This document provides a copy of the comments received during the 30-day comment period for the Parley's EIS Preliminary Alternatives. UDOT is reviewing and considering these comments as they refine the project alternatives. Comments received after the 30-day comment period will be reviewed and considered. There will be additional opportunities to provide comments during the Draft EIS public comment period in the summer of 2019.
Comment #1
Date: 7/12/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Joshua Stewart
Comments:
I am opposed to widening of Foothill. We need to be discouraging people from travelling here rather than encouraging them.

Comment #2
Date: 7/18/2018
Source: Email
Name: Emily W. Allen
Comments:
Just writing to indicate my opposition to the current alternatives for the I-80/ I-215 redesign which may impact my neighbors and the Grandeur Peak trailhead.

Thanks!
Emily Allen

Comment #3
Date: 7/18/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jen Schmidt
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to formally voice concern and object to any plans that may put at-risk homes or trailheads as a result of the Parley’s reconstruction. I live in a home that could potentially be impacted. I also love this area for recreation, and I am not alone. There are many, many individuals who enjoy Wasatch Blvd as well as Grandeur Peak for all sorts of recreation activities. Please do not consider any plans that would put these amazing areas at risk.

Sincerely,
-Jennifer Schmidt
Comment #4
Date: 7/19/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Elizabeth Giraud
Comments:
I would like to be added to the email list. I work for UDOT environmental. I would mainly like to address the following issues:

- Nobody in our neighborhood was notified about the Parley’s EIS open house. I believe we live within the ¼ mile of the project that received mailers about the open house.
- I’m concerned about the impacts to Stringham Avenue off of Foothill as that is a common route that police departments use.
- I’m concerned about any proposed alternatives that would eliminate westbound access onto Parley’s; the only other option would be to get off the freeway at 1300 East or take a dangerous loop on Foothill.
- I would like to know who is representing my neighborhood from the Sugarhouse Community Council on the Stakeholder Working Group. If they don’t attend, can I be added as a member to the group?
- I will be contacting the SLC Council and SL County Council members in my district.

Comment #5
Date: 7/19/2018
Source: Email
Name: Marjorie Rasmussen
Comments:
Hi Becky,

I had a couple of gentlemen, Mr. Munns (contact information below) and Mr. Bennion who live in the vicinity of I-80 near your Parley’s Interchange project.

They are mainly concerned about the environmental noise study and had a lot of technical questions regarding how these studies are conducted, the schedule for the study as part of the EIS, how it is determined where the sensors are placed, and quite a few other questions.

They had done some research on their own and provided me a packet that I have at my desk. Please stop by when you get a minute and I can provide you that packet.

We talked about possibly getting a second meeting set up with these gentlemen, yourself and Brandon Weston and maybe the consultant firm working on the project so they can have their questions answered. Please stop by when you get the chance and I can provide you more information.

Thank you Becky!
Marge
Comment #6
Date: 7/19/2018
Source: Email
Name: Charles Hansen
Comments:
Alternative A is clearly the best
Alternative B is acceptable
Alternative C and modified alternative C are both unacceptable
due to a traffic signal which would significantly and negatively
impact traffic flow.

Perhaps a better idea would be to involved public transportation
as a way to limit future car/truck use.

However, it is not at all clear that there will be NO
eminent domain issues or limiting/modifying Wasatch Drive.
It would seem if you wish to plan modifications, all potentially
impacted areas should be clearly indicated along with potential
impacts. This does not seem to have been done but verbally,
the community councils of these areas have said this information
was discussed.

Comment #7
Date: 7/19/2018
Source: Email
Name: Rita Lund
Comments:
Dear Sirs:

Attached please find a statement from Millcreek Mayor regarding the preliminary alternatives to the
Parleys EIS.

We would request this letter be placed into the record and carefully considered in future planning
discussions.

Thank you.

Rita Lund

[See Appendix A for mayoral letter and call-to-action]
Comment #8
Date: 7/20/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Logan Hellenstein
Comments:
As a resident of Millcreek, I am concerned about potential impacts to my neighborhood east of Wasatch. The maps on the site are unclear as to what will happen to the neighborhoods. I oppose any option that would destroy our neighborhood there and hinder our ability to get home. Additionally, I use Wasatch Boulevard daily and frequently use the trail.

Comment #9
Date: 7/20/2018
Source: Email
Name: Terra Reilly
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I am an active member of the my community and well acquainted with the Millcreek City Council and the Community Council. I live at [redacted] These are my personal comments regarding the proposed options for Parleys Interchange shown here at www.parleyseis.com.

I generally agree with the concept of straightening out the roads to the extent practical and making all exit and entrance ramps safer, where possible.

However, for our community north of 3300 S, south of I-80 and east of I-215, we would like to preserve the already narrow Wasatch Blvd heading north from 3300 S. This section of Wasatch Blvd is a regional access road for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail trailhead at the northern end of Wasatch Blvd. As such, it is heavily traveled by bicycles headed both north and south in addition to cars headed to and from homes and the trailhead.

The present arrangement of the entrance ramp heading north onto I-215 from 3300S is acceptable given the significant length to merge onto I-215 and for people to cross from I-215 onto the I-80 eastbound ramp. If the proposed segregated crossover arrangement shown on the maps can be done without impacting Wasatch Blvd or the homes in the area, that is great. However, the maps suggest that Wasatch Blvd north of 3300 S would be severely compromised and homes may be impacted.

Infringing on Wasatch Blvd is completely unacceptable due to its impact on the homes in the area. Cutting into the hillside could have the impact of destabilizing homes not just along Wasatch Blvd but up the hill as well. Are there other options that preserve the Parley’s creek in the middle of the canyon exit and entrance but do not require impacting existing homes? The upper end of the park east of “suicide rock” is not used as a Park and can be dangerous due to vagrants.

Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into the draft designs. However there needs to be considerations for current home owners and residents.
Comment #10
Date: 7/20/2018
Source: Email
Name: Mitch Probert
Comments:
To whom it may concern-

I am writing to voice my formal opposition to the currently proposed alternatives for the Parley’s Canyon freeway entrance.

These design plans could severely limit or eliminate the Grandeur Peak Trailhead, along with a considerable section of Wasatch Blvd. As a resident of this area I urge you to explore options that will not eliminate this trailhead access or cause risk the existing residential neighborhood.

I agree with both the Millcreek Mayor, Mount Olympus Community Council and other local bodies in opposition to these designs that show that this freeway on-ramp will need to be expanded and additional right of way will need to be acquired to build dedicated lanes into the mouth of Parley’s Canyon, and similar lane structures continuing north towards Foothill Blvd and westbound I-215 in the mouth of the canyon.

I hope the UDOT engineers can work out a better design. As even though we all endure the frustrating traffic patterns in the mouth of Parley’s Canyon. Alternative designs should not be built at the expense of homes and trailheads being removed to make way for more roads.

Thank you for your time.

Comment 11
Date: 7/20/2018
Source: Email
Name: Logan Hauenstein
Location:
Comments:
Hello,

I live in the area just east of Wasatch Blvd. and north of 3300 South, and I’m very concerned with the proposed Parley’s Interchange alternatives. We travel on Wasatch Blvd. daily to get to and from our home, and my family uses the Grandeur Peak trailhead multiple times per week. The current alternatives appear to plow right through our neighborhood... I hope this isn’t truly the case, but I strongly oppose any alternatives that drastically alter our neighborhood.

Regards,

Logan Hauenstein
Comment #12
Date: 7/21/2018
Source: Email
Name: Sandy Straley
Comments:
I am a resident in the area and I feel you can make changes with the area you have already. You do not need the bike bridge torn out or the grandeur peak parking lot torn out or the house. Thx
Sandy Straley

Comment #13
Date: 7/21/2018
Source: Email
Name: Marc Bodson
Comments:
I would like to transmit the following comments for the EIS on the Parley’s interchange.
Thank you, Marc Bodson

To: UDOT’s Environmental Impact Study for Parley’s Interchange:

I write to comment on the alternatives proposed for the Parley’s interchange. I attended the open house on July 10 and studied the plans offered on the web site. My conclusion is that Alternative A will have a strong negative impact on residents of the South side of Wilshire Drive close to Parley’s Park. People using Parley’s Way and Parley’s Park will also be negatively affected. The reasons are as follows:

1. The new on-ramps connecting Foothill & Parley’s Way to Westbound I-80 will bring a significant volume of traffic very close to our houses, increasing noise, vibration, and pollution.

2. Because the new on-ramps will need to be graded for the difference of height between Parley’s Park and I-80, the roads will come significantly higher than I-80 and cut into the existing canyon wall. This will greatly increase the transmission of noise and pollution not only from the new traffic, but also from the existing traffic on I-80 (not to mention the increased traffic anticipated by the time construction will take place).

3. The view from our backyards will be degraded from the sight of vehicles or top of vehicles driving by, or by some wall that may need to be placed to take care of the problem.

4. Cutting into the canyon wall could reduce the margin of safety of our properties to landslides and earthquakes.
5. In case of heavy traffic on Foothill, drivers headed to Westbound I-80 will shift from Foothill to 2300 East and Parley’s Way. Traffic on Parley’s Way will be significantly increased. This issue will negatively impact the residents along Parley’s Way.

6. Contrary to the statement that the plans have “No impacts to activities and features of any parks,” a small area of Parley’s Park is lost under Alternative A. If the design of the ramps needs to be adjusted for engineering considerations, the loss could become greater. In any case, there will be an increase of noise and pollution at the South end of the park. The relaxing experience that people enjoy walking in the park will be degraded by the sight of a constant flow of two lanes of cars, which will be much more visible than in the current situation. This issue will affect many users of Parley’s Park.

7. Not long ago, a fire started next to I-80 and quickly moved up the canyon wall to reach the edge of our backyards. The fire was put out by fire trucks that used a gate at the corner of Parley’s Park. Alternative A removes that access, and the reduced buffer zone next to the canyon wall will make access by fire trucks more difficult, reducing our safety.

Alternative A places an undue burden on the residents of my area. Given the wide space available in the canyon for other options, I urge you to account for these concerns in your future plans.

Sincerely,

Marc Bodson

Comment #14

Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Julie Wilkerson
Comments:

I want to note my opposition to proposed re-design plans of Parley’s. Alternative designs should not be done at the expense of homes and trailheads should not be removed to make way for more roads.

Comment #15

Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jonathan Skarda
Comments:

Please consider the ramifications of where traffic will go if the eastbound offramp to Parleys Way is eliminated (Alternative C). That offramp might have less traffic than the other off-ramps. However, it provides critical relief to off-ramps that are cannot be improved due to space. Where will that traffic go?

The Parleys Way offramp serves primarily the homes between Foothill Drive and 1300 E. The Foothill Dr exit seems like a reasonable alternative until you realize that you’re turning left across U
of U rush hour traffic. That’s “exciting” for experienced drivers in their prime. It’s downright terrifying for everyone else. Accidents and injuries would increase. Protected left arrows would be lengthed in response, which would add to Foothill’s rush hour traffic congestion.

The eastbound offramp at 1300 E isn’t much better. That offramp already suffers from congestion problems at rush hour. It is heavily utilized as an exit. It is also preceded by a short merge from the heavily utilized 700 E onramp.

Eliminating the Parley’s Way offramp would force its traffic onto Foothill Dr and 1300 E. Last year’s bridge construction traffic would become the norm. That doesn’t even consider the problems that 30-50+ years of growth will bring.

The existing tight-looped off-ramp might not be up to current highway design standards. However, it is substantially less dangerous and more capable of handling its traffic than where that traffic will go under Alternative C. Would you rather be forced to slow down for a tightly curved off-ramp or take your chances turning left on Foothill? ;)

Comment #16
Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Email
Name: David A Harris
Comments:
Hello: I am a Millcreek resident at [redacted], and as a dogwalker, I use the north end of Wasatch blvd to access both the grandeur peak trail and the parley’s gulch dog park via the bridges over the freeway. I do this three-four times weekly.

I would oppose any Parley’s proposal which either closes the trailhead entrance, or puts any homes on that stretch at risk for purchase/destruction via eminent domain in pursuance of whatever option is eventually pursued.

Sincerely yours, David A Harris

Comment #17
Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jason Eldredge
Comments:
Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

- We are writing to express our opposition to any changes to the Wasatch Blvd as it extends North from 3300 South (often referred to as the Grandeur Peak trail road). We oppose any changes to Wasatch Blvd as well as an impact on existing homes from 3300 South to the North, East of Wasatch Blvd.
- Looking at the four alternatives, it appears that all four plans allow for this area to keep all existing homes and trail heads with no change to Wasatch from 3300 South to the North.

- With all the technology at the disposal of UDOT, engineers and consultants in this modern age, the need for eminent domain in established and unique neighborhoods such as this are unnecessary. We sincerely request that no homes are impacted from this change as there are so many other alternatives to research and utilize.

- The traffic accident occurrences found in the study show the area of Foothill being the overwhelming issue (237 crashes) and with anyone who travels this area often or lives near here can validate. The Foothill entry from I-80 West or I-215 loop needs severe study. The secondary area noted in the study is on the on ramp from 3300 South to the merge between Parley entry and I-215 heading west. This area is noted to have 37 accidents between 2010 and 2015; for an average of 7.4 per year or on every 49 days. This seems very low to consider a major change at 3300 South heading North.

- Additionally, regarding merging areas identified in the Study Area. While many of these areas need to be evaluated, the North on ramp at 3300 South towards the Parleys entrance/I-215 West to the I-80(W)/Foothill Exit seems to be the least of the problems. Traffic does not bog down due to current designs from this ramp, the only challenge is the cross over between travelers coming off the 3300 South on ramp looking to merge West and the I-215 travelers crossing over to get to Parleys. Changing Wasatch Blvd won’t fix any of this.

- Once again, from looking at all the alternative routes it appears (I’m no traffic engineer), but it seems that the new off ramp at Wasatch at 3300 South would allow for a lane dedicated to Parleys and a lane dedicated to I-80W/Foothill. And from the I-215 a lane to cross under the new 3300 South on ramp dedicated to Parleys access. If this doesn’t affect the Wasatch North of 3300 and keeps all homes, it’s an AWESOME move. Additionally, the new exit from Parleys to wrap around is genius as it would elevate the tricky cross over at the 3300 South off ramp.

- I request a list of those noticed and to understand the point of origin for the noticing of residents about this project. It’s stated within a .25-mile radius residents were noticed. I believe we are in that impact zone, but I don’t believe we were ever noticed. We could be wrong, but I would like a copy of those noticed.

- Obviously you can tell that we are most concerned with the area North of 3300 South and Wasatch Blvd. After looking for the last five years we recently just built what is to be our forever home and literally put our life savings into this home. Seeing this area every day and noticing the area of Wasatch Blvd North of 3300 South not really be the traffic problem or contribute to it we would request the issue areas of Foothill, the exists from Parleys into the Salt Lake Valley and the Eastbound exit to 3300 South be addressed as these will elevate much of future traffic problems.

Thank you again for the time in reading our comments with the Parleys project.

The Eldredge Family
**Comment #18**

Date: 7/22/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Julie Wilkerson  
Comments:

Hello,

Please note that my family is opposed to the proposed redesign plans of I-215, I-80, Parleys Way and Foothill Blvd.

The alternative designs should not be built at the expense of homes and trailheads being removed to make way for more roads.

Thank you,

Julie Wilkerson

**Comment #19**

Date: 7/22/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Sharilyn C. and Lowell C. Bennion  
Comments:

We object to plans for a Parley’s Canyon interchange that would impact the Grandeur Peak trailhead and cause severe changes for homes north of 3300 South along Wasatch Boulevard. Surely some way of preparing for future needs that does not so drastically impact the neighborhood should be available.

Sincerely,

Sherilyn C. and Lowell C. Bennion

**Comment #20**

Date: 7/24/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Steve Motzkus  
Comments:

To Whom It May Concern,

I am opposed to the proposed idea of revamping the traffic flow in the mouth of parleys canyon.

No homes should be affected! If anything happens it should be closing in the canyon, filling in the gorge. Please leave the homes and wasatch blvd alone.

Thanks.
**Comment #21**

Date: 7/20/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Scot and Susan Morgan  
Comments:  

Everyone,

I am unhappy with your web site, because I can’t see highlighted effect of the common features. I think it is critical to be able to easily view the model of each different design; which is not currently possible on their site.

With the 3D visualization tools available, we should be able to see each design in its entirety.

- You did a poor job with your web site. Please improve this ASAP!
- It would be nice to be able load the designs in Sketchup (free 3d design app) so anyone can navigate in 3D.
- I think it should be able to see which unique features from the alternatives that could made to work together.
  - The idea being that I don’t like some of the unique items in each design; and I would like to cobble better alternatives.

However you made a serious mistake in not first addressing publicly the severe neighborhood impact prior to distributing any of the four alternatives for public comment.

Scot and Susan Morgan

---

**Comment #22**

Date: 7/10/2018  
Source: Website  
Contact:  
Name: Frank Lengyel  
Comments:  

I live at [redacted]. My biggest concern is traffic flow from I-80 eastbound onto I-215 southbound to access 3300 So exit. Currently this is an obstacle course...1) defensively negotiation the I-80E/I-215S split, 2) funneling 2 lanes to one at the mouth of the canyon, 3) merging with Foothill traffic, 3) moving over two lanes on an uphill grade, then 4) merging with I-80 traffic exiting onto southbound I-215. I have endured this daily challenge for more than 25 years and would like to see a driver friendly solution. Also anything to minimize traffic noise in the 3300 So area would be good.

I look forward to following the progress of your project. Thank you.
Comment #23
Date: 7/12/2018
Source: Website
Name: Joshua Stewart
Comments:

Alternatives along Foothill Drive to Stringham Ave should include a no-widening scenario. Widening Foothill Drive from 2 lanes each way to 3 lanes each way will decrease pedestrian and cycling use in the corridor and make the road wider and less safe for pedestrians and cyclists (more exposure to traffic and longer crossing times as well higher vehicle speeds and noise). Widening also increases traffic in the corridor leading to more air pollution and induced demand. Congestion on Foothill Drive is a positive deterrent to increased numbers of SOV commuters. Level of service is an inappropriate matrix for judging Foothill Drive because the congestion actually encourages people to make choices to use transit, walk, or cycle or tele-commute. Widening Foothill will have negative aesthetic implications as well as sound walls will be added and existing trees and building could be demolished.

A no widening of Foothill Drive Alternative that improves the pedestrian and active transportation amenities should be included as part of the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) since it will cost the least, encourage more transit riders, reduce air pollution, be safer for pedestrian and cyclists, and have the least negative aesthetic impacts.

Joshua Stewart
Architect
Salt Lake City, UT

Comment #24
Date: 7/12/2018
Source: Website
Name: David K Holbrook
Comments:

I am very opposed to both Alternate C proposals. We in the Parleys area have waited for more than 40 years for a safe exit from I-80 to Parleys Way. The bridge was recently widened allowing us direct safe exit over the bridge and onto Parleys. With either Alternate C it would divert too much traffic either thru Walmart parking lot, Stringham ave. thru the Foothill apartments or onto 2100 South endangering people and traffic. This increases an already unsafe left turn across Foothill either at Walmart, Stringham or the light on 2100. This would impact Foothill traffic that is already in a failure mode because of demands of University area.

I like plan B the best. It accomplishes everything that needs to be accomplished to help the Foothill northbound traffic and the I-80 East to I-215 South transition that was very poorly engineered since the interchange was designed back in the late 60's - early 70's. I personally have lived in this area for 62 years and for our Parleys neighborhood, the current updated changes is the best and safest access to our Parleys neighborhood from I-80 or I-215 since the Interstate was originally built.
Plan A makes a very unsafe situation for the Parleys neighborhood having a very short distance to get across 2 lanes from I-215. Accidents will happen because cars will slow down (causing a back-up on I-80 off ramp) to get to the Parleys exit or cut dangerously in front of as they try to merge over. I see this leading to a barrier being installed to not allow us the option to exit onto Parleys and then we have same issues as stated above for Plan C.

The only option I will support is Plan B.

Comment #25
Date: 7/12/2018
Source: Website
Name: Suzanne Stensaas
Comments:
I attended the open house at Skyline. I saw the plans and talked to UDOT people. We live in 84109 near Parleys way and find alternate C with no off ramp from I 80 east unacceptable. Access to both E and W needed from Parleys way and i 215 as it begins going south.

Comment #26
Date: 7/17/2018
Source: Website
Name: Toan Lam
Comments:
The congestion problem is at Foothill itself. Having only 2 lanes on Foothill north bound to the U causes back up congestion to I-215 entrance. Without enlarging Foothill, the I-215 improvement will cause a bottle-neck effect at the entrance of Foothill.

Comment #27
Date: 7/19/2018
Source: Website
Name: Elisa Koehler
Comments:
I have many concerns about this proposed Parley's Interchange plan. I truly believe that a smarter idea is to run a Trax line from somewhere around Cottonwood Heights along 2-15 and then through Foothill (if not along 2-15 even further south/west). If large parking lots could be provided for people to park and then take Trax along 2-15 (one at Cottonwood Heights, one at Millcreek, by other freeway on ramps, etc.) I think this would dramatically reduce Foothill & I-80/2-15 Traffic, eliminating the need for the whole Parley's Interchange proposal altogether. I am guessing Foothill home owners would protest a Trax line running along Foothill (placed in the middle turning lane, like it works on 4th South), but this is the smartest and most effective way to reduce not only the traffic at the Parley's Interchange area, but all along Foothill, which leads to less back-up onto the freeway.
around rush hour. Traffic on Foothill is only going to increase as SLC and the University grows. Why would we put a bandaid on an injury that requires surgery and stitches? As someone who attended the U of U and has worked there for 10+ years, I can make one important observation: the problem here is clearly Foothill & University commuters.

I also agree with these below points, as made by Richard Williamson:

[See comment #29]

Thank you,

Elisa Koehler

Comment #28
Date: 7/20/2018
Source: Website
Name: Michelle Kolbe
Comments:

I’m a resident living north of 3300 off of Wasatch Blvd. I’d like to provide my support for the Alternative C with the Flyover. It’s such a mess to have the traffic from I-80 westbound and eastbound all merging around the 3300 s exit. I would love to see these routes spread out to provide better flow.

I also want to state that I hope that Wasatch Blvd will stay as is in our neighborhood and traffic will not be directed through our side streets. We get a lot of traffic for the trailhead and bike traffic that would be unsafe on our narrow neighborhood roads.

Comment #29
Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Website
Name: Richard Williamson
Comments:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a resident in Millcreek and a member of the Mount Olympus Community Council, and I would like to voice my concerns about these four Alternative Plans, and point out the obvious -- that Foothill Drive traffic currently needs to be addressed in conjunction with this Parley's Interchange discussion. If these plans are looking ahead to the future, 5-10-20-50 years, then there should be futuristic public transportation options as well (e.g. light rail TRAX lines from Park City to the University, TRAX lines from Big Cottonwood Canyon to the University--with stops along the way, and enough parking at each TRAX stations for local residents). Additionally, in the future, I would hope there are other non-polluting options for transportation--replacing commuter cars with Segways, bicycles, and other battery powered mobility devices, as needed. These possibilities would require extra space on TRAX, as well as expanding roads for direct bike routes (instead of making bikers
zigzag through residential streets). Foothill Drive may need to become a multi-layered thoroughfare, similarly designed like certain bridges in San Francisco, New York, Seattle, Portland, Hong Kong, etc. Another futuristic option may include tunneling for TRAX lines, to and from the University and other locations as needed.

In my Parley’s Interchange analysis, I did not like any of the plans presented, because Foothill Drive traffic would essentially get worse every year as the population increases—regardless of the Interchange redesign.

Below is my analysis of each plan, and the concerns I have about my own residential neighborhood (Mount Olympus North).

Alternative A: No.

Morning commuters from I-80 eastbound trying to exit onto Foothill Drive, via the “slower speed ramp,” could easily get backed up, and that will cause an I-80 eastbound traffic jam. Also, from I-80 eastbound, the off ramp for I-215 and the off ramp for the Foothill Drive exits-are-too-close-together. Another potential problem is at the merging section, where the off ramps and routes (from I-80 E and I-215 northbound) are combined into one “interstate to arterial” Foothill Drive; one fender bender at that merge point will adversely affect both freeways. Also, the commuter exiting eastbound I-80, onto Foothill Drive, would have to cross over two lanes of I-215 northbound commuters to reach the exit onto Parley’s Way. Any homes adjacent to these Interchange areas should NOT be removed by UDOT. Also, the north section of Wasatch Blvd and Grandeur Peak Trailhead (parking lot) should NOT be removed.

Alternative B: Maybe... (but this plan will need Foothill Drive revisions and neighborhood clarification)

“Most similar to current interchange configuration.” Morning commuters from I-80 eastbound, trying to exit onto Foothill Drive, would have a longer off ramp (compared to Alternative A), and in my opinion, that would cause less traffic jams on I-80 eastbound.

This option (Alternative B) is the least obstructed route for both north and south commuters, I-215 <> Foothill Drive. Correct me if I’m wrong, but I would guess that the I-215 eastbound Belt Route is used by a majority of Salt Lake County residents—those who live south of ~5400 S.—who commute to the University, University Hospital, VA, or Research Park, etc. As you probably know, the I-215 eastbound Belt Route avoids the I-15/I-80 spaghetti bowl for a good reason.

If the I-215 <> Foothill Drive could be a direct route, north and south, without needing to slow down for merging lanes, then I would imagine that all of those commuters would be much happier getting to work on time and not so late getting home at night.

There are some complications with Alternative B that need to be addressed, as I would like to know if the proposed road changes along I-215 will retain, remove, or relocate the sound wall barriers protecting residents and their homes along Wasatch Blvd and the east side of Canyon Rim? I would expect that the sound wall barriers and homes remain in place.

Also, for the Alternative B plan, I would suggest widening the merging section onto Foothill Drive where I-80 E and I-80 W off ramps combine; that may need three lanes at that merging point instead of two, so commuters coming down the hill from I-80 westbound might have a clear right-of-way onto Foothill Drive, and that would allow the accelerating commuters from I-80 eastbound, after the 90° turn, to have enough room to regain their speed and move their way into the merge lane.
Again, any homes adjacent to these Interchange areas should NOT be removed by UDOT. Also, the north section of Wasatch Blvd and Grandeur Peak Trailhead (parking lot) should NOT be removed.

Alternative C: NO.

A “signalized intersection” is a bad idea. That will not reduce congestion, that will make it worse. Again, any homes adjacent to these Interchange areas should NOT be removed by UDOT. Also, the north section of Wasatch Blvd and Grandeur Peak Trailhead (parking lot) should NOT be removed.

Alternative C Flyover: NO.

Again, a “signalized intersection” is a bad idea. That will not reduce congestion, that will make it worse. The “Flyover” off ramp, exiting I-80 westbound to join I-215, is not needed, as the existing two-lane highway, connecting those two freeways, along the south side of Parley’s Canyon would continue to serve that purpose just fine, especially with the wider configuration shown in plans A, B, and C. Again, any homes adjacent to these Interchange areas should NOT be removed by UDOT. Also, the north section of Wasatch Blvd and Grandeur Peak Trailhead (parking lot) should NOT be removed.

As Socrates once said, “By far the greatest and most admirable form of wisdom is that needed to plan and beautify cities and human communities.” I would ask that you expand the scope of this EIS to include long range, futuristic planning and designs, not just for Parley’s Interchange, but to include endpoint destinations.

Thank you,

Richard Williamson

Mount Olympus Community Council--Treasurer

Comment #30

Date: 7/22/2018
Source: Website
Name: Melissa Pearce
Comments:

It is critical to my family that the access to and from Parleys way and all the freeways in each direction is maintained. So much of the neighborhood relies on that to get to and from home. Left turns off of north bound Foothill and into the neighborhood are nearly impossible. Having to send all that neighborhood’s traffic through 1300 east seems like a terrible idea, given the current traffic and future developments there. Please keep the access as it is and allow us to continue to access all the freeways with ease as well as return home without having to deal with and contribute to foothill or 1300 east traffic. We already deal with the noise and pollution, but most of us are ok with living close and tolerating some noise in exchange for the easy access.
Comment #31
Date: 7/23/2018
Source: Website
Name: Victor and Robyn Kimball
Comments:
After reviewing the different concept drawings at the Skyline open house, we believe that the east off ramp to Parleys Way and Foothill Drive are essential. I believe this is concept drawing “B” or “C”.

Moving the freeway to the South, installing another Engine Brake Sign further east for west bound traffic, paving the road with asphalt rather than concrete and installing sound ways on both sides of the freeway would be optimal.

Installing an additional sign stating ‘No” Engine Brakes further east is easy. Could a solar light enhance the visibility of these signs. The existing sign is too far west to inform truckers to slow down.

Comment #32
Date: 7/23/2018
Source: Website
Name: Steve Longnecker
Comments:
I like plan B

Comment #33
Date: 7/27/2018
Source: Email
Name: Karen Domer
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern:

I currently live on the North side of Olympus Cove, directly above Wasatch Blvd (Plateau Dr). I have been reviewing the Alternative Traffic Plans for the Parley’s Interchange and would like to make the following comments:

1. It is of utmost importance to me that no homes in my neighborhood are removed and that the north end of Wasatch Blvd remains in tact with bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular access to Grandeur Peak Trailhead and Foothill Road. I use Wasatch Blvd as a cyclist and the Grandeur Peak Trailhead as a hiker multiple times per week. Disrupting this area would affect far more people than just the residents of this area. Cyclists and hikers come from all over the valley to access this area.

2. The removal of the north end of Wasatch Blvd while maintaining the Grandeur Peak trailhead would result in an enormous increase in traffic and congestion on my street. The streets in this
neighborhood cannot withstand that sort of vehicular traffic. There aren’t currently sidewalks in our neighborhood (something I actually prefer) and more cars would result in far more pedestrian and bicycle collisions. It would not be safe for my children to be anywhere near the street.

3. The interchange is already noisy and I want to ensure that any sound barriers along 215 N/80E are replaced with better, more effective sound barriers.

