- West Valley City Council
- West Jordan City Council

Feedback from the presentations is outlined below:

Phase 1 Presentation Feedback (July 17—October 9, 2007)

17-Jul-07, Midvale

- Questions
  - Any what ifs now?
- Comments
  - Concerned with East-West impacts to Midvale—cut in half
  - High growth areas (11400 South to Herriman, Draper), Roadway improvements, Creating a limited-access freeway, Connection between I-15 and Bangerter, Need two or three east-west connectors in several places to go out west, Buy right-of-way now, take out homes, I-215 connector to Bangerter, Feeder system close to Midvale new retail area, Fort Union works well on east-side, problems on west-side, bottleneck on 7200 South, West Jordan widened 7000 South, Limited access where you can move more effectively, Make road as wide as you can with an east-west facility.

18-Jul-07, Taylorsville

- Questions
  - Where will the improvements be? Are you looking at three routes? Is the funding identified for this study? Will municipalities be funding it? Are there some improvements to east-west from WFRC? What are the parameters for recommendations to legislature?
- Comments
  - 2100 South Freeway, Bangerter Highway.
  - Three identifiable routes in the Taylorsville area, not just on the north or south ends of the study area.
  - East-west always a problem.
  - Need improvements to 3500 South, 2100 South, 2700 West (4700 South to I-15) and 5400 South (all UDOT owned roads).
  - Hope funding burden doesn't fall back to city.
  - Look at 6200 South bottleneck off of I-215, Bangerter and 6200 South bottleneck and 5400 South.
  - Freeway level connector east-west to MVC, maybe connect I-215. Las Vegas airport took out large neighborhood of single-family homes.

31-Jul-07, Draper

- Questions:
  - What is the status of the 11400 South EIS?
  - How long before the interchange is built?
  - 14600 South, will this be addressed?

- Council—person Stephanie Davis was interested in the status of the 11400 South Interchange legal resolution.
- No specific comment to the East-West planning study.

- Comments:
  - Bicycle and pedestrian access at the Utah County, Salt Lake County line. Rivers are the main geographic dividers.
  - Draper is in pretty good shape. LRP to widen 14600 South with commuter rail line.
  - Council person Paul Edwards (works for UTA construction) was interested in how current plans for Commuter Rail development to the South would affect the 14600 South railroad structure replacement.
  - Although presented as a current project issue, the ramifications of such a structural replacement would certainly influence the future improvements, if any, to the 14600 South east-west roadway.
  - Draper does have a Parks and Trail committee, which is interested in bike and pedestrian access across the SL and Utah County line. No specific connection with the high level nature of the East/West planning study.

2-Aug-07, Magna Town Council

- Comments:
  - SR 201 is highly congested and 3500 South plans to emphasize transit to move people.
  - Greg Shulz of the County recognizes the need for additional TRAX to extend to 8000 or 8400 West or to the mountains. He does not want to see it stop at the Valley Fair Mall.
  - Greg said the growth in Tooele valley is having an impact on the congestion in Magna and SR 201. 7800 South and the SR 201 traffic light is highly congested.
  - Consider extending 7200 West to I-80 from SR 201 to alleviate SR 201 traffic.

7-Aug-07, South Jordan

- Comments:
  - Mayor Money wanted the 11400 South corridor considered for a connection with South Jordan as there is nothing currently connecting to it.
  - David Colton said four of the seven projects listed at the end of the fact sheet are of great interest to South Jordan.
  - Leona Winger pointed out a possible error in the GOPB figures on the SLCO East-West fact sheet.
  - Mayor Money said to be sensitive to the Jordan River environment and explained that there are interested activists who favor and actively try to preserve the river bottoms. Please take this into account when assessing options.

9-Aug-07, South Salt Lake

- Questions:
  - Why the study area? Please look outside the study area boundaries. Has BRT been considered?
  - Have additional light rail lines been considered?
- Comments:
  - State and 2100 South Development, 500-700 condominiums. 3300 South backs up to the west of I-15. Pedestrian movements, sidewalk improvements are important.
  - Light at 1100 W. and 3300 South, crosswalk or pedestrian light. Don't let east-west corridors conflict with north-south pedestrian movement.

9-Aug-07, Association of Community Councils

- Comments
  - Magna, Kearns, Copperton, and planners from the County with Kennecott Land were present, expressed disappointment that these entities are not represented on the SWG.

15-Aug-07, Copperton

- Questions:
  - Where is the word future in all this? 2030 and beyond? Are we using the exercise information that was developed Wasatch Choices 2040? Are we taking into account new developments?
  - Will toll roads be a consideration for this study?
- Comments:
  - Concerns in Magna, Kearns and Copperton.
  - Upset about West Jordan closure proposal of new Bingham Highway at 6400 West.
  - Glad to have representation on the stakeholder working group
  - West Jordan connection to 9000 S. to take out New Bingham Highway. New Bingham Highway, four-lane highway that goes over or under the Mountain View Corridor, concerned that West Jordan City is considering closing the New Bingham Highway with the Mountain View Corridor.
  - Expressed a strong desire to have each individual community council have a seat at the SWG
  - Emergency services access to Copperton. Come back and present at the community meeting on the third Wednesday of March.

21-Aug-07, West Valley City

- Questions:
  - How long will it take to see improvements?
  - Left turn lights timing changed during rush hour?

- Any inkling of what street you will look at in this study?

- Comments:
  - Turn lane signal timing and capacity. Problem Areas: (listed below)
  - 4100 South and Bangerter (two intersections backed up before Bangerter)
  - 3500 South and Redwood
  - 2700 South and Bangerter (only one lane that turns left)
  - Extend length of 4700 South to Bangerter and to the Mountain View Corridor as state road
  - Extend 6200 South west to SR 111, 500 homes going in, don't know how to fund transportation improvements in the area

21-Aug-07, West Jordan City

- Questions:
  - Why isn't the Mountain View Corridor identified on the study area map? What type of solutions are you looking at?
- Comments:
  - Needs are great with West Jordan for east-west connections. We need the Mountain View Corridor?

