



Public Open House #3

Wednesday, July 15, 2009
Woodruff Elementary School Multipurpose Room
5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Results Highlights

Purpose of the meeting: to present the proposed design and gather comments

I. Attendance

- The meeting was attended by 76 people from across the corridor. There were also a few who did attend, but did not register on the sign in sheet. The majority of the attendees were from the residential area between 200 South and 800 South.

II. Comment Highlights

- **General Overview** - 44 comment forms were submitted (43 at the meeting and one via e mail). Attendees expressed strong support for the proposed design, especially appreciative of the widened section through the residential area between 200 South and 600 South. Several expressed specific thanks to UDOT and the design team for listening to their concerns and making changes to the design that reflected their concerns. There is very solid understanding of the need and support for the proposed capacity increase to five lanes.
- **Two primary issues** – Two issues gathered more comments than other items of the proposed design.
 - Frontage road routing - 15 comments expressed concerns regarding proposed routing of the frontage road through Thomas Court to 200 South for various reasons. Reasons expressed included pedestrian safety, increased traffic and congestion, narrow street and lack of on-street parking space. Some individuals also indicated a desire to “dead-end” the south end of Thomas Court and 350 South and not connect to the planned frontage road to reduce expected traffic flow through those neighborhoods. Several individuals expressed a desire for extension of 1200 West to provide an alternate connection from the residential area to 200 South to reduce traffic and congestion through the residential area to the frontage road. None of these comments expressed opposition to the frontage road concept, only the routing. One comment was received that expressed concern for anticipated increased traffic congestion and safety problems at the south end of the frontage road where it connects to 600 South.

- Signal at 200 South – Eleven comments expressed a desire for installation of a traffic signal at 200 South / 10th West intersection, now or as soon as possible. Reasons expressed included anticipated congestion if a signal is not installed and pedestrian safety for crossing 10th West.
- **Other significant comments** – the most
 - Maintenance of landscaped/buffer areas – Seven comments noted concern for good maintenance on the planned landscaped/buffer areas.
 - Noise / sound walls – Eight comments were received regarding noise/sound walls. Opinion was nearly split with four comments in support of noise walls, three comments opposed to noise walls and one concern for noise in general. Several other comments expressed concern regarding noise from truck “Jake-brakes” and a desire for an ordinance prohibiting their use in the residential area.
 - Fencing – Five comments were received regarding a potential fence in the buffer space between 10th West and the frontage road. Of the five comments three were supportive and two were not.
 - Redevelopment of the buffer areas – There was no support expressed for the concept of potential residential redevelopment of the new buffer areas between 10th West and the frontage road between 200 South and 600 South. All comments on this issue preferred to retain the green space, with a few even suggesting development of recreation/playground equipment in these areas. Three comments noted this opinion specifically.
 - Three Point Ave. crossing – Two specific comments were made regarding a desire to continue allowing crossing of 10th West at Three Point Ave. One comment especially requested a crosswalk at this location and the other requested that the crossing not be blocked.
 - 1400 North intersection – one comment expressed concern regarding the lane reduction at 1400 North from five lanes to three. Specific concern is regarding times of reduced visibility such as winter / foggy conditions, etc.
 - Speed limits – several comments expressed concern for speed on the corridor, desire not to increase the speed limit and for better enforcement