4. My son will be attending Eastwood Elementary along Wasatch and 3300 S. The school is already in close proximity to 215, so I would like to reiterate my concern with sound barriers and removal of access to the Grandeur Peak Trailhead via Wasatch Blvd. It would not be safe for people to park at the school (which they would) in order to access the trail.

I understand the need to “fix” the issues surrounding the Parley’s interchange, but it certainly seems there is a lack of concern or interest in preserving existing neighborhoods and recreational access. Every Alternative presented shows the 215N to 80E on ramp interfering with Wasatch Blvd. Because of this, I cannot support any of these Alternatives. I would strongly encourage your team to explore options that do not have such a negative impact on our neighborhood.

There should be an increased focus on integration and accessibility via bike lanes, pedestrian walk ways, and transit options…not simply prioritizing personal vehicle traffic flow.

Lastly, I would like to express my discontent regarding the Presentation and Open House dates/times. As a working mother, I am unable to attend personal meetings at 4PM on a weekday. How many people do you expect to have the flexibility to attend these meetings? Or is that the intent?

Best,
Karen Domer

Comment #34

Date: 7/26/2018
Source: Email
Name: Barb Hansen
Comments:

Jani,

Having just read through this I do have questions that come to mind immediately.

1. They mention accident rate. 37 accidents north of 3300 S. between 2010 and 2015. For years on the north bound lanes of I-215 there was a large drop(or dip in the road that went all the way across all the lanes, some lanes were worse) this dip was located approximately 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile north of 3300 S. The dip was severe enough that it would actually “throw” your car into the next lane of traffic depending on the lane you were in and if you were going freeway speed yet. If someone was speeding the effect was more severe. I know I called once or twice saying there was a problem. It has been fixed for a while now, possibly 3 years. Or That “forgive me ramp”, the ramp that lets you change your mind and go north once you are already on the south I-215 exit from the canyon. It should be closed! It’s connection to the northbound lanes is dangerous.
QUESTION: How many of those accidents were because that road needed to be repaired? And how many accidents were caused by that “bad ramp”? Where have all those accidents occurred? A map with Xs showing where accidents happened would be interesting.

2. It’s true, the area immediately north of 3300 S is very constricted but less than half a mile north of the constricted area there is a HUGE OPEN area.

QUESTIONS: Why is UDOT trying to fix the problem in the most confining area?

Why not just move all these concerns north half a mile where there is no physical constriction, water pipes, trails, bike paths and homes?

Example: Use the open space in the east part of the mouth of the canyon! They could widen the current bridges, or build a large tunnel for Parleys Creek down in the East end of the mouth of the canyon (that would allow for more than enough water to flood through if needed), much larger and less appealing than the (highly popular) 7 foot pipe that goes under the freeway farther west. Then fill in that part of the canyon and widen the existing roads and bridge to complete the ramp part of the project? Bike paths can be realigned if needed. You make an east bound flyover on ramp that could meet structurally with the southbound flyover ramp. Or take out that rock that currently limits the east side of the on/off roads on the south side of the canyon, That is a lot less to take out than a mile of cliff along the east side of 215, just north of 3300 S.

3. Why do all the “alternatives” look the same? All options solve the ramp problem in the same constricted area, with a couple “smaller” road changes in the center of this huge open area... as the change part?

QUESTION: Why are the “options” so very similar?

4. They mention saving or being aware of historical areas. The area west of where I-215 crosses over to Foothill Blvd. that was originally dedicated to the state to be a wildlife preserve has been allowed to be turned onto a Dog park, Probably the last place wild life wants to be. So the intended use for that land is long gone and vandalized. Dipping into that open space should be better because it seems less expensive to construct and only reducing the use area as opposed to the impact to trailheads, paths, roads, and home owners road access and financial investments of their homes.

QUESTION: The historical areas already seem to have been changed or damaged so much for other reasons that they are may be less of a consideration in this factoring? not to be developed, but to allow for a flyovers or a portion to be taken for this project?

5. Nothing talks about when the Construction would begin.

QUESTION: The study was projecting traffic needs in 2050 how soon will this start?

6. A neighbor was told at the open house not to worry because the options are shown on google maps which is not accurate so they don’t truly show the impact to roads, homes, trails & paths.

QUESTION: How is the public and even UDOT suppose to make choices and determine impact using inaccurate tools? It seems to me investing in an accurate map could save a lot of money before going to the cost of measuring things. And it would be more honest to the public reflecting the true potential impact
Summary

Utah has pretty bad/rude drivers, who will speed from well behind you to cut in, just to be in front. Sometimes even to just to be in front of you so they can get into the exit lane (that just began on the other side), instead of just falling in behind and moving over 5 sec later.... They need to be in front. And I suppose sometimes cause and accident.

To which I say: THERE IS NO ASPHALT FIX FOR RUDE DRIVERS!

Jani, I tried to explain my thinking or understanding with each of the questions. If you feel it’s better to paraphrase or just list the questions please feel free to do that or let me know and I’ll redo this.

Thanks for your help with this,

Barb Hansen

Comment #35

Date: 7/25/2018
Source: Email
Name: Brian Strong
Comments:

I have reviewed the suggested alternatives for the UDOT changes to the Parleys Interchange. None of these alternatives work. By putting in a stop light or reducing the flow of traffic or decreasing the access will the needs of the interchange be improved. We need a more thorough review and alternatives suggested. Much can be done to simplify the interchange and to meet the increase in demand that is coming.

For example:

- Connect west bound traffic from I-80 to Foothill and Parleys by an earlier exit from I-80 and cutting the north slope of the mountain.
- This same exit, starting earlier than the current one, for west bound I-80 to south bound I-215 can be a bridge instead of the current narrow one lane along the south slope of the mountain.
- This same bridge can also be used for north bound I-215 going east to I-80.
- West bound I-80 continuing to I-15 would be the main lanes.
- East bound I-80 from I-15 would be the main lanes.
- East bound I-80 to south bound I-215 would be the main lanes but there needs to be better flow by adding an additional lane on the south that would continue to 3300 and also to 3900 and 4500 exits and at a future point to 6200 exit.
- North bound I-215 would flow onto west bound I-80 as it does now.
- North bound I-215 would stay as it is now to Foothill and to Parleys.
- East bound I-80 to North bound Parleys and to Foothill would exit I-80 after 2300 and flow under I-215 and connect to Foothill and Parleys.
• South bound Foothill and Parleys to go west onto I-80 would be an entrance.
• South bound Foothill and Parleys to go east onto I-80 would connect to the current east and west lanes of traffic going west bound from I-80 to south bound I-215.

Thank you.

Comment #36
Date: 7/26/2018
Source: Website
Name: Julie Peck-Dabling
Comments:
You’v got listed a meeting with the COUNTY Council, but you are showing an address at CITY hall, not at the county’s offices. You do need to have a meeting with Salt Lake County Council as well, so I would suggest that you set up a meeting with them too.

Julie Peck-Dabling
Open Space
Salt Lake County Parks & Recreation

Comment #37
Date: 7/27/2018
Source: Email
Name: Melanie Soelberg
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

Please do not make changes to the I215 and I80 interchange that would disrupt the trail access to Grandeur Peak, and particularly do not disturb the homes, bike route, and neighborhood around Eastwood Elementary. Consider that, as telecommuting becomes an increasing aspect of our careers and society, there’s a decreasing need to anticipate road infrastructure changes decades in advance. Add to this the fact that air pollution caused by vehicles of long-distance commuters should be discouraged, and please plan transportation accordingly. An improved public transportation system from Salt Lake to Park City, including park-and-ride lots in convenient locations, would better serve both communities.

Thanks for your consideration,

Melanie Soelberg
Comment #38
Date: 7/28/2018
Source: Email
Name: Janet Wolcott
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern:

As a lifelong resident of the Parley’s Canyon area, I oppose your current plans regarding the Parley’s Canyon Interchange. While we know that something must be done, restricting access to the Grandeur Peak Trailhead and taking residential property should not be the means to the end. My family home was “purchased” back in 1965 for the I215 East construction, severing my ties to my childhood friends and causing me and my family great emotional stress.

Please reconsider, rethink and remember that what you do has long term consequences.

Thank you,

Janet Wolcott
Wolcott Optical Service, LC

Comment #39
Date: 7/28/2018
Source: Email
Name: Richard and Laurie Nash
Comments:
Dear friends:

My wife and I live at [redacted], and we’re writing to strongly endorse Alternative C as the best plan for the reconstruction of the Parley’s interchange. At the same time, we strongly oppose Alternative A. We hope you’ll consider these reasons why:

· Alternative C is the simplest, straightest line from point A (the Salt Lake valley) to Point B (Parleys Canyon). Traffic will move better on the simplest route. UDOT’s “Preliminary Alternatives” statement says Alternative C (flyover) would cause “less merging and weaving” at the southbound 3300 South exit on I-215. It would also cause less merging and weaving on I-80.

· Alternative C better aligns with I-80. Alternative C moves the current traffic lanes that lead to Parleys Canyon further south, toward the main part of I-80, away from residential areas and toward the main part of the freeway. That’s a good environmental decision.

· Alternative C calms traffic. The slower-speed ramps to northbound Foothill Drive from eastbound I-80 and northbound I-215 can “better define change from interchange to arterial,” as the Preliminary Alternative statement says.

· Alternative C calms traffic part 2. We like the new signalized intersection that will funnel traffic
from eastbound I-80 to Foothill Drive and from southbound Foothill Drive to eastbound I-80 and southbound I-215. That’s a simple, safe, and traffic-calming strategy.

- Alternative C is less traumatic to residential neighborhoods. Alternative C doesn’t require UDOT to cut into Parleys Way Park and doesn’t require the onramp at the top of Parleys Way to be graded to lower the level of its road. It also doesn’t require I-80 to be built up so it connects with the Parleys Way onramp — all of which are expensive, would bring more traffic into the neighborhood north of the Parleys interchange, and would bring untenable volumes of traffic, noise, and pollution to our residential neighborhood. Alternative A does threaten all those negative repercussions.

Laurie and I are enthusiastically supportive of Alternative C and strongly opposed to Alternative A. Please log our conclusions and our concerns as part of your environmental impact statement, and please advise us about opportunities for further public input by affected residents as the planning process continues.

Thank you —

Richard and Laurie Nash

---

**Comment #40**

Date: 7/29/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Shane Domer  
Comments:

To Whom It May Concern:

I currently live on the North side of Olympus Cove, directly above Wasatch Blvd. I have been reviewing the Alternative Traffic Plans for the Parley’s Interchange and would like to make the following comments:

1. It is of utmost importance to me that no homes in my neighborhood are removed and that the north end of Wasatch Blvd remains intact with bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular access to Grandeur Peak Trailhead and Foothill Road. I use Wasatch Blvd and the BST Parleys crossing path as a cyclist to connect to Foothill and access Emigration Canyon. Disrupting this area would affect far more people than just the residents of this area. Cyclists and hikers come from all over the valley to access this area. In fact, I know that many current and future Olympians use the BST Parleys Crossing path to connect their Emigration Canyon rides with Canyons along Wasatch Blvd, as I am currently the Sports Science Director for US Speedskating team.

2. The removal of the north end of Wasatch Blvd while maintaining the Grandeur Peak trailhead would result in an enormous increase in traffic and congestion on my street. The streets in this neighborhood cannot withstand that sort of vehicular traffic. There aren’t currently sidewalks in our neighborhood and more cars would result in far more pedestrian and bicycle collisions. It would not be safe for my children to be anywhere near the street.

3. The interchange is already noisy and I want to ensure that any sound barriers along 215 N/80E
are replaced with better, more effective sound barriers.

4. My son’s will be attending Eastwood Elementary along Wasatch and 3300 S. The school is already in close proximity to 215, so I would like to reiterate my concern with sound barriers and removal of access to the Grandeur Peak Trailhead via Wasatch Blvd. It would not be safe for people to park at the school (which they would) in order to access the trail.

I understand the need to “fix” the issues surrounding the Parley’s interchange, but it certainly seems there is a lack of concern or interest in preserving existing neighborhoods and recreational access. Every Alternative presented shows the 215N to 80E on ramp interfering with Wasatch Blvd. Because of this, I cannot support any of these Alternatives. I would strongly encourage your team to explore options that do not have such a negative impact on our neighborhood.

There should be an increased focus on integration and accessibility via bike lanes, pedestrian walk ways, and transit options…not simply prioritizing personal vehicle traffic flow.

SHANE DOMER | Sports Science Director
US SPEEDSKATING

Comment #41
Date: 7/29/2018
Source: Email
Name: Mathew White
Comments:
Hello,

I am a citizen of Millcreek City (I live by Tanner Park), and I am concerned about the proposed EIS plans proposed by UDOT to date. Each of the proposed plan alternatives seems to impinge on Wasatch Boulevard, with the associated potential to negatively impact access to or the existence of the Grandeur Peak west face trail head, as well as homes along that route. I often hike the west face of Grandeur Peak, at times taking the trail through Tanner Park to the top of the mountain, and at other times driving to the start of the trail via Wasatch Boulevard. My Fiancée and I have also biked this area. And we have friends who live just East Wasatch Boulevard between 3300 South and the trail head. New construction and/or traffic in this area will depress home values, cause noise issues, and restrict public access to these important natural areas.

I think the proposed plans should be updated not to affect this important and highly-utilized area.

Sincerely,

Mathew White
Comment #42
Date: 7/28/2018
Source: Website
Name: John Janson
Comments:
Seems like this needs to address the 3900 S interchange also.

Flyover seem too expensive to me.

I don’t really understand how the alternatives with the lights actually will work. I think I get the idea generally but seems hard to figure out how the lights would be an improvement as opposed to unimpeded flow. Foothill is crazy busy during the peak hours - seems like a light would make that worse.

Comment #43
Date: 7/29/2018
Source: Website
Name: Linda Smith
Comments:
We all endure the frustrating traffic patterns in the mouth of Parley's Canyon, but alternative designs should not be built at the expense of homes and trailheads being removed to make way for more roads.

Comment #44
Date: 7/30/2018
Source: Email
Name: Michael John Jurynce
Comments:
Hi.

I wanted to give a few brief comments on the Parley's Interchange.

I am a resident of the area – I live just above Wasatch and 3300 S and commute daily to the U of U using the Parley's/Foothill interchange. Furthermore, I often bike and run commute and use the bike path across I-80 on a weekly basis. I have been doing this commute for almost 20 years.

1. I would love to see congestion reduced, but NOT at the expense of certain structures in the area.

2. I am vehemently opposed to any restructuring that results in:

3. Loss of the Parley's/I-80/Foothill bike lane.

4. Reduction or closure of Wasatch Blvd.
5. Loss of homes or personal property along Wasatch Blvd. Loss of access to Foothill Dr.

I disagree with the statements on your website that improvements to Foothill would NOT have any significant impact on Parley’s interchange. On the contrary, Foothill traffic IS the reason that Parley’s interchange so congested. It is the continued growth at the U and Research Park areas without any improvements to the infrastructure leading to this area that has led to the massive increase in congestion. Over the past 20 years there has been significant growth at the U, while almost nothing has been done to improve flow or congestion on Foothill. The ENTIRE stretch of Foothill needs to be considered in this project.

Comment #45
Date: 7/30/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jono Gibson
Comments:

To whom it may concern,

I don’t like any of the options that are proposed for the new freeway plans. I specifically care about the portion of the plan that goes from 3300 S., north to the entrance of Parley’s canyon. Why would you widen that and make the entrance to Parley’s happen at 3300 S. It is a narrow corridor already, plus it looks like it will affect all of the houses east of the freeway. Why not make the transition happen further north where there is a huge open space and no houses. Plus my wife and kids and I frequently use the Grandeur Peak trailhead parking lot to go on walks and bike rides along the trail that goes over the freeway and along the gully. From the plans it looks like that will all be done away with. Where will we and all the other people park? Should we park by Eastwood elementary and walk along the side of the freeway to get to the trail.

I can see that there are different plans on the website, but they all look the same for the area that I care about. Try coming up with something different for that area before forging ahead. Think about the families that you’ll be displacing with your current plan. If you lived there would you want someone to take your house from you and pay you way less than it’s value?

Try having a meeting that is after work hours so that people can attend the meeting. My guess is that just like you, they would rather not be at the meeting at 7pm, but you are forcing them to be there because of the bad planning.

If you take nothing else from this email, just know that I’m not against improving the freeway in the parley’s canyon area, I just think that there needs to be more thought and consideration as to how it is done. There are areas of the plans that negatively affect peoples lives. That is probably more important than a little bit of traffic slowing.

Sincerely,

Jono Gibson
Comment #46
Date: 7/30/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Barb Hansen
Comments:
I am shocked that the alternatives look like one plan.

Why have you picked the tightest spots for the extra lanes and not on 3300 South?

I am against the plan. If they are alternatives, they should be different plans with more options on how it should be done.

The alternatives proposed are foolish and costly to put everything north of 3300 South – why not put in roads there?

This is wasting homes. You will need gigantic retaining walls to put them in the 3300 South corridor instead of the canyon.

Did the other alternatives show other options for 3300 South at Parley’s Canyon?

I couldn’t tell what the maps were on the website.

Why does a ramp need to be two miles away?

I would like a cost estimate cost of moving the ramps.

The maps aren’t consistent with google maps. They are off by 15 feet?

Comment #47
Date: 7/30/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Andrew Burton
Comments:
I saw a flyer saying there will be impacts to the Grandeur Peak trailhead

I want to learn more about the alternatives and how they might affect my home.
Comment #48
Date: 7/31/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Jennifer Jury nec
Comments:
I live in the neighborhood east of the freeway, and I object to plans to remove driving or parking for Grandeur Peak Trailhead or the bridge over Parley's onto Wasatch. Before the bridge was built, bike and pedestrian traffic used to go down 3300 South which created an issue for pedestrians. Removing or altering the bridge would affect the safety of our city and the ability to walk or run to the University or along Wasatch.

Comment #49
Date: 7/31/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Virginia Jensen
Comments:
I share concerns with others, and oppose designs for Parley’s Canyon Interchange. These plans will affect our homes. I live behind the bike path on Wasatch Blvd. This will affect access into our neighborhood. Roads may need to be increased but it shouldn't be at the risk of homeowners and bike trail, hiking trail and parking at the end of Wasatch Boulevard. I have lived here since the 60s. I would like information about future meetings.

Comment #50
Date: 7/31/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Marleen Neal
Comments:
I live on Cascade Circle. I am against any plans on the interchange that would take any of the houses down. There could be a better plan than to take away Wasatch Boulevard.

Comment #51
Date: 7/31/2018
Source: Email
Name: Cheri Jackson
Comments:
Hello,

I wanted to share with you my concerns about the Parley’s EIS proposals and the impact they would have on the Millcreek residents that I represent.
Alternatives A, B, and C all propose significant changes to Wasatch Boulevard, one of the major thoroughfares through the eastern part of Millcreek. Each of the proposals present the scenario of eliminating Wasatch Boulevard, condemning properties and forcing residents to move from their homes. Understandably, the residents who would be affected by this are very concerned and unhappy with this possibility.

Additionally, loosing Wasatch Boulevard would dangerously isolate the remaining residents who live east of Wasatch Boulevard and north of Mill Creek Canyon. Resident evacuation routes and access for emergency vehicles would be severely limited by replacing Wasatch Boulevard with a major freeway.

I hope you will carefully look at the proposals being presented and urge UDOT to go back to the drawing board and find a solution that does not create such a hardship and dangerous situation for the Millcreek residents living in this area.

Thanks you,

Cheri Jackson

Millcreek City Council District 3

Comment #52
Date: 7/30/2018
Source: Website
Name: Trish Stran
Comments:
Will any homes be impacted by the upgrade as in demolished?
Thank you,
Trish

Comment #53
Date: 8/1/2018
Source: Email
Name: Vicky Thomas
Comments:
Hi,

My name is Victoria Thomas. My husband and I live in the neighborhood just south of 80 and east of 215 that will be affected by the Parley's Interchange project. I, along with a dozen other residents from the neighborhood, attended the Salt Lake City Council Meeting yesterday. As there was not opportunity for public comment at the meeting, I wanted to express a few concerns here:

1) I understand that the project needs to balance a handful of impossible trade-offs - reducing
congestion, minimizing environmental impact, maintaining access to recreation, etc. That said, I’m very concerned about the possibility in several of the alternatives that the homes along Wasatch Boulevard, and the Grandeur Peak trailhead, could be demolished to create additional roadway space. These changes, if they come to fruition, would increase noise in our neighborhood, increase congestion at our quiet and more private neighborhood trailheads, decrease property values, and, of course, displace families. We moved to this neighborhood largely because of the trail access and the ease of getting on the freeway while still having little freeway noise and streets quiet enough to comfortably go on family dog walks. These changes could dramatically change the character of our neighborhood, and my family is strongly opposed to them.

2) I also wanted to share that I was quite underwhelmed yesterday after the council meeting by project staff’s professionalism. My neighbors (whose homes may be destroyed) respectfully tried to express their concerns with the plan, and the woman who gave the presentation didn’t seem to want to hear any of it. It was clear that she was just listening because she was obliged to endure the comments, not because she was actually willing or interested to hear feedback. It felt very much like the roadshow of presentations is just for show, and that the question of which alternative to go with is a foregone conclusion, and that residents’ feedback doesn’t matter. Again, I realize that this meeting was not intended for public comment, but given that a dozen of my neighbors cared enough to show up to the meeting, it would have been nice for us to feel listened to. I understand that working on a controversial project like this must be a very tough job, but I would hope that the staff working on the project could have a bit of empathy for the families whose homes and neighborhood is at risk.

3) The project website is a bit misleading about the meetings. My neighbors and I (again, there were about a dozen of us, and we hadn’t previously coordinated to show up) had separately reached the conclusion that yesterday’s presentation would be an opportunity for discussion and feedback, not just a presentation without opportunity for feedback. The website does indicate that yesterday’s meeting would be a presentation, and I do see several different types of meetings there (e.g. presentations, open houses, etc.), but it’s not clear where there is opportunity for feedback, and where there isn’t. If it had just been my mistake, that would be one thing, but since it confused a dozen of my neighbors, I think it’s worth addressing in the future. This confusion from the website makes it seem like the project is actually trying to avoid getting public feedback.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Respectfully,

Vicky Thomas
Comment #54
Date: 8/1/2018
Source: Email
Name: Anthony Morelli
Comments:
Hello,

My name is Anthony Morelli, and I live in the neighborhood I’m concerned about the impact of the Parley’s Interchange project on the neighborhood and, in particular, that it will eliminate many of the benefits that led me to move there.

My wife and I (along with our dog) moved to the Woodridge Terrace neighborhood because it uniquely balances freeway access, quiet local streets, proximity to Salt Lake City, and immediate trailhead access. Based on the number of other families moving into the area and remodeling homes, we’re not the only ones that love this area. A number of young, professional families have moved into the area just this year, and home prices are continually increasing.

Demolishing homes and creating additional roadway space along Wasatch Boulevard would have a disastrous effect on the character of the neighborhood. The increased traffic and road noise, along with the reduction in trail access and commensurate crowding of other trailheads, would likely lead us to move away, and would certainly drive down home values.

I’m sure that there are many tradeoffs to balance while deciding on the best improvements to Parley’s Interchange, but I hope you can find a solution that avoids displacing families and changing the character of a growing and desirable neighborhood.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Best,

Comment #55
Date: 8/2/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Michael Rauger
Comments:
I am a resident of Millcreek. Regarding EIS, I am concerned about the alternatives. They appear to limit access to the Grandeur Peak trailhead and looks like Wasatch Blvd would be eliminated.
Comment #56
Date: 8/2/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Michelle Marsh
Comments:
I want to express the opinion that I am opposed to all plans. I am not an architect, so the maps and plans are hard to read. It looks like roads will be eliminated. I’ve heard talks of eliminating Grandeur Peak trailhead, and demolishing homes due to eminent domain. The narrowing of Wasatch Boulevard would cause congestion problems. I would like to see other alternatives brought to the table.

Comment #57
Date: 8/2/2018
Source: Email
Name: Kim Marron
Comments:
Good morning,

My husband attended the meeting on July 10. After reviewing all the information, I feel Alternative A would be the most detrimental plan to our neighborhood, and people who travel on Parley’s Way. I feel the least intrusive would be Alternative C.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comment #58
Date: 8/1/2018
Source: Website
Name: Ellen Reddick
Comments:
I take real issue with the complete lack of attention given to transit and active transportation in their Study alternatives. All the alternatives look at HUGE investments in the SOV commuter and truck traffic infrastructure but nothing in terms of improved transit and active transportation improvements. This corridor needs to be first addressed from the transit and active transportation solutions and then address the auto congestion. This is just like Davis County Legacy Highway, where the commuter rail and other transit (light rail systems and land use improvements) should have been put in first and then evaluate if the highway is wanted.

The 2008 Foothill Corridor Study makes it clear that the stakeholders recommended a focus on transit. Quoting the study,

During the initial phases of the study, several common themes were heard and became the
foundation for further development of improvement alternatives. These included:

- While vehicle traffic will continue to grow in the Foothill Drive corridor, the growth should be minimized by greater use of transit and other higher occupancy modes.
- A multi-modal approach is desired with a balanced strategy of traffic management, transit improvements and neighborhood amenities.
- Foothill Drive has an important regional transportation role, serving both vehicle traffic and regional transit services.
- Improved transit service is an important future strategy, but should extend beyond the corridor, connecting the University and Research Park destinations with multiple origins.
- There is a strong desire for the corridor to look better, including improved and more uniform sidewalks and attractive landscaping.

The Parley's EIS flies in the face of this input as well as the very thoughtful and creative East Bench Master Plan and focuses exclusively on highway improvements and accommodating road widening.

Besides all this, the congestion on Foothill is beneficial in terms of encouraging folks to find alternative ways to commute. It also encourages institutions to look at moving growth to places where transportation infrastructure is better such as downtown. The University Medical Centers, VA Hospital, University campus and Research Park continue to add more parking garages and surface lots enticing more commuter traffic.

Please call out UDOT for ignoring the recommendations of the Foothill Corridor Study and our regional air pollution and sprawl problems and help them use transportation study dollars to implement good land use decision by major East Bench Institutions, transit and active transportation improvements, and more comprehensive regional planning.

Like Peter Calthorpe wrote in Urbanism in the Age of Climate Change,

**Comment #59**

Date: 8/3/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Mary Ann Strong  
Comments:

UDOT,

Please cease plans for the Grandeur Peak Trailhead if these plans have any serious impact on any homeowners in the region of the Grandeur Peak Trailhead or if there is any narrowing of the Wasatch Blvd.

Thank you,

--

Mary Ann Strong
Comment #60
Date: 8/2/2018
Source: Website
Name: Glenn Strong
Comments:
Hi,
I want to vote for alternative B.
Thanks

Comment #61
Date: 8/3/2018
Source: Email
Name: Mike Marron
Comments:
Hello,
I attended the meeting on July 10. After reviewing all the information, I feel Alternative A would be the most detrimental plan to our neighborhood, and people who travel on Parley’s Way. I feel the least intrusive plan would be Alternative C.

Thank you,
Mike Marron

Comment #62
Date: 8/4/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Jen Keller
Comments:
I am a resident of East Millcreek City. I am adamantly opposed to moving the freeway onto Wasatch Boulevard. All iterations of maps show Wasatch Boulevard will be reclaimed. I think that plans need to be reviewed by UDOT. I will respond through email as well. These plans would close off access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and Grandeur Peak trailhead to those who use the area for recreation.
Comment #63
Date: 8/4/2018
Source: Email
Name: Clay Northrop
Comments:
Hello – I’d like to register my opposition to all of the proposed alternatives, as they all severely impact my neighborhood, and I don’t feel a significant modification of the interchange is required:

Safety – the statement that ‘parts of the interchange have accident rates above the state average’ isn’t very impressive – by definition half the interchanges have accident rates above the state average. Certainly the state isn’t planning to modify half the interchanges in the state.

Traffic Flow – yes, there is a problem with traffic trying to exit to Foothill in the mornings, but that won’t be improved by any interchange redesign – the traffic has to fit itself onto Foothill, and unless Foothill gets more lanes of traffic, the same congestion will occur.

Regional Mobility – the statements around Regional Mobility are just filler – the travel delays are minimal and affect commuters almost exclusively, and east/west on I-80 doesn’t slow unless there’s an incident. We shouldn’t be encouraging freight traffic on I215, in any case, as that will only further slow the commuter traffic that is the primary user of the interchange.

Updated Design – agreed the design is not ideal, but it is adequate and the expense and degree of disruption required by any of the proposed alternates is not warranted by the flaws in the existing interchange.

I would challenge any prediction for significant increases in traffic through this interchange, since there are no areas served by this interchange in which significant population or job growth can realistically occur. Areas served by Foothill are fully built out, as is the east side of the Salt Lake Valley. Summit County is too expensive for significant growth in commuter traffic in either direction on I80.

I would prefer a ‘no action’ alternative, or a redesign that is vastly reduced in scope.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Clay Northrop

Comment #64
Date: 8/4/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jemina Keller
Comments:
To Whom it May Concern:

The I-80 I-215 Interchange Alternatives A, B, and C are unacceptable to me and my family.

All 3 maps show reclamation of Wasatch Blvd and “moving” the freeway and freeway retaining wall
to the east.

We oppose this for 5 reasons:

-Wasatch Blvd north of Eastwood Elementary at 3300 South is the only egress for hundreds of homes in this neighborhood. In a situation such as wildland fire danger, the only way out is via Wasatch Blvd. Driving and threading one’s way through a residential neighborhood is not tenable in an emergency situation.

-Wasatch Blvd north of Eastwood Elementary is part of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This trail is effectively eliminated if you move the freeway to the East. Cyclists will have to ride up and down very steep (35 degree) streets to reach the bridges over I-80 and I-215.

-Wasatch Blvd is the only reasonable route for individuals to recreate at the Grandeur Peak Trailhead. Eliminating portions of Wasatch will mean vehicular traffic will have to drive through a residential neighborhood to reach the trailhead. The residents of this community do not agree that this is a good solution.