21-Aug-07, Kearns

- Questions:
  - Possibility of more than one route? Airport No. 2, run 7000 South through there?
- Comments:
  - Rumors about 6200 South and 5400 South. 5600 W. construction between Hunter High School and 6200 South

23-Aug-07, Herriman

- Comments:
  - Want funds attributed to southwest area of the study.
  - Wants additional meeting with UDOT to discuss changes to master plan. Look at widening 11800 South, 13400 South and 12600 South

23-Aug-07, Magna Community Council

- Questions:
  - What about 7200 West connectors to 2100 South?
  - Congestion on 3500 South, what are the plans?
  - What is the role of Kennecott Land in this study?

- How many corridors do you think we'll have?
- Is this study looking at more than east-west? Is north-south included?
- Is the Mountain View Corridor going to be on 5800 West?
- Is there a possibility that 3100 South will be widened?
- Can we look at timing the traffic lights?

- Comments:
  - If 7200 West came through from I-80 to 2100 South it would help traffic tremendously.
  - Traffic on 8400 West has tripled or quadrupled.
  - Widen 3500 South from 5600 West to 8400 West.
  - Widen 3100 South due to new development.
  - More left turn lights and turn lanes
  - Widen 8400 West and 2100 South.
  - Widen 7800 South to Bangerter and SR 111 (8400 West)
  - Widen 9000 South to SR 111 (8400 West).

28-Aug-07, Bluffdale

- Comments
  - Jesse Kelley, council person, expressed interest in finding legal options to stop Herriman traffic from using Bluffdale roads.
  - The mayor disagreed.
  - Nancy Lord, council woman, considers 13800 South as a high priority for improvement and made note of a potential new High School somewhere on 13800 S. around Riverton.
  - The school location had not yet been determined.

28-Aug-07, Riverton

- Comments
  - Include Trace Robinson, the new city engineer, in the SWG discussions.
  - No specific comments on the study but the city has ongoing discussion with UDOT on the Mountain View Corridor.

10-Oct-07, Chamber West

- Questions
  - Will the system alternatives be divided geographically?
  - Are there any corridors that stand out as a potential limited-access freeway?
  - What went into phase 1?
  - Is it easier to implement the 5400 South system vs. 6200 South?

- Did the study take into account existing business centers?
- Did you look at double level road in the study?
- Are reversible lanes an option for Bangerter Highway in peak travel times?
- USANA Amphitheater—Does the study take into account the temporary events?
- Kearns and Magna are unincorporated areas.
- Is Salt Lake County up to speed on planning?
- Salt Lake County seems to be behind the 8-ball and not aggressive enough in its planning for the Kearns and Magna area.
- What can we expect from mass transit as compared to a road, like a four lane highway?
- What costs are there to move one person on transit vs. on a road?
- Does a higher percentage of the money from Washington go toward transit than roads?
- What is causing people to drive more (referring to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) chart)? What will the population growth be in the next decade?

- Response
  - Not at this time. We have not identified alternatives yet. We used the WFRC LRP and Kennecott land.
  - What impacts matter most to you Mr. Stakeholder?
  - In June—August we will provide a priority list of what improvements should be made first.
  - We used the city's master plans and the WFRC's LRP that include existing business centers. We also used input from SWG members, specifically city planners.
  - We are trying to put a limited access facility somewhere in the study area.
  - West Jordan is looking at 6200 S., which would be more than 1800 resident relocations.
  - The devil will be in the details. We won't go that deep.
  - Reversible lanes may be an option but the impacts may be defined as too much.
  - This study won't go into it, but there are many things you can do with Travel Demand Management (TDM). The Citrus Bowl is an example. We are not there yet in our study. We will not compare this in the study. Affluence and quality of life. Kennecott Land discussion.

9-Oct-07, Wasatch Front Regional Council

- No notes taken in this meeting

Phase III Presentation Feedback (June 3—Aug. 12, 2008)

3-Jun-08, South Jordan

- Comments:

- Mayor expressed that if Mountain View Corridor were to become a Toll Facility that the projected congestion as identified from our Phase I findings would quadruple. Other Council members concurred and requested we make note and assure the comment be provided to UDOT
- Council expressed the concern regarding increasing the capacity of 11400 South and suggested continued development of the North/South facilities and use SR 201 and I-215 to move East/West.
- Council expressed a general interest in who would lead development of the improvements, when and how they would be funded.
- Mayor stated involvement in the study and the effort conducted was resulted in a positive effect; the communities are now aware of the need for transportation solutions needed into the future.

3-Jun-08, Kearns

- Questions:
  - When will the improvements presented be implemented? It was explained that the improvements being suggested are not necessarily projects that will come to fruition. The communities and leaders will first need to identify if any of these suggested improvements should be furthered into the Long Range Plan and subsequently funded. Further dialogue by community leaders is required to move any, if any, of these suggestions forward.

- Comments:
  - The Salt Lake City Airport No. 2 has long outlived its usefulness and its land ought to be considered for a route to relieve 6200 and 7800 South roadways. Multiple additional dialogue ensued both for and against the continued existence of Salt Lake City Airport No. 2.

11-Jun-08, South Salt Lake

- Questions
  - Has the Right of Way for SR 201 improvements been acquired? Response: No, this study addresses the long term planning associated with the entire roadway and transit network, not corridor specific project implementation.
  - Do you have a cost estimate associated with the suggested improvements? Response: Not at this time.

12-Jun-08, Association of Community Councils

- Questions

- Have you considered which suggested improvements would be developed before other improvements? Response: We are currently preparing a list for potential prioritization of the improvements based upon cost versus reduction in travel time benefit.

- Comments
  - The Alternative 6 map currently shows the future SR 111 going through a Senior Citizen Center.
  - Representative from Copperton was concern with potential future connection of a new, unfinished roadway built within a subdivision adjacent to the Bingham Hwy. The unfinished roadway appears to intersect the Bingham Hwy at a skewed angle and would be dangerous to connect in that fashion. Response: Comment noted but not applicable to the planning focus of this study

Chamber West, 16-Jun-08

- Questions
  - Have the suggested potential improvements been placed in a list by priority? Response: We are currently preparing a list for potential prioritization of the improvements based upon cost versus reduction in travel time benefit.
  - Have the impacts and details related to the impact to residential and business areas been evaluated and considered in the development of the potential improvements? Access into residential neighborhoods along improvement N7a (6200 S) are of concern, because a few neighborhoods, only have access into and out of there area via 6200 S. The impacts to residents may go beyond the footprint of the improvement. Response: This study did not develop the design concepts for the potential improvements with enough detail to assess specific impacts along each corridor.
  - What happens with the information from this study moving forward? Response: The list of potential improvements and a suggested prioritization list will be provided to the Legislature. The WFRC intends to consider the applicability of the various potential improvements as they update their Long Range Plan in the future.
  - How realistic is it that this set of improvements will occur? Response: This is dependent upon the decisions of the local and state officials and their ability to plan and manage the growth.
  - Will this plan be adopted by the Wasatch Front Regional Council? Response: No, however, it will be taken under consideration.
- Comments
  - Reversible lanes used in Atlanta were considered very useful and have potential here.
  - Use technology to provide drivers information on the required driving speed necessary to flow through the next signalized intersection without encountering a red light.
  - SR 201—Consider the designation of exclusive truck lanes to accommodate the high incidence of truck traffic on this facility.

