Parley’s Interchange EIS

Alternative Screening Update

May 2019
MEETING PURPOSE

- Review and Discuss
  - Project Overview and Summary
  - Alternatives Screening Process
  - Initial Results of the Draft EIS
  - Schedule
WHY IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED

- Interchange does not meet current design standards
- Accident rate exceeds State averages
- Traffic congestion during the AM and PM commute periods
- Morning commute traffic backs onto mainline I-80 and I-215 causing unsafe conditions
- Many weave movements do not meet design standards

---

Safety
Parley’s Interchange has not had a capacity or major safety upgrade since its completion in the mid-1960s. Parts of the interchange have accident rates above the state average for similar facilities.

Traffic Flow
Parley’s Interchange is congested during the morning and evening peak commutes, with traffic backing up onto the interstate travel lanes.

Regional Mobility
Travel delay through the interchange has reduced regional mobility for passenger and freight traffic that use this critical local and national link of the interstate system.

Updated Design
Parley’s Interchange does not meet current design and safety standards.
HOW CONGESTED?

2050 AM LOS
- LOS A-C
- LOS D
- LOS E

0 .25 5 miles

2050 PM LOS
- LOS A-C
- LOS D
- LOS E

0 .25 5 miles

UDOT’S GOAL IS LOS D OR BETTER

LEVEL OF SERVICE

FLOW CONDITIONS

FREE FLOW
Low volumes and no delays.
LOS A

STABLE FLOW
Speeds restricted by travel conditions, minor delays.
LOS B

STABLE FLOW
Speeds and maneuverability closely controlled because of higher volumes.
LOS C

STABLE FLOW
Speeds considerably affected by change in operation conditions: high density traffic restricts maneuverability; volume near capacity.
LOS D

UNSTABLE FLOW
Low speeds; considerable delay; volume at or slightly over capacity.
LOS E

FORCED FLOW
Very low speeds; volumes exceed capacity; long delays with stop-and-go traffic.
LOS F
SAFETY NEEDS

Safety Hotspots
Areas with higher than average crash rates*
*Accidents between 2010 and 2015

Priority Areas
Areas with inadequate capacity, congestion, slow speed traffic merging with higher speed traffic, and weaving movements

The crash data and associated analysis in this report is protected by 23 USC 409 and is inadmissible in State or Federal court.

PARLEY'S INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT I-80/I-215 Eastside
PURPOSE AND NEED

Based on previous needs, the draft project purpose is:

- **Improve the Level of Service at Parley’s Interchange in 2050**
  - Level of Service D is UDOT’s goal
- **Improve Regional Mobility in 2050**
- **Improve Safety**
  - Upgrade the design elements.
**ALTERNATIVE REFINEMENT PROCESS**

- July 2018 alternatives released for public/agency review
- Main issue home and utility impacts at 3300 South area
- UDOT made refinements in coordination with SLCDPU/MWDSLS
- Results of refinement process
  - No home relocations (minor strip takes)
  - Wasatch Blvd will continue to function similar to current configuration
  - No impact to the Grandeur Peak Trailhead
  - All trail connections maintained
  - Relocations of some water infrastructure
DRAFT EIS ALTERNATIVES

- **Alternative A**
  - 40% reduction in delay
  - 2019 Cost - $353 M

- **Alternative B**
  - 47% reduction in delay
  - 2019 Cost - $336 M
Key Results:
- No home relocations
- One potential business relocation
- No wetland impacts
- 0.1 acre of Parley’s Creek impacted
- Improved water quality and stormwater systems
- Most construction within existing UDOT property
- All trail connections maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>No-Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land converted to roadway use</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential residential relocations</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential business relocations</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation areas affected</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities affected</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental justice impacts</td>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails affected</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality impacts above regulations</td>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptors with modeled noise levels above criteria</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>95/77</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality improvements</td>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to waters of the United States (Parley’s Creek)</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impacts to cultural resources</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste sites affected</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain impacts</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] No wetlands would be impacted. The only impact would be fill placed in Parley’s Creek.

\[b\] The noise analysis for Alternatives A and B includes only the areas where there would be roadway improvements with Alternative A or B. The Alternative A noise analysis evaluated 611 receptors. The Alternative B noise analysis evaluated 516 receptors. For the No-Action Alternative, 95 out of the 611 receptors for Alternative A would have noise levels above criteria, and 77 out of the 516 receptors for Alternative B would have noise levels above criteria.
UPCOMING REVIEWS

- 45-Day Draft EIS Review and Public Hearing
  - September/October 2019
- Final EIS/ROD – February 2020
FINAL QUESTIONS?