-Wasatch Blvd is a route many schoolchildren use to get to and from Eastwood Elementary. Putting the freeway and retaining walls in this path is deleterious to young children from this neighborhood.

-Moving the freeway east severely impedes the quality of life for hundreds of residents above the freeway retaining wall. Already, the noise from I-215 ricochets up onto the hillside; moving the retaining wall and widening the freeway will create even more noise for this 70+ year old residential community.

Thank you for your time. We are opposed to any east side freeway expansion.

Regards,

Jemina A. Keller

Comment #65

Date: 8/4/2018
Source: Email
Name: Arline Holbrook
Comments:

After carefully studying the alternatives you offer for the proposed restructuring of the interchange, I strongly feel Alternative B is the best choice. While all of the alternatives have their merits, B will have the lowest impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and makes the most sense.

We live in the area west of Parleys Park. At the meeting at Skyline we asked about how each alternative served traffic in our area. Like many of our neighbors, most of the time we travel home from the downtown area and most of the proposed changes will severely impact our ability to drive down Parleys Way. We were told we had four options once we exit I-80: hope the traffic is light enough we can cross from the far left lane to the far right lane in a short space (Alternative A), cut through the Walmart parking lot (illegal), turn left at Stringham and wind down a narrow residential street not equipped to handle such an increased traffic flow, or go to 2100 South and backtrack
several blocks through another residential area. If part of the goal is to ease traffic on Foothill, Alternative B is the only one that will not add to the congestion and allow cars to stay off of Foothill and slow traffic with left turns. Traffic calming or not, in our opinion, traffic signals make no sense on a freeway interchange (both Alternative C options).

We’ve lived in this neighborhood for nearly 40 years and until the bridges were replaced last year, we put up with the dangerous merging situation of the ramp from I-80 to Foothill Drive/Parleys Way. Alternative B is the only one that doesn’t undo that change.

Please select Alternative B.

Comment #66
Date: 8/5/2018
Source: Email
Name: Isaac Vincent
Location:
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I am in opposition to all the current plans for the Parleys EIS Alternatives. My opposition primarily relies on the impact the neighborhood north of 215 at the 33rd south exit/entrance. Please create an additional alternative to mitigate this impact.

My background: I own and live at [redacted], UT. My address is already in close proximity to the freeway and the expansion of multiple additional on ramps and additional lanes at the junction of the freeway will very negatively impact my home and Wasatch boulevard that I use to get to my home. As it is currently, this is a nice neighborhood that provides lots of access to hiking and biking trails and is very conveniently placed. All three alternatives will destroy the character of this neighborhood and highly impact my home and neighbors properties negatively.

My opinion is that so long as the freeway were to stay within the current bounds (south of the current sound barrier of Wasatch), that this would be acceptable. Also, I would rather not have an entrance 33rd south heading north than having one at the expense of destroying the neighborhood if that is what it comes to. I also have other concerns relating to all the alternatives, however, I will just leave it at my main point: the impact to the Woodridge Terrace neighborhood is unacceptable.

Lastly, i am leaving my contact information below if you would like to speak to me further about my concerns and get further input from me.

Sincerely,

Isaac Vincent
Comment #67
Date: 8/6/2018
Source: Email
Name: Victor Kimball
Comments:
I have written letters and have talked on the phone with UDOT representatives concerning the noise that is generated from the I-80 freeway. I am hopeful that this time, with these additional improvements that are to be made, that UDOT will act to mitigate a few problems.

It seems unjust that a sound wall is installed on the South side of the freeway and continues onto I-215 south bound, yet nothing was done on the North side of the freeway, which makes the noise level that much greater.

First, there should be a wall that continues from Foothill and Parley’s Exit on I-80 on the North side of the freeway all the way to 1700 East. The noise is unbelievably loud and makes decks and backyards unusable, due to not being able to hear one another talk. Even walking in the neighborhood it sounds like you are at Hill Air Force Base, hearing jets taking off.

The second thing that should be done to mitigate the noise and damage to cars, is to pave over the concrete remaining on I-80. It has significantly made a difference where you have paved over the concrete.

The third thing that needs to be done is to put another “No Air Brake” sign further up the canyon prior to the neighborhood, with possibly a solar panel to light the sign, with a threat of a fine. By the time they get to the one sign that you have it is too late, they are at our neighborhood, they are blasting those brakes at all times of the days and night.

We appreciate you taking public comments and would gladly pass a petition regarding these issues. Again, we are hopeful that this will not fall on deaf ears and something positive will take place this time.

I feel property values are being damaged, which hurts everyone that pays and enjoys tax revenue.

Thanks
Victor Kimball

Comment #68
Date: 8/6/2018
Source: Email
Name: John Bennion
Comments:
August 6, 2018

Dear UDOT:

I am deeply disturbed by the direction that the Parleys Interchange Project is headed, driven by
UDOT’s apparent unwillingness to address noise abatement head-on. Let me explain:

1. UDOT issued a draft EIS statement in April, soliciting public comments on the needs and purpose, indicating a “Study Area” from the Parleys Interchange to 1300 East. By May 25, UDOT received at least 136 emails (I have copies) from residents on the north side of I-80 between 1700 East and the Parleys Interchange, all urging UDOT to address the noise levels that already exceed its own 66 decibel maximum, based on many personal dB measurements taken by myself and several other residents.

2. UDOT’s reply to those emails was that noise abatement is not a “purpose and need” of the project, and that the issue will be addressed later in the process.

3. I then met with UDOT representatives, including HDR consultants involved in the sound study, and learned that the “scope” will extend only to 2300 East, not 1300 East. I learned that the “preliminary sound study” has already been performed all the way to 1300 East, but is not yet distilled into a report. And the report will not include study results beyond 2300 East. I asked for permission to see the data but was refused access to it. I received a nice explanation of the impressive analytical methodology, but my questions about dates, times, and locations of the sensors’ data gathering were not answered. I was told I could submit a GRAMA request, and was reminded that GRAMA applies to government reports, not data, and the report won’t be available until October 15, well beyond the August 15 public comment deadline. And the report won’t cover 2300 East to 1300 East anyway, because it is not in the “scope.” The project as currently envisioned will increase noise well beyond the scope area in neighborhoods that already exceed the 66 dB maximum.

4. I have carefully read UDOT’s website description of the “Level 2” screening process of the four alternatives that have survived thus far. The environmental items mentioned: “wetlands, … other waters, … wildlife habitat, existing and planned parks and trail systems, cultural resources, and community facilities (such as schools, senior centers, fire stations, and community gathering places).” Why is noise not included? If the answer is because it’s not in the federal environmental regulations, that is an unacceptable excuse. We need to do what right for the environment of the people, and noise is the environmental problem here. Water and wetlands and wildlife are undoubtedly considered when they are adjacent to rather than inside the “scope” – why not noise?

5. Alternative A seems to include construction (aka “scope”) down to 2100 East. So why is the sound report planning to stop at 2300 East? Should I vote for Alternative A because it will do the best job of the four alternatives in minimizing noise, assuming a sound wall is built to 2100 East? Or is Alternative A going to be rejected because it extends the scope? Or will the extension to 2100 East will be excused as a typo or eliminated to avoid extending the scope?

6. I was told by UDOT that the area from 2300 East to 1300 East will be addressed in “Phase 2”, which means at least 10 more years of excessive noise. That is unacceptable. We have been told similar things at least three times in the last 30 years. UDOT’s historical records will verify that.

7. The April 2018 draft of the Parleys Interchange Environment Impact Statement states:

“The existing pavement in the study area is a mix of asphalt and concrete. UDOT’s maintenance strategy for asphalt is to mill and overlay it periodically (every 7 to 10 years) while causing minimal impacts to traffic. UDOT has used this strategy in the study area, and the asphalt pavement remains in good condition. Concrete pavement requires minimal routine maintenance during its lifecycle but needs major rehabilitation or replacement after 40 to 50
years. The concrete pavement on I-80 and adjacent I-215 ramps has been in service about 50 years, and UDOT has identified the need for a pavement reconstruction project between the Parley’s interchange and 1300 East by 2021."

That statement has mysteriously disappeared from the current draft. Is that because UDOT reduced the scope to 2300 East, punting on our neighborhood for yet another 10+ years?

8. When I brought up the possibility of asphalt or other noise-reducing paving, the idea was routinely dismissed as requiring too much maintenance, because its life span is only 10 years instead of 40. But there are hundreds of miles of interstate highways in Utah with asphalt paving, and Phase 2 won’t happen for at least 10 years, so why not asphalt now?

9. Our homes are in the only residential section on either side of I-80 between Parleys Canyon and downtown without a sound wall. When the noise wall on the south side was erected several years ago, our noise levels went up significantly. Where are the UDOT noise studies that led to that decision? What consideration was given to noise reflection?

10. We have heard that UDOT is not interested in our problems because our neighborhood is one of the nicest in SLC, implying that we are “too rich” and should solve our own problems. This ignores the fact that over half of the affected homes are standard middle-income homes, virtually identical to the homes directly across I-80 on the south side, where a sound wall was installed to our detriment. I invite UDOT to tour the neighborhood south of 2100 East and between 2100 East and 1700 East to more fully understand and appreciate our demographics.

Summary: We have lost our trust in the standard UDOT processes for “doing the right thing” in our neighborhood. The sound problem affects at least 300 homes, but UDOT won’t even conduct the analysis to discover the exact number of affected homes, let alone accept responsibility to mitigate the problem that is already over the max and will inevitably grow. UDOT seems focused on “checking the box” on noise rather than understanding the problem and working cooperatively to solve it.

We respectfully invite UDOT to work cooperatively with us to dive into the details of the noise problems and solutions, from the Parleys Interchange to 1700 East. (The remainder of the study area, from 1700 East to 1300 East, is Sugarhouse Park, which we do not understand because we don’t live there.) Solutions obviously exist, evidenced by hundreds of miles of interstate highways with sound walls and asphalt throughout the Wasatch Front area.

I look forward to hearing from UDOT and hopefully working cooperatively together.

Respectfully submitted,
John E. Bennion
Chair, Parleys Neighborhood I-80 Noise Abatement Committee

[Copy of letter located in Appendix B]
Dear Parleys Friends and Neighbors,

Our noise abatement project is proving to be quite challenging, but we still hope for success. The big news is that there is another public comment period that is currently open, but it ends this Friday, August 10. You can either use the “contact us” form on the ParleysEIS.com website, or send an email to parleysEIS@utah.gov.

Attached is a copy of the comments that I sent to UDOT today. It explains the situation and our frustrations in considerable detail, including our request for action and cooperation. It will bring you fully up to date on the current status of our efforts.

My suggestion is that you read my comments carefully, then take one of the following three actions, using either the “contact us” form on their website ParleysEIS.com or the email address parleysEIS@utah.gov –––

1. State that you live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and you wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

2. State that you live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and you endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6 with the following exceptions and/or additions:

   Exceptions: .....  
   Additions: .....  

3. Submit your own comments as you see fit.

Then, please send me a copy of what you submitted, or at least send me an email that you did in fact submit something. That way I can keep track of the comment count, which is critical to our process.

Please share this message with as many of your neighbors and nearby friends as possible. I have attached a spreadsheet of the names of the people who receive this email, so you can check and see if any of your neighbors are missing. You might want to approach them for their participation in this worthy project. It only takes a couple of minutes to send an email, and the cumulative effect will be powerful and enhance our chances for success in improving our neighborhood.

If you have any questions or concerns or suggestions or comments for me, please don’t hesitate to call or text or email me anytime.

Sincerely yours,

John

John E. Bennion
Comment #70
Date: 8/6/2018
Source: Email
Name: Susan McGarrigan
Comments:
As a resident of the Millcreek Canyon North of 3300 South. I am strongly opposed to all the plans proposed by UDOT to improve the Parleys Canyon access. Not only does it not address future, continued growth, it limits our access to green space, potentially harms are property values, if not destroys them, and will definitely increase noise by simply allowing for more traffic not less. Sorry those barriers are not very good at improving the noise.

I totally agree that improvements are necessary but why aren’t we discussing way to improve mass transit? Stand on that overpass and watch during the congestion times... most cars have only one driver. UTA does a great job in most areas but not on the east side. one cannot even access the U with out transferring and walking. forget about getting downtown or to the business districts even in the high traffic its faster than UTA transit. We need mass movement that is efficient.

rumor has it that our currently density is going to double in the near future. double the people double the cars... pollution, noise, safety, green space are all important. but so is having a plan to address long term use not just a short term bandage.

Lastly, this is a a beautiful old neighborhood. I live here and do not wish to see my home or my neighbors devalued in any way.

I am opposed to these alternatives.

Susan McGarrigan

Comment #71
Date: 8/6/2018
Source: Email
Name: Loretta Frost
Comments:
I live on the North side of I-80 near the Parleys interchange project, and wholehardley agree with the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6th, 2018.
Comment #72
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Paul Markosian
Comments:
I have lived here for over 45 years. The elimination of Wasatch Boulevard west of us would create extreme safety problems. That is a main feeder for our neighborhood; it would force people to drive the narrow streets of our neighborhoods. Eliminating Wasatch Boulevard is preposterous.

Comment #73
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Thomas Hammond
Comments:
My name is Tom Hammond and I am a resident on the north side of the I-80 interchange. I wanted to write about the upcoming project to redo the interchange and I-80 freeway to 1300 East. First, I wholeheartedly endorse the comments of John Bennion dated August 6, 2018. I would only add that as a resident, these noise levels are a constant daily issue for many of us. It is for our family, the single most significant reason we hesitate to go outside. It’s hard for me to understand why this particular section of freeway would go without a sound wall while so many others along the corridor have one. It’s also hard to understand the significant downside of putting one in. There is expense, but we are all taxpayers like the rest of the residents along the corridor. I’m not sure why we should be singled out as unimportant. Please please address this issue. Again, it is a daily challenge for my family. I am hopeful you will consider a soundwall/asphalt in your upcoming renovation plans.

Sincerely,

Tom

Comment #74
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Neil Henderson
Comments:
I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Internet project and fully endorse the comments made by John Bennion on Aug. 6, 2018
Comment #75
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Mark Webber
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

We live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and we wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

We have lived here for over 25 years and the noise levels continue to get worse each year. It’s time for something to be done about it. Please consider our requests so that we can work together to resolve the noise problems.

Thank you.

Mark Webber

Comment #76
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jonathan Lear
Comments:

To whom it may concern,

I am a five year resident of the Parley’s neighborhood, on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project. During this time, I have noticed an increase in noise from traffic along I-80 near the I-215 interchange. The noise from the traffic is an extreme annoyance in our community.

By this email, I give my full endorsement of John Bennion’s comments submitted August 6, 2018.

I further request you consider constructing a sound wall on the North side of the interstate to reduce noise levels – much like the sound wall that exists on the South side of the interstate (if it was determined that a sound wall on the South side of the interstate was necessary, you’d think the same would apply to the North side). This would reduce noise levels in the Parley’s neighborhood significantly and to acceptable levels (expert reports show that the noise levels often exceed acceptable levels of 53 decibels). I feel that this is a pressing need for our community and in the grand scheme of this project, would not significantly increase costs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jonathan Lear
Comment #77
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Chris Nielson
Comments:
Dear UDOT -

My name is Chis Nielson and I live immediately north of I-80 at approximately 2100 east.

I am writing to let you know that I am in full support of John Bennion’s August 6, 2018 letter to UDOT.

Our home has been and continues to be severely impacted by the noise generated from the various prior decisions and actions regarding this stretch of the freeway. We are not able to enjoy the outdoor aspect of our home due to the continual noise from this section of Freeway. We encourage you to do the right thing and provide funding and timely installation of sound mitigation measures along this stretch of freeway.

Thank you,

Chris Nielson

---

Comment #78
Date: 8/5/2018
Source: Website
Name: Larry Smithee
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I would like to express many of the same concerns that my wife, N. Maureen Smithee, recently submitted. I feel that the best option for the new interchange is Alternative B. It will improve the interchange without causing more problems, unlike Alternatives C and A.

Huge congestion problems would result from Alternative C, which eliminates direct access to westbound Parleys way from eastbound I-80. Without the westbound off-ramp, not only will local residents be forced to use either Foothill or the 1300 East off-ramp to reach the Parleys Way area, employees and customers of these local businesses who currently use the off-ramp will also create outrageous amounts of congestion if unable to get to Parleys Way from eastbound I-80: Ski Utah, WalMart, Woodbury Commercial Real Estate, Prudential Interwest Business Consultants, First American Title, Stewart Title, Sera Prognostics, Bombay House Restaurant, East Valley Veterinary Clinic, (several) Dental offices, Harbor Seafood Restaurant, Architectural Nexus, Any Time Fitness, Foothill Personal Training, Endurance Orthopedics and Sports Medicine, Internal Medicine of Salt Lake, Sylvan Learning Center, Alpine Sports Medicine, Fresh Market, Foothill Tire Pros, Rite Aid and many more! This represents, at best estimate, thousands of commuters traveling on eastbound I-80 needing to shift to using the 1300 E. off-ramp and then driving along 2100 South to get to the Parleys Way area, or using northbound Foothill and trying to turn left across Foothill at Stringham...
A left-turn arrow would need to be installed with a long interval to accommodate these drivers, and back up traffic on Foothill, in both directions, even more than it already is with current number of commuters.

Alternative A is also problematic, since it would cut off the corner of Parleys Park and bring noise and pollution closer to the people using the park and to the homes in the neighborhood.

Alternative A also have a negative impact because the ramps will need to be graded for the difference of height between Parley's Park and I-80, so the proposed on-ramp elevation/angle will come significantly higher than I-80 and cut into the existing canyon wall. This will greatly increase the transmission of noise and pollution not only from the new traffic, but also from the existing traffic on I-80 (not to mention the increased traffic anticipated by the time construction will take place). Another point is that cutting into the canyon wall could reduce the margin of safety of our houses to floods/landslides/mudslides and earthquakes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Larry Smithee

**Comment #79**

*Date: 8/6/2018*  
*Source: Website*  
*Name: Toshiharu Kano*  
*Comments:*  

Your map show impacting Wasatch Blvd. but there is nothing about that in your explanation. I would like to more detail explanation and maps to go with them. Thank you.

**Comment #80**

*Date: 8/6/2018*  
*Source: Website*  
*Name: Reid Thorpe*  
*Comments:*  

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by my neighbor, John Bennion, on August 6, 2018.
Comment #81
Date: 8/6/2018
Source: Website
Name: Jack E. Frost
Comments:
I live on the North side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. Please help us lessen the terrible noise problem soon.

Comment #82
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Angela Anderson
Comments:
Hi,

I have a home on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John E. Bennion on August 6, 2018. I urge you to please give due diligence to his concerns. His views are my views. I hope the UDOT and us residents can cooperate to reach a solution.

Thank you,

Comment #83
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Jon Hansen
Comments:
Please add my email to you mailing list and keep me informed of updates, changes and meetings. Thank you.

Comment #84
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Sheryl Tucker
Comments:
Will Wasatch Blvd end up being a part of the i80/215/Foothill exchange? As a home owner in the area, I’m concerned that the property values will go down as Wasatch becomes a major thoroughfare rather than a deadend. Little information has been given about how these changes affect our neighborhood elementary school.
Comment #85
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Pearl Wright
Comments:
I am opposed to any plan that restricts access to the Grandeur Peak Trailhead via Wasatch Boulevard or diverting traffic into the neighborhood.

Comment #86
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Joan Haven
Comments:
My family and I are opposed to any plan that may demolish homes and relocate families.

Comment #87
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ryan Smith
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this email to state that you live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and you wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. I live near [redacted] and can definitively say that the noise from I-80 is intrusively loud. My home is directly north of Sugar House Park, and the noise from the roadway is unacceptable. Please work in concert with us residents to FIX THIS PROBLEM, preferably building a noise wall. There is no difference between the north side of I-80 and the south side of I-80, neither by noise level or economic demographic, yet they have been given reprieve from this nuisance. I plead with you that this gets solved quickly so we do not have to deal with this any longer.

Humbly Yours,

Ryan A Smith
Comment #88
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Megan Woodman
Comments:
To whom it may concern...

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Please do something about the noise,
Megan Woodman

Comment #89
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Bethany Smith
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this email to state that I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. I live near [redacted] and can definitively say that the noise from I-80 is intrusively loud. My home is directly north of Sugar House Park, and the noise from the roadway is unacceptable. Please work in concert with us residents to FIX THIS PROBLEM, preferably building a noise wall. There is no difference between the north side of I-80 and the south side of I-80, neither by noise level or economic demographic, yet they have been given reprieve from this nuisance. I plead with you that this gets solved quickly so we do not have to deal with this any longer.

All the best,

BETH SMITH, CPA

Comment #90
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ian John Olson
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and you wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Ian John Olson
Comment #91
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Kris Swart
Comments:
To Whom it May Concern:

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Please reconsider the excessive noise for our neighborhood.

Thank you.

Comment #92
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Tyler and Sally Kaneko
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Sincerely,

Tyler & Sally Kaneko

Wellington St

Comment #93
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Garrett Hyde
Comments:
Hello,

As a frequent traveler into and out of Parley’s canyon I fully understand the dangerous spots and the need for improvement. As an East Millcreek resident north of 3300s just off of Wasatch, however, I think the redesign needs to accommodate pre-existing homes and trailheads. The current plans would severely limit the Grandeur Peak trail head as well as disrupt travel to and from our home. Not only would this change dramatically affect our everyday lives, but also bring the highway closer and significantly reduce our property value. The merges called into question are not so dangerous that
residents homes need to be sacrificed. There is plenty of time to find an alternative that maintains our neighborhoods and trail heads as well as address the issues of parleys canyon. We are firmly against the changes that have been proposed.

Thanks

**Comment #94**

Date: 8/7/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Devin Vernick  
Comments:

Hello,

As a resident and citizen of Salt Lake City, and supporter of the outdoors and the many things that makes our community unique - I implore you, do not allow the Utah Department of Transportation to expand it's network of concrete and asphalt and lesson our beautiful network of trails.

I hope you understand my concern, and the concern I represent among many citizens of the Wasatch Front. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

**Comment #95**

Date: 8/7/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Cristina Shapiro  
Comments:

Hello,

As a frequent traveler into and out of Parley's canyon I see the areas of concern; however as an East Millcreek resident north of 3300 South just off of Wasatch Blvd, I think the redesign needs to accommodate pre-existing homes and trail heads. The current plans would severely limit the Grandeur Peak trail head as well as disrupt travel to and from our home. Not only would this change dramatically affect our everyday lives, but also bring the highway closer to all the homes and significantly reduce our property value. The merges called into question are not so dangerous that residents homes need to be sacrificed. If drivers simply follow basic rules of the road, there should be no issues. Not many accidents have occurred in the areas of concern and those that have are clearly a result of careless driving that could happen anywhere on the road. This is not fair for our neighborhood and those that utilize the trail head. We are firmly against the changes that have been proposed.

Thank you.
Comment #96
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: John Trout
Comments:
To whom it concerns,

We are strongly against the expansion of Northbound 215 and the potential plans to encroach on the neighborhood and Wasatch Blvd east of 215.

The safety, characteristics and property values of 100’s of homes and families would be negatively affected. UDOT needs to find other solutions that leaves Wasatch Blvd and the Granduer Peak neighborhood as it currently is.

Sincerely

John Trout

Comment #97
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jennifer Robertson
Comments:
COMMENT

EIS Team - Yes, this interchange is a mess for cars and will only get more congested. However, the current bike path over / under / around Parley’s is wonderfully safe for cyclists. Please ensure that safe bike lanes are part of your masterplan. As you likely well know, the path over / under / around Parley’s is a major cycling thoroughfare in large part because it maintains continuity with Wasatch Blvd (north-south). If bike lanes aren’t kept in your update or are made comparative less safe, I expect it’ll have numerous negative consequences - sending a great deal more cyclists bombing down 3300 S at or above the posted limit which is awkward around cars, very slowly up 3300 S where there isn’t an adequate bike lane, causing grief at both the on- and off-ramps, dramatically increasing the bike traffic through the neighborhoods searching for better N-S routes, etc. In short, today’s path through Parley’s is an effective and safe bike thoroughfare that should not be lost as a result of the auto interchange. Respectfully - Jennifer Robertson
Comment #98
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Charles Sorenson
Comments:
We have lived on the north side of I-80 at about for the last 30 years. During that time, the noise coming from the I-15 freeway has dramatically increased and has significantly affected the quality of life in our neighborhood. On some days, when traffic is busy and atmospheric conditions are right, the noise level in our back yard is up to 70 dB.

As Utah and US taxpayers, we feel that UDOT should be consistent and fair in its assessment of the need for freeway soundwalls in our neighborhood. When you built soundwalls on the south side of I-80, it increased the noise levels in our neighborhood. The concrete freeway and increasing traffic have made this much worse over the last 5-10 years. Will you please let me know why you constructed soundwalls on the south side of I-80 but not on the north side?

I completely agree with and support the points made in comments John Bennion sent you on 8-6-18.

Your response to this email with an explanation of why some neighborhoods get soundwalls and others don’t will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles Sorenson

Comment #99
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Bill and Robin Larson
Comments:
Dear UDOT

Please confirm my support of my neighbor, John Bennion in his letter of August 6th. From his extensive research into this issue I have to agree that our neighborhood North of I-80 is not getting its fare share of the studies being done. We have lived in the neighborhood bordering the Salt Lake Country Club and 24th east for 30 years. We have noticed the noise levels going up. We can’t sleep with windows open and notice noise and engine brakes when in our yard. We need a sound wall on the north side of I-80 because there is no other alternative. Please take some kind of action for the many homes from 17th east on up to Wilshire Drive. We are the only homes on the north side above 13th east because of the park. Don’t forget us, this is our plea.

Bill and Robin Larson
To Whom it May Concern:

The I-215 I-80 Interchange Alternatives A, B, and C are unacceptable to me and my family. All 3 maps show reclamation of Wasatch Blvd from 3300 South northward and “moving” the freeway and freeway retaining wall to the east.

We oppose this for 5 reasons:

-Wasatch Blvd north of Eastwood Elementary at 3300 South is the only egress for hundreds of homes in this neighborhood. In a situation such as wild land fire, the only way out is via Wasatch Blvd. Driving and threading one’s way through a residential neighborhood is not acceptable in an emergency situation.

-Wasatch Blvd north of Eastwood Elementary is part of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This trail is effectively eliminated if you move the freeway to the East. Cyclists will have to ride up and down very steep (35 degree) streets to reach the bridges over I-80 and I-215.

-Wasatch Blvd is the only reasonable route for individuals to recreate at the Grandeur Peak Trail Head. Eliminating portions of Wasatch will mean vehicular traffic will have to drive through a residential neighborhood to reach the trail head. The residents of this community do not agree that this is a good solution. -Wasatch Blvd is a route many schoolchildren use to get to and from Eastwood Elementary. Putting the freeway and retaining walls in this path and forcing them to utilize other streets with no sidewalks is dangerous for the young children from this neighborhood.

-Moving the freeway east severely impedes the quality of life for hundreds of residents above the freeway retaining wall. Already, the noise from I-215 ricochets up onto the hillside; moving the retaining wall and widening the freeway will create even more noise for this 70+ year old residential community.

Thank you for your time. We are opposed to any east side freeway expansion.

Sincerely,

Heather Bringard
Comment #101
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Liz Raybould
Location:
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern,

We live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project. We wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. We hope that his efforts will be thoughtfully and carefully considered.

Thank you,

Ben and Liz Raybould

Comment #102
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Mark Kirk
Comments:
I live in the area north of I-80 in the vicinity of the country club. I’ve seen various e-mails and attended discussions relating to I-80 from the mouth of Parleys canyon down to 1300 East. At least part of the discussions relate to the very high noise levels along that stretch of I-80. I remember when that stretch of I-80 was ground down making it the only stretch of any highway with the aggregate exposed and making it the loudest stretch of highway anywhere in greater Salt Lake. If asphalt is deemed unadvisable would it be possible to “top” the existing concrete with concrete without the aggregate exposed -- there are a few stretches from Parleys to 1300 East with a top and much quieter. I noticed on a recent trip up to Park City that asphalt has been re-laid as has been done regularly. Please explain why the few-mile stretch from Parleys to 1300 East is the only road with the aggregate exposed.

Comment #103
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Dorothee Serpas
Comments:
I attended the open house on July 10 and studied the plans offered on the web site. My conclusion is that Alternative “A” will have a strong negative impact on people residing on the South side of Wilshire Drive close to Parley’s Park and the canyon and our neighbors along Parley’s Way and Foothill Drive.
Thanks for your valuable time and for investing in our community of concerned citizens and for considering the opinions and preferences of those affected by the Interchange proposals.

Comment #104
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Bryan Hull
Comments:
My only input is that I hope any alternative that is chosen has as little impact or attempts to improve the connection that the Parley’s Trail provides to bicycles, pedestrians, and others. This is one of the most important connection points for alternate users to get across I-80 and i-215, with the nearest passing point being 4.5 miles to the west on 2000 East. This must be preserved regardless of what alternative is used. If Wasatch Blvd is reduced or removed a multi-use path connecting to the Parley’s Trail and Grandeur Peak trailhead should be included to mitigate the loss of the road. As long as these recreation and commuter paths are kept in tact the alternatives will be acceptable.

Alternative A seems to be the best for automobile traffic with the least amount of impact. The traffic lights in C & D seem odd.

Comment #105
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Website
Name: Elizabeth Giraud
Comments:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives. I have three concerns and observations, based on the fact that my husband and I live in the neighborhood bounded by Foothill to the east, [redacted] to the west.

1. We are opposed to Alternative C and Alternative C with the flyover because westbound access to Parley’s Way from I-80 would be closed, making access to our neighborhood very difficult. We would have to exit I-80 at 1300 E. or turn left from northbound Foothill onto 2100 S. There is not a protected or permitted left turn signal at the intersection of 2100 S. and Foothill and the cars traveling south on Foothill are accelerating quickly as they approach I-215. Making this turn, especially after 5:00 p.m., is scary. Turning left onto Stringham is even more terrifying and Stringham is used primarily by residents of the Foothill Place Apartments. Stringham is not an option as it was intended to accommodate primarily traffic generated by a few houses, the apartments and a LDS Church.