17-Jun-08, West Valley City

- Questions
  - What is referred to as the "Kennecott's Planned Rail System" on the Alternative 6 map? Response: An assumed future transit facility that runs North and South. For the purposes of this study, this potential transit system would be integral to completing the transit network necessary to receive the transit ridership assumed to travel into the future developments on the Kennecott lands.
  - Have you developed a cost for these improvements? Response: Not at this time.
  - What was the reasoning for considering 3100 S. (N3b) as a candidate facility for reversible lanes? Response: No specific criteria led us to this one conclusion, the nature of the roadway as it exists today, the proximity to other major East West routes (SR 201) and the nature of the surrounding community (Residential) were a few of the considerations.
  - What is an Expressway? Would it require Access Control? Response: 700 East along Van Winkle in SL County is an example of an expressway in the County. Access Control would be considered a critical element for success of an expressway.
  - What was your assumption regarding the Mountain View Corridor? Response: The facility was built in an ultimate configuration as a limited access, separated grade, 8-lane divided highway.
  - Was there consideration for the impacts of travel from those on the East side of I-15? Response: We did not consider new demographics or volume adjustments for East side generated traffic outside of the network of roads and volumes that are planned for by implementation of the WFRC LRP as it stands today.

18-Jun-08, Copperton

- Comment
  - It appears SR 111 expansion is under consideration and this would be good to move high on the priority list for safety reasons.

24-Jun-08, Bluffdale

- Question
  - What is the next step after the legislator receives the report findings? What would happen if Bluffdale residents came out in numbers to oppose any of these potential improvement? Response: The WFRC, state and local leaders will need to determine how they would like to use the information developed in making future decisions regarding the way the communities grow and manage transportation. No commitments to actual projects generating from this effort are being made at this time. We cannot conjecture to the response of Bluffdale resident opposition.
- Comment
  - Bluffdale City Council feels they would like more communication from UTA and UDOT regarding the Commuter Rail Station location.

26-Jun-08, Magna Community Council, Town Council and Chamber of Commerce

- Questions
  - Did the study team consult with UTA bus drivers for in the development of potential solutions? Response: No, however, we did consult with representatives of UTA planning department.
  - Will the overall plan provide a schedule for implementation of these improvements? Response: We will develop a suggested prioritization for the improvements in relation to one another, however, the timing of implementation will be dependent upon others.
  - Has any consideration been taken into account for the purchase of the rail line along the Mountain View Corridor? Response: Yes
  - What kind of power does UDOT have to get Kennecott to develop transit and roadways to accommodate growth on their property? We are concerned that Kennecott would develop without accommodating mobility.
  - Where will the results of the study be disseminated? Can we see comments prior to release of the information? Can a blog site be developed for an open discussion of transportation? Response: Each community in the study area will be provided access to the results. Their administration will determine further dissemination of results.
- Comments
  - Historically, it appears the focus for travel has always been North and South travel. It is good to see a focused effort to consider the east and west travel mobility.
  - There is concern that the suggested potential improvements to SR 201 identified in this alternative, while desirable, not take away from the plans already in place to improve that roadway as set in motion already.
  - Concerned with the heavy truck traffic on SR 111 and wonder if there was consideration for the heavy truck traffic on that route? A: The potential improvements identified for SR-111 would aid in the management of truck traffic along that corridor, but this study did not investigate specifics regarding this issue.

1-Jul-08, Riverton

- Comments:
  - Mayor requested the removal of the improvement labeled S4 which identified adding lanes to 13400 South from Redwood Road to Bangerter Hwy. A good part of it has already been improved and there is no desire of the community to increase the capacity of the remaining facility. He acknowledged that the state is not suggesting that they will make the improvements or force the widening of the road.
  - Council expressed a general interest in who would lead development of the improvements, when and how they would be funded.

2-Jul-08, Taylorsville

- Questions:
  - Was Transit ridership factored into the analysis and subsequent results? It was explained that it has been.

- Will it be difficult to find the right of way for the 10 and 8 lane improvements suggested on SR 201? (Improvement N1) It was explained that it would require additional right of way.
- Will the study support the half diamond interchange at 5400 South and I-215? It was explained that it would and that improvement N8 identifies this specific type of improvement.
- Have these improvements been identified for phasing and priorities? It was explained that during the final portion of the project an implementation plan would be developed.

- Comments:
  - Council person pointed out the significance of economic impact due to the increased congestion on the roads on the west side.

8-Jul-08, West Jordan

- Questions:
  - How much money has been set aside for the improvements to be developed? It was explained that no money has been set aside.
  - Have preliminary cost estimates been developed for the improvements? It was explained that a rough order of magnitude cost estimates are being prepared and we will develop a suggested prioritization for the improvements in relation to one another, however, the timing of implementation will be dependent upon others.

8-Jul-08, Midvale

- Questions:
  - Where will the connection of improvement C2c be made between 7800 and 7200 South? It was explained that currently the map shows Holden Street is the facility to make the connection. Midvale recommended moving the connection to Bingham Jct. Blvd. and to also consider additional improvements with the connection at I-15.
  - Was there a highway identified by this study? A: Yes, improvement C1b (9000 South) is an example of on E/W facility suggested to change from arterial to a freeway facility.
- Comments:
  - Favorable perception was given regarding the improvements to the Bangerter Hwy intersections to separate grade and improve flow. Council felt air quality would improve with the improvement in air flow.

15-Jul-08, Sandy

- Questions:
  - How feasible is the implementation of Alt 6?—Brandon response was “not very.” What are three initiatives [alternatives] to promote for maximum effectiveness?
  - How does this coordinate with Mountain View Corridor?
  - How many people are in this area?