2. The notification area did not include our neighborhood even though we would be adversely affected by the above-mentioned alternatives. When I look at the names on the Steering Committee, I see no representation from neighborhoods north of Parley’s Way. I understand that Alternative C and Alternative C with the flyover are attractive to residents of the Wilshire neighborhood because they would shift I-80 farther south than Alternatives A and B. There is also organized rumbling from residents who live east of I-215 to fight against alternatives.
that would require right-of-way acquisitions east of I-215 E. Obviously, projects like these pit neighborhoods against neighborhoods but at least the Wilshire and east-of-215 residents were notified of the project. We were not.

3. To the north, the study area extends only to Stringham Avenue although the effects of any of the alternatives would impact traffic much farther north. I believe the study area should have extended at least as far north as 2100 S.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Comment #106
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Phone
Name: David Iltis
Comments:
I am with the organization Cycling Utah. I am concerned about how the bike lanes may be impacted by the alternatives. I am wondering when construction may begin and how UDOT will determine if homes may need to be demolished. Please add me to any mailing list that will provide updates.

Comment #107
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Paul Kelson
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

I would like to voice my opposition to any alteration of the Parley’s Canyon interchange that requires the destruction of homes on Wasatch Blvd. north of 3300 south. I am a resident of one of those properties.

Respectfully,

Paul Kelson
Comment #108
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Dave Iltis
Comments:

[Located in Appendix D]

Dear UDOT,

The Parley's Canyon Interchange EIS and potential construction needs to take in to account the needs for transportation, recreation, and mountain cyclists. The area is a key crossing point for the Parley’s Trail, the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, the potential Parley’s Canyon Trail (to the east), and E-W cycling traffic to the north of I-80.

1. All existing bike connections should be maintained through the network of Parley’s Canyon Trail, Foothill Drive, Wasatch Boulevard, and the bridges over the freeways.

2. In particular, bike lanes on Wasatch Blvd need to be maintained. They connect Parley’s Trail with the south and east parts of the valley and are critical transportation and recreation facilities. Narrowing Wasatch Blvd to accomodate the new construction is not acceptable if this leads to cyclists being unable to use this corridor. Forcing cyclists into the neighborhoods to the east is not acceptable.
   a. If Wasatch Blvd is moved, please add a protected bike facility or paved bike trail alongside Wasatch to 3300 S.

3. Use the project as an opportunity to add more and better bike connections in the area. Particularly:
   a. Add a connection from Parley’s Way to cross Foothill Boulevard. Parley's Way should have a bike lane installed by Salt Lake City.
   b. Pave a connecting trail from the mouth of Parley’s Canyon to the end of the study area (and eventually to Mountain Dell, and the summit of Parley’s Canyon.)
   c. Work with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Committee, Salt Lake City, and Millcreek City to improve the BST in this area, and connections to it.
   d. Fix the ‘sidewalk’ bike path just to the north of the interchange on Foothill Blvd. This needs to be improved as part of this project.

4. Please add more details as to what is being considered, especially on Wasatch Blvd. It’s pretty difficult to comment on nebulous plans.

5. Please consider transit as a viable alternative to not undertaking this project. Combine this with improved active transportation alternatives.

6. Since this is an Environmental Impact Study, please consider the impact of inducing demand for more cars to drive, rather than looking for better alternatives.

Sincerely,

Dave Iltis
Cycling Utah
Comment #109
Date: 8/7/2018
Source: Email
Name: Sam Bell
Comments:
[See comment 108]
Thank you.
--
Mr Sam Bell

Comment #110
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jacob Croft
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project. My family consists of 7 people. I own two homes in this area so would like to voice my opinion on behalf of both of those homes and my family of 7.

I fully endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

In my opinion one of the worst things about our neighborhood is the excessive and constant noise from I-80.

Please do not ignore this problem, but rather take appropriate action to mitigate the problem.

Thank you,

Jacob Croft

Comment #111
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Eric Steckel
Comments:
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE COMMENTS AND PROPOSALS

There is no doubt that the Parley’s interchange is inadequate at best but it still functions at the current traffic load. If I were making decisions about what should be done I would think outside of the box and strongly consider tunneling into the foothills to make an express route and eliminate
traffic on the surface. The benefits are plenty: less snow removal, less accidents due to weather, real estate values would greatly increase, much faster access to the hospital for both emergency vehicles and civilians with an emergency. These are just a few of the many benefits from tunneling. I imagine the tunnel to have 3 exits: one exit into the Research Park, one exit into the University area and then the re-emergence of the tunnel into downtown. The only risk worth mentioning is the earthquake risk. I would let the public vote in a referendum if they would take the physical and financial risk of such a plan over not pursuing this plan. Of course, a substantial amount of the earthquake risk could be mitigated using proper building techniques. Tunneling would be easy since the grade is already exposed at the mouth of Parley’s and the re-emergence is just as simple. Excellent examples on tunneling and their benefits are very commonly seen in northern and central Italy.

I cannot imagine this project being delayed indefinitely so everything needs to be considered.

Other transportation concerns need to be addressed when planning this project. The list below is in a random order (not based on importance)

Maintain continuity of bicycle/multiuse trails.

Safety is paramount while maintaining continuity.

Increase access to trails that are isolated by major roadways.

Improve safety to current pathways that are either incomplete or force cyclists and other users into a greater risk of conflict with motor vehicles.

Thank you for your effort in reading all comments to make the best possible decision.

Eric Steckel

Comment #112

Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Benny Yih
Comments:

[See comment 108]

Thank you.
--
Mr Benny Yih
Comment #113
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Richard Williamson
Comments:
[See comment #29]

Comment #114
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jodi Benson
Comments:
August 8, 2018

I’m writing to provide comments towards the Parley’s interchange Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) I-80/I-215 Eastside Draft Alternatives:

After reviewing the plans offered on the website for the draft alternatives I find that Alternative A will have a strong NEGATIVE impact for the residents of the South side of Wilshire Drive including the Parley’s Way Park and also to MY RESIDENCE that borders with the park. The negatives are as follows:

Your new on-ramps connecting Foothill and Parley’s Way to the Westbound I-80 will bring a substantial amount of traffic very close to residential housing, increase volume of noise, ground shaking and substantial pollution. The Salt Lake Valley has enough pollution, why bring it up closer to the mountains?

Because the new ramps will need to be graded for the differences of height between Parley’s Park and I-80, the roads will become significantly higher than I-80 and cut into the existing canyon wall. This will greatly increase the transmission of noise and pollution not only from the new traffic, but also from the existing traffic on I-80 (not to mention the increased traffic anticipated by the time construction will take place).

The view from our backyards will be degraded from the sight of vehicles or top of vehicles driving by, or by some wall that may need to be placed to take care of the problem.

Cutting into the canyon wall could reduce the margin of safety of our properties to landslides, and potential earthquakes.

In the case of heavy Foothill traffic, drivers headed Westbound I-80 will shift from Foothill to 2300 East and Parley’s Way. Traffic on Parley’s Way will be significantly increased. This issue will negatively impact the residents along Parley’s Way.

Contrary to the statement that the plans have “No impacts to activities and features of any parks,” a small area of Parley’s Park is lost under Alternative A. If the design of the ramps needs to be adjusted for engineering considerations, the loss could become greater. In any case, there will be
an increase of noise and pollution at the South end of the park. The relaxing experience that people enjoy walking in the park will be degraded by the sight of a constant flow of two lanes of cars, which will be much more visible than in the current situation. This issue will affect many users of Parley’s Park as well as my home that borders the park, as I mentioned above. I’ll see this out my window and deck and feel most of this negative impact.

Not long ago, a fire started next to I-80 and quickly moved up the canyon wall to reach the edge of our backyards. Fire trucks that used a gate at the corner of Parley’s Park put out the fire. Alternative A removes that access, and the reduced buffer zone next to the canyon wall will make access by fire trucks more difficult, reducing our safety.

Alternative A places an undue burden on the residents in my area. Given the wide space available in the canyon for other options, I urge you to account for these concerns in your future plans.

Sincerely,

Jodi Benson

Comment #115
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Paul Nelson
Comments:
I would like to voice formal opposition to the alternatives proposed for the Parley’s Interchange.

Comment #116
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Phone
Name: David Anisman
Comments:
I disapprove of the alternatives because of damage to the neighborhood. We invested in our homes. We don’t take kindly to having our homes trashed or putting I-80 in our front yards. Not acceptable costs.

Comment #117
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Phone
Name: Becky Wilkes
Location:
Comments:
I want to voice opposition to the plans. I am concerned about what it would do to our neighborhood and some of the homes on my street could be removed. I have sent in an email that includes more detail.

**Comment #118**

Date: 8/9/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Blaine and MarJean Wilcox  
Comments:  
August 9, 2018  

Dear UDOT:  

---We live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project.  
---We endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6.  
---We appreciate your attention and support to the needs of our community regarding this matter.  

Sincerely,  

Blaine and MarJean Wilcox

**Comment #119**

Date: 8/9/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Jesse Munion  
Comments:  
Hello,  

I am a homeowner on Cascade Way within the Olympus Cove North (Grandeur neighborhood). I am deeply concerned about the potential plans that impact the 3300 S/Wasatch Blvd/Grandeur neighborhood area.  

We as a group of Home Owners, bikers, hikers, runners, mothers, fathers, have compiled our comments and suggestions for consideration in this process.  

My observation is that the UDOT team has done extensive computer modeling and scenario forecasting. I recommend you drive the actual roads, talk to shareholders, and pay attention to how users and traffic actually move and can move. The comments we have submitted reflect the user perspective of these roads by people that travel them each and every day.  

Last of all, we are homeowners. I’d ask the question, how would you feel if a highway was placed in the backyard of your $500,000 dollar home?? Would you like that? How would you feel if your neighbors homes were threatened? What about the environmental impact of noise, pollution, and
traffic? the danger of neighborhood family streets becoming a more travelled road and increasing the danger for kids and families?

Let’s make good decisions here folks and let’s keep the Shareholders involved. This is unnecessary and does not take into consideration the impact on the people who pay taxes, use these roads, or live here.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jessa Munion

Comment #120

Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jeffry Roche
Comments:

Hello City Leaders and UDOT,

I am a homeowner on Cascade Way within the Olympus Cove North (Grandeur neighborhood). I am deeply concerned about the potential plans that impact the 3300 S/Wasatch Blvd/Grandeur neighborhood area.

We as a group of Home Owners, bikers, hikers, runners, and many more have compiled our comments and suggestions for consideration in this process.

My observation is that the UDOT team has done extensive computer modeling and scenario forecasting. I recommend you drive the actual roads, talk to shareholders, and pay attention to how users and traffic actually move and can move. The comments we have submitted reflect the user perspective of these roads by people that travel them each and every day.

Last of all, we are homeowners. I’d ask the question, how would you feel if a highway was placed in the backyard of your $500,000 dollar home?? Would you like that? How would you feel if your neighbors homes were threatened?

Let’s make good decisions here folks and let’s keep the Shareholders involved.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jeff Roche

Cascade Way

Grandeur Neighborhood

[From attached document; document and petition located in Appendix B]

OLYMPUS COVE NORTH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS

As a group we, the undersigned, are unilaterally opposed to any alignment alternative that involves
the condemnation of any property or portion of property east of I-215 in the Parley’s EIS study area. Further we, the undersigned, are unilaterally opposed to any alignment alternative that eliminates or reduces Wasatch Blvd and/or the current access to the Grandeur Peak Trail Head.

Parley’s Interchange Comments

- Eliminate congestion at 3300 S interchanges by moving traffic to other exits
  - Eliminate the I-215 NB entrance at 3300 South; this would alleviate the traffic weave associated with the merge of I-215/Foothill/I-80
    - This will allow more distance for merging activity of drivers as they will enter off 3900 S or 3800 S
  - If you eliminate the 3300 S I-215 SB exit, you will alleviate some of the stress of the convergence of the I-80/I-215 SB/Foothill/I-80 East
    - This will allow more distance for merging activity of drivers as they will exit at 3900 S or 4500 S
  - It is much safer if this traffic is pushed to the exits on 3900 S or 4500 S
  - It would also help if 4500 S had a I-215 NB entrance added to flow traffic on to I-215 further south of the problem area.
  - The 3300 S I-215 SB entrance would still remain to flow traffic South
- Make the I-80 EB (Park City) entrance 2 lanes EB only
  - This is currently 2-way traffic and very dangerous in bad weather or when there is heavy truck traffic.
  - We recommend the most efficient solution which is to create 2 EB lanes going to I-80 (Park City)
  - The current WB traffic flow is what creates a tremendous amount of stress when these drivers are forced to merge onto I-215 where I-215/I-80/Foothill all merge together.
  - By eliminating this dated design, you can eliminate traffic stress and congestion.
- Eliminate the I-80/I-215 SB entrance and associate lanes
- This design is what creates much of the traffic and accident stress that occurs in the I-80/I-215/3300 S exits.
- We recommend the I-80/I-215 SB entrance be moved further West and create a light loop similar to what is in place at the I-215/I-15 interchange in the south valley.
- This type of tight loop not only slows fast moving traffic but it effectively merges it into the complex traffic environment of I-15.
- We believe a similar design approach could be taken in combining the I-80/I-215 SB entrance

Keep the the 33rd north on ramp

- Most plans have a divided highway (2 lanes each way) on the south side of the canyon, since bridges are already required in 2 places crossing over I-80 and crossing I-215. What if the east bound traffic into Parley’s was the northernmost of those lanes? and the SB lanes
out of the canyon were the lanes on the south side? This would allow for an additional weave merge distance of a possibly few hundred feet between the 33rd NB on ramp and I-215 drivers moving right to the Parley’s EB ramp. Since this is currently one of the least problematic areas this extension might be enough to adjust to the projected additional need in years to come. The SB bridge out of Parley’s now being a little farther south could bypass 3300 S adding to the freeway after the 3300 S SB off ramp, requiring the soonest exit to be 3900 S. out of Parley’s Canyon.

• Only add ONE additional lane. The current ramp works pretty well now, adding one lane on the east side of the current freeway could be enough to accommodate projected increased need. And could, if well designed, eliminate the need to affect Wasatch Blvd at all.

• Incorporate the ramp lanes on the east side into the current freeway, perhaps a cement barrier. The extra space required in the current plan for both the open space and the additional shoulders required affects the neighborhood to the east. That intrusion might be eliminated if the lanes were together. All the plans have a large looking space between the ramp lanes on the east and the current freeway eliminate that space.

• Move the EB ramp into Parley’s canyon farther north in the interchange. If the flyover plan is used, coordinate the EB onramp into the canyon to meet and run adjacent to the SB off ramp where possible.

• Perhaps a clover leaf turn where the existing clover turn is now (farther north) only this comes off I-80 and heads cars up Parley’s EB (the on ramp to Parley’s)

• Straighten the the curve of the freeway north of the 3300 S. adding lanes on the west side which would allow the space of existing lanes on the east to be incorporated into the space needed for the suggested “added lane(s)” on the east side.

○ Do not touch Wasatch Blvd North of 3300 S

◊ This is a school zone

◊ This is a highly sought after residential neighborhood where the average home price is upwards of $500K

◊ Highway interchanges have no place in this neighborhood

◊ This is a highly trafficked recreation zone for mountain bikers, hikers, and road bikers.

◊ All these user groups will stand against any and all development activity that impedes on Wasatch and the existing sound barrier that is in place to protect our residential and recreation area

COMMENT: We have all seen bad home remodels, where in the name of saving money the house looks terrible. It works at a basic level but is an eyesore in the neighborhood. UDOT has a choice to select the least expensive alternative, getting the job done but creating public discontent, possible eyesores, potential future problems having placed huge water lines underneath that would close the freeway lanes/ramps for days if they ever needed to be worked on. While cost is important, perhaps a plan that costs a little more but creates more of a legacy because of the less contentious, more beautiful and forward thinking design might be appreciated by everyone.

From Jim Cleason
These are the opinions of James Cleason; PE CE, New York State. Current resident at [redacted].

If you are truly trying to improve safety and flowability of the Parley's interchange while following the present-day guidelines of interstate and highway design, the only viable choice is Alternative C with the fly over. If A, B, or C alternative is chosen, the distances for merging distances are not met will continue in having slow downs and the rear end collisions will only increase by the predicted increases of traffic by 2050. The proposed design of the fly over is the only alternative that will give the proper merge distances and safety that is trying to be achieved. While removing the current I 80 west to I-215 South ramp should increase the area needed to move all the designs west enough to eliminate the need and the use of eminent domain to remove all or partial pieces of property along historic Wasatch Blvd. The fly over could be used in any of the proposed designs while moving I-215 west enough to save the culture and multiple uses along Wasatch Blvd, without the local disturbances to the tax paying residence of the area. Please do not do this half-assed, please look at the flow for tomorrow not the cost of today. It this engineer's opinion should you keep the current I 80 westbound to I-215 South ramps (Proposals A & B) UDOT will be redoing the construction again as the accidents increase with the projected flow increases.

The removal of the 3300 South bridge is unacceptable to the area neighborhoods as this is a major thoroughfare for local residence and Eastwood Elementary school. The bridge could be lengthened to accommodate additional lanes. The businesses on 3300 South would find significant losses in sales if the quick and easy access to I 80 and I-215 were removed. This would increase area taxes to the local homeowners from the loss of sales tax and sales to local businesses. Kroger (Smith’s), REI, and McDonalds who have deep pockets to fight such aggressive measures will be notified by nearby residence of this proposal. The possibility of the closure of local businesses is great if the access is taken away unfairly by an uncaring UDOT. Now there is a 2 lane on ramp from 3300 South to I-215 NB and the I-215 to I 80 EB ramp. It is this engineer's proposal that the right lane be used as a fly over of the I-215 to I 80 EB ramp to I-215 North that could help eliminate aggressive merging that occurs today, increasing safety and flowability. With the rebuild of the water tanks complete on the westside of I-215 and to the north of 3300 South the tank closest to 3300 South has been moved more North. This generates more room for the off ramp from I-215 South to 3300 South to be moved west giving more visual for the drivers turning left onto 3300 South increasing safety.

It is this engineer's belief that not all alternatives have been looked at. Why is that only the east side of I-215 is only being considered for the expansion. There are alternatives that move things west a little bit that limit exposure to all local residences. It's not all about money!!! If you’re really truly trying to increase safety and flowability do it correctly the first time and not have multiple reconstructions wasting time and money.
Comment #121
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Martin Cuma
Comments:
[See comment 108]
Thank you.
Martin Cuma
--
Mr Martin Cuma

Comment #122
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Rob Vorwald
Comments:
[See comment 108]
Thank you.
--
Mr Rob Vorwald

Comment #123
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Website
Name: Kristen Okland
Comments:
I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

I don not need to be contacted but would like to just voice my support for the efforts of John Bennion. His help is very beneficial to our neighborhood.
Comment #124
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Website
Name: Kirk Walton
Comments:
I’m partial to Alt A but leaving Wasatch Blvd from 3300 So to Parley’s alone. Also maybe having the Flex Lanes on Foothill Dr and/or leaving Stringham Ave intersection flashing yellow during rush hours to keep that traffic moving?

Also we don’t need to take out any homes in this project!

Comment #125
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Website
Name: Benny Yih
Comments:
As a cyclist that uses this crossing, I hope any changes will enhance alternative transportation across the mouth of Parley’s canyon and add to a future corridor up to Summit Park ...

-thanks much, benny

Comment #126
Date: 8/8/2018
Source: Website
Name: Sharee Sorenson
Comments:
We received information recently indicating that UDOT is not willing to consider putting sound barriers along the I-80 corridor east of 13th East. The freeway noise from the concrete freeway and the barriers on the south side of the freeway have made it increasingly noisy for those of us living on the other side of the freeway. Would you please explain to my why there are sound barriers along I-80 (including a long stretch where only businesses border the freeway) and you are unwilling to consider the neighborhood on the north side of the freeway. I am in support of the letter sent by John Bennion on August 6.
Comment #127
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Haley Polhill
Comments:
I am writing due to the disruption the alternative C (both C and the flyover plan) will cause to residents living east of Wasatch, including myself and my neighbors. This plan seems unneeded when there are other ideas with less theoretical impact to the current traffic flow and infrastructure. Impacting the Grandeur peak trailhead would be another negative, unnecessary impact. Protecting our natural resources and the beauty and accessibility of these mountains should be something we all strive for.

Thank you,
Haley Polhill

Comment #128
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Hallie French
Comments:
We have reviewed several plans to alter the future layout of Parley's interchange. One of your plans could severely limit or eliminate the Grandeur peak trailhead as well as eliminate or narrow the northern part of Wasatch blvd. The grandeur trailhead and the bike friendly Wasatch blvd are THE TWO BEST parts of Millcreek. To do away with them simply to enlarge our traffic surfaces seems like the poorest of all options for remedy. We support creative solutions in approaching Salt Lake City’s population growth and traffic congestion problems, but not when it requires trading popular local outdoor venues to enlarge our already sprawling concrete jungle. We hope an acceptable solution can be realized that does not destroy or alter the Grandeur trailhead or Wasatch blvd

Comment #129
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Daniel Benfield
Comments:
To UDOT,

RE: Parleys Canyon EIS

My name is Daniel Benfield and I own a house, and live, at [.Address Redacted]. I am writing this to voice my concern and opposition to several aspects of the Parleys Canyon I-215/I-80 interchange proposals.
My wife and I purchased our home over 15 yrs ago with the idea of raising a family and retiring here. We chose this location for several factors, among them; the ease of access to the surrounding wilderness areas, the access to bike paths and hiking trails, the access to various parks and the feel of the neighborhood. The potential expansion of the Parleys Canyon interchange will negatively impact all of these reasons for our living here, and destroy the local small neighborhood feel of the area.

The proposed changes will lead to greater traffic over the freeway resulting in a reduction in access (potential loss of Wasatch), the physical movement of heavy traffic closer to our house (resulting in increased vibrations from the heavy over the road trucking and increased pollution in our neighborhood) and the increased noise that would be associated with a larger freeway in our backyard.

Finally, the expansion to the interchange will decrease the value of our home. Once the change is announced our home values will decrease. People will no longer see this area as desirable to live in, resulting in a smaller pool of potential buyers and decreased home values. With our home being our primary investment you will be affecting our ability to retire with adequate monetary resources.

In the end what you will have is increased traffic, increased pollution, increased noise and all without addressing sustainable greater mass transit options, but you will have destroyed and polluted my neighborhood, reduced my families ability to access recreational resources and destroyed the value of my investment.

I oppose the expansion of the Parleys Interchange.

Daniel Benfield

**Comment #130**

Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Marcia Cleason
Comments:

We as a neighborhood have many concerns about UDOT’s plan to condemn homes on Wasatch Boulevard (East of I 215) for the purpose of the I 215, I 80, and Foothill Boulevard alignment.

Please see the attached document.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Marcia Cleason
Comment #131
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Chad Mullins
Comments:
[See comment 108]
Thank you.
--
Mr Chad Mullins

Comment #132
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Lori Barton
Comments:
UDOT,

I am taking this opportunity to share my thoughts and concerns related to the changes proposed for the Parleys Canyon Interchange.

I attended the County Council meeting on July 31st. In the meeting the UDOT representative stated they were “optimistic” they would be able to complete the updates to the Interstate without impacting (condemning) the homes along Wasatch Blvd., north of 33rd South.

Since I am an owner of one of those homes I sincerely hope that is the case.

I have lived in this home and traveled on I-215 for 36 years. I can honestly say that I have NOT noticed traffic increasing or slowing down noticeably in all those years. In addition, the East Bench is pretty much built to capacity, so I question whether there would be a substantial increase to traffic up through 2050. I am not sure who performed your study, but the results they came up with is something I have never experienced.

Over the past couple weeks I have made a conscious effort to note my commute time and rate of speed. I typically travel during peak times and very rarely do I go below the speed limit. The majority of the traffic is 5 to 10 miles above the speed limit. From the time I enter on 33rd South and exit on the 900 South Exit it takes me 5 to 7 minutes.

In addition I have my radio on a station that gives traffic updates. Every day I listen to reports of major delays coming south from Davis and Weber counties, north from point of the mountain and east on 2100 South. It is seldom that they even report the traffic on I-215 or I-80 West moving towards downtown. There is nothing to report. Everything is moving smoothly!

If I have experienced a delay it is due to a crash further up the interstate usually around 7th East or State Street. If there is construction somewhere, that will slow things down as well. Both of these things are the exception not the rule.
I travel I-215 home during peak times as well. Again, compared to travelling North, South or West it is a pretty easy commute. The traffic does get congested (I might slow down to 45 or 50 miles an hour) right when you split off onto the I-215 Belt Route; once you are through that area traffic returns to normal speeds.

There is plenty of unused ground, to the East, West and down the middle, to expand the area from the 23rd East exit ending at the mouth of Parleys Canyon to remedy the congestion.

I don’t agree that I-215 needs to be widened between Parleys Canyon and 33rd South, however there is more space on the west side of I-215 than on the east. It would make more sense to shift west than to take people’s homes.

I will agree it is awkward to cross 3 lanes of traffic to exit at 33rd South. I often choose to move down 6 more blocks and exit at 39th South. If you need extra lanes you could take the 33rd South exit out completely and make 33rd South similar to 45th South. On 45th South you can exit and enter going south but not north. You could eliminate the 33rd South exit, leave the entrance, and gain an additional lane.

I don’t know what to think about the Parleys Canyon entrance and exits. There is that rock outcropping on the north side of the entrance that could be leveled to gain a straighter entrance.

I feel like I have rambled on somewhat, but bottom line, I don’t want to lose my home, and I honestly think it can be avoided.

I can’t even wrap my head around starting over at my age and I know that many of the people on that stretch of Wasatch Blvd. are 20 or more years older than me. Forcing people to move at that age can sometimes be a death sentence, they just cannot exist once they are out of their familiar environments.

I will never be able to replace what I would be losing. Someone said to me “you have a million dollar view but not a million dollar house – you will never be able to find something comparable.”

Please take the lives of all the residents on Wasatch Blvd. into consideration as you make your decisions.

Sincerely,

Lori Barton
August 9, 2018

Dear UDOT Employees:

There are three main reasons for not altering Wasatch Blvd. or the 33rdSouth northbound onramp.

1. You study from December 2017 shows absolutely 0 (zero) accidents associated with the 33rd South North Bound on ramp and its merger areas with either I215 Northbound or Parleys Canyon eastbound. Please refer to pages 36 and 38. In contrast, the 33rd South exit ramp (southbound) had 34 to 37 accidents during the same study period. Again, refer to your pages 36 and 38.

2. You 2050 traffic predictions on Page 43 of the December 2017 study are irrational, in fact nonsensical. The combined eastbound traffic from both peak time periods is 2,639 vehicles. In contrast, the combined westbound peak traffic flow during the same two peak periods is 3,298.

In other words, your researchers have used a model the predicts 700 more people going east through the relevant intersection than go west each and every single day. Your researchers have intentionally presented a misleading statistic that overestimates the traffic heading east up Parleys from Northbound I215 and the 33rd South on ramp. As an aside, you 2050 predictions include a Summit County workforce of 81,409 and a population of 88,336. Again, a deliberate overestimation of employment levels leading to an incorrect vehicle traffic conclusion.

3. The last page of your December 2017 study lists the total number of condemned homes as six (6) under option B and three (3) under the other three options. It is clear from the engineer designs that all said homes are on the west side of I215. Nowhere have you published any information that lists possible condemnation of any homes on Wasatch Blvd or any design schematic showing any infringement on Wasatch Blvd.

In short, the flyover ramp on Southbound 33rd South is not scientifically justified and would be a waste of resources. The existing onramp will work perfectly well to accommodate the increase in predicted vehicles. It can easily and safely handle 8 to 12 vehicles per minute.

Of course, we still remember your deliberate failure to follow State Law in the erection of the Wasatch Blvd. Noise Barrier (and subsequent removal of the entire portion south of 33rd South) and UDOT's failure to conduct proper sound impact studies and failure to conduct proper voting surveys.

Thank You for Your Kind Consideration,

Gregory S. Coon, Ph.D.
Comment #134
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Bill Davis
Comments:
[See comment 108]

Thank you.

--
Mr Bill Davis

Comment #135
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: David Anisman
Comments:

All UDOT plans appear to include expanded North-bound access to 80E/Park City. This will mean converting S Wasatch Blvd into freeway access. The impact on the community east of S Wasatch Blvd will be terrible:

1. Homes currently bordering S Wasatch will have to be torn down via Imminent Domaine. The state cannot hope to compensate these families adequately for the loss - not just of a house - but of the home many families have lived in for more than a generation. They certainly won’t receive enough financial compensation to allow them to find comparable housing elsewhere.

2. Many of the homes in the neighborhood bounded by 3300 S and 215 will go from a relatively quite neighborhood to having a major freeway in their front yard. No amount of noise abatement will fix that. Property values will plummet.

3. Traffic within this neighborhood will have to be re-routed. Previously quite streets will become major through-ways (e.g., S Yosemite), once access off S Wasatch is lost. In the past few years, many young families with children have moved into this neighborhood specifically because of the good schools and quite streets, streets which will be decidedly less safe after re-routing is completed.

I accept that growth in the Wasatch Front requires change. But why should that development come at such a cost to those of us who have already invested so much - so much time, money and hard work - to make our homes here? Why is it acceptable for our homes, our property values and our neighborhood peace to be sacrificed for the sake of development elsewhere? Perhaps other options should be considered:

4. Limit development along the Wasatch Front. This area is geographically limited. The anticipated development these UDOT proposals are designed to address will contribute significantly to air pollution and stress water supplies that our region simply cannot support.

5. Put in eco-friendly mass transit rather than more freeway mileage which will only accommodate more car traffic and lead to worsening air quality.
Growth at any cost serves one constituency only: developers. UDOT should instead listen to those of us who have already invested in the Salt Lake Valley through our mortgage payments and halt these plans to destroy our community!

Pamela and David Anisman

Comment #136
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Taylor Daily
Comments:
[See comment 109]

Thank you.
--
Mr Taylor Daily

Comment #137
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Margaret Chaney
Comments:
[See comment 108]

Thank you.
--
Ms Margaret Chaney

Comment #138
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Teresa Coon
Comments:
August 9, 2018

To UDOT officials, Governor Herbert, Lieutenant Governor Cox, Mayor Silvestrini, Senator Iwamoto and Representative Arent,

As a longtime resident in Millcreek’s Grandeur Peak neighborhood that borders 3300 South, Wasatch Blvd., Parley’s bike trail and Grandeur Peak trailhead, I am in disbelief that UDOT would even remotely consider the land grab that would condemn homes in our neighborhood as set forth
in the Parley’s Interchange proposal.

The UDOT proposal states that the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange is a merging hazard. This assumption is wrong. Quoting from the PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN: Areas of the interchange have accident rates above the state average compared to similar areas. This is partially due to severe congestion during the morning and evening peak commute times, with traffic backing up onto the freeways. HOWEVER, UDOT contradicts and refutes their own statement within UDOT’s own study.

- UDOT’s own statistics show that there have been zero accidents on the northbound on-ramp from 3300 South to the Parley’s interchange. NO accidents whatsoever.

In fact, the table below (Parley’s Interchange Environmental Impact Statement, Page 1-17), shows that the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange is not even on UDOT’s list of areas with “Unacceptable Levels of Service”!

Table 1.4-2. Segments of the Parley’s Interchange with Unacceptable Levels of Service in the AM and PM Peak Hours under Existing Conditions (2017)

--Eastbound I-80 ramp to northbound Foothill Drive AM E

--Southbound Foothill Drive ramp to westbound I-215 AM F

--Northbound Foothill Drive between I-80 and Stringham Drive AM F

--I-215 southbound weave north of 3300 South (where I-80 westbound to I-215 southbound on ramp merges and 3300 South exits on southbound I-215) PM E *

--Southbound Foothill Drive merge with southbound I-215 PM E

—Source: UDOT 2018a

* I have highlighted the I-215 Southbound weave, because this is on west side of I-215, not on the east side by our Grandeur Peak neighborhood. Again, the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange is not even listed by UDOT as being a problem!

Furthermore, within pages 1-23 to 1-28 of the same Environmental Impact Statement chapter, titled 1.4.4.1 Safety Issues, there is not one single mention of the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange as having a safety issue.

So I ask, why is UDOT so eager to condemn homes in our established, 70+ year-old neighborhood that includes both longtime residents as well as eager, up and coming, new families? Why are you spending state taxpayer’s money to change an intersection that has had NO ACCIDENTS and doesn’t rise to UDOT’s level of Unacceptable Levels of Service?

I have lived in and loved our Grandeur Peak neighborhood since 1999. I can say for a fact that the only days that the on-ramp from 33rd South to Parley’s Canyon is congested are Memorial Day, 4th of July and Labor Day. The problems on those three days could easily be alleviated by having law enforcement positioned to cite reckless drivers/merging. The presence of law enforcement is always a deterrent, and much preferable and LESS COSTLY and DEVESTATING than pushing families out of their homes.
Other alternatives to destroying the integrity of our neighborhood include:

- Alerting drivers earlier to the upcoming merge onto I-80 on-ramp by installing a flashing sign(s).
- Restriping the exit lane beginning closer to the 3300 South overpass to give drivers more time to merge.
- UDOT must certainly have even more alternatives that could be used. But, any or all alternative measures must be taken FIRST before even entertaining your permanent and irreparable solution.

Quoting Mayor Silvestrini, “We all endure the frustrating traffic patterns in the mouth of Parley’s Canyon, but alternative designs should not be built at the expense of homes and trailheads being removed to make way for more roads.”

UDOT knows (or should know) better than any other group that the vast majority of long-haul trucks travel on I-80 westbound through the city. The few trucks that go southbound from Parley’s to I-215 are, in most part, servicing the grocery stores and businesses on the east side of the valley, or are lost. I can see the west side off-ramp from I-80 to 3300 south from my home (and hear when a truck goes by, thank you) and the number of trucks is insignificant. However, you can see trucks U-turning all the time on 3300 south to get back on the freeway to westbound I-80. I suggest that clearer UDOT signage would solve that problem.

I am also a homeowner and commercial business owner in Park City, UT. The UDOT study states that by the year 2050 the population of Park City will be 88,366 and the employee population will be 81,409. As an active business owner, I have NEVER heard that employee population statistic from any business group. I have serious doubts of its validity. The pinpoint accuracy down to the single person makes me doubt your findings even further. Moreover, 1), what does that statistic have to do with the 3300 S. Parley’s on-ramp? Most Park City employees will live in and around the Park City area. And 2), if we see such a phenomenal increase in Salt Lake residents commuting from the already filled-in areas of the east and southeast side of the valley to Park City (which seem highly unlikely), I have a feeling TRAX to Park City will be built as the preferred method of transportation.

The fact that public hearings were only held in July on this potentially life-altering subject is disgraceful. I believe that UDOT was counting on the fact that the summer months are busy or people are out of town, thus guaranteeing low attendance. Doesn’t matter; UDOT can check off the box for holding public hearings.

The two Residential and Recreational Stakeholder Working Group Meetings held 3/1/2018 did not include ONE affected resident from my Grandeur Peak neighborhood — the most important stakeholders — because they may lose their homes if UDOT’s vision ever becomes a reality. The “stakeholder” minutes of both meetings show what they spent their time on discussing. Below are representative highlights:

- Gravel pit up Parley’s Canyon is a source of dust and bad air quality in the valley
- The “tube” is a popular recreational area in the summer
- Stringham on Foothill Drive
- University of Utah and Research Park
- Attractions near the University of Utah (the zoo, Natural History Museum, and Red Butte
Gardens) do not have good transit options.

- U-turns were an issue on Foothill and Parley’s Way
- Existing [bike] trails and the potential for new trail connections
- Possibility of having a [bike] trail connecting directly from Suicide Rock to the Parley’s Historic Nature Park
- Possibility of having a new [bike] trail going into Parley’s Historic Nature Park from the Sons of the Utah Pioneers property in Canyon Rim

Improvements to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST).

As you can see, lots of bike trail talk and other topics/areas in the valley were discussed, but NOT ONE COMMENT was made nor the topic of the 3300 South on-ramp to Parley’s even brought up by the Chair.

**However, I did find interesting what was discussed in the 6-7:00 meeting. Per the minute notes:**

- Other members noted that improving the I-215/3900 South interchange (replacing the short northbound off-ramp and the northbound loop on-ramp) would also be beneficial.
- Millcreek representatives noted that there is a private developer who owns some property between Wasatch Drive and I-215 that could affect any changes to the 3900 South on-or off-ramps on the east side of I-215. They expressed an interest in relocating Wasatch closer to I-15 to prevent cross traffic across Wasatch once it’s developed.

It’s outrageous that the “stakeholders” are concerned about the developer’s needs, but made no mention that families and, in fact, the quality of life for an entire neighborhood could be decimated by the proposed on-ramp change!

One other interesting stakeholder comment was that afternoon congestion on Wasatch (and from 7:30 to 8:30 every morning, my comment) is often due to parents parked along the street waiting to pick up their kids from the Eastwood Elementary School.

- If UDOT counted these cars as part of the AM/PM 3300 South on-ramp congestion, it would be an absolute manipulation of the statistics, which should lead anyone to question all of UDOT’s data.

To conclude, I firmly believe, and have the facts to prove it from UDOT’s own proposal, that UDOT is again using its weight to push through changes to the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange that are unnecessary and, in fact, purposefully detrimental to our neighborhood. We have suffered enough at the hands of UDOT. Every day the soundwall on Wasatch reminds me how UDOT damaged our neighborhood. A small number of families who live directly on Wasatch benefit somewhat from the soundwall. Every other family living one street up and beyond are exposed to intolerable levels of freeway noise. But UDOT knew what was best for us. Now, ironically, those same families that benefitted from the soundwall may have their homes condemned to make way for another enlightened UDOT project!

Having read the entire proposal and attachments, I am unified with the families in my Grandeur Peak neighborhood in opposing any of the proposed changes to the 3300 South/I-215/I-80 interchange.

Sincerely,
Teresa S. Coon, MBA
Comment #139
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Shane Dormer
Comments:
My name is Shane Domer and I currently live on the North side of Olympus Cove, directly above Wasatch Blvd (Plateau Dr). Our community has been reviewing the Alternative Traffic Plans for the Parley’s Interchange and would like to make the attached recommendations….

Thank you in advance for your time reviewing our recommendations.

SHANE DOMER | Sports Science Director
US SPEEDSKATING

Comment #140
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Justin Hipple
Comments:
Dear Sir or Madam,

We are taking this opportunity to share our thoughts regarding the Parley’s Canyon Interchange project. Our family resides on Wasatch Blvd north of 3300 S and are very concerned about the potential loss of our home to this project. There are many viable alternatives to achieve the project goals that would not impact homeowners and the Wasatch Blvd corridor that is heavily used by recreationists from our neighborhood and beyond. The easy access to the mountains is a big part of what makes the Salt Lake City area so desirable. To unnecessarily impact that access by negatively affecting the Grandeur Peak trailhead is counter to what is driving the growth of our area. Please consider all alternatives thoroughly as we are confident there are solutions that are much better than reducing Wasatch Blvd and surrounding property.

Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns.

Sincerely,

Justin and Katie Hipple
Comment #141
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Email
Name: Brian Cheung
Comments:
Dear all,

Please review the attached comments and petition submitted by the Olympus Cove north neighborhood regarding the Parley’s Interchange project from UDOT.

Thanks for your consideration.

Comment #142
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jon Hansen
Comments:
I am sending you this petition to voice my absolute opposition to the four alternatives as posted on the parleyseis.com website. While I understand there is need to redesign the Parleys Interchange I feel it is totally unnecessary to take out Wasatch Blvd and potentially several homes on the east side of I-215.

Congestion on Foothill Drive is the main cause of back ups that affect I-215 on the south side of Parleys. Flex lanes, express signals and streamlining the rats nest of on and off ramps that are on the north side of the interchange are possible solutions. Also, building vertical retaining walls and shifting the design to the west are alternatives to removing streets and home on the east side of I-215.

I ask you to join me in opposition the the current alternatives so we can work to find solutions that achieve the goals of traffic safety and flow yet are not detrimental to citizens of Mill Creek City.

Sincerely,

Jon Hansen
Comment #143
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Joanna Mull
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I’m deeply displeased with the handling of the environmental impact work done thus far for the changes to I80 near Parleys. I live on the north side of I80. Every time I speak with someone, the scope is smaller and feels more a deliberate attempt to avoid having to fix our neighborhood after UDOT created an untenable noise issue several years ago in failing to build a sound wall on the north side of I80 across from where you built the one on the south side. Do you even understand how those walls work? Since my house is at higher elevation than the freeway and since there is nothing between it and my street which runs perpendicular to I80 other than a small patch of golf course, my street is a very effective carrier of that noise wave. It’s ridiculous. It’s also ridiculous that I keep getting told at each event or comment period that there is nothing for me to do for at least a year or more when you keep changing the parameters.

I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted to you by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. You need to do something to assist our neighborhood. Now. Not after you expand I80 and make the issue that much worse for us. Not in 10 years. Fixing our noise issue is a small drop in your financial bucket.

Sincerely,

Joanna Mull

Comment #144
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Mark O. Van Wagoner
Comments:
Gentlemen,

I fully endorse the comments of Mr. Bennion, whose letter I set out fully below:

[See comment #68 for letter]
Comment #145
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Katie Davis
Comments:
To whom it may concern,

I am writing regarding the opportunity for noise reduction on I-80.

My family and I live at [redacted]

The noise from the I-80 freeway is of huge concern to us. We hear truck horns and noise all through the night inside our home. We listen to it all day long and use sound machines throughout the house to decrease the noise.

My husband has even tried planting trees and bushes that will help give us some type of “sound barrier”, but to no avail. The noise problem is even worse when we are outside.

We feel strongly that “freeway noise reduction” is a primary need of the community and should be added as one of the needs and purposes of the project.

Thank you,

Katie Davis

Comment #146
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jack Frost
Comments:
To our UDOT hardworking professionals,

Please consider extending your construction project to cover the remaining short distance west to 1700 south to help our community with the bad noise we live with every day. Your I-80 project a few years back made I-80 a terrific highway from the Spaghetti Bowl to 1300 East continues our freeway system modern and nice. Now the parleysEIS project will make the eastern portion of this freeway system modern and something to be proud of. Why leave a small section between these areas 50 plus years old with broken and noisy. Try driving it in your family vehicle and feel and hear what the old sections feel and sound like. It must be bad on tires also. Completing this small section would complete this entry way to SLC instead of leaving an embarrassing section that we even now try to explain to our visitors about. AND it would make our children happier to be able to play in their yards instead of being driven to a park etc.

Look at a freeway map from parleys west to the new SLC Port Logistics Center and then mark the area which will be untouched between 23rd East and 17th East and see if it makes any sense. Extend the upcoming project to give us some noise relief and a complete I-80 system for everyone
to be proud of.

We need your help.

Thanks for considering my comment.

Jack E Frost

Comment #147
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Dixie Merback
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern;

It is a wonderful community that we live in. However, sitting on your patio enjoying conversation is impossible, as the freeway noise is so loud. One cannot hear another person speak for the noise of constant traffic. When we purchased our home in this amazing neighborhood, some 27 years ago and paid top dollar, the noise level of the traffic was much less. We all put a lot of money into our yards to enjoy. Please review the noise level problem and help us to find a cost effective way to reduce it. It then would be a win/win situation for everyone.

Please note my husband is in Alaska Fly Fishing for ten days and will not be home to meet the deadline for comments. However, he is an engineer and has plenty to say about it!

Warm regards,
Dixie Merback

Comment #148
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Kent Bowman
Comments:

UDOT:

Please see my attached letter related to the EIS for the Parleys Interchange to 1300 East project. I look forward to your response.

Kent M. Bowman

[Attached letter is similar to comment #68]

August 10, 2018

To Whom It May Concern at UDOT:
I live on the north side of I-80 and I am concerned with the lack of noise abatement efforts for the Parleys Interchange Project. I strongly encourage UDOT to make adjustments to its proposed plan as explained by John Bennion in the italicized paragraphs that follow:

1. UDOT issued a draft EIS statement in April, soliciting public comments on the needs and purpose, indicating a “Study Area” from the Parleys Interchange to 1300 East. By May 25, UDOT received at least 136 emails (I have copies) from residents on the north side of I-80 between 1700 East and the Parleys Interchange, all urging UDOT to address the noise levels that already exceed its own 66 decibel maximum, based on many personal dB measurements taken by myself and several other residents.

2. UDOT’s reply to those emails was that noise abatement is not a “purpose and need” of the project, and that the issue will be addressed later in the process.

3. I then met with UDOT representatives, including HDR consultants involved in the sound study, and learned that the “scope” will extend only to 2300 East, not 1300 East. I learned that the “preliminary sound study” has already been performed all the way to 1300 East, but is not yet distilled into a report. And the report will not include study results beyond 2300 East. I asked for permission to see the data but was refused access to it. I received a nice explanation of the impressive analytical methodology, but my questions about dates, times, and locations of the sensors’ data gathering were not answered. I was told I could submit a GRAMA request, and was reminded that GRAMA applies to government reports, not data, and the report won’t be available until October 15, well beyond the August 15 public comment deadline. And the report won’t cover 2300 East to 1300 East anyway, because it is not in the “scope.” The project as currently envisioned will increase noise well beyond the scope area in neighborhoods that already exceed the 66 dB maximum.

4. I have carefully read UDOT’s website description of the “Level 2” screening process of the four alternatives that have survived thus far. The environmental items mentioned: “wetlands, … other waters, … wildlife habitat, existing and planned parks and trail systems, cultural resources, and community facilities (such as schools, senior centers, fire stations, and community gathering places).” Why is noise not included? If the answer is because it’s not in the federal environmental regulations, that is an unacceptable excuse. We need to do what right for the environment of the people, and noise is the environmental problem here. Water and wetlands and wildlife are undoubtedly considered when they are adjacent to rather than inside the “scope” – why not noise?

5. Alternative A seems to include construction (aka “scope”) down to 2100 East. So why is the sound report planning to stop at 2300 East? Should I vote for Alternative A because it will do the best job of the four alternatives in minimizing noise, assuming a sound wall is built to 2100 East? Or is Alternative A going to be rejected because it extends the scope? Or will the extension to 2100 East will be excused as a typo or eliminated to avoid extending the scope?

6. I was told by UDOT that the area from 2300 East to 1300 East will be addressed in “Phase 2”, which means at least 10 more years of excessive noise. That is unacceptable. We have been told similar things at least three times in the last 30 years. UDOT’s historical records will verify that.

7. The April 2018 draft of the Parleys Interchange Environment Impact Statement states: “The existing pavement in the study area is a mix of asphalt and concrete. UDOT’s maintenance strategy for asphalt is to mill and overlay it periodically (every 7 to 10 years) while causing minimal impacts to traffic. UDOT has used this strategy in the study area, and the asphalt pavement remains in good condition. Concrete pavement requires minimal routine
maintenance during its lifecycle but needs major rehabilitation or replacement after 40 to 50 years. The concrete pavement on I-80 and adjacent I-215 ramps has been in service about 50 years, and UDOT has identified the need for a pavement reconstruction project between the Parley’s interchange and 1300 East by 2021."

That statement has mysteriously disappeared from the current draft. Is that because UDOT reduced the scope to 2300 East, punting on our neighborhood for yet another 10 years?

8. When I brought up the possibility of asphalt or other noise-reducing paving, the idea was routinely dismissed as requiring too much maintenance, because its life span is only 10 years instead of 40. But there are hundreds of miles of interstate highways in Utah with asphalt paving, and Phase 2 won’t happen for at least 10 years, so why not asphalt now?

9. Our homes are in the only residential section on either side of I-80 between Parleys Canyon and downtown without a sound wall. When the noise wall on the south side was erected several years ago, our noise levels went up significantly. Where are the UDOT noise studies that led to that decision? What consideration was given to noise reflection?

10. We have heard that UDOT is not interested in our problems because our neighborhood is one of the nicest in SLC, implying that we are “too rich” and should solve our own problems. This ignores the fact that over half of the affected homes are standard middle-income homes, virtually identical to the homes directly across I-80 on the south side, where a sound wall was installed to our detriment. I invite UDOT to tour the neighborhood south of 2100 East and between 2100 East and 1700 East to more fully understand and appreciate our demographics.

Again, I encourage UDOT to do the right thing and appropriately address the unacceptable noise levels and implement the available solutions for the area from the Parleys Interchange to 1700 East. (The remainder of the study area, from 1700 East to 1300 East, is Sugarhouse Park, which we do not understand because we don’t live there.) Solutions obviously exist, evidenced by hundreds of miles of interstate highways with sound walls and asphalt throughout the Wasatch Front area.

I would appreciate a response.

Sincerely,

Kent M. Bowman

Comment #149
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Liz Bradley
Comments:
To Whom It May Concern,

I live on the very noisy north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project and I want to submit that I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Thank you for your consideration.
Comment #150
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Chris Savarese
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

We live on the north side of I-80. Adjacent to the Parleys Interchange Project. We 100% endorse the comments submitted to you by John Bennion on August 6th.

I would like to further emphasize the unhealthy noise levels our neighborhood is exposed to due to our neighborhood being the only neighborhood that is left unprotected from the unhealthy, ever increasing, highway noise along I-80 and I-15 corridors that run directly through our city. This is unacceptable to the the hundreds of families who live in this unhealthy environment. Our homes are exposed to noise levels consistently in excess of 70 dB. Medical science has found the effects of sustained levels of noise pollution can harm cardiovascular health, and negatively effect children’s ability to learn, among a myriad of harmful affects.

As this project moves forward I implore you to re-assess the vital importance of addressing the highway noise from I-80. A sound wall must be built on the north side of I-80 protecting the hundreds of families that are exposed to this incessant unhealthy highway noise. It is bad, and as traffic levels continue to grow exponentially, will only become worse. We need your help to protect our children and make our homes safe. As all other neighborhoods are protected from excessive highway noise in Salt Lake City.

Sincerely,

Chris Savarese

Comment #151
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: April Savarese
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

I agree with my husbands below comments. I am extremely concerned about the health and well being of our family and our neighbors. Thank you for supporting our neighborhood; making these changes would improve our families well being. We would be able to hear our children playing in their own backyard.

Aprille

Begin forwarded message:

[See comment #150]
Comment #152
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Peter Barth
Comments:
Hello

My name is Peter Barth and I live at [address redacted]. I would like to request that as part of the remodel work to be done on the Parley’s interchange that attention be paid to the noise pollution our neighborhoods experience from the freeway. The concrete freeways transmit very loud tire noise that can be heard not just in our yards but inside our homes as well. I would ask that the freeway be paved with asphalt to address this issue AND that noise walls be put on the north side of the freeway. With walls on the south side only the noise just seems to rebound toward the north and impacts all of our neighborhoods.

It seems that more and more large semi trucks are using the freeway and their noise impact is significant, both in terms of tire noise but also their use of “air brakes” that literally wake us up in the night. Restricting the air brakes would be very helpful.

I’m confident a combination of asphalt and sound walls would make an enormous difference to the quality of life for us and our neighbors, and would ask that this be included in the scope of your project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter and Heather Barth

Comment #153
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ida Wilson
Comments:
Dear Powers in Charge:

I strongly implore you to make adjustment to I-80 sound by installing sound-barrier walls along north side of I-80 between 1300 E and Parley/Foothill exit.

I strongly encourage professional landscaping of Foothill/Parley’s Exit so the entrance to Salt Lake City is welcoming and weed-free.

Robert Wilson
Comment #154
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Stanford Owen
Comments:
Sent from my iPhone
I heartily endorse the statements made by John Bennion regarding the urgent need for noise abatement measures on the east side of I-80 east of 13th east.
I live where the noise is significant.

Comment #155
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ida Wilson
Comments:
Dear Authorities:
I strongly urge you to consider placing sound-barriers along East-bound I-80 from 1300 East to Parley’s/Foothill Exit.
I strongly urge you to consider the entrance from major traffic portals of I-80 East and I-215 North bound and the intersection of Foothill and Parley’s Way. The major traffic entering Salt Lake City at Subject Exit 129 is greeted by dry grass weeds. I suggest funds be appropriated to enhance this entrance to the University of Utah and major medical facilities with professional landscape. Cities in South Valley are a model of professional landscape exits to their cities, i.e., Draper, South Jordan, Sandy, West Jordan.

Comment #156
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Michael Gubarev
Comments:
We live in Westminster area, [redacted]. The noise from I-80 Parleys terrace is very remarkable, especially in early morning hours. Our location is approx. 1/3 mile from this interstate road. I can imagine how much suffering many people who live closer. The noise-guarding wall is absolutely necessary on both, East and West, sides of Parleys Terrace.
Respectfully,
Michael Gubarev, Ph.D.
Comment #157
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Becky Wilkes
Comments:
We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed alternative redesigns of the Parleys Canyon interchange.

We have owned our home on the corner of [redacted] for 27 years and have experienced firsthand the frustration of increased and congested traffic in the corridor. We realize this interchange is an important part of regional transportation and appreciate the need to find a long-term remedy for the growing traffic problems, but the four proposals at hand could have a devastating impact on the homeowners in our neighborhood, as well as limit or eliminate access to trailheads and potentially negatively affect the important fire road.

Fact is, driving on any freeway along the Wasatch Front today is a dangerous and a maddening experience.

Ours is a uniquely diverse neighborhood, and we have been good stewards of our community. We patiently waited for bike trails to be finished, tolerate delays caused by continual road construction and bridge work, and watched as traffic demands increased with thriving industry and local businesses. Yet, we happily welcome those who pass through our neighborhood to enjoy the many amenities and trailheads that make this such a treasured area in the Salt Lake Valley.

All this is worth living in our beloved community and I ask you to please consider the homeowners throughout your process. These are our homes. We have raised our children here. We recreate here and like you, deserve to keep that for which we have worked so hard.

We support efforts to look at remedies to growing traffic problems, but it should not happen at the expenses of local taxpayers. Homes and trailheads should not be removed to make way for more roads.

Thank you,

Comment #158
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Elliott Mott
Comments:
Hello UDOT:

In your redesign of the Parley’s interchange at the mouth of Parley’s Canyon please preserve existing trail and active transportation connectivity north-south and east-west, and make improvements where ever possible. In the future we anticipate a paved bike path in Parley’s Canyon as part of an important Provo-Park City-Salt Lake City loop -- so please incorporate design elements into the Parley’s Interchange for this important active transportation corridor connection to move cyclists off
of busy/noisy I-80 in Parley’s Canyon.

Foothill and Wasatch Boulevard are both key north-south cycling routes. The place where the paved bike path merges with Foothill Drive on the north side of I-80 needs a redesign to make the transition from bike path to public roadway more seamless. Cyclists riding to and leaving Sugarhouse on Parley’s Way need a way to safety transition to the paved bike path crossing over Parley’s Canyon. Thank you!

Best Wishes,

Elliott R. Mott

Comment #159
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Eric Kraan
Comments:

As a regular commute cyclist that transits this area in a regular basis I would like to stress the importance of not only maintaining but improving the connectivity of the active transportation network around the valley. I say this as a person that wants economic development that promotes sustainable growth and enhanced quality of life along the Wasatch Range rather than growth at the expense of QoL. Although motorized transit is and will continue to be a major source of mobility for the majority of Utahns in the foreseeable future, it is necessary to promote and provide the infrastructure to increase the ability and likelihood that more people will transport themselves through smaller and cleaner vehicles like a bicycle. It is you, as the engineers and shape-makers of our future to ensure it happens.

Thank you.

Comment #160
Date: 8/9/2018
Source: Website
Name: Monica Strong
Comments:

I like option B. I would like to see a safer way to get off at Parley’s way without having to change 2-3 lanes from the extreme left side to the extreme right around the Foothill area. One of the plans I saw had a lot of lane changing (B?) to get onto Parleys and I would like to see a little more improvement with that.

Also, please help us beautify the entrance onto Parleys way with natural indigenous plants.

Thirdly, I don’t know if you can address this, but drivers getting off the freeway and entering the freeway at Parleys way and Wilshire OFTEN run the yellow-turning-red light racing thru at speeds well above the limit. It’s dangerous!!
Thank you for your presentation to us,

Monica Strong

Comment #161

Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Lauri Welch
Comments:

[Similar to comment #68]

Dear UDOT:

We are deeply disturbed by the direction that the Parleys Interchange Project is headed, driven by UDOT’s apparent unwillingness to address noise abatement head-on. Let me explain:

1. UDOT issued a draft EIS statement in April, soliciting public comments on the needs and purpose, indicating a “Study Area” from the Parleys Interchange to 1300 East. In May, UDOT received at least 136 emails from residents on the north side of I-80 between 1700 East and the Parleys Interchange, all urging UDOT to address the noise levels that already exceed its own 66 decibel maximum, based on many personal dB measurements taken by several other residents in our neighborhood.

2. UDOT’s reply to those emails was that noise abatement is not a “purpose and need” of the project, and that the issue will be addressed later in the process.

3. John Bennion met with UDOT representatives, including HDR consultants involved in the sound study, and learned that the “scope” will extend only to 2300 East, not 1300 East. John learned that the “preliminary sound study” has already been performed all the way to 1300 East, but is not yet distilled into a report. And the report will not include study results beyond 2300 East. I asked for permission to see the data but was refused access to it. John received a nice explanation of the impressive analytical methodology, but my questions about dates, times, and locations of the sensors’ data gathering were not answered. John was told he could submit a GRAMA request, and was reminded that GRAMA applies to government reports, not data, and the report won’t be available until October 15, well beyond the August 15 public comment deadline. And the report won’t cover 2300 East to 1300 East anyway, because it is not in the “scope.” The project as currently envisioned will increase noise well beyond the scope area in neighborhoods that already exceed the 66 dB maximum.

4. John Bennion carefully read UDOT’s website description of the “Level 2” screening process of the four alternatives that have survived thus far. The environmental items mentioned: “wetlands, … other waters, … wildlife habitat, existing and planned parks and trail systems, cultural resources, and community facilities (such as schools, senior centers, fire stations, and community gathering places).” Why is noise not included? If the answer is because it’s not in the federal environmental regulations, that is an unacceptable excuse. We need to do what is right for the environment of the people, and noise is the environmental problem here. Water and wetlands and wildlife are undoubtedly considered when they are adjacent to rather than inside the “scope” – why not noise?

5. Alternative A seems to include construction (aka “scope”) down to 2100 East. So why is the
sound report planning to stop at 2300 East? Should we vote for Alternative A because it will do the best job of the four alternatives in minimizing noise, assuming a sound wall is built to 2100 East? Or is Alternative A going to be rejected because it extends the scope? Or will the extension to 2100 East will be excused as a typo or eliminated to avoid extending the scope?

6. John Bennion was told by UDOT that the area from 2300 East to 1300 East will be addressed in “Phase 2”, which means at least 10 more years of excessive noise. That is unacceptable. We have been told similar things at least three times in the last 30 years. UDOT’s historical records will verify that.

7. The April 2018 draft of the Parleys Interchange Environment Impact Statement states:

“The existing pavement in the study area is a mix of asphalt and concrete. UDOT’s maintenance strategy for asphalt is to mill and overlay it periodically (every 7 to 10 years) while causing minimal impacts to traffic. UDOT has used this strategy in the study area, and the asphalt pavement remains in good condition. Concrete pavement requires minimal routine maintenance during its lifecycle but needs major rehabilitation or replacement after 40 to 50 years. The concrete pavement on I-80 and adjacent I-215 ramps has been in service about 50 years, and UDOT has identified the need for a pavement reconstruction project between the Parley’s interchange and 1300 East by 2021.”