- What roads affect us the most?
- They went on to identify 9000 South, 9800 South, and 11400 South; all of which they noted need lots or R/W with large impacts.
- Where is the 11400 South Interchange now? Status?
- How do reversible lanes work?

- Comments:
  - Overall, the city seemed very receptive and had lots of questions that I think were all answered.

15-Jul-08, Draper

- Questions
  - 11400 S, 12300 S, 12600 S, and Bangerter Hwy are the corridors of most interest to Draper City. Will Bangerter for sure be grade separated?
- Comments
  - Comment to preserve R/W along SR 111 for future freeway interchanges. Draper wants the Commuter Rail Station to be at Bangerter interchange rather than at 14600 S.
  - A Council member stopped discussion after a short discussion/comment to move on with their agenda.
  - Draper seemed less interested than Sandy or other cities councils that I have attended.

17-Jul-08, Herriman

- Questions:
  - How has the study team accounted for the increase in gas prices and how it may affect people's travel decisions?
  - Where are the 11400 South improvements on Alternative 6? (Andrew explained that these improvements are accounted for in WFRC's Long Range Plan)
  - What about 12600 South? (Again, this is accounted for in WFRC Long Range Plan)
- Comments:
  - The mayor thanked Andrew and UDOT for the time and effort put into this study. One council member needed clarification on the travel time chart.
  - Another council member stated that he wanted light rail to extend to Herriman.

Western Growth Coalition, 21-Jul-08

- Questions:
  - What is considered a high capacity interchange? An example of a high capacity interchange was described as the continuous flow intersection (CFI) that was recently constructed at 3500 South and Bangerter Hwy.

- Why haven't additional highways been looked at east of I-15? It was explained that the HB-108 directed the focus of the study to be concentrated west of I-15.

- Comments:
  - West Valley City has a favorable perception of the functionality of the CFI.
  - When communicating with the Legislature, do not infer the existing funding for what is on the plan for implementation today is not necessary.

Salt Lake City, 12-Aug-08

Questions:

- Was the study focused purely on roadways and highways or did it include transit as a component? It was explained that UTA was involved on the technical advisory committee and over $1 billion in improvements are suggested for transit improvements.
- Will these suggestions move forward into the WFRC long range plan? It was explained that the WFRC was also involved on the technical advisory committee and will consider these improvements in their planning process.
- Have preliminary cost estimates been developed for the improvements? It was explained that a rough order of magnitude cost estimates are being prepared and that in the final portion of the project a suggested prioritization for the improvements in relation to one another, however, the timing of implementation will be dependent upon others.
- Was Kennecott involved in the development of these ideas? It was explained that Kennecott was involved and that they helped in providing information on demographic projections and possible solutions.

4.6 Maintained a Contact Database

The study team created a contact database for stakeholders and the general public who would like to receive updates on the project progress. The team logged comments and responses. All general public comments, including comments from the Public Review Period (June 3-July 18) are listed below.

3-Jul-07, Michael Packard, Consultant

- He told us we should look at the study more globally.
- Response: We will pass on his information to the study team

Paula Cox, Resident

- Make sure she stays updated. Her home would be affected if we built a freeway on 6200 South.
- Response: Told her we are still at the beginning stages of the study so do not have specific plans yet, told her about the next city council meeting with an East-West presentation

27-July-07, Matthew Emmett, Resident

- I recently moved back to Taylorsville City from Portland, Oregon. I am an occasional bike commuter and a fan of public transit. I grew up in the Taylorsville area and am disappointed how often road improvements in the area often neglect bike lanes and alternate transportation. Currently I mostly use 4700 South which is good east of Redwood, but terrible West of Redwood. Most other east/west roads are terrible to bike on. I would like to know what bike/public transit options are being looked at for this study. Any information would be great. Thanks.
- Response: Mr. Emett, Thank you for your interest in the Salt Lake County East-West transportation study. We appreciate public feedback and will use your comments in our decision making process. At this phase in the study we are simply identifying needs. In phase 2 we will evaluate those needs and identify possible solutions along with the challenges associated with those possible solutions. We are looking at all modes of transportation in this study including bicycle and pedestrian paths. We haven't made any specific decisions yet but please continue to visit our website for updates.

21-Aug-07, Erik Brondum, Employee of West Valley City

- Didn't leave a comment

16-Aug-07, Suellen Riffkin

- Can you tell me what the progress is for this project? What is the time-line and when will the public have input? Have any documents/maps been produced yet? May I read them?
- Response: Thank you for your interest in the project. The study team has narrowed the study from three system alternatives to two, each consisting of several improvements. After meeting again with a working group of city and transportation planning representatives we are now using the feedback to narrow the two alternatives to one. This is a high-level planning study so we will be presenting study updates again to your city councils within the next few months. The city council presentations will kick off a 45-day public review period to continue the transparent nature of the study. The review period will begin in June and will give the public an opportunity to share what it thinks of the suggested alternative, which will be available online and at city offices. The study team will provide a summary of comments in a final report for the Legislature. Cities and UDOT officials may use these comments as they make future transportation plans. Another important point to remember is that the transportation improvements will not receive federal funds until they are approved by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and included in its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

27-Sept-07, Lori Weintz, West Jordan resident

- She heard from a West Jordan city engineer that this study was looking into making 9000 South a major east-west freeway and she doesn't like the idea of a major thorough fair cutting through a residential area. She lives in the residential area just north of 9000 South. Right now it has quite a bit of truck traffic that it is not designed to accommodate (9000 South west of 4000 West.) There is no room to widen 9000 South. She would like to see some type of road that goes over 9000 South to connect to the Old Bingham Highway. She wondered if the city and even Kennecott could contribute to such a road because some of the truck traffic goes out to Kennecott. There is land that could accommodate an overpass. She is also concerned about all of the school kids that have to cross 9000 South. There are

no plans to build a skywalk. We need to be planning for the heavy truck traffic and realize that people live along these roads and the truck traffic affects their quality of life. Sysco, Dannon, Kennecott etc. trucks go through this area. We should have them on the Stakeholder Working Group. She wants to be involved with the study.

- Response: I told her about our website and that she should check it periodically as the study progresses. I told her we are still gathering feedback from many different stakeholders. I explained the study timeline and when we will start to consider alternatives. I explained the stakeholder working group and all the city council meetings we have attended to gather public input. We will consider her comments as we evaluate all alternatives.

27-Sep-2007, John Cook, Resident

- Can someone please explain to me why the west side of Magna, all of Copperton, the Bingham Canyon mine and the West Bench Master Plan have been left out of the study area? Have we been deemed unworthy of consideration just as the Mountain View Corridor EIS? A plan, which ironically dead-ends the New Bingham Highway SR-48, which is both Copperton's primary east-west route and the only road approved by UDOT for hauling large pieces of equipment to the Bingham Canyon mine. I noticed "Project Info" portion of the Web page shows population projections through 2050. Is UDOT not aware that over 50 percent of the remaining developable land within Salt Lake County is in the West Bench General Plan, 90 percent which lies west of SR 111 (Bacchus Highway). If you need information on the West Bench General Plan, go to http://www.pwpds.slco.org/zoning/html/GeneralPlans/wbplan.htm. It would be nice UDOT included ALL west side residents in its study as well as the needs of the mine and future residents.
- Response: Thank you for you feedback. We will look at your comments as we evaluate possible east-west alternatives. The Utah State Legislature defined the study area in HB 108, the bill that mandated this and other studies to improve east-west traffic in rapidly growing areas throughout the state. The study team understands that residents west of the study area also face rapid population growth and use the same east-west transportation system as jurisdictions within the study area. For this reason Greg Schulz, a community council representative for Magna, Copperton and Kearns, is part of the Stakeholder Working Group. The SWG also includes representatives from Kennecott Land and Salt Lake County. This group gathers every few months to discuss the needs of each affected jurisdiction and organization. In addition, the study team has given short presentations about the study to the Magna Town Council, Magna Community Council, Salt Lake County Council and the Copperton Community Council. After the presentations we solicit public feedback. We have been coordinating with and will continue to coordinate with Salt Lake County and Kennecott Land about the West Bench General Plan. I hope this properly addresses your concerns. Feel free to call or e-mail with any additional questions.

4-Oct-07, Lori Weintz, Resident

- Thanks for taking the time to talk with me last week about the UDOT east-west corridor study. As I understand it, the purpose of the First Phase of the study is to identify the needs of the different cities. I am writing to let you know of some needs in West Jordan that I do not think have been presented by those representing the City at the Stake Holders Working Group meetings.

- As a citizen representing many other West Jordan residents, who have asked me to be a spokesperson on this issue, I request that you bring up my comments at the meeting on October 4. I am writing to let you know of some needs in West Jordan that I do not think have been presented by those representing the City at the Stake Holders Working Group meetings. As a citizen representing many other West Jordan residents, who have asked me to be a spokesperson on this issue, I request that you bring up my comments at the meeting on October 4.
- West Jordan City officials are pushing for 90th South to be the main artery as an east/west corridor in West Jordan. In fact, the City master plan shows that it is looking to further direct traffic down 90th by merging New Bingham Highway with 8600 South and closing off the part that goes to the Industrial Park and on to Kennecott Copper. In addition, the City is looking to downgrade Old Bingham Highway, which is currently a main route for trucks approaching the Industrial Park. Although it is not on the plan to close Old Bingham, the City recently chose to minimize accessibility to the road by installing a turn-bay off of 90th South, instead of an overpass.
- The main reasons I have been given for this short-sighted long-range plan to close/limit the Bingham Highways are I) 90th South is a straight shot to the freeway, 2) the grid system is better than the diagonal system because it is easier to plan around for development. Here is the problem: 90th South from about 4000 West to 5600 West is a residential neighborhood. Every child living in a home on the south side has to cross 90th to get to school or to the Bingham Creek Library. People living on the north side of 90th have to cross it to attend their chapels on the south side. Up and down 90th South, in the above—mentioned area people are out jogging, biking, pushing their children in strollers, and walking their dogs.
- It is a RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD. (There will be one small section of community shopping to the east of Bingham Creek Library, but other than that, every single structure in the above mentioned area is a home, church, school or library.) The semi-trucks do not belong in the residential area of 90th South. It is essential that UDOT keep both New and Old Bingham Highways open in order to facilitate east/west traffic flow. By proposing closing, or downgrading the Bingham Highways, West Jordan essentially forces the semi-trucks to use 90th South, along with all of the other traffic. West Jordan City is proposing gridlock and creating serious hazards to safety, when neither is called for.
- The diagonal Bingham Highways border the manufacturing and industrial areas. The speed limit on them is 55 MPH and you don't see kids biking and mothers pushing strollers down these roads. No one is trying to cross them to get to school or church. They are not residential roads. I have spoken with two large companies in the Industrial Park, Dannon and Sysco, and they don't want to use 90th South if the Bingham Highways are left open. They don't want to be driving big trucks through school zones and 35 MPH residential areas to get to the Industrial Park. Although I have not spoken with the company directly, I understand that Kennecott Copper is adamantly opposed to closing New Bingham Highway. (Since Kennecott is in the Stake Holders group, I'm sure a company representative can confirm this at your meeting.) As UDOT knows, New Bingham is the only road in West Jordan that was properly built to handle the weight of Kennecott's trucks. It makes absolutely no sense to close, or limit traffic to, either of those highways. The citizens I represent are not asking that 90th South be closed to traffic. We understand and support the idea that the road will eventually go through to the Mountain View Corridor. We all see

the need for improved east/west access and see 90th South as part of the solution. However, 90th South cannot be widened from a four-lane road in the residential area referenced above, without taking people's homes. The residential area of 90th South can handle cars, trucks, motorcycles—but not the semi-trucks.

- Imagine trying to shuffle all the big semis that have been on New and Old Bingham into a road with two lanes in each direction and inadequate setbacks for the homes on either side. Then tell me how that facilitates the flow of east/west traffic. I don't buy it. And neither do the other residents in this area. It is too late for West Jordan City to put in a skywalk and to provide proper setbacks along the residential area of 90th South. Since the road was opened to truck traffic in May of this year, residents of been given a small taste of what is to come, and it is not good.
- According to the study put together by Bill Barnasky, West Jordan Traffic Engineer, currently about 26,000 vehicles a day pass the Smith's at 90th South and 4000 West. Only about 6,000 vehicles per day are continuing west through the residential area of 90th because they turn off onto Old Bingham or 4800 West. Within 10 to 20 years, upwards of 40,000 vehicles per day are expected to be going through the residential area of 90th South. The City did not properly plan for 90th South to be the main artery for all east/west semi-truck and other traffic. The road is adequate for residential traffic only.
- Therefore, the citizens of West Jordan request that UDOT keep New Bingham Highway open, that West Jordan and South Jordan work together to maintain and expand Old Bingham, and that the semi-trucks not be allowed in the residential area of 90th South. As stated before, we are fine with 90th South being a main road for residential traffic. This is a safety and quality of life issue for hundreds of residents that can be properly addressed by the Stake Holder's Committee. It is not too late to meet everyone's needs. As we see it, there is only one "need" that won't be met, if semi-truck traffic is kept off of 90th South and allowed to use the diagonal Bingham Highways. That is, someone's stubborn, short-sighted "vision" of forcing a grid system into West Jordan and ONE "straight-shot" to the freeway would be replaced by a rational approach.
- An analogy of traffic—flow in conclusion. For those of you unfamiliar with the Zion's Narrows in Southern Utah, the trail provides spectacular hiking down a river bed that is bordered on either side by towering red-rock walls. However, these same walls, so awe-inspiring and uniquely carved by the water, don't allow for escape if there is a flash flood. Since there is only one channel for the water in the Narrows, they fill up and wash away anything, or anyone, not secured or out of reach when the huge wall of water barrels through. Obviously, if there were other outlets along the way, the water would channel off in other directions and the flood would dissipate. Is UDOT going to support West Jordan officials in planning the Narrows? Or is it going to incorporate a sensible plan that allows several channels for traffic, with big truck traffic properly routed on roads that were built to carry it? Our hope, and request, is the latter. Sincerely, Lori L. Weintz
- Response: Explained that we will use her comments when considering options.

15-Oct-07, Judy Harvey, Resident

- Would you please keep me informed regarding the East-West transportation studies? I recently moved further west and would like to know what plans are in the process to

facilitate an easier commute? It seems that the biggest problems occur when the east-west streets meet Bangerter Highway.

- Most of the problems occur because there are several lights prior to and after crossing Bangerter Highway. I recently tried the new intersection at Bangerter and 3500 South. I don\'t travel through that intersection enough to know if it has improved traffic flow. I would like to know if any studies are being done to measure the flow and accident rates with the improved intersection? If the improved design works maybe it can be implemented at other intersection points on Bangerter Highway.
- Thanks and please keep me posted. Thanks for responding, please continue to keep me posted.
- Response: Thank you for your interest in the Salt Lake County East-West transportation planning study. We appreciate your feedback and will use your comments in our decision making process. We just completed the first phase of the study dedicated to working with cities and stakeholders to identify needs. In Phase II we will evaluate those needs and identify possible solutions and associated challenges. Please continue to watch our website www.udot.utah.gov/slcountyeastwest for updated information about the study and feel free to call or e-mail with specific questions. As of now the Federal Highway Administration plans to conduct a study on the Continuous Flow Intersection at 3500 South and Bangerter and there have not been any reports of accidents since it was implemented. In addition, wait times have been reduced by about half during peak traffic. CFIs will be considered in the study among many other improvement options.

John Cook, Resident, 18-Oct-07

- It's good to hear that you are working with the Copperton Township. That is one thing that the MVC EIS Team never did even though at one point they considered moving the freeway as far west as our township. I would, however, recommend that you Kennecott Utah Copper's Director of Government and Public Affairs or someone in that office. The Director used to be Louie Cononelos, but I'm not sure who has replaced him. The phone number over there is 801-569-7433. Until July this year when my term expired, I was part our town's Community Council for planning and zoning issues. The reason why I strongly recommend talking to the mine people is because, in my experience working with both the Kennecott Utah Copper and Kennecott Land, is that they have different interests and they are not always aware of the needs of each other. It really is better to think of and treat them as completely separate entities. I'll give you two prime examples of this:
- The MVC EIS Team worked with Kennecott Land but not Kennecott Utah Copper. No one at Kennecott Land knew enough that the mine's only haul route for large equipment is the New Bingham Highway. And so the MVC EIS Team decided that it was okay to abandon a section of the New Bingham Highway where it crosses the MVC Corridor in favor of a future 9000 South expansion. This issue was only brought up to the EIS Team very late in the study process. As far as I am aware, the issue of their haul route in the current MVC design remains unresolved.
- Three years ago, it was discovered that approximately 640 acres of land that Kennecott owned had somehow been incorporated into West Jordan City in 1978 and was not part of Copperton Township as everyone had previously thought. Kennecott Land was in favor of leaving the land within the boundaries of West Jordan City because of the West Bench

Master Plan. However, Kennecott Utah Copper currently wants that parcel of land as a buffer zone between their concentrator and any surrounding development for the next 20—50 years. Additionally, because Kennecott Utah Copper has a strong desire to keep the mine and all of its related facilities in unincorporated Salt Lake County they overruled Kennecott Land and de-annexed the property from West Jordan City. If you want a more info, see Item #5 on pages 5—9 of this document: http://www.wjordan.com/files/pz0511161.pdf

- Response: Thank you for the insight about Kennecott. The project team will discuss your feedback as we move forward with the study. Please continue to stay informed on our website www.udot.utah.gov/slcountyeastwest and feel free to contact us with additional feedback or questions. You may also be interested that the comment period for the Mountain View Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement just opened and runs until Dec. 24. Visit www.udot.utah.gov/mountainview for more information.

17-Apr-08, David Newton, Mayor, West Jordan

- He said that a planning study like this takes a lot of work and bringing stakeholders together for to come to the best option also takes a lot of work. He said we were doing a great job.

7-May-08, Greg Schulz, West Township Representative

- I don't know if you can be ready by June 3rd to present, but the Kearns Community Council is having a massive meeting on Transportation issues that night; and they would like the East/West Group to participate. Please let me know if you can make it ASAP. They're looking at impacts from Mtn View Corridor, 5600 West Upgrades, and possible upgrades of 5400 South, 4700 South, and 6200 South.
- Response: We are already scheduled to be there on the 3rd of June. We should be on the end of the agenda, as we will be doing a presentation in another city prior to Kearns. Out of curiosity what is the focus of the transportation issues? Is there anything in particular the council is interested in hearing about? Anything we should be aware of prior to the meeting?

15-May-08, Janalee Tobias

- She wanted to be included on the contact list.

Public Review Period Comments (June 3—July 18):

3-Jun-08, Michael T. Packard, Employee

- He wanted his contact information in our reports.

5-Jun-08, Bradley Frisby, Resident

- I am sure this has been looked into already, but anything that would improve the time to get from Sandy to West Valley City would be amazing! There is no really easy way to do with out having to use crowded surface streets that have way too many traffic signals. Making the streets like 5600 S, 4700 S, 4100 S, and 3500 S with limited access would definitely improve some flow of traffic. Adding stoplights every 5 to 10 blocks that stay red for the east/west traffic longer than they should does not help out any problems at all.

5-Jun-08, Charles W. Chappell, Wasatch Front Regional Council Executive Director

- Thank you for the opportunity to participate and comment on the proposed transportation system alternatives developed through the East-West Transportation Planning study for Salt Lake County. The stakeholder outreach program developed a wide range of transportation options. As the MPO, our participation both helped clarify the starting point (the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)) and gave us a good perspective on the westside's mounting transportation issues.
- We understand that the projects identified in the East-West Study are in addition to the projects adopted in our 2007 RTP. We will work with UDOT to consider the additional project needs identified in the East-West Study during development of the next RTP. Should funding be allocated to a project identified in the Study between now and the adoption of a new RTP, in approximately May 2011, the project will be amended into the current RTP 2007-2030. Some lead time is needed because the RTP amendment process can take up to 90 days.
- Again, I want to commend your extensive effort in developing the East-West Transportation Planning Study proposed transportation alternatives and look forward to our continued work with you and the Utah Department of Transportation.

9-Jun-08, Thomas McMurtry, Resident

- I appreciate this study that is being conducted to look at east-west movement, and I hope that the legislature approves some funding for the improvements. But I am very concerned about an east-west freeway along 9000 South.
- The people in this study area need access controlled higher speed facilities, but freeways are not the answer. 9000 South has a large commercial development around redwood road that many people use and will need access to, also the best hospital in the south valley, Jordan Family Medical Center in located on 9000 South and Bangerter and people will need access to that as well.
- Not to mention all of the access to residential neighborhoods that people use. 9000 is over capacity and does need improvements, but a 6 lane arterial with appropriate raised medians will suffice. As long as other parallel facilities are improved as well, I.E. 10400 South, 7800 South, 12300 S, 7000 S, and other. I am interested in reviewing you travel demand modeling to understand, why you feel a freeway may be needed, or maybe you think that HB 108 requires it, which it doesn't. I am opposed to making 9000 A Freeway.

18-Jul-08, John Pearson, Resident

- It is important to realize that this is all coming 25 years to late.
- The impact of any potential changes will involve a lot more homes. Yet I agree with the need to add one to two north and south freeways.
- Also three to five expressways west to east.(which should really be freeways). The idea that the west side should be required to finance any aspect of these roads on its own by creating toll roads on the west side is ludicrous thinking.
- All people in the valley will use these roads all the time. The idea that mass transit can take care of peoples transportation needs as the prime source is wishful thinking by those who

have no clue what, who, and how such systems are finance, how expensive they are to put in place, how expensive they are to maintain and how much they can actually impact a lowering of road usage.

- The east side of this valley from the time of my youth has always been given priority in road planning. The west side has always been an after thought. With Kennecott's plans over the next 30 or 40 years and all the other many areas of available property that will be developed and is being developed right now I would suggest that the state get moving sooner than later.
- The west side will be the largest populated area in the state with the worst transportation problems. And the transportation means available the least adequate.

8-Jul-08, Jamie Chandler, Resident

- 5300/5400 South Street West of Redwood is a major traffic jam at rush hour, and also when there is a concert at Usana Amphitheater.
- It will be even worse when the new highway is built west of 5600 West, and the ensuing development of the large land area owned by Kennecott is started in earnest, as it will be the main access road.
- There desperately needs to be some changes to speed up East-West traffic through Taylorsville and Kearns on that street. Mass transit would be wonderful, but I understand mass transit is not being planned for 5400 South. What about a dedicated Speed Lane for through bus traffic at the very least, or widen it.
- The stoplight at Bangerter hinders thousands of motorists because there is not a fair amount of time at the light to allow the high volume of east-west traffic through, so the traffic builds up on both sides for miles waiting for that light.
- I drive it every day, and it\'s causing tons of emissions and a huge gas and time wast5300/5400 South Street West of Redwood is a major traffic jam at rush hour, and also when there is a concert at Usana Amphitheater.
- It will be even worse when the new highway is built west of 5600 West, and the ensuing development of the large land area owned by Kennecott is started in earnest, as it will be the main access road. There desperately needs to be some changes to speed up East-West traffic through Taylorsville and Kearns on that street.
- Mass transit would be wonderful, but I understand mass transit is not being planned for 5400 South. What about a dedicated Speed Lane for through bus traffic at the very least, or widen it. The stoplight at Bangerter hinders thousands of motorists because there is not a fair amount of time at the light to allow the high volume of east-west traffic through, so the traffic builds up on both sides for miles waiting for that light. I drive it every day, and it\'s causing tons of emissions and a huge gas and time waster for people to sit idling waiting to get through the light. There needs to be a way for this street to be more efficient.
- I am both a resident of Kearns and a Business Owner in Kearns.

13-Jul-08, Wayne Sharp

- C2C Consider fixing existing problem between 700 West and I-15. It's already at a failure much of the time.

4.7 Public Website

The public involvement team developed and maintains a website (udot.utah.gov/slcountyeastwest) that includes the following:

- Home Page: study summary, timeline, map of study area
- Side bar of related links and side bar of related articles
- Potential Improvements Page: interactive map of potential improvements
- Project Info Page: study background, planning area, timeline, Salt Lake County Demographic Projections, Links to Other Major Projects and Studies in the Study Area to Improve East-West Mobility
- FAQ Page: list of questions and answers
- Participants Page: study team summary, Stakeholder Working Group Summary
- Comment Page: This page provides a contact email address or fields to make comments or ask questions directly from the page. The study team answers all of these e-mails and records them in the contact log.

Web trends are tracked and sent out to the study team to help analyze the level of public awareness and interest in the study. Web Trends are listed below.

Number of page requests:

- June 2007 (27-30): 70
- July 2007: 533
- August 2007: 358
- September 2007: 249
- October 2007: 473
- November 2007: 585
- December 2007: 630
- January 2008: 556
- February 2008: 471
- March 2008: 674
- April 2008: 518
- May 2008: 785
- June 2008: 1460
- July 2008: 1002

Most page requests in one week:

- June 2007: 70 (Week of June 24-30)

- July 2007: 322 (Week of July 1-7)
- August 2007: 158 (Week of Aug 19-25)
- September 2007: 87 (Week of Sept. 23-29)
- October 2007: 155 (Week of Oct. 14-20)
- November 2007: 167 (Week of Nov. 4-10)
- December 2007: 233 (Week of Dec. 23-29)
- January 2008: 159 (Week of Jan. 20-26)
- February 2008: 105 (Week of Feb. 10-15)
- March 2008: 180 (Week of Mar. 16-22)
- April 2008: 121 (Week of Apr. 13-19)
- May 2008: 189 (Week of May 4-10)
- June 2008: 637 (Week of June 1-7)
- July 2008: 260 (Week of July 21-26)

Most popular day of the week:

- June 2007: Thursdays
- July 2007: Mondays
- August 2007: Tuesdays
- September 2007: Mondays
- October 2007: Mondays
- November 2007: Wednesdays
- December 2007: Mondays
- January 2008: Fridays
- February 2008: Fridays
- March 2008: Tuesdays
- April 2008: Tuesdays
- May 2008: Mondays
- June 2008: Tuesdays
- July 2008: Mondays

Most popular time:

- June 2007: 1-3 p.m., 4-5 p.m.
- July 2007: 8 a.m.-10 p.m., 1-4 p.m.
- August 2007: 10 a.m.-12 p.m., 4-6 p.m.

- September 2007: 9-11 a.m., 1-2 p.m., 3-4 p.m.
- October 2007: 12-1 p.m., 3-5 p.m.
- November 2007: 12-1 p.m. 3-4 p.m.
- December 2007: 1-2 p.m. 3-6 p.m.
- January 2008: 3 p.m., 11 a.m., 12-1 p.m., 3 p.m.
- February 2008: 10 a.m., 1-3 p.m.
- March 2008: 9 a.m., 11 a.m., 12 p.m., 4 p.m.
- April 2008: 1 a.m., 10-11 a.m., 1-4 p.m.
- May 2008: 11 a.m., 1-2 p.m.
- June 2008: 9-11 a.m., 9 p.m.
- July 2008: 9-11 a.m., 1 p.m.

Average time spent on site:

- June 2007: 17.2 minutes
- July 2007: 12 minutes
- August 2007: 16.8 minutes
- September 2007: 11 minutes
- October 2007: 16.6 minutes
- November 2007: 15.3 minutes
- December 2007: 16.7 minutes
- January 2008: 16.25 minutes
- February 2008: 18.05 minutes
- March 2008: 19.45 minutes
- April 2008: 16.65 minutes
- May 2008: 20 minutes
- June 2008: 23 minutes
- July 2008: 18.7 minutes

Most popular pages (in order):

June 2007:

1. Homepage
2. FAQ
3. Participants
4. Comment Opportunities
5. Project Info

July 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info
3. Participants
4. FAQ
5. Comment Opportunities
6. Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50”
7. Deseret Morning News “W.V. to update city plan”
8. Contact Process—submitted a comment
9. H.B. 108 download

August 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info
3. FAQ
4. Comment Opportunities
5. Participants
6. Deseret Morning News “W.V. to update city plan” 070207
7. Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807
8. H.B. 108 download
9. Contact Process—submitted a comment

September 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info
3. FAQ
4. Participants
5. Comment Opportunities
6. Download—H.B. 108
7. Download—Deseret Morning News “W.V. to update city plan” 070207
8. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807

October 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info
3. FAQ
4. Participants
5. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “WVC close to getting its hub”
6. Comment Opportunities
7. Download—Deseret Morning News “W.V, to update city plan” 070207
8. Download—H.B. 108
9. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807

November 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info

3. FAQ
4. Participants
5. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807
6. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “WVC close to getting its hub”
7. Comment Opportunities
8. Download—H.B. 108

December 2007:

1. Homepage
2. Project Info
3. FAQ
4. Download—“New east-west freeway in valley”
5. Participants
6. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807
7. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “Population surge state’s biggest yet” 111607
8. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “WVC close to getting its hub”

January 2008:

1. Homepage
2. Project Information
3. Traffic Study
4. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “Population surge state’s biggest yet” 111607
5. Study Findings

February 2008:

1. Homepage
2. Project Information
3. Traffic Study
4. New East West Freeway In Valley
5. Download—Salt Lake Tribune “Population surge state’s biggest yet” 111607

March 2008:

1. Project Information
2. FAQ
3. Study Findings
4. Homepage
5. Stakeholders

April 2008:

1. Homepage
2. Project Information
3. Download—HB_108
4. WVC Close to Getting It Sub
5. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807

May 2008:

1. Homepage
2. Download—Deseret Morning News “16 big cities have shrunk since ‘50” 62807
3. Comments
4. Study Findings
5. Project Information

June 2008:

1. Interactive Map of Potential Improvements
2. Homepage
3. Improvements
4. Contact
5. Stakeholders

July 2008

1. Interactive Map of Potential Improvements
2. Homepage
3. Improvements
4. Project Information
5. Facts and Questions

4.8 Media Relations Package

The study team worked with THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) to develop a media relations packet with a fact sheet, FAQ, study area map, project schedule with key milestones, list of Stakeholder Working Group Members, definitions of SWG member roles and responsibilities and a copy of House Bill 108.

To prepare team members for media interaction, the PI team also provided two sessions of media training.

4.9 Focus Groups

To gain a feel for the public reaction to two different sets of potential improvements (Alternative 4 and Alternative 5) the study team held two focus groups, January 10, 2008. The focus group organizer invited members of the general public who live in the study area to participate.

Summary of Comments:

- Positive overall reaction to potential improvements
- Improve Bangerter and SR 111
- Want business centers and recreation in communities
- Include both road and transit improvements
- Want to see more plans in southwest area of the study
- Perceived that the study team’s travel time projections were too low
- Concerned about air quality

4.10 Public Review Period

After the focus group the study project manager and a consultant delivered one set of potential improvements to study-area city councils and other organizations and introduced the Public Comment Period (June 3-July 18). The PI team posted an interactive map of potential improvements on the study website. The study team advertised that people could comment by website, e-mail, phone, fax or mail.