That statement has mysteriously disappeared from the current draft. Is that because UDOT reduced the scope to 2300 East, punting on our neighborhood for yet another 10 years?

8. When John Bennion brought up the possibility of asphalt or other noise-reducing paving, the idea was routinely dismissed as requiring too much maintenance, because its life span is only 10 years instead of 40. But there are hundreds of miles of interstate highways in Utah with asphalt paving, and Phase 2 won’t happen for at least 10 years, so why not asphalt now?

9. Our homes are in the only residential section on either side of I-80 between Parleys Canyon and downtown without a sound wall. When the noise wall on the south side was erected several years ago, our noise levels went up significantly. Where are the UDOT noise studies that led to that decision? What consideration was given to noise reflection?

10. We have heard that UDOT is not interested in our problems because our neighborhood is one of the nicest in SLC, implying that we are “too rich” and should solve our own problems. This ignores the fact that over half of the affected homes are standard middle-income homes, virtually identical to the homes directly across I-80 on the south side, where a sound wall was installed to our detriment. I invite UDOT to tour the neighborhood south of 2100 East and between 2100 East and 1700 East to more fully understand and appreciate our demographics

Summary: We have lost our trust in the standard UDOT processes for “doing the right thing” in our neighborhood. The sound problem affects at least 300 homes, but UDOT won’t even conduct the analysis to discover the exact number of affected homes, let alone accept responsibility to mitigate the problem that is already over the max and will inevitably grow. UDOT seems focused on “checking the box” on noise rather than understanding the problem and working cooperatively to solve it.

We respectfully invite UDOT to work cooperatively with us to dive into the details of the noise
problems and solutions, from the Parleys Interchange to 1700 East. (The remainder of the study area, from 1700 East to 1300 East, is Sugarhouse Park, which we do not understand because we don’t live there.) Solutions obviously exist, evidenced by hundreds of miles of interstate highways with sound walls and asphalt throughout the Wasatch Front area.

I look forward to hearing from UDOT and hopefully working cooperatively together.

Respectfully submitted,

Lauri Welch

---

**Comment #162**

Date: 8/10/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Barb Hansen  
Comments:

Dear UDOT,

I feel very strongly that the current UDOT plan for the Parleys interchange EIS is premature in it choice of solutions. The plan(s) being presented as a choice are not only unnecessarily detrimental to homes and neighborhoods they are single-minded and very myopic. You ask the public for feedback and to choose from plans that are so similar it is hard to see the differences and those differences seem to be in places of little importance to the larger plan. It appears that even after UDOT identifying that most constrictive and difficult area (utilities and waterlines) area of the plan, UDOT has chosen that area to do the largest amount of work adding 4 or 5 freeway lanes and impacting residential areas on both east and west side of the I-215 freeway north of 3900 S.

The problem area with north bound traffic is north as traffic gets onto Foothill where the lanes bottle neck. Until that bottleneck is fixed adding more lanes that funnel into the bottleneck will only make the problem worse.

Plus the neighborhood on the Eastside already has limited access for FIRE and Emergency Vehicles unable to get to and up the higher streets because of the steep angles of most of the roads in the area, most of those roads have narrower width too. Closing Wasatch or even moving Wasatch east will only cause bigger steeper problems for Emergency Vehicles access to these homes.

The public has the right to see other options before one plan (like you the ONE you are presenting as options, right now) is chosen and any money spent on measuring, or other developmental stages started.

Attached are Many suggestions for Alternative plans! UDOT representatives have asked us to send in, and they said they would be looked over and considered. With the amount of money this project is going to cost it seems taking the time to consider and ask questions about the attached suggestions and actually looking at other options with explanation why those options are not considered, other then it is too expensive. Any time you do a remodel and you end up with choices of paying a little more and doing it correctly OR saving money right then but having to undo some of your work in the future to do it right... then.
Doing a project right and the best way the first time while everything is being changed instead of saving money only to have to redo it sooner is the best plan for the taxpayers.

Also attached are one days worth of signatures of residents and some area users opposing all of the current option.

Below are the comments and suggestions cut and pasted from the attachment (so in a poor format). These are also included in the attachment along with the petition signatures.

Barb Hansen

CC : Mayor, Millcreek city, Salt Lake County &Salt Lake City Council persons, Mt Olympus Community Council

[Attached document contained in above comments: see Comment #120]

Comment #163

Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ken P. Jones
Comments:

These comments on the redesign of the Parley’s Interchange are being submitted on behalf of PRATT, The Parley’s Rails, Trails and Tunnels (PRATT) Coalition, which is a 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to assist public and private partners in completing a shared use path along I-80. Our comments are as follows:

1. Maintain active transportation routes during construction. Both Parley’s Trail and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail provide critical transportation corridors which will greatly affect communities during any periods that the trails are closed. A design which minimizes or eliminates trail closure periods should be selected. If closures are necessary, the time periods should be minimized (no longer that vehicle traffic closures) and should not close Parley’s Trail and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail simultaneously.

2. Maintain connectivity of Parley’s Trail and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

3. Redesign of the interchange should be used to improve the trails:
   - Minimize exposure to vehicle emissions.
   - Minimize trail noise.
   - Minimize elevation loss / gain.
   - Minimize out of direction travel
   - Where possible, provide lateral separation from freeway.
   - Preserve or enhance vegetated buffers where possible, particularly where freeways are being relocated away from the trail.

4. PRATT and other trail and active transportation organizations should continue to be part of the
Parley’s stakeholders working group (thanks for including us!), and should be consulted with, and given opportunity to review trail designs.

5. Include trail right-of-way in all potential locations in the EIS and in the project, and include necessary land acquisition for trails as part of the project. These areas would include a trail adjacent to Wasatch Drive between 33rd South and the interchange, along Foothill Blvd. between the interchange and Stringham Dr., and extensions of Parley’s Trail to the east. This is critical given the difficulty of separate condemnation of land for trail purposes under Utah statues.

6. At the north side of the interchange east of Foothill Drive, facilitate connectivity of the north – south trail crossing the interchange with both the paved trail along Foothill Blvd. and the planned dirt mountain bike trail (new planned portion of Bonneville Shoreline Trail). Extend Parley’s Trail eastward to project boundaries for future connection with planned trail headed east up Parley’s Canyon.

7. Facilitate connectivity of the neighborhoods west of I-215 with Parley’s Trail (new trailhead connections to Parley’s Trail), and connectivity of neighborhoods east and west of I-215.

8. Facilitate connectivity of neighborhoods west of Foothill with Bonneville Shoreline Trail and Parley’s Trail (trail connection crossing over or under Foothill and/or the interchange to neighborhoods; overpass/underpass across I-80 connecting this neighborhood to Parley’s Trail west of the interchange).

9. Facilitate a connection of the hiking trails at lower elevation of Parley’s Historic Nature Park to connect to Parley’s Trail.

10. Include a park & ride lot/trailhead on Foothill drive (North side of I-80 near Parley’s Way / Foothill split on the east side of Foothill). Add trailhead and/or park & ride parking in neighborhood east of 215 / Wasatch Boulevard, just south of the mouth of Parley’s, and in neighborhood west of 215, near water reservoir facility.

**Comment #164**

Date: 8/10/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: George Croft  
Comments:

As I stepped out of my home’s backdoor located at [redacted] this morning at 7 am I said to myself how ugly the freeway noise was even so far away across the golf course and through the neighborhood now that UDOT had installed new sound walls on only the south side of the freeway as part of the Parleys Trail construction project. I then walked around to the front of the house to retrieve the morning newspaper and noticed that’s it’s just as noisy out front but coming from another direction due to an older section of sound walls on the freeways south side only located around 17th east by the Tennis/Sport Club there. I was hearing two different projected vectors of sound directed at me from two areas of I-80 and it’s unbearable noise projection due to the conditions and the fact that UDOT has put up sound walls only on the south side of I-80. That allows the noise to bounce off the walls and project straight North morning and night. How fair is it for UDOT to have put sound walls up on only one side of a freeway and then now seems to be hedging on earlier announced plans to lay down
Asphalt to 13th East but has instead stopped laying asphalt down around 24th East. The noise is truly ugly and the situation is aggravating especially when other areas get asphalt and walls to greatly decrease the noise they are expected to endure day after day, year after year.

Thank you

George Croft

**Comment #165**

Date: 8/10/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Tyson Murdock  
Comments:

Dear Utah Department of Transportation,

Let’s improve the safety and traffic flow on the section of I80 between 1300 East and I215 by adding a sound wall on the North side and utilizing asphalt instead of the loud concrete.

This would be a great change for me and my family!

Tyson & Amby Murdock

**Comment #166**

Date: 8/10/2018  
Source: Email  
Name: Trevor Larsen  
Comments:

Dear UDOT,

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I completely endorse and agree with the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Over the 15 years that we have lived in the Parleys neighborhood the noise has only become louder, more harassing and excessive.

This is a health issue. The noise is disrupting our lives and a our children’s lives. It is affecting our sleep and the general use of our front and backyard.

The health department works with law enforcement to enforce noise regulation that prohibits loud noise between 10:00 pm and 7:00 am. The noise that affects my home and neighborhood is 24/7. The decibel readings that my neighbors and I have taken in our neighborhood at different times and in different places checks in at a level comparable to a noisy restaurant. Have you ever tried to sleep, read a book or listen to music in a noisy restaurant - its hard and extremely difficult. This is not like a barking dog or music from a neighbors party that will eventually stop, this freeway noise is 24/7.
And with the improvements that are to be made to the freeway will only improve the throughput, thus increasing the noise. I agree with John Bennion, “do the right thing” and address this 24/7 issue in our neighborhood. It has been addressed in all the other neighborhoods that surround I-80.

Thanks,

Trevor Larsen

---

Comment #167

Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Ian Davis
Comments:

August 10, 2018

Dear UDOT:

I am troubled by UDOT’s apparent unwillingness to address noise pollution in the Parleys Interchange Project. I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project on 1800 East. Even inside our house, we constantly hear freeway noise, especially semi-trailers and other noisy vehicles. Outside, it is even worse. We try to spend time on our patio and yard to enjoy being outside, but we find ourselves constantly talking over the constant din of traffic in the background. I have measured the decibel level multiple times (varying the day of the week and the time of day). The average decibel reading is consistently in the low 60s, with readings often reaching as high as 77, 78, 81, and even 84. This is real noise pollution in a residential neighborhood that exceeds your own standards. It is shocking to me that this is essentially the only stretch along I-80 East and I-215 near residential neighborhoods that does not have a sound barrier wall. In fact, it is worse than that, as there is a wall on the South side of the freeway, so we get noise reflected back to our neighborhood as well.

I have review and wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

I invite UDOT to work cooperatively with us to dive into the details of the noise problems and solutions, from the Parleys Interchange to 1700 East. Solutions obviously exist, evidenced by hundreds of miles of interstate highways with sound walls and asphalt throughout the Wasatch Front area.

I look forward to hearing from UDOT and hopefully working cooperatively together.

Respectfully submitted,

Ian Davis
Comment #168
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Larry Orton
Comments:
ATTN: UDOT
Re: Parley’s Interchange EIS

I am a resident of Salt Lake City on the north side of I-80 near the Parley Interchange Project. I want you to know I am concerned about the excessive noise from increasing traffic on I-80. I request you address the noise issue when making plans for the new Parley’s Interchange.

Further, I strongly agree with the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

- Larry Orton

Comment #169
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Rhett Jeppson
Comments:

To whom it may concern,

I live with my family on 20th east, on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I completely agree with the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. Please consider taking action to reduce the amount of noises that falls on our neighborhood constantly. We live in such a beautiful place, but the noise pollution is a serious problem.

Thank you for your consideration,

Rhett Jeppson

Comment #170
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Jacob Munns
Comments:

Dear UDOT,
I live not the north side of I-80 near the proposed Parleys Interchange construction project. I want to wholeheartedly endorse John Bennion's position as submitted on August 6, 2018 regarding the unhealthy level of noise pollution that is currently coming from I-80 into our neighborhoods. The proposed Parleys Interchange construction will definitely increase both the noise pollution and health hazards. Just this morning, I measured from my yard and got a reading of 69 decibels. Below are a few points I hope will resinate with the department.

- The current noise pollution coming from I-80 exceeds the current max 66db level and penetrates our yards and the walls/windows of our homes.

- The proposed construction will increase the noise pollution. This will increase the noise that penetrates into our yards and homes.

- Freeway noise pollution is linked to serious medical conditions including impaired sleep, heart failure, obesity, mental illness and others. There are plenty of studies to reference.
  - In one California study “we observed that the risk of death from any cause was increased by 4% in areas with noise level over 60 decibels when compared to quieter areas,” said study co-author Jaana Halonen. “Risk of death from ischemic heart disease was also increased by 3% in adults and 4% in the elderly in areas with daytime noise levels of 55-60 decibels, when compared to areas with noise levels under 55 decibels.”http://www.latimes.com/health/la-he-road-noise-20160109-story.htm

- UDOT appears unwilling to address the health concerns that are presented by noise pollution.

- Note: Over the years UDOT has changed/increased the acceptable max threshold of noise pollution to 66db. This is tantamount to the Division of Water Resources internally increasing the max allowable levels of certain toxins in the Utah water supply because the division didn’t desire to build the required infrastructure to reduce the toxins. This would pose a significant threat to public health. The I-80 noise pollution has been ignored in our neighborhoods for 30 years.

- At least 300 homes are affected by this noise pollution.

- We have presented in the past and currently reasonable solutions to reduce noise pollution and the associate health risks. These include an asphalt road surface and a north side sound wall.

- The sound wall that UDOT placed on the south side (and not the north side) of this section of I-80, which increased noise pollution toward the north, is a big concern.

- Our neighborhood has tried for 30 years to address this issue with UDOT.

We look forward to a hopefully cooperative and collaborative approach to this problem.

Thank you,

Jacob Munns
Comment #171
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Brian Riddle
Comments:
To Whom it May Concern,

I would like you know that I, along with my neighbors, am deeply concerned about the noise in our neighborhood from the section of I-80 bet from 27th East to 13th east. I live on the north side of I-80 and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. Please give this issue the consideration it deserves. Fixing the problem now will benefit the citizens of Salt Lake City for generations to come.

Sincerely,
Brian T. Randle

Comment #172
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Andrew Burton
Comments:
Hello, my name is Andrew Burton. I am a resident of the North Olympus Cove community in which there is discussion of alteration of the 33rd onramp and the connection from I-215 North to I-80E. I am strongly opposed to the currently suggested plans as drawn that have been offered as alternatives for this proposed change. I have signed and included my name to the attached document that is addressing our concerns about the plan as proposed.

We as a community are open to alternatives that will improve this region of the freeway system for everyone, but at this time the proposed alternatives do not appear to satisfactorily improve the region and are detrimental to the access to our homes including fire and emergency access.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Andrew Burton BS, DVM, DACVS-SA
Comment #173
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Sherry Cherrington
Comments:

To whom it may concern,
I live on 20th east between [redacted]. The noise from I 80 has become very troublesome and unpleasant in the neighborhood, especially at peak rush hour times. I would like to suggest a couple of solutions:
1) sound walls on the south side of I 80 from 1700 East to approx 2300 East
2) asphalt pavement on the same stretch of I 80

Thank you for you time and consideration on this very important issue.

Kind Regards,
Sherry Cherrington

Comment #174
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Jon Hansen
Comments:

I am absolutely opposed to the four alternatives as posted on the parleyseis.com website. While I understand there is a need to redesign the Parleys Interchange I feel it is totally unnecessary to take out Wasatch Blvd and potentially 20 homes on the east side of I-215.

Congestion on Foothill Drive is the main cause of back ups that affect I-215 on the south side of Parleys. Flex lanes, express signals and streamlining the rats nest of on and off ramps that are on the north side of the interchange are possible solutions. Also, I have been commuting from the Salt Lake Valley to Park City for over 10 years and I see absolutely no need for a 2 lane on ramp from I-215 to east bound I-80. If widening the south side of the interchange is necessary, building vertical retaining walls and shifting the design to the west are alternatives to removing streets and homes on the east side of I-215.

I know we can find better solutions to address safety and traffic flow than the ones currently presented by UDOT. Solutions that do not adversely affect the lives of families living near Wasatch Blvd.

Sincerely,
Jon Hansen
Comment #175
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Jon Hansen
Comments:
Even though the construction phase of this project is not going to start for many years the
neighborhood has been greatly harmed by the process already. Because there is a possibility that
homes may be removed in 8 to 10 years it has made them currently unsalable. People buy homes
to live in them for many years and as part of their nest egg. Who would want to buy a home that
is going to be leveled by UDOT a few years after they move in? Had I sold my home a year ago it
would have sold for close to $700,000 (my wife is a real estate broker so this is not a pie in the sky
estimate). Today, as a result of the Parleys EIS, the market value of my home is now close to $0.00.
And this is applies to the 20 or so homes along Wasatch Blvd. between Eastwood Elementary and
Warr Road.

Comment #176
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Ingrid Kelson
Comments:
As a resident and commuter in east Millcreek, I would offer several other solutions to traffic
congestion rather than a massive, and costly construction project. As such, I strongly oppose all
plans offered by udot to alleviate traffic congestion on north and south bound I215. I would strongly
encourage udot and it’s contractors to explore the solutions from the homeowners perspectives, as
well as from the pedestrians, cyclists, and others who enjoy the trails and Wasatch Blvd. I trust that
udot will hold public meetings where opinions and questions may be taken.

Comment #177
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Kevin Croft
Comments:
I fully support and endorse the comments and efforts of John Bennion on this endeavor. The noise in
our neighborhood is a MAJOR problem and makes outdoor living impossible at times without great
interference from the noise. Something MUST be done to mitigate this issue. Thank you.
Comment #178
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Michele Beck
Comments:

As a resident of a neighborhood close to the study area, I have significant concerns that’s DOT is not being more transparent about the specific impacts of the alternatives. It has come to our attention (although disturbingly the website is silent on the issue) that somebody or all of the alternatives will (or might, who knows since you aren’t telling us) result in condemnations, elimination of favored trailheads, and other potentially significant road access to certain neighborhoods. It is outrageous and contrary to good public policy that DOT is not disclosing these important impacts at this phase of the project. It also renders all of DOT’s claims of transparency false. Being only conveniently transparent is the same as being deliberately misleading. I request and demand more open communication and complete information before the DoT gets any further into the process.

Comment #179
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Barbara Hart
Comments:

To Whom It May Concern:

We live on the North side of I-80 near the Parley’s Interchange Project, and continue to be concerned about the noise issues that face this area. Many people are affected by the “noise pollution” caused by the immense traffic on I-80. We support the comments of John Bennion from August 6, 2018, and request that this issue be seriously considered. It is disturbing to think that a sound barrier was added to the opposite side of the freeway from our neighborhood, which increased the noise for the residents living on the north side of the freeway. Who would want to deal with such a constant distraction on their own property? Can’t something be done to lessen this problem, so that the residents here won’t have to continue to suffer? It’s been done for other neighborhoods; why not ours? Please, please help.

Thank you, Barbara Hart

Comment #180
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Patrice Arent
Comments:

(Sent letter written to Carlos Braceras. See Appendix E)
Comment #181
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Kevin Dwyer
Comments:
UDOT Team-

The Salt Lake Valley Trails Society represents the interests of mountain bikers in Salt Lake County. We appreciate your efforts to improve the Parleys interchange to improve efficiency and safety. According to the draft alternatives, it would appear that only Alternative C With Flyover would have impacts on bicycle access and use on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The Draft Alternatives Presentation does make mention of modifications to the trail connections and we would hope that would mean improvement as the BST is such a heavily used route.

Additionally, and for future reference, we would urge you to consider our proposal for a soft surface trail up Parleys Canyon south of I-80. While the proposed trail appears to lie outside of the UDOT ROW, interconnectivity, supporting infrastructure and traffic pattern effects from such a trail should be considered. Please see attached conceptual image for the trail.

Thank you for your good work please let me know if you have questions.

Comment #182
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Vickee Boswell
Comments:
To Those Concerned

previously emailed expressing my concerns and desire for noise mitigation on the section of I80 from 1300 East to the Parley’s Interchange. I live on the north side of the freeway and have read through the issues submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. Please know that I agree with and am equally concerned.

Your consideration is appreciated.

Vickee Boswell

Comment #183
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Bill Roland
Comments:
[See comment 108]
Comment #184
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Lisa Hazel
Comments:
[See comment 108]

Thank you.
--
Ms Lisa Hazel

Comment #185
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Terra Reilly
Comments:
(CC’d in email to public/government officials)

Dear Utah Government Officials

As a resident of [redacted] I am very concerned about the Parley’s EIS plans and feel that the options have been poorly planned. I join my neighbors in opposition to the current plans due to the concerns we have about the destruction of our neighborhood and removal of homes.

Thank you,

Terra Reilly

[See comment 120 for attached comment]
Comment #186
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Heather Whidden
Comments:
Dear UDOT,

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project, and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted to you by my neighbor, John Bennion, on August 6, 2018.

The noise issue from the highway has progressively gotten worse over the 18 years my husband and I have been homeowners in this area. I do hope you can work with our neighborhood to address this ongoing problem.

Best regards,

Heather Whidden

Comment #187
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Tom Diegel
Comments:
Hello

I stated this before in an earlier comment, but to be sure I am stating it again during this comment period….

I am supportive of the modifications of the parley’s crossing interchange, but want to make sure that the UT DOT does several important things:

Please install sound barriers on the north side of the freeway where it parallels the SLC country club. While the club and its park-like environment theoretically provides a sound buffer, since it is lower it isn’t very effective and the sound in my neighborhood is intolerably loud, which is not only annoying but also unnecessarily degrades the value of our entire neighborhood. Many sections of I-15 and I-215 have sound barrier walls, so I’m not sure why there would be any resistance to this section having sound walls as well.

If you re-pave the freeway, please use the quieter asphalt in lieu of the louder concrete as the surface. Highways and freeways around the country use asphalt very effectively, and I hope that it will be utilized here as well.

Please consider using the construction of the interchange as an opportunity to extend the Parley’s Trail up the canyon. Many freeways around the country – including the Legacy Parkway, Provo Canyon, and for many miles along Colorado’s section of I-70 – have adjacent paved bike/ped paths that are very popular, and given the investment that the community has already made in the Parley’s Trail it only makes sense to utilize the freeway corridor to link the SL valley with Summit Park. Much
of the infrastructure is already in place anyway.

Please keep the Grandeur Peak trailhead (at the SE corner of the interchange) intact. This is one of the most popular trailheads in the area, and one of the few that is perpetually dog friendly. It is not just the Olympus-area residents who use this trailhead; people come from all over the valley to use this trailhead.

I am totally fine with my tax dollars going towards infrastructure improvement; if SLC itself would spend more on its roads I would be very happy. UDOT seems to be much more effective and I’ve seen UDOT efforts around the area and the state and am generally fine with the decisions and work that is done. Please keep these 4 points in mind as you move forward.

Thanks,

Tom Diegel

Comment #188
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Brian Randle
Comments:
To Whom it May Concern,

I would like you know that I, along with my neighbors, am deeply concerned about the noise in our neighborhood from the section of I-80 bet from 27th East to 13th east. I live on the north side of I-80 and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. Please give this issue the consideration it deserves. Fixing the problem now will benefit the citizens of Salt Lake City for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Angela Randle

Comment #189
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Willow Jeppson
Comments:
I live with my family of 6 on the north side of I-80, near the Parleys Interchange Project, and although I’ve written to you about this previously, I’d like to request again urgently that you make noise reduction an integral goal in this project. I endorse completely the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018. The noise levels have risen significantly in the 23+ years we have lived in the neighborhood. The noise from the freeway has gotten extreme, especially in the mornings and especially when there’s any sort of cloud cover. I believe a sound barrier on the north side of the
freeway would make a needed, positive difference to many, many individuals.

You’re currently considering important changes and improvements — and now is the time to ameliorate this noise problem. I urge you to listen, to care, and to make this important change a part of the plan.

Respectfully,

Willow Luker Jeppson

Comment #190

Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Richard Jones
Comments:

Dear UDOT Committee Members,

I am appalled at the apparent underhanded dealings and manipulations that have thus far occurred with respect to the Parleys EIS. I don’t understand how some of you can sleep at nights. Yes, I know how funny this probably sounds but the truth appears in many different forms.

The noise issues that we face day after day and night after night does in fact cause sleepless nights for many of the residents on the North side of I-80 from about 1700 East up to the I-80/I215 interchange and you don’t hear any laughing.

After reading a copy of the August 6, 2018 letter addressed to UDOT from a Mr. John E. Bennion, Chair of the Parleys Neighborhood I-80 Noise Abatement Committee; some of my remarks above have taken on additional meaning and increased my alarm for the lack of some of our government leader’s interests and concerns for the voting and tax paying citizens living next to the area being addressed.

In reading remarks like this in my opening paragraph, I know that many times it puts people on their defensive heals and makes them upset and determined in their positions of not wanting to listen or to cooperatively work with the concerned citizens. It was a way of me voicing frustration.

I am a concerned citizen and wish to have an open, honest and fair communication path opened so that we can feel like our issues have been addressed properly. At present I don’t feel they have. The noise is a big issue.

Respectively,

Richard Jones
Comment #191
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: Becky Burbridge
Comments:

UDOT:

I am writing in regard to the noise levels in my neighborhood. I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange Project and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments submitted beckyburb@yahoo.com John Benion on August 6, 2018.

Noise levels are so loud, it is not enjoyable to use our yard and noise is constantly increasing. I live at [redacted].

Thank you,

Becky Burbidge

Comment #192
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Email
Name: David Burbridge
Comments:

UDOT:

I wholeheartedly endorse the comments sent by John Bennion on August 6.

I live on the north side of I-80 near the Parleys Interchange project. He noise levels in our neighborhood are so loud and are getting louder. We respectfully ask that you will help us improve this situation.

Thank you

David D. Burbidge

Comment #193
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Barbara Hansen
Comments:

I feel UDOT has done a poor job of coming up with alternative plans that are actually Alternatives from one another. The myopic-ness of the alternatives seems to be a subpar effort to truly evaluate the situation for the best possible total results. In which case UDOT is cheating the taxpayers by
misappropriating their money with this unilateral plan.

These plans unfairly target one neighborhood affecting not only taxpayers home that would be lost in this process but also would unfairly dramatically affect the value of all of the homes in this area.

One example of lack of foresight is. The increased risk to these home because of the limited Emergency Vehicle Access to the neighborhood because of the steep narrow streets made steeper and less accessible to large vehicles because of these plans should make all these plans totally unacceptable.

Very sincerely,

Barbara Hansen

Comment #194
Date: 8/10/2018
Source: Website
Name: Mark Gardner
Comments:
After the installation of the sound barrier on the south side of the freeway the amount of noise that know bounces back to us on the north side has increased significantly! With our bedroom on the freeway side we are having more issues sleeping and finding any peaceful times as traffic has increased 24hr a day! Please address this issue as the problem isn’t going to get better as the city continues to grow

Comment #195
Date: 8/11/2018
Source: Email
Name: Meredith Orton
Comments:
Attn: UDOT
Re: Parley’s Interchange EIS

I am a resident living on the north side of I-80 in Salt Lake City near the Parley’s Interchange Project. I am very concerned about the excessive noise from the increasing traffic on I-80. I would like to request that you address the noise issue while you are making plans for the new Parley’s Interchange.

In addition, I agree with the comments submitted by John Bennion on August 6, 2018.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,
Meredith Orton
Comment #196

Date: 8/11/2018
Source: Email
Name: Bob Palais
Comments:

To whom it may concern:

I have been a resident of the already narrow neighborhood below the permanently protected Grandeur Open Space for over 4 years, and visited it to enjoy the Shoreline trail and Grandeur Peak and Iron Curtain climbing area for nearly 30 years since I moved to Salt Lake. I have been active in the American Alpine Club as a committee chair, the Access Fund as a regional coordinator, and the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, as well as annual member of Save Our Canyons and Utah Open Lands.

When looking at the differences between the alternatives, they do not seem to impact the Grandeur base area north of 3300 S. I used to live off of Parley’s Way. The various alternatives seem reasonable to address the needs in that area.

Regarding the common aspects of the plan, those that I see that may affect the Grandeur base area north of 3300 S are these:

========

- Two lanes in both directions for all movements between I-80 and I-215
- Improves short vehicle weave distances at 3300 South and I-215

========

I cannot discern what the details of these modifications are, but have heard that they might involve removal or all or portions of Wasatch Blvd north of 3300 South.

I would discourage this approach due to the effect of limiting access, flow, and parking for the neighborhood and recreational and open space opportunities further than they already are constrained. We recently completed a long community-based process to address and mitigate these constraints.

Further reductions in space east of I-215 would make a barely manageable problem untenable.

If additional width is required, I would encourage you to shift westward, where this is considerable space, especially if the Tanner Park trail is simultaneously re-routed to the west. There is no restriction of the mountains in that direction.

If this is not feasible, I am not sure I am convinced that there is sufficient need to change anything on this portion, as there have not been any noticeable problems on that segment of freeway. The best way to accomplish the objectives below is to leave things as they are in that part of the plan.

========

- No impacts to activities and features of any parks
- Maintains all existing trail connections with minor modifications
Go West Young Freeway. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it?

Sincerely,

Dr. Bob Palais

Comment #197
Date: 8/13/2018
Source: Website
Name: Anna Orchard
Comments:
Where I-80 shifts to the south? How much closer to the homes across the fence? What is the health impact on people?

Comment #198
Date: 8/14/2018
Source: Website
Name: Mel Fullmer
Comments:
Noise Abatement: Yes, I-80 needs it.

“Engine Brakes Restricted” sign, there is currently only one...on the I-215 off ramp.

There needs to two or more of them on I-80 westbound. Just before the mouth of Parley’s. And again at mouth of the canyon. And add to the traffic update sign a mile up the canyon.

Install them now...no need to wait.
Comment #199

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 11/10/18
Name/Organization: Rosemary Olsen
Address: 
Email: 
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS:
Do not like C or C flyover.
Here to complain about the noise between 13th and 33rd. Because of the road surface rock and cement we were told it was going to absorb on your tires. We want you
to repave the rd from 13th E to 23rd.
place a sound wall on opposite site. I take
decimal everyday. Today at 3:00 it was
86 and not even during rush hour. Opened
my bathroom window and it measured
74 in my house. We can’t ever
use our backyard for
anything.
PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

[Maps and diagrams of Alternative A, B, and C]

COMMENTS:

B - is the only one that will work. A - too quick a merge from I-200 to Parley's Way. C - no way to access our neighborhood - Stringham is virtually one way & hard to turn left on Parleys Way at the intersection of 2100W (west) to 2300S (south) impossible.
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/18/18

Name/Organization: Sid Baucom

Email: [Email Address] Phone: [Phone Number]

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS:

Any improvements should include noise abatement in the north area.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS parleysEIS@utah.gov 801.743.7885
Option B Works. Also closest to simply widening/improving all existing flows. Both A and C both complicate an already complicated intersection and introduce undesirable movement elements. Handy to formulate, but A & C are both much worse than B.

Other Comments:
Preliminary Alternatives: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

Comments:

Only configuration B is acceptable. It is similar to what currently exists with simple changes that would improve traffic flow. Don't use Alternative D or E.
OTHER COMMENTS:

Please improve the road surface between I-215 & I-80 at 1300 East. The cement road is too noisy. A simple solution would be to use blacktop and to use sound walls on the north side.
Comment #203

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 

Name/Organization: 

Address: 

Email: 

Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENT:

Alternative A or B NOT C! Need access to/from Parleys Way.

My biggest concern is the noise. I live ¼ mile from the freeway and the noise is

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
completely unacceptable. I can hear trucks traveling down the freeway, in my house, with the windows closed. I hear trucks using jake brakes while I'm in my house. The noise has become worse over the years.

OTHER COMMENTS:

As sound walls have been erected on the south side of the freeway, making the noise bounce to the north. And, the surface of the freeway (I-80) between 2300 East and 1300 East adds to the noise. It is a terrible surface. When I drive down that section I can't even hear the radio in my car. PLEASE resurface the road soon and do not wait until the interchange rebuilt. Please take into account the added noise with the addition of more freeway lanes.

Alternative C is bad for people needing to go west on Parleys Way. If it becomes necessary to go to Strybing or 2100 South to head west it will be terrible for those neighborhoods. It is very difficult to turn left at the bottom of 2100 South by McDonald's even with no change.
Comment #204

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/10/2018

Name/Organization: David Olsen

Address: ____________________________

Email: _____________________________ Phone: ____________________________

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS:

Either Option C configuration poses a significant access issue to our neighborhood. I would hope that the Parley’s Way access would be maintained in any plan. Eliminating access to the residential and commercial is a problem.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
We are located on the north of I-80 and the noise levels are intolerable. The sound walls to the south redirect the sound to the north. The finishing on the road maximizes sound. The jack hammers on large trucks...

OTHER COMMENTS:

Kick in. Our neighborhood needs to be studied. The decibel levels exceed any acceptable level for the public health and welfare. The situation is critical and needs to be addressed.

We oppose option C.

The noise levels increase below 2300 east.
Comment #205

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: July 10, 2018
Name/Organization: Richard Turner
Address: 
Email: , Phone: 

Note: Alternative comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

My concern about Traffic Noise on the north side of I80 from 7800 E to 8700 E - I am concerned from attending the open house that there
is little importance being given to the issues regarding
the desirable levels currently being broadcast from
traffic. Some way this must be given a much
higher priority.
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/10/2018
Name/Organization: Claudia G. Jones
Address: 
Email: 
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

---

COMMENTS:

We need sound walls put upon the freeway from 1000 East to 1300 East. The noise in our yard is so loud we can't enjoy going out in Sun.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS parleysEIS@utah.gov 801.743.7885
Backyard and enjoy the quietness. When we open our windows at night in our bedroom, it is so loud it's really bad.
PARLEY'S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7-10-18

Name/Organization: Debra Hogan

Address: 

Email: 

Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

[Images of four alternative maps labeled A, B, C, and C']

COMMENTS:

Noise Reduction needs to be included in the plan → 17th East → Eastward.

86 dB reading in backyard at 2200 East, Parleys Terrace. = Noise Induced Hearing Loss Risk.
OTHER COMMENTS:

Plan B.

Maintain Exit west & East
on Parleys Way.

Not B or C
Comment #208

Preliminary Alternatives: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

Comments:

The noise to residents north of I-80 is really terrible, especially those closest to the freeway. If the surface was not concrete, that would reduce noise. Prefer Alternative B of those given.
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/10/18
Name/Organization: Terra Curley
Address: 
Email: curleys@gmail.com
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

![Map Diagrams]

COMMENTS:

This area is extremely noisy. Please seriously consider the noise reduction as you work on the models. Thanks for the open house.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS
parleysEIS@utah.gov
801.743.7885
Comment #210

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/19/18

Name/Organization: 

Address: 

Email: 

Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

![Alternative A](image1)

![Alternative B](image2)

![Alternative C](image3)

![Alternative D](image4)

COMMENTS:

Please address the sound wall possibilities on the north side of I-80. The sound noise is extremely loud - it has increased incrementally over the past 20 years.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: July 10th, 2018

Name/Organization

Address

Email

Phone

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS:

Comment not clearly legible but appears to be critical feedback on the project's impact on communities, suggesting a need for comprehensive and equitable solutions.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
**PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES:** Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

**COMMENTS:**

Keep Parley's Off Ramp
Please put up sound wall =
Comment #213

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 18 July 2018
Name/Organization: James Jardine
Address: 
Email: 
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

Comments:

Keep Parleys Way off-ramp
We think sound walls on the north side near residences would be helpful—change to 1700 East
Comment #214

PARLEY'S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7/10/18
Name/Organization: CHRIS NELSON
Address: 
Email: 
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS: My major concern is the noise that is generated. Our home is so bad in the freeway noise issue. We need sound walls and asphalt. Our home is currently used for a rental property and the conditions there are making it very difficult to maintain.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
Just east of 2000 East on the North side.

The noise is ridiculous and has become increasingly worse over the years rather than better.

OTHER COMMENTS:
Comment #215

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 7-10-18

Name/Organization: Allison Jacobsen

Address

Email ___________________________ Phone ______________

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMENTS: hoping for reduced noise to the north of I-80

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: 10 July 2018

Name/Organization: JACK FROST

Address: ________________________________

Email: ________________________________ Phone: ____________________

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

![Alternative A Diagram]

![Alternative B Diagram]

![Alternative C Diagram]

COMMENTS: Don't like C flyover

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
OTHER COMMENTS:

Very concerned about added noise to what already exceeds UDOT guidelines in Sugarhouse - (beyond 23rd East.)

We need help with noise.

* Slower speed
* No air brakes
  Quieter surface material
  Sound walls
* Enforce your current regs
Comment #217

PARLEY'S INTERCHANGE EIS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Date: JULY 10, 2018
Name/Organization: LORETTA FROST
Address: 
Email: 
Phone: 

Note: Alternative development comments must be submitted by August 10, 2018

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES: Please provide comments on the preliminary improvement alternatives presented or list new ideas for additional alternatives to address the Purpose and Need. Please be specific and include location.

COMMMENTS:

SUGAR HOUSE AREA NEEDS HELP WITH NOISE. WE ARE NOT IN THE CONSTRUCTION ZONE BUT TRUCKS AND CARS GO TO BEYOND THE 11TH AREA, SPEED + AIR BRAKE SEND DECIMAL LEVEL ABOVE YOUR OWN LIMITS.

udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS  parleysEIS@utah.gov  801.743.7885
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Alternative Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>7/10/2018 22:11</td>
<td>Residents of Wilshire Drive/City Drive</td>
<td>7/10/2018 22:11</td>
<td>Concerned with noise along this corridor. Primarily diesel truck noise from brakes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:06</td>
<td>Open House Comment</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:06</td>
<td>When driving northbound on I-215 residents would like an exit for 3300 South and/or at 4500 South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:13</td>
<td>Open House Comment</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:13</td>
<td>Alt C Alt C with Flyover: No access for I-80 eastbound to Parleys will force more traffic through the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:23</td>
<td>Open House Comment</td>
<td>7/10/2018 23:23</td>
<td>Alt C Alt C with Flyover: Concerns that the traffic light will cause backups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>7/11/2018 0:22</td>
<td>Dr. Floyd M. Anderson, Ed.D.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 0:22</td>
<td>Concerned about the noise. Long term resident has noticed noise has increased and neighbors have moved due to noise. It has increased three-fold since 1974. Almost unable to use yard for gatherings due to noise; inability to hear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>7/11/2018 0:30</td>
<td>Dr. Floyd M. Anderson, Ed.D.</td>
<td>7/11/2018 0:30</td>
<td>Preferred option. Would like asphalt from 1700 East to 2300 East to reduce noise and add a noise wall on the north side of I-80 to improve the quality of air.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:

- **Parleys Way Path**: Proposed as a solution to reduce noise and improve the quality of life for residents along the corridor.
- **Noise Walls**: Suggested for both north and south sides of I-80 to minimize noise impact on the community.
- **Traffic Flow**: Concern about traffic congestion due to the introduction of a new exit.
- **Accessibility**: Importance of maintaining access for both directions of I-80 to Parleys Way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Timm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Nelson</td>
<td>Tim Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Rent Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdout</td>
<td>Two Seen Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Nick Redaktion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Hagen</td>
<td>Rent Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Parleys Interchange Etz Development Phase
Parleys Interchange Etz Development Phase
Appendices

A. Milcreek Mayor Jeff Silvestrini Letter and Call-To-Action 156
B. John E. Bennion/Noise Abatement Letter 160
C. Olympus Cove Petition and Recommendations 163
D. Cycling Utah Letter 174
E. Representative Patrice Arent Letter 176
F. Alan L. Sullivan/Country Club Letter 179
G. Jon Larsen/Salt Lake City Department of Transportation Letter 182
H. Michael DeVries/Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake & Sandy Letter 187
I. Laura Briefer/Department of Public Utilities Letter 190

PARLEY’S INTERCHANGE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
I-80/I-215 Eastside
Appendix A

Millcreek Mayor Jeff Silvistrini Letter and Call-To-Action
July 19, 2018

Parleys Interchange EIS

Dear Sirs:

The Millcreek City Council has reviewed the Parley’s Interchange Environmental Impact Statement Preliminary Alternatives and has serious concerns related to the impact on the residents along Wasatch Boulevard north of 3300 South.

As presented, we understand that all alternatives other than C (Flyover) may require condemnation of properties and the removal of Wasatch Boulevard. Additionally, the Grandeur Peak trailhead and parking lot would be severely impacted.

The proposal to condemn homes and remove Wasatch Boulevard is unacceptable to Millcreek. Wasatch Boulevard is the only collector that provides year-round access to the community to the east providing the safest direct route to reach their homes, particularly in winter conditions. Another extremely important aspect is the fact that the northern section of Mt Olympus in our city is a high fire hazard area. In the event of a wildland fire in this urban interface area, a direct evacuation route for residents and access for fire equipment is of utmost importance. To suggest that the steep, narrow roadways to the east would be adequate in a fire emergency is not reasonable.

The Grandeur Peak trailhead is the connection point for three major trail systems and therefore is heavily used. Direct access to and parking for the Parleys Trail, the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, the Grandeur Peak trail system as well as the rock climbing area must be maintained. Increased neighborhood traffic caused by routing trailhead traffic through local neighborhood roads to the east would have a negative impact on the area and is not an acceptable solution. Any reduction in available parking at the trailhead and along the west side of Wasatch Boulevard would intensify a serious problem in an area where the city has already been required to institute a “resident only” parking program.

We would appreciate your consideration of these points in developing alternatives.

Very truly yours,

MILLCREEK

Jeff Silvestrini
Mayor
Call to Action from Mayor Jeff Silvesterini and MOCC Chair David Baird concerning Parleys Canyon EIS

To Millcreek:

We need you to comment by August 10th on UDOT's current plans to alter the Parleys Canyon interchange.

UDOT is currently conducting a Preliminary Alternatives analysis for the redesign of every lane of traffic in the mouth of Parley's Canyon, anticipating that in 50 years the incremental traffic will make the current design of I-215, I-80, Parleys Way and Foothill Blvd. ineffective. We've all experienced the frustrating and sometimes dangerous lane merging as we get on the northbound freeway at 3300 South, or we've had to quickly dart between semi trucks as they exit the mouth of the canyon onto I-215 Southbound, amongst about a dozen other dangerous spots as we crest up towards Foothill Blvd.

UDOT is currently evaluating four separate traffic designs to address long term traffic concerns here: udot.utah.gov/parleysEIS. We won't review every alternative design in great detail in this post, but as residents of Millcreek City, we need your help in this Call to Action expressing opposition to the UDOT plans as proposed.

The plans may severely limit or eliminate the Grandeur Peak Trailhead, along with a considerable risk that Wasatch Blvd may be severely narrowed or eliminated, plus there is a chance that homes along the northern sections of Wasatch Blvd. north of 3300 S. may be at risk.

UDOT's engineers' preliminary designs show that this freeway on ramp will need to be expanded and additional right of way will need to be acquired to build dedicated lanes into the mouth of Parley's Canyon, and similar lane structures continuing north towards Foothill Blvd and westbound I-215 in the mouth of the canyon.

Both the Mount Olympus Community Council and the Mayor have expressed formal opposition to these plans if they have severe impacts on any homeowners in the region or the Grandeur Peak Trailhead. Please note that these plans are very preliminary, with no costs or timelines for construction of any of the four alternatives yet. UDOT is legally required to assess and respond to any and all impacts created by their projects in surrounding communities.

This is where we need your help! We obviously object to any and all plans that require any of these severe neighborhood changes for homes, trailheads, and roads north of 3300 South, as this severe neighborhood impact should have been addressed prior to distributing any of the four alternatives for public comment.
So what can you do to help? Please join us in voicing formal opposition to these alternatives by reviewing the plans on the link above, then leaving a voicemail on the UDOT hotline (801) 743-7885 and sending an email to parleysEIS@utah.gov. Please voice your concern immediately as comments must be received prior to August 10, 2018. Plus, please join us at the next public meeting on this project, scheduled with the Salt Lake City Council on July 31st at 4 pm (451 S, State Street 3rd floor). There will likely be another set of meetings in the near future with the SL County Council and Millcreek City Council but the dates/times have not been finalized yet. We will post information on these meetings ASAP.

We all endure the frustrating traffic patterns in the mouth of Parley’s Canyon, but alternative designs should not be built at the expense of homes and trailheads being removed to make way for more roads. Please respond to our Call to Action and express your disapproval of these threats to the high quality of the neighborhood.

Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
MC CC Chair David Baird
Dear UDOT:

I am deeply disturbed by the direction that the Parleys Interchange Project is headed, driven by UDOT’s apparent unwillingness to address noise abatement head-on. Let me explain:

1. UDOT issued a draft EIS statement in April, soliciting public comments on the needs and purpose, indicating a “Study Area” from the Parleys Interchange to 1300 East. By May 25, UDOT received at least 136 emails (I have copies) from residents on the north side of I-80 between 1700 East and the Parleys Interchange, all urging UDOT to address the noise levels that already exceed its own 66 decibel maximum, based on many personal dB measurements taken by myself and several other residents.

2. UDOT’s reply to those emails was that noise abatement is not a “purpose and need” of the project, and that the issue will be addressed later in the process.

3. I then met with UDOT representatives, including HDR consultants involved in the sound study, and learned that the “scope” will extend only to 2300 East, not 1300 East. I learned that the “preliminary sound study” has already been performed all the way to 1300 East, but is not yet distilled into a report. And the report will not include study results beyond 2300 East. I asked for permission to see the data but was refused access to it. I received a nice explanation of the impressive analytical methodology, but my questions about dates, times, and locations of the sensors’ data gathering were not answered. I was told I could submit a GRAMA request, and was reminded that GRAMA applies to government reports, not data, and the report won’t be available until October 15, well beyond the August 15 public comment deadline. And the report won’t cover 2300 East to 1300 East anyway, because it is not in the “scope.” The project as currently envisioned will increase noise well beyond the scope area in neighborhoods that already exceed the 66 dB maximum.

4. I have carefully read UDOT’s website description of the “Level 2” screening process of the four alternatives that have survived thus far. The environmental items mentioned: “wetlands, ... other waters, ... wildlife habitat, existing and planned parks and trail systems, cultural resources, and community facilities (such as schools, senior centers, fire stations, and community gathering places).” Why is noise not included? If the answer is because it’s not in the federal environmental regulations, that is an unacceptable excuse. We need to do what right for the environment of the people, and noise is the environmental problem here. Water and wetlands and wildlife are undoubtedly considered when they are adjacent to rather than inside the “scope” – why not noise?

5. Alternative A seems to include construction (aka “scope”) down to 2100 East. So why is the sound report planning to stop at 2300 East? Should I vote for Alternative A because it will do the best job of the four alternatives in minimizing noise, assuming a sound wall is built to 2100 East? Or is Alternative A going to be rejected because it extends the scope? Or will the extension to 2100 East will be excused as a typo or eliminated to avoid extending the scope?

6. I was told by UDOT that the area from 2300 East to 1300 East will be addressed in “Phase 2”, which means at least 10 more years of excessive noise. That is unacceptable. We have been told similar things at least three times in the last 30 years. UDOT’s historical records will verify that.

7. The April 2018 draft of the Parleys Interchange Environment Impact Statement states:

“The existing pavement in the study area is a mix of asphalt and concrete. UDOT’s maintenance strategy for asphalt is to mill and overlay it periodically (every 7 to 10 years) while causing minimal impacts to traffic. UDOT has used this strategy in the study area, and the asphalt pavement remains in
good condition. Concrete pavement requires minimal routine maintenance during its lifecycle but needs major rehabilitation or replacement after 40 to 50 years. The concrete pavement on I-80 and adjacent I-215 ramps has been in service about 50 years, and UDOT has identified the need for a pavement reconstruction project between the Parley’s interchange and 1300 East by 2021.”

That statement has mysteriously disappeared from the current draft. Is that because UDOT reduced the scope to 2300 East, punting on our neighborhood for yet another 10 years?

8. When I brought up the possibility of asphalt or other noise-reducing paving, the idea was routinely dismissed as requiring too much maintenance, because its life span is only 10 years instead of 40. But there are hundreds of miles of interstate highways in Utah with asphalt paving, and Phase 2 won’t happen for at least 10 years, so why not asphalt now?

9. Our homes are in the only residential section on either side of I-80 between Parleys Canyon and downtown without a sound wall. When the noise wall on the south side was erected several years ago, our noise levels went up significantly. Where are the UDOT noise studies that led to that decision? What consideration was given to noise reflection?

10. We have heard that UDOT is not interested in our problems because our neighborhood is one of the nicest in SLC, implying that we are “too rich” and should solve our own problems. This ignores the fact that over half of the affected homes are standard middle-income homes, virtually identical to the homes directly across I-80 on the south side, where a sound wall was installed to our detriment. I invite UDOT to tour the neighborhood south of 2100 East and between 2100 East and 1700 East to more fully understand and appreciate our demographics.

Summary: We have lost our trust in the standard UDOT processes for “doing the right thing” in our neighborhood. The sound problem affects at least 300 homes, but UDOT won’t even conduct the analysis to discover the exact number of affected homes, let alone accept responsibility to mitigate the problem that is already over the max and will inevitably grow. UDOT seems focused on “checking the box” on noise rather than understanding the problem and working cooperatively to solve it.

We respectfully invite UDOT to work cooperatively with us to dive into the details of the noise problems and solutions, from the Parleys Interchange to 1700 East. (The remainder of the study area, from 1700 East to 1300 East, is Sugarhouse Park, which we do not understand because we don’t live there.) Solutions obviously exist, evidenced by hundreds of miles of interstate highways with sound walls and asphalt throughout the Wasatch Front area.

I look forward to hearing from UDOT and hopefully working cooperatively together.

Respectfully submitted,
John E. Bennion
Chair, Parleys Neighborhood I-80 Noise Abatement Committee
Appendix C

Olympus Cove Petition and Recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Home Owner Off.</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim @sionale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mclane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Halden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Stull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Greer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further note: the information on the petition is not currently available to any departmental administrators or elected officials who receive this notice related to the O'Connell Park Ball Field site. We are proceeding in accordance with the Planning process.

For any questions, please contact the City Clerk at (503) 555-1212.
OLYMPUS COVE NORTH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS

As a group, we, the undersigned, are unilaterally opposed to any alignment alternative that involves the condemnation of any property or portion of property east of I-215 in the Parley’s EIS study area.

Further we, the undersigned, are unilaterally opposed to any alignment alternative that eliminates or reduces Wasatch Blvd and/or the current access to the Grandeur Peak Trail Head.

We are providing our comments and input for consideration in the planning process.

We fully intend on being included in this Parley’s planning process and its implications. We fully intend on being vocal regarding our concerns to city leaders, trail users, recreational bikers, media, and UDOT.

- The Residents and Users of Olympus Cove North (Grandeur Peak Neighborhood)

Parley’s Interchange Comments

- The December 2017 UDOT Traffic Study Report
  - We as a group have passed this report around to our user group. The key points we noted in this report are as follows:
    - There were 0 reported accidents on the 3300 S Northbound 215 exit. Let me repeat that ZERO. Why are we suggesting investing tax payer dollars and impacting a neighborhood when there were 0 accidents???
    - The proposed thinking behind the increased investment in the 215 Northbound to I80 interchange was for truck consideration. The study discusses the need for trucks to have more room to get up to speed on I80. This is a false statement. There is a dedicated merge lane on I80 Eastbound that allows trucks and cars to regain their speed to highway speeds. Again, why are you proposing spending our tax dollars on this improvement??
    - There are many other shortfalls noted in this report including the budget associated with the 10 houses proposed to be condemned.
    - We will gladly continue to review this report and pull out its shortcomings to the media, city officials, state officials, Granite School district, hikers, bikers, and home owners.

- Eliminate congestion at 3300 S interchanges by moving traffic to other exits
  - Eliminate the I-215 NB entrance at 3300 South; this would alleviate the traffic weave associated with the merge of I-215/Foothill/I-80
    - This will allow more distance for merging activity of drivers as they will enter off 3900 S or 3800 S
  - If you eliminate the 3300 S I-215 SB exit, you will alleviate some of the stress of the convergence of the I-80/I-215 SB/Foothill/I-80 East
- This will allow more distance for merging activity of drivers as they will exit at 3900 S or 4500 S
  - It is much safer if this traffic is pushed to the exits on 3900 S or 4500 S
  - It would also help if 4500 S had a I-215 NB entrance added to flow traffic on to I-215 further south of the problem area.
  - The 3300 S I-215 SB entrance would still remain to flow traffic South

- Make the I-80 EB (Park City) entrance 2 lanes EB only
  - This is currently 2-way traffic and very dangerous in bad weather or when there is heavy truck traffic.
  - We recommend the most efficient solution which is to create 2 EB lanes going to I-80 (Park City)
  - The current WB traffic flow is what creates a tremendous amount of stress when these drivers are forced to merge onto I-215 where I-215/I-80/Foothill all merge together.
  - By eliminating this dated design, you can eliminate traffic stress and congestion.

- Eliminate the I-80/I-215 SB entrance and associate lanes
  - This design is what creates much of the traffic and accident stress that occurs in the I-80/I-215/3300 S exits.
  - We recommend the I-80/I-215 SB entrance be moved further West and create a tight loop (Clover leaf exit) similar to what is in place at the I-215/I-15 interchange in the south valley.
  - This type of tight loop not only slows fast moving traffic but it effectively merges it into the complex traffic environment of I-15.
  - We believe a similar design approach could be taken in combining the I-80/I-215 SB entrance

Keep the 33rd north on ramp

- Most plans have a divided highway (2 lanes each way) on the south side of the canyon, since bridges are already required in 2 places crossing over I-80 and crossing I-215. What if the east bound traffic into Parley's was the northernmost of those lanes? and the SB lanes out of the canyon were the lanes on the south side? This would allow for an additional weave merge distance of a possibly few hundred feet between the 33rd NB on ramp and I-215 drivers moving right to the Parley's EB ramp. Since this is currently one of the least problematic areas this extension might be enough to adjust to the projected additional need in years to come. The SB bridge out of Parley's now being a little farther south could bypass 3300 S adding to the freeway after the 3300 S SB off ramp, requiring the soonest exit to be 3900 S. out of Parley's Canyon.

- Only add ONE additional lane. The current ramp works pretty well now, adding one lane on the east side of the current freeway could be enough to accommodate projected increased need. And could, if well designed, eliminate the need to affect Wasatch Blvd at all.

- Incorporate the ramp lanes on the east side into the current freeway, perhaps a cement barrier. The extra space required in the current plan for both the open space and the additional shoulders required affects the neighborhood to the east. That intrusion might be eliminated if the lanes were together. All the plans have a large looking space between the ramp lanes on the east and the current freeway eliminate that space.

- Move the EB ramp into Parley's canyon farther north in the interchange. If the flyover plan is used, coordinate the EB onramp into the canyon to meet and run adjacent to the SB off ramp where possible.
• Perhaps a clover leaf turn where the existing clover turn is now (farther north) only this comes off I-80 and heads cars up Parley's EB (the on ramp to Parley's)

• Straighten the curve of the freeway north of the 3300 S. adding lanes on the west side which would allow the space of existing lanes on the east to be incorporated into the space needed for the suggested “added lane(s)” on the east side.

• Do not touch Wasatch Blvd North of 3300 S
  o This is a school zone
  o This is a highly sought after residential neighborhood where the average home price is upwards of $500K
  o Highway interchanges have no place in this neighborhood
  o This is a highly trafficked recreation zone for mountain bikers, hikers, and road bikers.
  o All these user groups will stand against any and all development activity that impedes on Wasatch and the existing sound barrier that is in place to protect our residential and recreation area

General COMMENT: We have all seen bad home remodels, where in the name of saving money the house looks terrible. It works at a basic level but is an eyesore in the neighborhood. UDOT has a choice to select the least expensive alternative, getting the job done but creating public discontent, possible eyesores, potential future problems having placed huge water lines underneath that would close the freeway lanes/ramps for days if they ever needed to be worked on. While cost is important, perhaps a plan that costs a little more but creates more of a legacy because of the less contentious, more beautiful and forward thinking design might be appreciated by everyone.

From Jim Cleason

These are the opinions of James Cleason; PE CE, New York State. Current resident at

If you are truly trying to improve safety and flowability of the Parley’s interchange while following the present-day guidelines of interstate and highway design, the only viable choice is Alternative C with the fly over. If A, B, or C alternative is chosen, the distances for merging distances are not met will continue in having slowdowns and the rear end collisions will only increase by the predicted increases of traffic by 2050. The proposed design of the fly over is the only alternative that will give the proper merge distances and safety that is trying to be achieved. While removing the current I 80 west to I-215 South ramp should increase the area needed to move all the designs west enough to eliminate the need and the use of eminent domain to remove all or partial pieces of property along historic Wasatch Blvd. The fly over could be used in any of the proposed designs while moving I-215 west enough to save the culture and multiple uses along Wasatch Blvd, without the local disturbances to the tax paying residence of the area. Please do not do this half-assed, please look at the flow for tomorrow not the cost of today. It this engineer’s opinion should you keep the current I 80 westbound to I-215 South ramps (Proposals A & B) UDOT will be redoing the construction again as the accidents increase with the projected flow increases.

The removal of the 3300 South bridge is unacceptable to the area neighborhoods as this is a major thoroughfare for local residence and Eastwood Elementary school. The bridge could be lengthened to accommodate additional lanes. The businesses on 3300 South
would find significant losses in sales if the quick and easy access to I 80 and I-215 were removed. This would increase area taxes to the local homeowners from the loss of sales tax and sales to local businesses. Kroger (Smith’s), REI, and McDonalds who have deep pockets to fight such aggressive measures will be notified by nearby residence of this proposal. The possibility of the closure of local businesses is great if the access is taken away unfairly by an uncaring UDOT. Now there is a 2 lane on ramp from 3300 South to I-215 NB and the I-215 to I 80 EB ramp. It is this engineer’s proposal that the right lane be used as a fly over of the I-215 to I 80 EB ramp to I-215 North that could help eliminate aggressive merging that occurs today, increasing safety and flowability. With the rebuild of the water tanks complete on the west side of I-215 and to the north of 3300 South the tank closest to 3300 South has been moved more North. This generates more room for the off ramp from I-215 South to 3300 South to be moved west giving more visual for the drivers turning left onto 3300 South increasing safety.

It is this engineer’s belief that not all alternatives have been looked at. Why is that only the east side of I-215 is only being considered for the expansion. There are alternatives that move things west a little bit that limit exposure to all local residences. It’s not all about money!!! If you’re really truly trying to increase safety and flowability do it correctly the first time and not have multiple reconstructions wasting time and money.
Appendix D

Cycling Utah Letter
Dear UDOT,
The Parley’s Canyon Interchange EIS and potential construction needs to take into account the needs for transportation, recreation, and mountain cyclists. The area is a key crossing point for the Parley’s Trail, the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, the potential Parley’s Canyon Trail (to the east), and E-W cycling traffic to the north of I-80.

1. All existing bike connections should be maintained through the network of Parley’s Canyon Trail, Foothill Drive, Wasatch Boulevard, and the bridges over the freeways.

2. In particular, bike lanes on Wasatch Blvd need to be maintained. They connect Parley’s Trail with the south and east parts of the valley and are critical transportation and recreation facilities. Narrowing Wasatch Blvd to accommodate the new construction is not acceptable if this leads to cyclists being unable to use this corridor. Forcing cyclists into the neighborhoods to the east is not acceptable.
   a. If Wasatch Blvd is moved, please add a protected bike facility or paved bike trail alongside Wasatch to 3300 S.

3. Use the project as an opportunity to add more and better bike connections in the area. Particularly:
   a. Add a connection from Parley’s Way to cross Foothill Boulevard. Parley’s Way should have a bike lane installed by Salt Lake City.
   b. Pave a connecting trail from the mouth of Parley’s Canyon to the end of the study area (and eventually to Mountain Dell, and the summit of Parley’s Canyon.)
   c. Work with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Committee, Salt Lake City, and Millcreek City to improve the BST in this area, and connections to it.
   d. Fix the ‘sidewalk’ bike path just to the north of the interchange on Foothill Blvd. This needs to be improved as part of this project.

4. Please add more details as to what is being considered, especially on Wasatch Blvd. It’s pretty difficult to comment on nebulous plans.

5. Please consider transit as a viable alternative to not undertaking this project. Combine this with improved active transportation alternatives.

6. Since this is an Environmental Impact Study, please consider the impact of inducing demand for more cars to drive, rather than looking for better alternatives.

Sincerely,
Dave Iltis
Cycling Utah
August 10, 2018

Carlos Braceras  
Executive Director, Utah Department of Transportation  
4501 South 2700 West  
P.O. Box 141265  
Taylorsville, Utah 84114-1265

Dear Mr. Braceras:

I am a member of the Utah House of Representatives for District 36, which includes the Wasatch Boulevard (south of I-80) and 3300 South. I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Parley’s Interchange Environmental Impact Statement Preliminary Alternatives, which may seriously impact many residents and businesses in this area. I appreciate your department’s work on the preliminary analysis, but respectfully request a much more thorough review of the impacts of the various options, including those not yet considered, be completed before any final decision is made.

There are a variety of legitimate concerns that have been raised by my constituents. You have received their thoughtful letters, email, and petitions. I request that you pay special attention to the suggestions by Mr. James Cleason, who has professional expertise in this area. You have also received opposition from Millcreek City, that has highlighted many critical issues. Because of the importance of the analysis of my constituents, including Mr. Cleason, and Millcreek City, I have repeated some of their concerns below.

It is my understanding that all alternatives, other than “Alternative C with fly over,” require condemnation of properties and the removal of Wasatch Boulevard north of 3300 South. While there may be a long-term need to redesign the Parleys Interchange, it is not necessary to remove portions of Wasatch Boulevard and several homes on the east side of I-215. This would not only have an impact on the homes condemned for this project, but also on the quality of living, safety, and value of other homes remaining in this neighborhood.

An extremely important concern is that the northern section of Mount Olympus is a high fire hazard area. Wasatch Boulevard is the only collector that provides year-round access to the community east of I-215 and provides the safest direct route to reach homes, particularly in winter conditions. It is important that this access be maintained. In the event of a wildfire in this urban interface area, a direct evacuation route for residents and access for fire equipment is of utmost importance. The need to maintain Wasatch Boulevard is critical in this situation. The steep, narrow roadways to the east would not be adequate. I would ask that you consult with the State Fire Marshall and the United Fire Authority on this issue.
Wasatch Boulevard is a route many schoolchildren use to get to and from Eastwood Elementary. Putting the freeway and retaining walls in this path could be dangerous to young children. I request that you consult with Granite School District and Eastwood Elementary on this important safety issue.

The Grandeur Peak trailhead is heavily used by many people throughout the Wasatch Front because it is the connection point for three major trail systems - Parleys Trail, Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and Grandeur Peak trail system, as well as the rock climbing area. It is important to maintain direct access and parking. Increased neighborhood traffic caused by rerouting trailhead traffic through local roads to the east would have a negative impact on the area. Any reduction in available parking at the trailhead and nearby streets would intensify a serious problem in an area where Millcreek City has already instituted a “resident only” parking program.

As you complete a more in-depth analysis, I request that you also review the congestion on Foothill Drive, which is often a major cause of the back-ups impacting I-215 south of Parleys. Flex lanes, express signals, and streamlining the ramps on the north side of the interchange are possible solutions to consider. Also, building vertical retaining walls, reduction in the size of median strips, and shifting the design are alternative that should be reviewed.

Many water lines operated by Salt Lake City Public Utilities and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake & Sandy (MWDSLS) could be impacted by the proposals. As you know, their input is critical in analyzing the various alternatives.

Another concern is the impact on businesses located on 3300 South directly west of I-215. These businesses could experience a significant reduction in customers if the current easy access to I-215 and I-80 is removed. These businesses should also be consulted in your planning process.

I appreciate your consideration of the concerns raised by Millcreek City and my constituents, and ask that you do a more in-depth analysis to develop additional alternatives. I appreciate that your department has indicated it will coordinate with Millcreek City, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, MWDSLS, community councils, and local property owners. I suggest that you also coordinate with the State Fire Marshall, United Fire Authority, Granite School District, Eastwood School, and local businesses on these proposals. I would also request that you inform me of community meetings on this critical issue.

Please feel free to contact me if there is any information that I can provide.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Representative Patrice Arent
Utah House District 36
August 10, 2018

Vincent Izzo
David Nazur
Tammy Champo
HDR, Inc.
2825 East Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 200
Salt Lake City, UT  84121-7077

Re: Parley’s Interchange Environmental Impact

Dear Vincent, David, and Tammy:

I write in my capacity as President of the Country Club of Salt Lake, whose golf course and maintenance facilities abut the southernmost edge of the westbound on-ramp to I-80 from the Parley’s Interchange. A group of us from the Country Club met with you onsite on July 25, to discuss alternatives now under consideration for the realignment of that on-ramp. You provided us with detailed drawings for Alternative A and Alternative B. You also provided us with a less detailed sketch of Alternative C. You requested our comments on Alternatives A and B in connection with your preparation of an environmental impact statement for the reconstruction of the interchange.

We appreciate your time in visiting the Country Club to visualize the proximity of the on-ramp to the Country Club’s property. After carefully reviewing the plans you sent to us, we have two comments for your consideration. We ask that you share our comments with responsible officials of the Utah Department of Transportation.

Safety

We are concerned that your Alternative A would move the on-ramp to an alignment that would be dangerously close to a part of the Country Club property that is used by members, guests, and staff on a continuous basis. As shown on page 2 of Alternative A, the new alignment would be within a couple of feet of the Country Club property line in the vicinity of our Hole No. 18 tee boxes and our maintenance buildings and greenhouses. This portion of the Country Club’s property is a high-traffic area for golfers and our maintenance staff. The relocation of the very steep slope to a point even closer to the Country Club property would, in our view, increase the risk of serious accident to users of the Country Club property.
As you are aware, vehicles have, in the past, veered off the ramp and slid down the existing slope onto Country Club property. If the on-ramp’s alignment is moved even closer to this heavily used area of the Club – as Alternative A contemplates – the risk of injury would merely increase. So, we urge you to consider carefully those risks. For reasons of safety, we ask you and UDOT to reject (1) Alternative A and (2) any plan to move the freeway closer to Country Club property.

**Noise**

The noise of I-80 traffic is already a serious problem along the entire southern boundary of the County Club property. The relocation of the on-ramp or I-80 closer to the Country Club would make the noise pollution even worse. We ask you and the UDOT to seriously evaluate the need for a system of sound walls along the freeway for at least the length of the Country Club property, from Parley’s Way to approximately 1500 East.

We understand that the Country Club’s residential neighbors have repeatedly made this request in the past, and we ask you reconsider this issue now, regardless of the reconfiguration of the Parley’s Interchange. The noise of traffic on I-80 along the Country Club property line is intolerable not only to those who use the Club’s facilities and work on the property, but to hundreds of our neighbors. As usage of I-80 increases, the noise will only increase—unless measures are taken now to abate the problem.

To put the Country Club’s position in perspective, you should know that the Club moved to its current location in 1921. In the 1960’s, the Club lost about 75 acres of its property to the State for the construction of I-80. Since then, the Club has done its best to deal with the consequences of having a major interstate highway in such close proximity. We ask you to seriously consider our concerns so that those consequences do not become even more dangerous or disruptive to our members, guests, staff and neighbors.

Thanks for listening to our concerns. If you have questions about our position, you’re welcome to call me anytime at [blank].

Very truly yours,

Alan L. Sullivan

ALS:sjm
cc: Rebecka Stromness, Utah Department of Transportation
Appendix G

Jon Larsen/Salt Lake City Department of Transportation Letter
August 9, 2018

Ms. Naomi Kisen
Environmental Program Manager
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West Box 148450
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-8450

Subject: Comments to the Parley’s Interchange EIS Alternatives

Dear Ms. Kisen:

This letter transmits comments from Salt Lake City Transportation Division in response to the Parley’s Interchange EIS Preliminary Alternative Development. We appreciate the opportunity to serve as a Participating Agency in the Parley’s Interchange EIS process.

The Salt Lake City Transportation Division has a variety of interests in the development and outcomes of the Parley’s Interchange EIS. A number of regional and local transportation plans have proposed changes to the function of both Foothill Drive and Parley’s Way to expand transportation choices, enhance safety, and improve active transportation connections. In particular the City has worked in earnest with our residents and multiple agency partners, including UDOT, UTA, WFRC, Salt Lake County, and the University of Utah, to build consensus around a long term vision for the Foothill Drive corridor from Parley’s Interchange to the University of Utah campus described in the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy. The City has also developed a long term vision for the Parley’s Way corridor from the Parley’s Interchange to 2300 East, described in the Parley’s Way Corridor Plan. The City has also been a partner in the development of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and the Parley’s Trail, in collaboration with Salt Lake County, the Parley’s Rails, Trails, and Tunnels (PRATT) Coalition, Utah Transit Authority, and South Salt Lake. Beyond the specific comments related to these various plans, the content included in this correspondence reflects the City’s broader transportation goals for improved safety, efficiency, equity, resilience, innovation, and sustainability.

Comments to All Alternatives

The City’s established vision for both Foothill Drive and Parley’s Way includes a diversification of infrastructure in order to support comfortable walking, biking, and transit use along the entirety of both corridors. Furthermore, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adopted by WFRC specifically identifies Bus Rapid Transit (or Enhanced Bus) for the entirety of Foothill Drive to continue south along the I-215 corridor to 3900 South. While the initial correspondence produced in support of the Parley’s Interchange EIS suggested that an alternative would be developed in support of “Alternate travel modes” including transit and active transportation,
none of the alternatives that have been developed thus far appear to adequately reflect an intentional focus on modes other than travel in private automobiles and freight transport. The City requests that once a preferred alternative has been selected for upgrading the interchange and the broader roadway network that the UDOT team then produces a modified alternative to best incorporate access to and operation of other modes of transportation. Following are some specific comments and requests organized under various transportation modes.

**For High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV):**

The recommendations of the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy included the addition of one lane in each direction on Foothill Drive from Parley’s Interchange to the existing six/seven lane cross section south Foothill Village at approximately 1400 South. The inclusion of these additional lanes in the implementation strategy was contingent on their use being restricted to HOVs (e.g., transit, carpool, taxi, TNCs) and right turns only. The city requests that all of the alternatives included in the EIS reflect this designation in the outside lanes within Salt Lake City and that at least one of the alternatives reflect how the HOV lanes could continue through the interchange so that buses and HOVs might be able to avoid heavy congestion in general purpose lanes in the likelihood of future LOS E or F traffic conditions.

**For Transit:**

Various adopted transportation plans, including the Unified Transportation Plan, the RTP and the City’s Transit Master Plan recommend Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Enhanced Bus to operate on Foothill Drive and south along I-215 to 3900 South. In addition to those plans, the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy includes a long term consideration for the possibility of center running BRT. The City requests that all alternatives included in the EIS reflect the following, as appropriate:

- A center and/or side running BRT/Enhanced Bus station located between Stringham Ave./Thunderbird Dr. and Parley’s Interchange.
- A grade separated crossing below and/or above Foothill between Stringham Ave./Thunderbird Dr. and Parley’s Interchange to serve a future BRT/Enhanced Bus station.
- Lanes and/or ramps that would facilitate efficient and safe bus turnaround on Foothill Drive between a future Stringham Ave./Thunderbird Dr. station and Parley’s Interchange.
- Lanes and/or ramps that would facilitate safe and efficient two way connections and turnarounds between Parley’s Way and Foothill Drive.

**For Active Transportation:**

In addition to the network of existing trails surrounding Parley’s Interchange, the City’s adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan recommends the addition of several more trail connections. To that end the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy includes both a recommendation for 10-foot unobstructed multi-use paths on both the east and west sides of the corridor and seamless
connections to both Parley’s Way and the existing Bonneville Shoreline Trail and Parley’s Trail facilities. As the UDOT team continues to refine the EIS alternatives, the City requests that it consider the following design, connectivity, and construction considerations for the trail network designs for each alternative.

- Design requests for existing or future connections:
  - Minimize elevation loss / gain. Consider routes directly adjacent to the freeway if this will facilitate flatter routes.
  - Minimize out of direction travel
  - Where possible, provide lateral separation from the freeway; where not possible, prefer corridors lower than the freeway are preferred for a quieter experience.
  - Preserve or enhance vegetated buffers where possible, particularly where freeways are being relocated away from the trail.
  - Avoid sharp curves and corners, particularly on steeper grades.
  - Avoid interaction with traffic on/off freeway ramps. This traffic is often moving faster than traffic on surface streets and not expecting to see people walking or biking
  - Where freeway on/off ramps do intersect with surface streets, avoid slip lanes and free-flowing traffic. Use turning radii appropriate for slower traffic and an urban setting.
  - Consider incorporating space for a separated path on any of the bridge structures or underpasses that are required for the general interchange infrastructure or surrounding road network.

- Key areas for connectivity:
  - Use this as an opportunity to create additional connectivity; go beyond replacing existing connections.
  - Over Parley’s Creek, turn the freeway into a bridge instead of an overpass. Daylight the creek and connect the open space inside the triangle into the Parley’s Historic Nature Park. This eliminates “the tube” with a positive impact project.
  - New connections would ideally include:
    - Facilitate a connection from the paved trail at the Parley’s Way exit, east side, to the new open space and anticipated mountain bike/ hiking trails. The existing, currently-named Bonneville Shoreline Trail, part of a primarily mountain bike trail network, is likely to become part of the Foothill Drive Trail. A future adjacent and natural surface trail will be named the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.
    - Build the Foothill Drive trail to the recommended dimensions and conceptual design included in the Foothill Drive Implementation Strategy. Include any additional ROW needed for the Foothill Drive project south of Stringham Ave. / Thunderbird Dr. in this EIS and design.
    - Facilitate a connection between the hiking trails at the lower elevation of Parley’s Historic Nature Park and the rebuilt Parley’s Trail. There is a considerable slope there; evaluate whether this connection be made or facilitated. This would be a natural surface trail connecting to the paved Parley’s Trail.
Consider an overpass or underpass connecting the neighborhood east of I-215 and the neighborhood west of I-215 (approximately 3020 South) between these two dead end roads.

Consider an overpass or underpass between the neighborhood south of I-80 and the Salt Lake Country Club area (approximately 2700 East).

Include a parallel paved Parley’s Trail extension up Parley’s Canyon as far as the project extents, possibly on the benches on the north side of the canyon (extension of the future-named “Foothill Drive Trail”). Interim connectivity can be via mountain bike trails, but eventually a paved trail would continue further east to Mountain Dell, if Parley’s Canyon constraints permit.

- The City also requests that construction impacts on existing trail connections be evaluated and mitigated so that all active transportation access is reasonably maintained during all phases of construction. This could include rapid construction sequencing or temporary structures. Active transportation users often have no practical alternative particularly in this area.

In addition, a marked up plan of Alternative A is attached for reference to some possible trail and transit connections described above, some of which could also be applied to other alternatives.

Salt Lake City believes this input provides useful information regarding the Preliminary Alternative Development and evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the Parley’s Interchange EIS. Thank you for your consideration of Salt Lake City’s comments on the proposed alternatives. Again, we appreciate the opportunity, look forward to continuing to serve as a Participating Agency, and hope to enhance this process through our participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or would like to discuss these requests further.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Larsen
Director, Salt Lake City Transportation Division

Attachment

Cc: Kevin Kilpatrick, HDR
    Laura Briefer, Salt Lake City
    Carly Castle, Salt Lake City
    Becka Roolf, Salt Lake City
    Patrick Nelson, Salt Lake City
    Lewis Kogan, Salt Lake City
Appendix H

Michael DeVries/Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake & Sandy Letter
August 8, 2018

Ms. Naomi Kisen
Environmental Program Manager
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West Box 148450
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-8450
nkisen@utah.gov

Subject: Comments to the Parley’s Interchange EIS Preliminary Alternative Development

Dear Ms. Kisen:

This letter transmits comments from Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake & Sandy (MWDSLS) in response to the Preliminary Alternative Development. MWDSLS appreciates the opportunity provide comment.

Legal Jurisdiction

MWDSLS has regulatory jurisdiction related to its significant water infrastructure under Utah Code Ann. Title 17B, Chapter 2a, Part 6 Metropolitan Water District Act. Specific MWDSLS infrastructure near and adjacent to the study area includes the Terminal Reservoir (TR) complex with its associated 48 million-gallons of concrete storage reservoirs, pipelines, valves and chemical feed facilities and the Salt Lake Aqueduct (SLA).

General Comments

MWDSLS has considered the four (4) preliminary alternatives, referred to as Alternatives A, B, C, and C-Flyover. In general, the following comments apply:

1. Alternative C-Flyover appears to have little to no conflict with MWDSLS infrastructure and poses the least potential to interruption or disruption of water service to Salt Lake City, either during or after construction.
2. Alternatives A, B, and C each propose the same impact to MWDSLS in that the southbound off-ramp to 3300 South encroaches onto MWDSLS lands and associated facilities. These alternatives should give consideration to not having major infrastructure, namely large diameter aqueducts, within or under any travel surfaces. Any transportation improvements, roads, abutments, walls, etc. shall be designed and constructed such that a 10-foot minimum clear space distance remains from the improvement and water infrastructure. Relocation of existing aqueducts should only be considered if adequate space remains for its future operation, maintenance, repair and/or replacement.
Thank you for your consideration of MWDSLS’s comments on the Preliminary Alternatives. We appreciate the opportunity to serve as a Participating Agency, and hope to enhance this process through our participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael J. DeVries
MWDSLS General Manager
August 08, 2018

Ms. Naomi Kisen
Environmental Program Manager
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West Box 148450
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-8450
nkisen@utah.gov

Subject: Comments to the Parley’s Interchange EIS Alternatives Development

Dear Ms. Kisen:

This letter transmits comments from Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities (Salt Lake City) in response to the Parley’s Interchange EIS Alternatives Development. Salt Lake City appreciates the opportunity to serve as a Cooperating Agency in the Parley’s Interchange EIS.

Salt Lake City is a Public Water Supplier as defined by state and federal laws. Our water service area encompasses the area of Salt Lake City and numerous cities along the east bench of Salt Lake County, including Mill Creek, Cottonwood Heights, Holladay, and others. Currently Salt Lake City serves about 340,000 people. Our water supply plans use statewide population projections for growth in the area, adding an additional 150,000 people over the next 40-60 years. Salt Lake City owns and operates significant water infrastructure within the EIS Study Area, as well as infrastructure that may be significantly impacted by project-area construction, transportation improvements, and ongoing road maintenance and operations. Salt Lake City provided HDR with GIS data detailing our infrastructure in the EIS Study Area on July 17, 2018. We also sent GIS data containing real property owned by Salt Lake City Public Utilities and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy in the EIS Study Area to HDR on August 7, 2018. Additionally, Salt Lake City requests a meeting and field visit with UDOT and HDR’s project team in order to identify this infrastructure and property.

Damage to or impairment of Salt Lake City’s water infrastructure in the EIS Study Area would result in grave consequences for the reliability of water delivery in Salt Lake City’s service area, which could present a significant hazard to public health and the quality of life in the Salt Lake Valley. Salt Lake City requests UDOT enter into a separate project agreement with the City to mitigate the impacts that the Parley’s Interchange EIS transportation improvements will have on Salt Lake City’s water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure. This agreement will need to, amongst other things: (1) outline the timing of construction projects to maintain continuity of service and the timing of construction projects; (2) specify the responsibilities of each party; (3) dictate standards, terms, and conditions pertaining to any and all construction, rebuilds, and relocations impacting Salt Lake City’s watershed, culinary water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure; and (4) create a permanent record, such as an easement, of the location of State
and Salt Lake City facilities to implement written understanding of rights and responsibilities pertaining to operation, maintenance, and future replacement or expansion of facilities.

**Comments to All Alternatives**

Any additional infrastructure and construction in each alternative will impact Parley’s Creek and Salt Lake City’s water distribution and stormwater systems. In general, the following comments apply to all alternatives:

1. Where a proposed alternative (or operations associated with that alternative) may affect water resources or water infrastructure, the alternatives must be capable of incorporating appropriate plans for costs, mitigation, monitoring, assessment, and reporting those effects. Salt Lake City recommends that the EIS analysis rely on the protocols, metrics, and targets already included in programs and policies of the local, state and federal authorities, so that the interested public has a consistent frame of reference for understanding the water infrastructure discussion.

2. Salt Lake City recommends that the Alternatives Analysis recognize the full costs of understanding, accommodating, and mitigating impacts to water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure inside in the EIS Study Area.

3. We recommend that the alternative screening process and methodologies consider not just direct impacts within the EIS Study Area, but also the cumulative, indirect, and connected impacts to the natural and built environment outside of the EIS Study Area, as impacts to Salt Lake City’s infrastructure and natural resources may be significant both up and downstream from the Study Area.

4. Each alternative is adjacent to, parallel to, and repeatedly crosses significant drinking water infrastructure. These facilities are critical to water storage and distribution in Salt Lake City’s service area. The water pipelines cannot withstand any additional fill, and the casings for these pipelines will need to be reinforced if new fill or infrastructure is added. For example, the Parley’s pipeline convey water from Parley’s Treatment Plant to the Salt Lake Valley was installed at or near the original ground surface in 1958 before I-80 or I-215 were installed. As a result, the pipes are covered by up to 40 feet of fill.

5. Salt Lake City recommends that analysis of impacts to the built environment include not just canals and pipelines, but any pumps, valves, lift stations, reservoirs, and sewer and stormwater infrastructure that may be impacted in the EIS Study Area. Notable property infrastructure potentially impacted by this EIS process includes, but is not limited to:
   - Parley’s Water Treatment Plant, Little Dell Reservoir, and Mountain Dell Reservoir: This infrastructure is adjacent and in close proximity to the EIS Study Area. The alternatives should not compromise delivery of finished water from the City’s reservoirs and treatment plant to Salt Lake City’s distribution system and its service area.
   - The Terminal and Park Reservoirs and associated facilities and real property.
   - Several large diameter water transmission lines run in and through the Parley’s Interchange EIS project area:
     - The Big Cottonwood Conduit, a 48-inch pipeline that runs the length of I-215 in the project area. The Conduit parallels I-215 South on the west side, crosses both I-215 and I-80 and continues to the University of Utah along Foothill Drive.

Page 2 of 5
Parley’s Highline to the Park Reservoir: a 16-inch ductile high pressure line.
Parley’s Canyon Conduit: 30-inch bar-wrapped concrete pipe.
A 20-inch diameter steel pipe installed in 1964.
A 6-inch cast-iron pipe installed in 1951.
The Terminal and Park Reservoirs, and associated support infrastructure serving the reservoirs.
The Parley’s Exchange: An area where Salt Lake City has three major supply conduits coming together that service a major portion of Salt Lake City. This gives Salt Lake City flexibility and redundancy in case of loss of a source of supply.

- Stormwater infrastructure: New impervious area, generated from additional or widened roadway sections will have an impact on the storm drain system, Salt Lake County’s flood control operations, and Parley’s Creek. Potential additional runoff from construction and additional road surface area should be analyzed with respect to existing stormwater infrastructure capacity. The stormwater system downstream from the study area may also need to be analyzed should alternatives cause additional runoff or discharge. In addition, stormwater quality must be evaluated to minimize the downstream water quality impacts. The existing stormwater drainage system—whether owned by Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, or UDOT—west of Foothill and North of I-80 is at or above capacity in several locations.

6. Interstate drainage must be designed and maintained so as not to damage other infrastructure.
7. Relocation of Salt Lake City’s infrastructure should only be considered if adequate space remains for future construction, access, operation, maintenance, repair, and/or replacement. Additionally, any relocation, modification, alteration, construction, or improvements to Salt Lake City Public Utilities’ infrastructure will require extensive coordination and sequencing in a project agreement between UDOT and Salt Lake City to ensure that, among other things: (1) water service is not interrupted; (2) the distribution system is capable of accommodating the adjustments; and (3) these transportation projects do not interfere with or undermine Salt Lake City Public Utilities’ CIP and maintenance schedules or priorities.

8. Any transportation improvements (roads, abutments, walls, etc.) must be designed and constructed such that a 10-foot minimum clear space distance remains from improvement and water infrastructure. Depth to the water infrastructure must also be considered when placing improvements, as deeper infrastructure will require larger clear space distances. Relocation of existing infrastructure should only be considered if adequate space remains for future access, operation, maintenance, repair, and/or replacement or if depths of bury will exceed the rating of the pipe. Bedding conditions are unknown.

9. The Alternatives Analysis must evaluate as an impact all potential pipeline, conduit, or other water infrastructure relocations, modifications, or diversions that occur due to construction. The Alternatives Analysis should be performed for both the construction phase of the project, as well as the long-term operation and maintenance of the transportation projects.
10. Any transportation solutions involving fill around Suicide Rock must preserve Salt Lake City Public Utilities’ access to its water infrastructure in the area.

11. Salt Lake City recommends that the alternatives’ impacts to natural resources not be limited to “wetlands and other waters of the United States,” but include all water and stormwater resources in the EIS Study Area. The EIS should identify all the waterbodies likely to be directly and indirectly impacted by the Project, describe the nature of the potential impacts, and the specific discharges and pollutants likely to impact those waters. Specifically:

- **Watershed:** Protection of the Parley’s Creek Watershed must be a priority when evaluating, designing and implementing road projects. Currently, Parley’s Creek from 1300 East to Mountain Dell Reservoir (AU UT16020204-025_00) is on the EPA list of Impaired and Threatened Waters per § 303(d) of the CWA for *E.coli* and OE Bioassessment impairments. In addition, monitoring demonstrates that Parley’s Creek has increased levels of conductivity/salinity in areas that has increased road salting along the I-80 corridor (SLCo Watershed, 2016). Therefore, we recommend significant setbacks, protection of vegetation, appropriate siting, and minimal disturbance of hillsides.

- **Stormwater:** We ask that UDOT comply with the requirements and recommendations of the Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (UPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Permit (No. UTIS 000003), which is mandated by § 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) to control pollutants in waters of the U.S., including stormwater. We recommend appropriate BMPs, both during and after construction, are implemented to address stormwater impacts to the watershed and water quality. Additionally, ensure there is a funding source for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of BMPs.

- **Nonpoint Source Pollution:** We encourage UDOT to incorporate BMPs to minimize nonpoint source pollution into the Parley’s Creek Watershed. The Environmental Protection Agency defines “nonpoint source” to mean any source of water pollution that does not meet the legal definition of “point source” in § 502(14) of the CWA. The steep topography of Parley’s Creek Watershed must be considered when evaluating feasibility of transportation projects, and then when designing and implementing those projects. We recommend significant setbacks, protection of vegetation, appropriate siting, and minimal disturbance of hillsides to mitigate impacts of nonpoint source pollutants. For guidance and information on mitigation of nonpoint source pollution, we recommend you reference the Utah Non-Point Source Management Plan, which is a requirement of § 319 of the CWA. Additionally, ensure there is a funding source for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of BMPs.

12. Each alternative must ensure that ground disturbance is limited and incorporates stormwater best management practices (BMPs). Also, ensure restoration of disturbed lands is conducted to avoid sedimentation, invasive species introduction, and overall watershed degradation.

13. We recommend including Salt Lake County Flood Control and Watershed Division, if they are not already engaged, given their jurisdictions related to flood control within Parley’s Creek and under Clean Water Act Section 208.

14. We suggest incorporating green infrastructure (GI) and post-construction stormwater BMPs where feasible. Furthermore, ensure there are long-term monitoring and maintenance plans for installed GI and stormwater BMPs to ensure they continue to function and provide associated benefits.
15. Ensure appropriate permits are identified and obtained from the State Engineer's Office, Salt Lake County Health Department, Salt Lake County Planning and Development Services, and Salt Lake City.

Comments on Alternatives A, B, and C

These Alternatives each produce the largest impact to Salt Lake City's water infrastructure, as the proposed off-ramp to 3300 South encroaches on Salt Lake City lands and facilities serving the Terminal and Park Reservoirs (including the Big Cottonwood Conduit). The Terminal and Park Reservoirs and associated facilities and pipelines are critically important to Salt Lake City's distribution system because they convey finished water from Metro's Little Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant, and Salt Lake City's Big Cottonwood Treatment Plant to Millcreek and Salt Lake City. Moving or modifying infrastructure such as the Big Cottonwood Conduit would present enormous risk to Salt Lake City, and would be extremely difficult to do. Any construction, modification, alteration, etc. impacting these facilities will need to be the subject of the Project Agreement Salt Lake City wishes to enter into with UDOT, mentioned above.

Comments on Alternative C with the Flyover

This alternative appears to have the relative smallest impact to Salt Lake City Public Utilities' infrastructure and disturbance or disruption of Salt Lake City's water service, as the water distribution lines and associated facilities adjacent to the Terminal and Park Reservoirs and Big Cottonwood Conduit would not need to be moved or reinforced.

Salt Lake City hopes this input provides useful information regarding the Preliminary Alternative Development and evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the Parley's Interchange EIS. Thank you for your consideration of Salt Lake City's comments on the proposed alternatives. We appreciate the opportunity to serve as a Cooperating Agency, and hope to enhance this process through our participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Laura Briefer
Director

cc: Kevin Kilpatrick, HDR
    Marian Rice, Salt Lake City
    Jesse Stewart, Salt Lake City
    Jason Brown, Salt Lake City
    Carley Castle, Salt Lake City
    Cris Jones, Salt Lake City, Transportation Division
    Jonathan Larsen, Salt Lake City, Transportation Division
    Mike DeVries, Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy