

Chapter 6: Community Impacts

6.1	Introduction	6-2
6.1.1	Community Impacts Analysis Area	6-2
6.1.2	Resource Identification Methods	6-2
6.2	Regulatory Setting.....	6-3
6.3	Elements of the Social Environment.....	6-4
6.3.1	Community Cohesion.....	6-5
6.3.2	Quality of Life.....	6-6
6.3.3	Recreation Resources	6-7
6.3.4	Community Facilities	6-7
6.3.5	Public Services and Utilities	6-7
6.3.6	Public Safety	6-7
6.3.7	Relocations.....	6-8
6.4	Resources in Salt Lake County.....	6-8
6.4.1	Community Cohesion.....	6-8
6.4.2	Quality of Life.....	6-12
6.4.3	Recreation Resources	6-13
6.4.4	Community Facilities	6-16
6.4.5	Public Services and Utilities	6-18
6.4.6	Public Safety	6-19
6.4.7	Relocations.....	6-20
6.5	Resources in Utah County	6-21
6.5.1	Community Cohesion.....	6-21
6.5.2	Quality of Life.....	6-25
6.5.3	Recreation Resources	6-26
6.5.4	Community Facilities	6-29
6.5.5	Public Services and Utilities	6-29
6.5.6	Public Safety	6-30
6.5.7	Relocations.....	6-31
6.6	Environmental Consequences	6-32
6.6.1	Methodology	6-32
6.6.2	No-Action Alternative.....	6-35
6.6.3	Salt Lake County Alternatives	6-38
6.6.4	Utah County Alternatives.....	6-66
6.6.5	Mitigation Measures.....	6-80
6.6.6	Cumulative Impacts	6-84
6.6.7	Summary of Impacts	6-85
6.7	References	6-86

6.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the social environment in the Mountain View Corridor (MVC) study area and the impacts to the social environment from the proposed project.

6.1.1 Community Impacts Analysis Area

The general community impacts analysis area includes the communities that surround or are immediately adjacent to the proposed MVC alternatives in both Salt Lake and Utah Counties. This impact analysis area applies to community cohesion and quality of life considerations. For certain resources, a specific impact analysis area was selected to focus on the area where effects would likely occur. These impact analysis areas are as follows:

- **Recreation facilities, public facilities (such as churches, schools, and medical facilities), and public safety facilities (such as police, fire, and ambulance services):** all facilities within 0.5 mile on either side of an MVC alignment. This width was selected because it includes the area where traffic and other aspects of the alternative's location could affect access or a service provider's ability to perform adequate emergency response.
- **Utilities:** 0.25 mile on either side of an alignment. Though most impacts to facilities would be within the roadway right-of-way and would occur during construction, the 0.25-mile area was selected because impacts could extend beyond the right-of-way if construction in the right-of-way were to require a more extensive reconfiguration of utilities in the general area.
- **Relocations (property impacts):** properties that would be directly affected by construction of an alignment.

6.1.2 Resource Identification Methods

Some community elements, such as community cohesion and quality of life, are difficult to define. What makes a community cohesive or defines a quality living environment for one person might not match the perceptions or values of his or her neighbor. Because of this subjective nature, community cohesion and quality of life impacts are difficult to measure. This chapter focuses on general measures that most people associate with cohesion and quality living, such as community interaction and leadership, community amenities, and general opinions of well-being.

Physical, project-related impacts to community facilities, recreation resources, utilities, public safety, and relocations are easier to measure but in some cases include a degree of subjectivity, especially when considered in conjunction with quality of life. For example, one person might enjoy having convenient shopping opportunities and feel safer in a more developed area, while another might feel that the community is adversely affected by traffic, noise, air pollution, and lighting associated with the development. For this project, impacts to community facilities, recreation resources, utilities, public safety, and relocations are quantified based on physical impacts to structures or services. Quality of life concerns associated with these elements are addressed under the community cohesion and quality of life discussions, as appropriate.

Information for community impacts was obtained by reviewing community plans and maps, by reviewing community Web sites, through public meetings and meetings with local officials, by reviewing public comments, and through field reviews. All identified community facilities were added to a data layer in an electronic map file. Once the alternatives were developed, the appropriate impact area boundary for each alternative was overlaid on the community facilities data layer to identify the facilities within the impact analysis area for each resource.

Utility companies and municipalities were also contacted in order to learn more about belowground and overhead utilities in the corridor. Representatives of the utilities that parallel the MVC corridor were contacted throughout the process because the presence of these utilities can affect where an alternative is located. Discussions were also held with the local jurisdictions that operate water, sewer, and storm drainage infrastructure.

To assist in the community impact analysis, Dan Jones & Associates (2003) conducted a quality of life survey focusing on the MVC project area in 2003. This survey of 414 people in Salt Lake and Utah Counties sought opinions about what issues residents felt were important, quality of life, transportation conditions, and community involvement in the area. Other surveys completed by the United Way of Salt Lake (2001) and the United Way of Utah County (2001) also provided information about the general social environment in the project region.

6.2 Regulatory Setting

Section 109(h) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 required the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to promulgate guidelines “designed to assure that possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project ... have been fully considered in developing such project, and that the final decisions on the project are made in the best overall public interest” (see 23 United States Code (U.S.C.) 109(h)). Section 109(h) lists several types of



community impacts that are to be considered, including impacts to community cohesion, the availability of public facilities and services, tax and property values, and displacements of people, businesses, and farms. Section 109(h) goes on to describe the necessary balancing of the need for fast, safe, and efficient transportation with eliminating or minimizing adverse impacts to natural, human-made, and socioeconomic resources. FHWA's regulations concerning Environmental Impact and Related Procedures at 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 771 state that Section 109(h) is the policy of the agency when conducting a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review (see 23 CFR 771.105(b)). The essence of the process leading up to the preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to compile and assess data necessary to balance the interests identified in Section 109(h) and the FHWA NEPA regulations, including impacts on communities. Completion of the NEPA process in accordance with the Part 771 regulations fulfills the requirements of Section 109(h).

The other community aspect discussed in this chapter that is subject to regulation is the acquisition of residences, businesses, public facilities, or farms required for the MVC project. When such acquisitions are necessary, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) must comply with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq., amended 1989) and the State of Utah Relocation Program (part of the Utah Relocation Assistance Act, Utah Administrative Code Section 57-12). These acts provide for uniform and equitable treatment of all persons displaced from their homes, businesses, and farms without discrimination on any basis. The guidelines used by UDOT for carrying out the provisions of these acts are contained in its 1997 *Relocation Assistance Brochure*. Relocation resources are available to all residents (including renters) and businesses whose properties need to be acquired, and the process for acquiring replacement housing and other sites must be fair and open.

6.3 Elements of the Social Environment

For the affected environment and environmental consequences sections of this chapter, the social environment is divided into the following topic areas:

- Community cohesion
- Quality of life
- Recreation
- Community facilities
- Public services and utilities
- Public safety
- Relocations



Each of these topic areas is briefly described below.

6.3.1 Community Cohesion

Community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their neighborhood or community, including commitment to the community or a strong attachment to neighbors, institutions, or particular groups. Community cohesion can also be described as the patterns of social networking within a community (NCHRP 2001). What makes a community cohesive is subjective and cannot be solidly defined, though specific indicators include interaction among neighbors, use of community facilities and services, community leadership, participation in local organizations, desire to stay in the community and length of residency, satisfaction with the community, and the presence of families in communities (FDOT 2003). Cohesive “communities” can be neighborhoods, cities, or regions. However, for this analysis, the impact analysis area for community cohesion is made up of the established cities and townships in the MVC study area.

6.3.1.1 Physical Characteristics of Communities

Cohesion can be greatly affected by the physical layout of the community. Lynch (1960), in his book *Image of the City*, describes elements that help define the physical layout of a community: paths, edges, districts, and landmarks. These elements can encourage or hinder the social interaction in a community and are described below.

- **Paths** are linear features such as roads and trails along which people and vehicles travel. Paths can encourage cohesion or create a physical separation that decreases cohesion.
- **Edges** are linear elements that separate the landscape and can include boundaries between different types of land use, boundaries of large developments, or major roads.
- **Districts** are areas of the community that have a distinctive character or degree of unity. The presence of districts, such as a historic downtown, is often a good indicator of community cohesion.
- **Landmarks** are points of reference in the community with which people can identify.

6.3.1.2 Social Interaction

Social interaction is an important part of community cohesion. There are several factors that can lead to and affect social interaction, including the types of



facilities and services in a community, how integrated an individual is in the community, or the amount of community leadership and activism that is taking place. The existing boundaries for churches and school districts in the community cohesion impact analysis area already contribute to some degree of east-west division in social interaction and community involvement patterns in the community impact analysis area.

The use of and reliance on local services and facilities provides opportunities for interaction. Churches and schools create centers where people can interact, and these centers promote cohesiveness within the community. Community events and programs to create neighborhood identity also increase community cohesion.

Social integration and interaction can also be affected by family type and by how long people have lived in the community. Long-term residents tend to have higher levels of social attachment and integration into neighborhood and community life than shorter-term residents (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). The presence of children often brings neighbors together and results in interactions at school events and other youth activities.

Finally, the type and amount of leadership and activism occurring in a community also help define cohesiveness. When members of an area are engaged in the day-to-day operation of the community, they can feel a strong sense of pride and belonging in their community.

6.3.2 Quality of Life

Quality of life can be characterized as a person's well-being and happiness. Like community cohesion, what constitutes a positive quality of life is subjective and cannot be solidly defined. For this analysis, quality of life considerations focus on those elements that the public generally associates with a high quality of life: education, safety, recreation opportunities, convenient shopping and services, access to transportation facilities, and a positive general living environment. Other factors, such as air quality and noise, could also contribute to a person's sense of quality of life. See Chapter 12, Air Quality, and Chapter 13, Noise, for more information about air quality and noise impacts.

Residents of Utah generally consider their quality of life to be high. Contributing factors include a varied four-season climate, a moderate cost of living, diverse natural resources, a low rate of violent crime, high-quality education and health care, and varied cultural and recreation opportunities (State of Utah 2001).

As stated in Section 6.1.1, Community Impacts Analysis Area, the impact analysis area for quality of life is made up of the established communities in the MVC study area.



6.3.3 Recreation Resources

Recreation activities refresh, enliven, entertain, and enhance people's quality of life. Activities in the recreation impact analysis area include hiking, bicycling, equestrian uses, trap and skeet shooting, and golf as well as activities offered through various recreation facilities and centers. The recreation impact analysis area includes existing and proposed recreation resources within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Specific considerations related to pedestrians and bicyclists (including trails) are discussed in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists.

6.3.4 Community Facilities

Community facilities provide opportunities for residents to interact socially. Community facilities generally include (but are not limited to) schools, churches, community centers, libraries, senior centers, and city facilities (such as city halls). As stated in Section 6.1.1, Community Impacts Analysis Area, the community facilities impact analysis area includes existing and proposed community facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Fire, ambulance, emergency response, and law-enforcement facilities (that might also be community facilities) are discussed in Section 6.4.6, Public Safety. Recreation-related community facilities are discussed in Section 6.4.3, Recreation Resources.

6.3.5 Public Services and Utilities

The availability of public services and utilities helps define the social environment. The more services are available, the more densely settled a community is likely to be. Physical impacts to public services and utilities can affect the social environment, especially as they relate to convenience.

As stated in Section 6.1.1, Community Impacts Analysis Area, the impact analysis area for public services and utilities is the area within 0.25 mile of the proposed alternatives. The analysis focuses on physical impacts to public utilities during construction with the understanding that the availability of functioning services is an important part of the social environment.

6.3.6 Public Safety

The public safety discussion focuses on how public safety needs are met by various emergency services such as fire, ambulance, and law enforcement. Police service, fire protection, and ambulance service in the MVC study area are typically provided by combined jurisdictions. Police and fire services in the study area are provided by the county sheriff departments, county fire departments, city



police departments, or city fire departments, depending on whether the community is in an incorporated or unincorporated area of the county. (The county departments often serve small incorporated cities as well.) Emergency medical service and ambulance service are provided by local ambulance services or by the fire departments. The 911-dispatch service is usually provided at the county level by a countywide 911-dispatch center.

As stated in Section 6.1.1, Community Impacts Analysis Area, public safety impact analysis area is the area within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. State, county, city, and private emergency response providers that serve the public safety impact analysis area were contacted to discuss how the transportation network affects or could affect emergency response times. Impacts to emergency service providers and facilities, including impacts to the facility's ability to operate because of the project, were analyzed for those providers within the public safety impact analysis area.

6.3.7 Relocations

Acquisitions and relocations of homes and businesses that would occur as part of the proposed alternatives are considered in this chapter. In general, a relocation occurs when constructing the project would require purchasing an occupied structure, such as a home or business. In such instances, the affected residents would receive relocation assistance in addition to compensation for the fair market value of the property itself. See Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for a more detailed discussion about the methods used to identify relocations.

6.4 Resources in Salt Lake County

6.4.1 Community Cohesion

The community cohesion impact analysis area includes communities that would be physically crossed by the MVC alternatives. For this analysis, the communities are defined by existing city and township boundaries. See Chapter 4, Land Use, for more information about each of these communities.

Within Salt Lake County, the communities in the community cohesion impact analysis area vary from urban to rural. Some communities were settled over 100 years ago and retain their own main street or town center. Others were settled more recently and exhibit suburban characteristics. From a physical layout standpoint, these newer communities often contain many edges and lack the districts and identity that promote cohesion.



6.4.1.1 Physical Characteristics of Communities

The following discussion uses Lynch's (1960) concepts of the physical elements of the community that were described in Section 6.3.1.1, Physical Characteristics of Communities.

Districts

Within the Salt Lake County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area, Magna, Herriman, Copperton, Bluffdale, Riverton, and South Jordan all have town centers or main streets, which are districts according to Lynch's model. Magna, Herriman, Riverton, and Copperton have incorporated these districts into their community plans and identity. Although South Jordan has a main street, it experienced most of its growth in the 1970s and so has more characteristics in common with suburban communities such as West Valley City, West Jordan, Taylorsville, and Kearns.

Kennecott Utah Copper is developing a master-planned community called Daybreak in South Jordan. This master-planned community will have its own town center which will likely become another district as defined by Lynch's model. This district would be in addition to the existing main street for South Jordan.

Edges

The existing boundaries for churches, schools, and school districts in the community cohesion impact analysis area create edges in each of the communities in Salt Lake County. Because a person is more likely to interact with others from their church or who attended the same school, these edges (such as roads and other identifiable boundaries) reduce the degree of interaction with people who are located on the other side of an edge.

Edges created by physical separators such as the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor in the community cohesion impact analysis area also reduce the tendency for interaction among individuals because of the physical separation. Notable edges in these communities include the boundaries of the Kennecott land holdings in South Jordan, Copperton, and Herriman; the edges of the Alliant Tech Systems and Lake Park properties in West Valley City; and the boundaries of the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor in West Valley City, West Jordan, South Jordan, Herriman, and Bluffdale. Interactions are often reduced more at the neighborhood level than for the entire community because of the social relationships that neighborhoods often foster. However, the reduction in interaction depends on the size of the edge. For example, the power corridor



separates several neighborhoods, so the effect occurs at the city level as well as the neighborhood level.

Paths

The major roads that create paths in the communities are Bangerter Highway, Redwood Road, 5600 West, 4800 West, 7200 West, 3500 South, 4100 South, 7800 South, and 12600 South. Because of the size of the major roads, they tend to divide the communities more than they provide a potential for interaction by promoting travel. See [Figure 1-1](#), Mountain View Corridor Study Area Map, for more information on roads in the MVC study area.

Landmarks

Important landmarks in the Salt Lake County communities include the E Center, Hale Theatre, and West Valley Family Fitness Center—all of which are in West Valley City—and the Jordan River Temple in South Jordan. These facilities help create a sense of community in cities that do not have a distinct downtown district.

6.4.1.2 Social Interactions

Local Facilities and Services

Local facilities in the community cohesion impact analysis area (shopping areas, churches, businesses, medical facilities, social services, and parks and recreation facilities) are mostly accessed by car, and so are used by residents outside the community as well as local residents. However, even though these facilities are accessible by car, this does not seem to reduce the overall community cohesion for any of these communities. In some cases, the use of vehicles helps overcome the paths and edges that can adversely affect community cohesion.

Social Integration

The 2003 Dan Jones & Associates public opinion survey that was conducted for the MVC project measured various aspects of social integration. The survey results show that 45% of the respondents have lived in their current residence for over 10 years, while another 19% have lived in their current residence for at least 5 years. These residency rates are an indicator of community cohesion. Additionally, 60% of the households in the community cohesion impact analysis area reported having children under age 18. This means that over half of the residents have families, which is an indicator of community cohesion because of the interaction between children in neighborhoods, at school, and at social events.



Leadership and Community Activism

Leadership and community activism are indicators of community cohesion. Reviews of community Web sites, newspapers, and general plans revealed different styles of leadership and activism. For example, Magna has a healthy-living committee, whose mission is to promote a safe, clean, unified, growing community by bringing people together who live, work, and serve the area (City of Magna 2004). A news posting on the West Valley City Web site in the fall of 2004 noted that the City was proud of the leadership and community programs that have brought the community from one of fear to a place where people want to live. The examples cited included development of parks (such as Lake Park) and neighborhood watch groups.

During the planning phase of the MVC project, more public comments were received from residents in Magna and West Valley City than from residents in the other study area communities. The level of public involvement, in addition to the leadership committees and community programs, indicates that these communities might be more cohesive than other communities. Quality of life and the diversity of communities can also affect community cohesion; see Section 6.4.2, Quality of Life, and Chapter 7, Environmental Justice, for more information.

6.4.1.3 Summary of Community Cohesion

Table 6.4-1 below summarizes the physical elements that affect community cohesion in each of the communities in the Salt Lake County portion of the community cohesion impacts analysis area. Edges and paths generally diminish community cohesion; the extent of the reduction depends on the type of path or edge. For some residents, Bangerter Highway and the Rocky Mountain Power utility corridor might diminish community cohesion more than smaller roads do. Districts and landmarks such as main-street, downtown areas and community centers promote community cohesion and community identity.

The physical layout of the communities, the presence of districts and landmarks, the absence of edges, and the social interaction observed as part of this project indicate that Magna, West Valley City, Copperton, Herriman, and Riverton generally have the most cohesive communities.



Table 6.4-1. Elements That Influence Community Cohesion in Salt Lake County

Element	Salt Lake City	Magna	West Valley City	Copperton	Kearns	West Jordan	South Jordan	Taylorsville	Herriman	Riverton	Bluffdale
<i>Elements That Promote Cohesion</i>											
Downtown	X	X ^a		X ^a			X		X ^a	X ^a	X ^a
Town center							X				
Landmarks	X		X				X		X		
Social activism		X	X								
<i>Elements That Inhibit Cohesion</i>											
Major existing roads	X	X	X ^b		X	X ^b	X ^b	X ^b	X	X ^b	
Power corridor			X			X	X		X		X
Suburban development			X		X	X	X	X			
Development boundaries			X	X			X		X		
School boundaries and ward boundaries for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church) are present in all communities.											
^a The downtown is more active or has been incorporated into general use plans for the community.											
^b Freeway or high-speed roadway.											

6.4.2 Quality of Life

Most of the cities in the quality of life impact analysis area do not conduct their own community quality of life surveys. However, the 2003 Dan Jones & Associates survey that focused on the MVC area and a 2001 United Way needs assessment were reviewed to help assess quality of life.

The results from the Dan Jones & Associates survey show that residents of the communities in the quality of life impact analysis area that were surveyed are somewhat dissatisfied with the convenience of travel east and west into and out of their communities and are very dissatisfied with the existing access to TRAX and other mass transit. Residents are also concerned about transportation issues (53% of the respondents were somewhat concerned with transportation issues involving their communities, while 23% were very concerned). In addition, 21% of the respondents said that new roads should be considered for western Salt Lake County and Utah County. Finally, over 20% of the respondents said that the most important issue facing their community in the next 5 years would be growth. Although growth could help a community create additional jobs, some respondents are concerned that growth could negatively affect their quality of life.



The United Way needs assessment (United Way of Salt Lake 2001) included a household survey in which participants were asked to review a list of 34 potential problems and indicate which they thought were minor, moderate, or major problems. The problems viewed by participants as “most serious” were barriers to education, crime, cost of health care, inadequate financial resources, and inadequate public transportation.

Although neither survey asked respondents about their desired lifestyle, it is likely that residents are attracted to their communities for different reasons. For example, some residents in the southern part of Salt Lake County might have been attracted to communities such as Herriman because of the rural lifestyle. However, development is occurring so quickly in these communities that new residents are likely not looking for a rural lifestyle but, instead, a lower cost of living. These new residents are commuters, and travel issues become important quality of life factors as shown by responses to the Dan Jones & Associates survey.

Other communities such as West Valley City contribute to residents’ quality of life in other ways. The West Valley City general plan (West Valley City 2005) states that many West Valley City residents see their neighborhoods as clean, safe, and friendly places to live and work. The goals of the community to increase open space, add more parks and trails, and provide better landscaping would likely help increase West Valley City residents’ quality of life. On the other hand, communities such as Copperton have historically had a quality of life that is based on livability, including open space, a historic character, air quality, safety, and good public services. According to the Copperton Township general plan (Salt Lake County 2004), residents want to maintain this quality of life while accommodating growth and change.

6.4.3 Recreation Resources

Within the Salt Lake County portion of the recreation impact analysis area, the local municipalities provide numerous recreation activities and facilities. Residents enjoy recreation opportunities in their neighborhoods as well as accessibility to the Wasatch and Oquirrh Mountains. [Table 6.4-2](#) below lists recreation opportunities and facilities in Salt Lake County within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. Some of these recreation facilities are Section 4(f) resources as defined by Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. See Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, for more information about Section 4(f) resources.

▲ ▲

Table 6.4-2. Recreation Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Salt Lake County

Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Attributes	Address	City
Gun range	Yes	Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education	Gun range and a dog-training area (about 1,253 acres)	2100 South, west of 5600 West	Salt Lake City
Golf course	Yes	Wingpointe Golf Course	18 holes, links-style	3602 West 100 North	Salt Lake City
Golf course	Yes	West Ridge Golf Course	200 acres, 18 holes, driving range, putting green, club house	5055 S. Westridge Blvd.	West Valley City
Recreation facility	Yes	West Valley Family Fitness Center at Centennial Park	Two swimming pools, a climbing wall, indoor track, dance studio, racquetball	5415 West 3100 South	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Centennial Park	77 acres, ball fields, outdoor swimming pool, ice rink	5405 West 3100 South	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Hunter Park	22 acres, pavilion, football field, baseball field, tennis courts, playground	3600 South 6000 West	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Hunter Ridge Park	Pavilion, playground	4383 South 5710 West	West Valley City
Park	Yes	West View Park (Brookfield)	Pavilion, tennis courts, playground, ball fields, picnic tables	6050 West 4100 South	West Valley City
Golf course	Yes	Stoneridge Golf Course	27-hole Scottish links-style course, driving and practice ranges	4415 Links Dr.	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Fassio Farm Park	Pavilion, play structure	3720 South 5200 West	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Woodledge Park	Play structure, tennis courts, pavilion	5210 West 4310 South	West Valley City
Amphitheatre	No	USANA Amphitheatre	93-acre outdoor amphitheatre used for concerts	5150 South 6055 West	West Valley City
Park	Yes	Western Springs Park	County park with one softball field, sleigh-riding hill, snack shack, restrooms, two soccer fields	12600 South 4800 West	Riverton
Park	Yes	Western Springs Park	Playground	12868 S. Cactus Berry Dr.	Riverton
Park	Yes	Western Springs Park	Playground	12689 S. Diamondback Dr.	Riverton
Park	Yes	Monarch Meadows Community Park	Pavilion, playground, trails, soccer fields, picnic areas	4800 West 13600 South	Riverton

▼ ▼



Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Attributes	Address	City
Park	Yes	Foothill Park	Playground	14000 South 4900 South	Riverton
Park	Yes	Autumn Hills Park	Pavilion, play structure	5400 West 13400 South	Riverton
Park	Yes	Rosecreek Park	Playground; managed by Salt Lake County	5128 W. Little Water Peak Dr.	Riverton
Park	Yes	Park Haven Park	Playground, trails, open space	12100 S. Midas Park Rd.	Herriman
Park	Yes	Lodestone Park	New park under construction	6120 W. Lodestone Ave.	Kearns
Park	Yes	Impressions Park	Trails, playground	5382 West 6200 South	Kearns
Park	Yes	Impressions Park	Playground	6020 S. Impressions Dr.	Kearns
Park	Yes	Mountain Man Park	Playground, retention basin (football, soccer)	5000 South 5000 West	Kearns
Recreation facility	Yes	Oquirrh Fitness Center	Swimming pool, gym, dance studio, racquetball	5624 South 4800 West	Kearns
Golf course	Yes	Glenmoor Golf Course	18 holes	9800 South 4800 West	South Jordan
Park	Yes	Beargrass Park	Playground	5308 W. Crus Corvi Rd.	West Jordan
Park	Yes	Welby BMX Track Park	Bicycle track	9738 South 5200 West	West Jordan
Park	Yes	Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park	Baseball fields, trails, pavilion, bleachers	5900 W. New Bingham Hwy.	West Jordan
Park	Yes	Wood Creek Park	No facilities	7520 South 5130 West	West Jordan





6.4.4 Community Facilities

The community facilities impact analysis area for Salt Lake County, which is predominantly urban, includes numerous community facilities. The facilities that are located within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives in Salt Lake County are listed in [Table 6.4-3](#). These facilities include churches, schools, a senior center, and a city hall. There are no libraries or other community facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. The public emergency service providers listed below in [Table 6.4-5](#), Emergency Services and Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Salt Lake County, that are within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives can also serve as community facilities.

Table 6.4-3. Community Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Salt Lake County

Type	Name	Address	City
School	West Valley Elementary	6049 W. Brud Dr.	West Valley City
School	Hunter High School	4500 South 5600 West	West Valley City
School	Hillside Elementary	4283 South 6000 West	West Valley City
School	Whittier Elementary	3585 South 6000 West	West Valley City
School	Hunter Junior High	6131 West 3785 South	West Valley City
School	Sandburg Elementary School	3900 South 5325 West	West Valley City
School	Orchard Elementary School	6744 West 3800 South	West Valley City
School	Hunter Elementary School	4351 South 5400 West	West Valley City
School	Valley Crest Elementary School	5240 West 3100 South	West Valley City
School	Copper Hills Elementary School	7635 West 3715 South	Magna
School	Lake Ridge Elementary	7400 West 3400 South	Magna
School	Thomas W. Bacchus Elementary School	5925 South 5975 West	Kearns
School	Beehive Elementary	5655 South 5220 West	Kearns
School	Silver Hills Elementary School	5770 West 5100 South	Kearns
School	Thomas Jefferson Junior High	5850 South 5600 West	Kearns
School	Mountain Shadow Elementary	5255 West 7000 South	West Jordan
School	West Hills Junior High	8270 Grizzly Way	West Jordan
School	Copper Hills High	5445 W. New Bingham Hwy.	West Jordan
School	Copper Canyon Elementary	8917 S. Copperwood Dr.	West Jordan
School	Hayden Peak Elementary School	4920 W. Hayden Peak Dr.	West Jordan
School	Jim Bridger Elementary School	5368 W. Cyclamen Way	West Jordan
School	West Ridge Academy	5500 W. Bagley Park Rd.	West Jordan
Youth center	Copper Hills Youth Center	5899 W. Rivendell Dr.	West Jordan



Type	Name	Address	City
School	Foothills Elementary	13717 S. Shaggy Peak Dr.	Riverton
School	South Hills Junior High School	13508 South 4000 West	Riverton
School	Herriman Elementary School	13170 South 6000 West	Herriman
Youth center	Genesis Youth Center	14178 S. Pony Express Rd.	Draper
Senior center	Kearns Senior Center	4850 West 4715 South	Kearns
Church	LDS Meeting House	3665 South 6000 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	3930 South 6000 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	4333 South 6400 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	6567 South 6035 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	6710 West 4145 South	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	6755 West 3800 South	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	6170 Marcrest Dr.	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	7035 W. Loch Ness Ave.	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	3372 Merry Ln.	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	6170 Marcrest Dr.	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	4322 South 5400 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	4195 South 6000 West	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	5180 West 4700 South	West Valley City
Church	LDS Meeting House	3735 S. Washington Rd.	Magna
Church	LDS Meeting House	3606 Wing Pointe Dr.	Magna
Church	Magna Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	3164 South 7200 West	Magna
Church	LDS Meeting House	5017 Grandview Peaks Dr.	Riverton
Church	LDS Meeting House	6253 West 6200 South	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	8176 South 5140 West	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	5208 Cyclamen Way	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	6673 Clernates Dr.	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	5176 Parr Dr.	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	5156 W. Clay Hollow Ave.	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	5360 West 7000 South	West Jordan
Church	LDS Meeting House	5107 South 5600 West	Kearns
Church	LDS Meeting House	5422 S. Sarah Jane Dr.	Kearns
Church	LDS Meeting House	5380 West 5400 South	Kearns
Church	LDS Meeting House	6175 W. Borax Ave.	Kearns
Church	LDS Meeting House	40 N. Pioneer St.	Herriman
City hall	Herriman City Hall	97 N. Pioneer St.	Herriman

6.4.5 Public Services and Utilities

Several utilities—electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, storm drains, and sanitary sewer—are adjacent to or cross the proposed alternatives.

Four companies have utilities parallel to the proposed alternatives and within the public services and utilities impact analysis area: Rocky Mountain Power (formerly PacifiCorp), Kern River Gas Transmission Company (which operates the Kern River pipeline), Questar Gas, and Level 3 (formerly WilTel). These utilities use a corridor that is referred to as the “power corridor.” This approximately 300-foot-wide corridor, which is mostly owned by Rocky Mountain Power, has the largest concentration of utilities in the public services and utilities impact analysis area. The power corridor originates just north of SR 201 and 5800 West and runs south to Bluffdale, where it splits into two sets of lines just south of 12600 South. From this location, one set of lines heads south and the other set of lines heads southeast.

The power corridor contains two high-voltage overhead power lines, one low-voltage overhead power line, a fiber optic line, and natural gas pipelines. The overhead power lines are operated and maintained by Rocky Mountain Power. Rocky Mountain Power also operates a substation and power plant at 4700 South 5800 West, which is the origination of the power corridor. The fiber optic line, which is owned by Level 3, hangs on the power poles beginning at 700 South 4800 West and continues southwest to 5700 West where it follows the power corridor to New Bingham Highway. The line is then buried and follows the Kern River line.

Kern River Gas Transmission Company has two high-pressure natural gas transmission lines (36 inches and 42 inches) in the power corridor. These lines follow the corridor until the split just after 12600 South in the Bluffdale area. The natural gas lines follow the westernmost power lines. Questar has a 12-inch natural gas line that follows the power corridor from 3500 South to 13400 South.

Other utilities in the public services and utilities impact analysis area do not run parallel to the power corridor; these utilities include electrical substations, irrigation canals, telecommunication facilities, water treatment facilities, and stormwater and sewer facilities. Stormwater and sewer facilities make up the majority of other utilities in the corridor.

6.4.6 Public Safety

The emergency responders in the Salt Lake County portion of the public safety impact analysis area who were contacted said that emergency response times were acceptable and were not currently affected by the existing transportation infrastructure, access availability, roadway conditions, or roadway congestion (Berry 2004; Frame 2004; Freitag 2004; Lucas 2004). Salt Lake County emergency service providers that require efficient roadway operation to provide services are shown in [Table 6.4-4](#).

Table 6.4-4. Emergency Service Providers in Salt Lake County

Jurisdiction	Provider		
	Police	Fire Protection	Ambulance Service ^a
Salt Lake County	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City Police Dept.	Salt Lake City Fire Dept.	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
West Valley City	West Valley City Police Dept.	West Valley City Fire Dept.	West Valley City Fire Department
Taylorsville	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
West Jordan	West Jordan Police Dept.	West Jordan Fire Dept.	West Jordan Fire Dept.
South Jordan	South Jordan Police Dept.	South Jordan Fire Dept.	South Jordan Fire Department
Riverton	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority/ Riverton Fire Dept.	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Herriman	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Bluffdale	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Bluffdale Fire Dept.	Unified Fire Authority
Magna ^b	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Kearns ^b	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Copperton ^b	Salt Lake County Sheriff	Unified Fire Authority	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.

^a Most fire departments provide emergency medical services. Typically, emergency medical technicians and/or paramedics from the county or city fire department respond to emergencies. When a patient needs to be transported to a hospital, the transport is handled by a public or private entity such as Gold Cross Ambulance that holds the license for the given jurisdiction.

^b Magna, Kearns, and Copperton are townships in Salt Lake County.



Emergency service providers and facilities within 0.5 mile of the Salt Lake County portion of the public safety impact analysis area are shown in [Table 6.4-5](#) and in [Figure 6-1 through Figure 6-3](#), Community and Recreational Facilities. The location of these facilities is important because emergency response originating from these facilities must be maintained during construction.

Table 6.4-5. Emergency Services and Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Salt Lake County

Jurisdiction	Type	Facility	Address
Salt Lake City	Fire department	Salt Lake City Fire Station 9	5822 W. Amelia Earhart Dr.
West Valley City	Police department	Centennial Park Substation	5315 West 3100 South
West Valley City	Fire department	West Valley Fire Station 71	4160 South 6400 West
West Valley City	Fire department	West Valley Fire Station 74	5227 West 3100 South
West Jordan	Fire department	Salt Lake County Fire Station 7	6035 South 5600 West
West Jordan	Fire department	West Jordan Fire Station 55	7750 South 6400 West
West Jordan	Fire department	West Jordan Fire Station 54	5595 W. Hawley Park Rd.
Riverton	Fire department	Riverton Fire Station 121	4146 West 12600 South

6.4.7 Relocations

6.4.7.1 Residences

The area adjacent to the proposed alternatives is classified as primarily urban with some farmland and undeveloped land in the central and southern portions of the relocation impact analysis area in Salt Lake County. (See Chapter 4, Land Use, for a detailed discussion of the land uses along the corridor.) In general, housing is more densely concentrated in northern Salt Lake County in Magna and West Valley City along 7200 West and 5600 West. Most residences in the relocation impact analysis area are single-family units, with a few apartments or multi-family units interspersed throughout.

The central and southern portions of the relocation impact analysis area in Salt Lake County are less populated, and housing is more scattered with fewer residential and business developments adjacent to the proposed alternatives. However, much of this portion of the relocation impact analysis area, which is undeveloped (and therefore available for new development), is experiencing a high rate of growth. Many new subdivisions are being built adjacent to the proposed alternatives.

6.4.7.2 Businesses and Public Facilities

Businesses and public facilities in the relocation impact analysis area are more highly concentrated in areas where there is a higher population. In the northern



Salt Lake County portion of the relocation impact analysis area, more businesses and public facilities are located adjacent to the proposed alternatives along 7200 West and 5600 West in Magna and West Valley City. Along 7200 West, most business are at major intersections such as 3500 South. 5600 West has a concentration of businesses from State Route (SR) 201 to 5400 South. The central and southern portion of the relocation impact analysis area is primarily undeveloped.

6.4.7.3 Farms

Farmland areas are located throughout the relocation impact analysis area (see Chapter 5, Farmlands). Higher concentrations of farmland are located in the southern Salt Lake County portions of the relocation impact analysis area. Some farms are located adjacent to the proposed alternatives. See Chapter 5, Farmlands, for a more detailed discussion of farmlands.

6.5 Resources in Utah County

6.5.1 Community Cohesion

For the most part, neighborhood and community cohesion in the Utah County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area is the same as that described in Section 6.4.1, Community Cohesion, for the Salt Lake County portion of the impact analysis area. The Utah County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area is more agricultural in nature than the Salt Lake County portion. However, this profile is rapidly changing as more development continues in northern Utah County. This trend is evidenced by the recent incorporation of the cities of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs as well as continued growth in the other communities in northern Utah County. Lehi is the densest residential community in the Utah County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area.

6.5.1.1 Physical Characteristics of Communities

Because there is more agricultural land in Utah County than in Salt Lake County, the physical layout of this portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area is different than that in Salt Lake County. Edges are formed around the widely separated horse properties, ranchettes, and large-lot agricultural properties, and the distance between these properties makes interaction more difficult. However, this type of development forms an identity of rural living that connects the residents and creates districts that are based on a rural lifestyle. For Lindon, this type of development is older and more established. For Eagle



Mountain, this type of development is being established through new master-planned developments that include large-lot residences.

As shown by the new developments and recent city incorporations, rapid development is occurring in the community cohesion impacts analysis area in Utah County. Although some planned developments do include village cores, which may one day become districts, other traditional suburban developments do not have defined cores of any kind but do have edges. This type of development plan hinders community cohesion and could reduce the overall cohesion that currently exists in certain parts of the county. Any cohesion in this type of suburban development must result from leadership and community interaction because the physical barriers and lack of districts created with this type of development make interaction and cohesion more difficult. Because these communities are still developing, leadership and social interactions are also developing.

Districts

The older communities—Lehi, American Fork, Lindon, and Pleasant Grove—have main streets or central business districts. These districts give residents places for interaction and identity that promote community cohesion. However, the physical and economic condition of these areas is a factor in determining whether they actually provide community cohesion. Lehi's Main Street is the most well-defined downtown district in any of the communities in northern Utah County and exhibits a great deal of community cohesion. Lehi also has Thanksgiving Point, a master-planned destination place that includes gardens, shopping, a golf course, an animal park, and museums. Under Lynch's model, Thanksgiving Point is defined as a landmark that helps bring identity to the community. Some communities such as Pleasant Grove have developed downtown revitalization plans for their central business districts that are not thriving economically. The need for a revitalization plan is an indication that the district is less cohesive.

Edges

As in Salt Lake County, the Rocky Mountain Power corridor and major roads, such as Redwood Road and Main Street through Lehi, have created edges that separate the communities and reduce cohesion. In Utah County, the local businesses and public facilities in the community cohesion impact analysis area are accessed by car, which has helped to mitigate these edges. Churches, schools, and school districts in the community cohesion impact analysis area also create edges in Utah County while providing common facilities for interaction.



Paths

In Utah County, major roads also create paths in the communities; these roads include Redwood Road, 1500 North, 8570 North, 7350 North, and 10800 West. Because of the size of the major roads, they tend to divide the communities more than they provide a potential for interaction by promoting travel. The roadway paths are not as numerous, as wide in cross-section, or as continuous as the major roads in Salt Lake County. See [Figure 1-1](#), Mountain View Corridor Study Area Map, for more information on roads in the MVC study area.

Landmarks

Important landmarks in the Utah County communities include Thanksgiving Point, Broadbent's department store, and the Lehi Legacy Center.

6.5.1.2 Social Interactions

Local Facilities and Services

As in Salt Lake County, the use of and reliance on local services and facilities indicates community cohesion because people are interacting as a community. Churches and schools also promote cohesiveness within the communities. For other facilities that are separated physically from the residents' neighborhoods, such as shopping areas, businesses, medical facilities, and social services, residents use their cars to reach these locations, and by doing so overcome the paths and edges that might diminish cohesion.

Social Integration

The presence of agriculture in the area gives the local farmers and ranchers an identity (especially given the continued growth and development in the area), which helps provide cohesiveness among these individuals. The recent incorporations of Eagle Mountain (1996) and Saratoga Springs (1997) show interaction among individuals living in these areas and likely shared values that contributed to the action of incorporating, which demonstrates the cohesiveness of these communities.

Social integration can be provided by a church. Over 68% of the respondents questioned in the Dan Jones & Associates survey (see Section 6.4.1, Community Cohesion) said that their religious affiliation was LDS. The dominance of the LDS religion in the community cohesion impact analysis area and the role of this church in facilitating interactions within neighborhoods help foster social interactions and community cohesion in Utah County.



Safety can also be a factor in helping promote social interaction. A majority of people (about 89%) who responded to the United Way of Utah County Community Needs Assessment (United Way of Utah County 2001) feel very safe or reasonably safe in their neighborhoods, which is an indicator of community cohesion. As mentioned in Section 6.4.2, Quality of Life, Utah residents feel they have a good living environment. As stated in the United Way report, “[L]iving environment is undoubtedly related to both quality of people and quality of the community.” This feeling indicates community cohesion.

Leadership and Community Activism

In Utah County, the examples of leadership and community activism are planning efforts and incorporation of municipalities. In the communities of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, community leaders emerged to carry out the process needed to incorporate these areas. As part of the incorporation and general planning efforts, these communities are determining the identity and physical elements that ultimately influence cohesion. As discussed in Section 6.5.1.1, Physical Characteristics of Communities, Pleasant Grove developed a revitalization plan for its downtown. The process of developing a revitalization plan brings together leaders as well as residents and businesses during the community outreach phase of the planning process, which stimulates community activism. Together, the leadership and community involvement in developing the plan help promote community cohesion.

6.5.1.3 Summary of Community Cohesion

As in Salt Lake County, each of the communities in the Utah County community cohesion impact analysis area has attributes that contribute to community cohesion (see [Table 6.5-1](#) below). In some instances, the physical elements that promote cohesiveness are within the community cohesion impact analysis area (for example, districts such as Lehi’s Main Street), while in other instances the physical elements are not within the impact analysis area (such as the village cores in the Eagle Mountain developments). The social interaction necessary for incorporating these communities shows cohesion as well. Although unincorporated and newly developed or sparsely developed areas show some cohesion (such as the connection that local ranchers might feel), the communities of Lehi, Eagle Mountain, and Saratoga Springs generally exhibit the strongest community cohesion within the Utah County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area.



Table 6.5-1. Elements That Influence Community Cohesion in Utah County

Element	Lehi	Saratoga Springs	Eagle Mountain	American Fork	Lindon	Pleasant Grove
<i>Elements That Promote Cohesion</i>						
Downtown	X ^a			X	X	X ^a
Town center						
Landmarks	X					
Social activism		X	X			X
<i>Elements That inhibit Cohesion</i>						
Major existing roads	X	X ^b				
Power corridor	X					
Suburban development		X	X			
Development boundaries						
School boundaries and LDS Church ward boundaries are present in all communities.						
^a The downtown is more active or has been incorporated into general use plans for the community.						
^b Freeway or high-speed roadway.						

6.5.2 Quality of Life

For the most part, the general character of the Utah County portion of the quality of life impact analysis area is the same as described in Section 6.4.2, Quality of Life, for the Salt Lake County portion of the quality of life impact analysis area. In the United Way of Utah County Community Needs Assessment (United Way of Utah County 2001), respondents were asked to measure the perceived quality of life in Utah County. The majority of respondents (86.4%) considered Utah County a “good” or “excellent” place to live. This response is due in large part to the living environment, which was the greatest strength identified by the residents of Utah County. Living environment includes a good and clean location, natural beauty, high morals, good working conditions, and low crime rate (according to the survey).

A large number of respondents (88.9%) felt very safe or reasonably safe in their neighborhoods. Index crime rates in Utah County are lower than the overall rates in Utah in all crimes areas, except arsons, over the last 10 years. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s annual Uniform Crime Report, Utah County is one of the safest places to live in the nation and boasts the second-lowest violent crime rate in the country (Utah County 2002). The United Way survey identified transportation for the elderly and disabled as a weakness for the northern part of



Utah County. This finding is in addition to the general transportation issues that were identified by the Dan Jones & Associates survey discussed in Section 6.4.2, Quality of Life.

6.5.3 Recreation Resources

In the Utah County portion of the recreation impact analysis area, recreation activities are focused around Utah Lake and the Jordan River. Additionally, there are several neighborhood parks and other recreation opportunities in Utah County within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives as described in [Table 6.5-2](#) below. Some of the recreation facilities listed are Section 4(f) resources. See Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, for more information about Section 4(f) resources.

Utah Lake State Park, which is outside the recreation impact analysis area but is an important resource to local residents, is located on the northeastern shore of Utah Lake. The park provides access to Utah Lake through four boat ramps and a 30-acre marina as well as camp and picnic sites. The American Fork city boat harbor also provides public access to Utah Lake.

The Jordan River flows north from the north end of Utah Lake and provides recreation opportunities in Saratoga Springs and Lehi including fishing, rafting, bird watching, and a multi-use trail (see Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, for more information on trails). The Jordan River extends to the Great Salt Lake in Salt Lake County and provides recreation opportunities in Salt Lake County as well.





Table 6.5-2. Recreation Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Utah County

Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Attributes	Address	City
River	Yes	Jordan River Parkway	9-mile trail in Utah County extends into Salt Lake County; fishing, bird watching, canoeing, multi-use trail, horseback riding	Inlet Park to Salt Lake County	Lehi, Saratoga Springs
Park	Yes	Inlet Park	Picnicking; provides access to Jordan River Parkway (21 acres)	Saratoga Road	Saratoga Springs
Park	Yes	Wetlands Park (Radio-Controlled Airplane Park)	Radio-controlled airplane flying, trails; access to the Jordan River; wildlife preserve (50 acres)	Saratoga Road	Saratoga Springs
Park	Yes	Wildlife Park	Wetland preserve with trails for nature viewing	Jordan River at 9600 North	Lehi
Park	Yes	Pointe Meadow Park (under development)	Playground, basketball court, tennis court	2145 N. Pointe Meadow Drive	Lehi
Park	Public/private	Spring Creek Ranch (under development)	Playground, basketball court, tennis court	1760 S. Weeping Willow Way	Lehi
Park	Yes	Chappel Valley Park	Playground	880 West 975 South	Lehi
Park	Yes	Gateway Park	Playground (adjacent pavilion and ball fields owned by LDS Church)	1450 West 1870 North	Lehi
Park	Yes	Greens Park	Pavilion, playground, basketball court	1900 North 1700 West	Lehi
Park	Yes	Indian Ford Park (under construction)	Crossing of the Jordan River	Jordan River at Camp Williams	County
Park	Yes	Jordan Willows Park	Detention basin	2670 W. Main Street	Lehi
Park	Yes	Lehi Sports Park (under construction)	Pavilions, playground, horseshoe pits, basketball, volleyball net, football, soccer, and tennis	2000 West 700 South	Lehi
Park	Yes	Mountain Meadows Park	Currently undeveloped; future development planned	Between 500 West and Storrs Ave. at 370 South	American Fork
Park	Yes	North Entrance Park	Entryway to community	1830 N. Trinnaman Lane	Lehi
Park	Yes	Northlake Park (under construction)	Playground	2000 South 500 West	Lehi



▲ ▲

Facility Type	Publicly Owned?	Name	Attributes	Address	City
Park	Yes	Olympic Park	Pavilion, playground, volleyball, basketball, horseshoe pits	1650 North 2650 West	Lehi
Park	Yes	Parkview Park	Detention basin	220 West 1425 South	Lehi
Park	No	Saddle Ridge Park	Playground	410 West 1730 South	Lehi
Park	No	Scottfield Acres Park	Playground	1780 West 1500 North	Lehi
Park	Yes	Somerset Park	Playground, pavilion	200 South 1700 West	Lehi
Park	Yes	Stagecoach Crossing A	Playground, pavilion, basketball court	1900 West 550 South	Lehi
Park	Yes	Stagecoach Crossing C	Playground	1500 West 700 South	Lehi
Park	Yes	Thanksgiving Point Golf Course	18-hole golf course	3003 N. Thanksgiving Way	Lehi
Park	Yes	Willow Park	Camping, canoeing, fishing, hiking, playground, pavilion	9800 West 8570 North	Lehi
Park	No	Cranberry Farms Park	Playground	Jordan River at 2100 North	Lehi
Park	Yes	Wines Park	Playground	500 N. Center St.	Lehi
Park	Yes	Band Wagon Park	Playground	900 North 200 West	Lehi
Park	No	Courtyard Cove	Playground	1300 North 600 West	Lehi

▼ ▼

6.5.4 Community Facilities

The community facilities that are located within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives in Utah County are listed in [Table 6.5-3](#) and in [Figure 6-4](#) through [Figure 6-6](#), Community and Recreational Facilities. These facilities include only churches and schools. There are no libraries or other community facilities within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives.

Table 6.5-3. Community Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Utah County

Type	Name	Address	City
Church	LDS Meeting House	1364 West 1870 North	Lehi
Church	LDS Meeting House	600 South 500 West	Lehi
Church	LDS Meeting House	700 South 1700 West	Lehi
Church	LDS Meeting House	587 S. Saratoga Rd.	Saratoga Springs
Church	LDS Meeting House	270 W. Harvest Hills Blvd.	Saratoga Springs
Church	LDS Meeting House	600 South 100 West	American Fork
Church	LDS Meeting House	2150 N. Pointe Meadow Drive	Lehi
Church	LDS Meeting House	2256 N. Providence Drive	Saratoga Springs
Church	LDS Meeting House	1149 North 300 West	Lehi
School	Sego Lily Elementary School	550 East 900 North	Lehi
School	Harvest Elementary	2105 N. Providence Drive	Saratoga Springs
School	Lehi Elementary School	765 N. Center Street	Lehi
School	Lakeview Charter School	11281 West 7600 North	Saratoga Springs

6.5.5 Public Services and Utilities

With the exception of Questar Gas, the major utilities that run parallel to the proposed alternatives are the same in Utah County as in Salt Lake County and include Rocky Mountain Power, Kern River Gas Transmission Company (which operates the Kern River pipeline), and Level 3. These utilities follow the power corridor as discussed in Section 6.4.5, Public Services and Utilities.

6.5.6 Public Safety

The emergency responders in the Utah County portion of the public safety impact analysis area who were contacted said that the current transportation facilities in Utah County are a limiting factor in providing emergency services in a timely manner. In particular, SR 73 slows emergency response times during peak traffic periods. Emergency response times are slowed even more when there is an accident along SR 73 because there are limited alternate east-west routes. Emergency responders in the Utah County municipalities are concerned that, as development continues in the northern part of the county, this situation will worsen (City of Lehi Emergency Services 2004; Lucas 2004; Barlow 2005). Utah County emergency service providers that require efficient roadway operation to provide services are shown in [Table 6.5-4](#). There are no emergency service provider facilities within the Utah County portion of the public safety impact analysis area.

Table 6.5-4. Emergency Service Providers in Utah County

Jurisdiction	Provider		
	Police	Fire Protection	Ambulance Service ^a
Utah County	Utah County Sheriff	Utah County Fire Dept.	Gold Cross Ambulance Service, Inc.
Lehi	Lehi Police Dept.	Lehi Fire Dept.	Lehi Emergency Medical Services
American Fork	American Fork Police Dept.	American Fork Fire Dept.	American Fork Ambulance Dept.
Saratoga Springs	Utah County Sheriff (Eagle Mountain Sheriff's Office)	Saratoga Springs Fire Dept.	Lehi Emergency Medical Services
Lindon	Pleasant Grove Police Dept.	Pleasant Grove Fire Dept.	Pleasant Grove Fire Dept.
Eagle Mountain	Utah County Sheriff	Eagle Mountain Fire Dept.	Eagle Mountain Fire Dept.
Pleasant Grove	Pleasant Grove Police Dept.	Pleasant Grove Fire Dept.	Pleasant Grove Fire Dept.
Camp Williams ^b	Base Federal Civilian Security Force	Base Military Range Control	Rotation of Local Municipalities

^a Most fire departments provide emergency medical services. Typically, emergency medical technicians and/or paramedics from the county or city fire department respond to emergencies. When a patient needs to be transported to a hospital, the transport is handled by a public or private entity such as Gold Cross Ambulance that holds the license for the given jurisdiction.

^b Camp Williams is a National Guard training facility.

6.5.7 Relocations

6.5.7.1 Residences

Within the relocation impact analysis area in Utah County, land use is classified as primarily undeveloped and farmland with some urban development toward the eastern (Lehi) and southern end of the corridor adjacent to Utah Lake and Interstate 15 (I-15) (American Fork and Pleasant Grove). (See Chapter 4, Land Use, for a detailed explanation of the land uses along the corridor.) Most residences in the relocation impact analysis area are single-family units, with a few apartments or multi-family units interspersed throughout.

The northern and central portions of the relocation impact analysis area in Utah County are less populated, and housing is more scattered with fewer residential and business developments adjacent to the proposed alternatives. However, this portion of the impact analysis area, which is largely undeveloped and available for new development, is experiencing a high rate of growth. Many new subdivisions are being built adjacent to the proposed alternatives, especially between Main Street in Lehi and Utah Lake.

6.5.7.2 Businesses and Public Facilities

Businesses and public facilities in the relocation impact analysis area are more concentrated in areas where there is a higher population. The northern Utah County portion of the relocation impact analysis area is primarily undeveloped land and farmlands. The areas near I-15 in Lehi, American Fork, and Pleasant Grove have the highest concentrations of commercial businesses.

6.5.7.3 Farms

Farmland areas are located throughout the relocation impact analysis area (see Chapter 5, Farmlands). Higher concentrations of farmland are located in the northern and western Utah County portion of the relocation impact analysis area. Farther south and east and closer to the I-15 corridor, fewer farmland areas are located adjacent to the proposed alternatives. See Chapter 5, Farmlands, for a more detailed discussion of farmlands.

6.6 Environmental Consequences

6.6.1 Methodology

As noted in Section 6.1.2, Resource Identification Methods, community facilities and parcel data were added to an electronic map file. These data were examined during the impact analysis for community cohesion, quality of life, recreation, public facilities, utilities, public safety, and relocations impacts. Each alternative (and the associated right-of-way) was overlaid on the electronic map file to determine which buildings or facilities would be directly affected and which buildings or facilities would be adjacent to the proposed alternatives. Impacts were calculated or quantified for any facilities that would be completely acquired or for which a partial property acquisition, also called a strip take, would be necessary. Other impacts, such as those to community cohesion and quality of life, were evaluated on both a qualitative level as discussed below and in quantitative terms by analyzing how some community facilities would be affected by the alternatives.

The impact analysis has been updated since the Draft EIS based on refinements to the action alternatives as described in Section 2.1.7.3, Design Options Incorporated in the Final EIS, and Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS. In addition, changes to the chapter were made to document steps that will be taken by UDOT during project implementation to address concerns raised by utility companies.

Community Cohesion and Quality of Life

For community cohesion and quality of life, a qualitative analysis was performed. Additionally, the potential for alternatives to affect community facilities was considered in order to determine the impacts to the physical layout of the community and to resources that might provide opportunities for community interaction. The elements evaluated included barriers that divide or limit access to areas of the community (edges), access (paths/nodes), connections to services and facilities (districts), removal of community facilities and services (districts/landmarks), residential or business displacements, and opportunities for infill or new development.

For analyzing quality of life, the factors that are generally identified as contributing to a person's quality of life—including safety, recreation opportunities, convenient shopping, nearby services, transportation facilities, diverse natural resources, and general living environment—were reviewed for changes resulting from the proposed alternatives. Other factors, such as air quality and noise, could also contribute to a person's sense of quality of life. See

Chapter 12, Air Quality, and Chapter 13, Noise, for more information about air quality and noise impacts.

Recreation Resources

For recreation facilities, the same process of overlaying alternatives on the electronic map file was used. Impacts to recreation facilities were reported as the total acreage removed from parks and recreation facilities. Additionally, the analysis of impacts looked at changes in the use of park or recreation land that is not proposed for acquisition (that is, indirect impacts that affect the use of a park or facility). Examples of such indirect impacts include noise or visual impacts. (For more information on noise and visual impacts, see Chapter 13, Noise, and Chapter 19, Visual Resources.)

The current FHWA procedures for highway noise analysis and abatement are contained in 23 CFR 772, Procedure for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. This procedure sets a construction noise abatement criterion of 57 dBA (decibels on the A-weighted scale) for outdoor recreation areas in which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose. Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, and parks have a construction noise abatement criterion of 67 dBA. An impact occurs when this criterion is exceeded or when the predicted noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise level. Under UDOT guidance, a 10-dBA increase is considered substantial, and an abatement criterion for recreation areas such as playgrounds, active sports areas, and parks of 66 dBA is used (UDOT 2008). Because UDOT's guidance is more conservative than FHWA's guidance, it was used in the noise impact analysis for park and recreation facilities.

Recreation areas that are publicly owned and open to the public are subject to the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 303, commonly referred to as Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act. These properties and the expected impacts from the MVC project are discussed in more detail in Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation.

Community Facilities

The community facilities analysis used a process similar to that used for recreation facilities. Impacts were determined by using an electronic map file to evaluate how the facilities related to the alternatives. The impacts were reported as the total acreage removed from facility properties and/or as physical impacts that could affect facility operation.

Public Services and Utilities

The utility analysis focused on the utility companies in the project area, including Rocky Mountain Power, Kern River Gas Transmission Company, and Questar Gas, because the utilities they operate parallel the MVC corridor. Impacts to utilities are referred to as *points of conflict*, or places where the proposed alternatives would require either a crossing or a relocation of the utility. Some utilities (including water, sewer, and storm drainage) would cross the proposed alternatives perpendicularly, and the effects on these utilities would be determined by working with local jurisdictions during the final design phase of the project once a preferred alternative is identified. Impacts to these utilities can usually be accommodated within the design of an alternative and would not affect the alternative's overall location. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost, in Chapter 2. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. In addition, the environmental impacts associated with each relocation have been evaluated in the appropriate resource sections in this EIS.

Public Safety

For the public safety analysis, information was gathered directly from personal communications with emergency response providers. Emergency response personnel were asked whether there was a connection between the existing traffic conditions or roadway limitations and emergency response times and whether the project could hinder emergency response times or roadway accessibility.

Relocations (Housing and Business Acquisitions)

For this analysis, three types of relocation effects were considered: total acquisitions (called relocations), potential relocations, and strip takes (land-only impacts).

- A *relocation* occurs when an existing structure is within the right-of-way of a proposed alternative, the entire property needs to be acquired, and the residents or business would need to relocate.
- For this analysis, a *potential relocation* is defined as a situation in which a property is directly affected by the project and an existing structure (excluding porches and garages) is within 15 feet of the proposed right-of-way, but it is not clear whether the entire property needs to be acquired. See [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions, for an illustration of how potential relocations were considered. By the end of the right-of-way acquisition phase, UDOT will determine whether each

potential relocation is a full acquisition (relocation) or a strip take (see below). This determination will depend on an independent valuation of the property that will include any project-related damage to buildings.

- A *strip take* generally occurs when a property is located within the proposed right-of-way, but the right-of-way is more than 15 feet from an existing structure (see [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions). For this type of impact, only a strip of land would need to be acquired. As with potential relocations, UDOT could refine strip takes during the right-of-way acquisition phase.

In addition, for some properties, *construction easements* might be necessary. These properties are not included in the right-of-way analysis conducted for this EIS. These properties are outside the right-of-way but might be affected by cut or fill required during roadway construction. UDOT would temporarily use these properties during construction, and compensation would be provided to the landowner for the temporary use. The property would be fully returned to the owner when the use of the property is no longer required, typically when construction is complete. These properties might be affected, but are not considered relocations or partial acquisitions because use of the property is not permanent. Construction easements are not included in the relocation impacts discussed in this section.

For this analysis, the numbers of relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes were calculated from county records of property data as of January 15, 2007. To determine whether an acquisition was a relocation or potential relocation, UDOT considered whether there were known structures on a property or whether the property had been platted for development and lots had been identified in the plat. In some cases, if a property was about to be platted or if development was occurring along the alternative alignments, UDOT acquired the property early to avoid taking occupied homes in the future. Section 2.3, Land Acquired to Date, in Chapter 2 lists the properties that were acquired early. If an early-acquisition property was platted or building sites were identified, this information was included in the analysis. If the property had not been developed or platted, it was not considered to be an affected property.

6.6.2 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, the MVC project would not be constructed. Other transportation projects identified in the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) long-range transportation plans and by the local communities would be constructed, and these projects could cause community impacts.

6.6.2.1 Community Cohesion

As discussed in Section 6.4.1, Community Cohesion, many factors contribute to community cohesion, including the connectivity of the physical community and social interactions. Under the No-Action Alternative, the physical layout of the communities would continue to present challenges and opportunities for cohesive communities. Schools, churches, and a general familiarity with the neighborhoods will continue to foster social interactions and cohesiveness under the No-Action Alternative, and more cohesive districts would develop in the newer communities over time. The planned transportation improvements under this alternative would not change the cohesive nature of communities in the community cohesion impact analysis area.

6.6.2.2 Quality of Life

Under the No-Action Alternative, jurisdictions in the quality of life impact analysis area would continue to grow and develop as specified in the land use and general plans for each of the cities and counties. As part of the No-Action Alternative, anticipated future population growth and associated residential and commercial development in the community would continue. This would result in increased opportunities for recreation, shopping, and other community services and activities. Other transportation facilities would be developed as specified in the WFRC and MAG long-range transportation plans. However, as described in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, by 2030, roads throughout the region will become more congested as more people move into the area and the population continues to grow. Because congestion would continue to increase under the No-Action Alternative, residents' quality of life would continue to be affected by transportation issues. In addition, the continued growth would likely contribute to a further reduction in open space and a loss of the rural and small-town lifestyles that many local residents value and wish could be preserved. Overall, the general quality of life is expected to change (become more urban) but not necessarily diminish.

6.6.2.3 Recreation Resources

Under the No-Action Alternative, recreation facilities would continue to be managed according to the recreation plans and policies for each of the jurisdictions. No recreation facilities are expected to be removed, and amenities such as playground equipment or picnic shelters could be added or replaced as needed and as determined by each recreation service provider.

6.6.2.4 Community Facilities

Under the No-Action Alternative, existing community facilities would be maintained. As the population of Salt Lake and Utah Counties continues to grow, additional community facilities could be constructed as determined by each jurisdiction.

6.6.2.5 Public Services and Utilities

Under the No-Action Alternative, normal and necessary utility maintenance needed to supply service to utility customers would continue. Regional growth could also require the construction of new facilities needed to serve planned development. Ground-disturbing activities associated with such development could physically affect utilities.

6.6.2.6 Public Safety

Under the No-Action Alternative, the MVC freeway and transit components would not be built. However, the projects identified in the WFRC and MAG long-range transportation plans would continue to be implemented. Construction of roadway and transit projects specified in the long-range plans could improve traffic flow, which should result in a decrease in traffic accidents. However, even with these improvements, the amount of traffic delay will increase between 2002 and 2030 as the region grows. This increase in delay could affect emergency response times.

In Salt Lake County, as described in Section 6.4.6, Public Safety, the current response times are acceptable and are related to the type of emergency more than the current transportation infrastructure. However, future response times would likely change as traffic delays increase. Emergency responders in Utah County are concerned that additional growth in the county would continue to worsen congestion and response times unless major east-west transportation improvements are made (City of Lehi Emergency Services 2004; Lucas 2004; Barlow 2005).

6.6.2.7 Relocations

Under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no relocations as a result of the MVC project. Other improvements identified in the WFRC and MAG long-range transportation plans would continue to be implemented. The extent of relocations associated with these other proposals would be determined during project planning and design.



6.6.3 Salt Lake County Alternatives

In Salt Lake County, two roadway alternatives and a transit alternative which would be implemented as part of the roadway alternatives are under consideration: the 5600 West Transit Alternative, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, and the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. Under the 5600 West Transit Alternative, there is a dedicated right-of-way option and a mixed-traffic option. In addition, a tolling option was considered for each freeway alternative. Impacts under each combination of alternatives and options are discussed in the following sections.

6.6.3.1 5600 West Transit Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, two transit options are under consideration along 5600 West in Salt Lake County. One option, the Dedicated Right-of-Way Option, would incorporate a transit system running down the center of the roadway, and the other, the Mixed-Traffic Option, would incorporate a transit system running alongside the roadway.

Impact Summary. Overall, this alternative would not substantially affect the social environment of the MVC study area. The direct impacts to recreation resources, community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability.

5600 West Transit Alternative Impacts		
Community Resource	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option	Mixed-Traffic Option
Community cohesion	Enhanced opportunities for interaction	
Quality of life	Enhanced	Enhanced
Recreation resources	2	2
Community facilities	3	3
Utilities	3	3
Public safety	No adverse impact	No adverse impact
Relocations ^a	8	2
Potential relocations ^a	22	15

^a See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

5600 West Transit Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option

Community Cohesion

The northern terminus of the proposed Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option is the Salt Lake City International Airport. From the airport, the transit option crosses through a commercial and light-industrial area where it then connects to



5600 West just south of Interstate 80 (I-80). The area surrounding 5600 West from I-80 to SR 201 is primarily undeveloped land with some industrial and commercial businesses near SR 201. This portion of the transit option would not affect community cohesion because there is not a high degree of social interaction occurring here.

Between SR 201 and 4700 South, the transit option crosses through West Valley City. West Valley City is primarily suburban, with low-density residential and commercial areas of large “big-box” stores near the proposed transit option. This option passes by the West Valley Family Fitness Center and Hunter High School. However, since the operations of these community gathering places would not be affected by construction of the transit option, there would be no negative impacts to community cohesion in West Valley City. In fact, the mobility of residents would be increased by the availability of transit, which could provide better access to facilities such as the fitness center.

The transit option would generally follow the future alignment of 5600 West, in an area that is agricultural but beginning to urbanize, and connect with the alignment of the Mid-Jordan Light-Rail line in the planned Daybreak development (located in South Jordan). Transit would function as an important part in community planning by serving as a path (and thus improving mobility) in the physical layout of the community. This ultimately could help improve community cohesiveness. The transit option would follow the Mid-Jordan Light-Rail line north of the Daybreak development between 10400 South and Old Bingham Highway.

The southern terminus of the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would be a connection with a planned town center in Herriman. The transit option could positively affect Herriman’s community cohesion by providing access to the town center, which is a district that promotes social interaction through retail activity and community facilities. In this way, what might have otherwise been an edge in the community would become a pass-through point and would provide access to local and regional service as well as greater mobility. Although access to the town center and the pass-through point might not directly promote social interaction, they can provide opportunities for personal contact, which is a factor in staying and socializing in the community for a longer period of time.

In summary, this transit option would not isolate any areas of established communities and could lead to enhanced cohesion by providing additional opportunities for interaction.



Quality of Life

The limited amount of right-of-way required for the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would have minor impacts on recreation facilities in the quality of life impact analysis area. Because impacts would be minor, aspects of quality of life related to recreation would not be affected. Access to convenient shopping and nearby services as well as access to transportation facilities would be improved under this option, enabling residents to have more mobility. This is particularly important for groups that might not otherwise have transportation access, such as elderly people and children. This greater mobility can positively affect quality of life.

Growth is seen as a big detractor from quality of life in the quality of life impact analysis area (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2003). As a response to anticipated social discord related to growth, the local municipalities and Envision Utah have developed a “Vision Scenario” for the MVC study area that addresses how roadway improvements, transit improvements, and changes in land use are related to sustainable growth (see Section 3.2.3, The Vision Scenario). The Vision Scenario, which was developed through Envision Utah’s Growth Choices process, was intended to address local concerns about growth. Transit is an important element of the Vision Scenario and would help address residents’ concerns about the effects of growth on quality of life.

In summary, the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would enhance the quality of life in the quality of life impact analysis area by providing greater mobility.

Recreation Resources

The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would directly affect the following recreation resources:

- **Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education.** This transit option would require about 3 acres along the eastern edge of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education. The area is adjacent to 5600 West. This impact would not affect the function or overall use of the facility.
- **Centennial Park.** This transit option would directly affect less than 0.3 acre of the northwest corner of the park, which also contains the Family Fitness Center and the West Valley Centennial Park police substation. The affected area is undeveloped next to 5600 West. The impact would not affect any park facilities or the park’s function.

Noise levels at Wingpointe Golf Course, the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education, and Centennial Park would not exceed 66 dBA or increase by at least



10 dBA. Noise levels at West Ridge Golf Course would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. For more information on noise impacts and mitigation, see Chapter 13, Noise.

Community Facilities

The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would affect the following community facilities:

- **Hunter High School.** Acquisition of about 0.04 acre of open field next to the existing roadway (5600 West). This minor loss of land would not affect the use of the school or any school facilities.
- **West Jordan Fire Station 54.** Acquisition of about 0.075 acre that would take part of the driveway along Hawley Park Road (5600 West). The impacts would not affect station operations.
- **West Ridge Academy.** Acquisition of about 0.3 acre of parking strip and parking lot along 5600 West. The impact would not affect the overall parking or use of the academy.

Numerous schools and other community facilities are within 0.5 mile of this option but would not be affected by its construction or operation.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to utilities are referred to as *points of conflict*, or places where the proposed alternatives would require either a crossing or a relocation of the utility. With the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option, there would be three points of conflict. These conflicts are listed in [Table 6.6-1](#) below. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

The utilities primarily follow the power corridor that runs along 5800 West. However, the power lines cross over the existing 5600 West, and the Kern River pipeline crosses under the existing 5600 West north of 500 South (at separate locations). Questar Gas and Kern River Gas Transmission Company have pipelines that would also be crossed on the southern end of the alignment. The pipelines would be identified and appropriate measures would be taken in coordination with the utility companies to ensure the safety and continuity of service during construction of the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. The power lines cross over the existing 5600 West, and the height of the utility poles might have to be adjusted to accommodate the transit line.



Table 6.6-1. Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County

Utility Type	Conflict Location	Type of Conflict (for Power Line)	Proposed Resolution^a	Alternative
Kern River	11600 South to 11400 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to east side of ramps.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	11400 South	Crossing	Adjust lines to span MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	11200 South to 10700 South	Relocation	Move utilities to east side of MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Kern River	11000 South to 10600 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to east side of ramps.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	10200 South	Crossing	Cross over MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	Old Bingham Highway (10000 South)	Crossing	Cross over MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	9400 South to 8900 South	Crossing	Move utilities to east side of MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Questar Gas	9500 South to 8900 South	Relocation and Crossing	Realign pipe to east side of MVC and back to current alignment.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Kern River	9500 South to 8900 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to east side of ramps and back to current alignment.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Kern River	8400 South to 8000 South	NA	Expose gas pipelines and backfill; realign segment running under proposed freeway to east side of ramps.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	8400 South to 8000 South	Crossing	Cross over MVC.	All Salt Lake County roadway alternatives
Rocky Mountain Power	4700 South to 3500 South	Relocation	Move utilities to east side of MVC; cross over MVC to west side of MVC.	5800 West Freeway





Utility Type	Conflict Location	Type of Conflict (for Power Line)	Proposed Resolution ^a	Alternative
Kern River	4700 South to 3800 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to east side of ramps. Cross under proposed freeway to west side.	5800 West Freeway
Rocky Mountain Power	3500 South to SR 201	Crossing	Move utilities to west side of MVC.	5800 West Freeway
Kern River	2900 South to 1900 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to west side of ramps. Tie to existing pipeline prior to SR 201.	5800 West Freeway
Rocky Mountain Power	SR 201	Crossing/relocation	Reroute lines to west of proposed SR 201 interchange. Avoids need for taller transmission towers.	5800 West Freeway
Rocky Mountain Power	1500 South to 1200 South	Relocation	Move utilities to west side of MVC.	5800 West Freeway
Rocky Mountain Power	1000 South	Crossing	Construct two crossings over MVC.	5800 West Freeway
Kern River	1000 South to 800 South	NA	Realign pipe segment running under proposed freeway to west side of ramps. Expose gas pipelines and backfill.	5800 West Freeway
Kern River	5600 West near 500 South	NA	Expose gas pipelines and backfill.	5600 West Transit
Kern River	11400 South near Daybreak	NA	Expose gas pipeline and backfill	5600 West Transit
Questar Gas	11800 South and 5600 West	NA	Expose gas pipeline and backfill.	5600 West Transit
Rocky Mountain Power	1300 South	Crossing	Adjust lines to cross over MVC.	7200 West Freeway

NA = not applicable

^a The proposed resolution has not yet been determined for every conflict. The final resolution of utility conflicts would be determined during the final design phase of the project.





Public Safety

As described in Table 6.4-5 above, Emergency Services and Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives in Salt Lake County, there are two fire stations along 5600 West (one in West Valley City, one in West Jordan) and one along Amelia Earhart Drive in Salt Lake City. The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would be designed so that it would not affect emergency response ability or response times.

Relocations

The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would require eight relocations including one residential, three commercial, two industrial, and two government-owned properties (see Table 6.6-2). In addition, 13 residential, six commercial, two industrial, and one government property have been identified as potential relocations. For more information on relocations, see Appendix 6A, Property Impacts.

Table 6.6-2. Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County

Type of Relocation ^a	Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option	Mixed-Traffic Transit Option	5800 West Freeway Alternative	7200 West Freeway Alternative
<i>Residential</i>				
Relocations	1	0	160	253
Potential relocations	13	9	10	15
<i>Commercial</i>				
Relocations	3	0	9	23
Potential relocations	6	4	0	0
<i>Industrial</i>				
Relocations	2	1	5	3
Potential relocations	2	1	0	1
<i>School</i>				
Relocations	0	0	0	0
Potential relocations	0	0	0	0
<i>Government/Other</i>				
Relocations	2	1	1	1 ^b
Potential relocations	1	1	0	0
Total	30	17	185	296

^a See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

^b Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall.



5600 West Transit Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

Community Cohesion

The majority of the impacts to community cohesion from the Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would be the same as those from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. However, the Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would have more stops that could encourage added local use of the facility.

Quality of Life

The Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would have similar effects on quality of life as the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (increased mobility and accessibility). However, because the Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would have more local stops, improvements to local transportation access would be greater than those from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. This, in turn, could further enhance residents' quality of life.

Recreation Resources

The recreation impacts from the Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would be the same as those from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Community Facilities

This option would affect the same facilities as the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Public Services and Utilities

The Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would have the same impacts on public services and utilities (three conflicts) as the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (see [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County).

Public Safety

The Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would have the same public safety impacts as the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. The Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would be designed so that it would not affect emergency response ability or response times.

Relocations

The Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would require two relocations including one industrial properties and one government-owned property (see [Table 6.6-2](#) above,



Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County). In addition, nine residential, four commercial, one government, and one industrial property have been identified as potential relocations. For more information on relocations, see Appendix 6A, Property Impacts.

6.6.3.2 5800 West Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from I-80 to the Utah County line.

Impact Summary. Overall, this alternative would result in localized community cohesion impacts but would not substantially affect the general social environment of the MVC study area. The direct impacts to recreation resources, community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this alternative would be lower than that required under the 7200 West Freeway Alternative (see Table 6.6-2 above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County, for a comparison).

5800 West Freeway Alternative Impacts	
Community Resource	Impacts
Community cohesion	Increased separation between neighbors along existing power corridor; localized impacts related to right-of-way takes at Hunter Park, Hillside Elementary, and Hunter High School
Quality of life	Not diminished
Recreation resources	5
Community facilities	3
Utilities	19
Public safety	No adverse impact
Relocations ^a	175
Potential relocations ^a	10

^a See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

Community Cohesion

I-80 to SR 201. There are only two communities along the northern portion of this alternative: Salt Lake City and West Valley City. As noted in Section 6.6.3.1, 5600 West Transit Alternative, this part of Salt Lake City is mainly an industrial area that does not exhibit characteristics of a cohesive community.

Landmarks such as the Hale Theatre and the E Center in West Valley City are farther east and would not be directly affected by this alternative. Hunter High School and the West Valley Family Fitness Center, which serve residents of these areas, would continue to provide physical locations for social interaction. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would not affect community cohesiveness in West Valley City.



SR 201 to 5400 South. Along this segment, the alignment crosses through a primarily residential area west of 5600 West as it follows the power corridor. The power corridor has already created an edge that breaks up the residential area. Along the east side of the power corridor, there are fewer homes, and they are bounded on the east by interspersed “big-box” commercial stores, so these homes are already separated from the larger residential area. Under this alternative, separation would increase as additional homes are displaced along the power corridor. West Valley City has raised concerns about pedestrian access with increased separation of the residential area.

As noted in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, existing trails would be maintained under any of the proposed alternatives. New trails would be included along the southern portion of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative from 2700 South to 7800 West, where the new system would tie in to an existing trail connection. The new trail would resume between 11400 South and 12600 South and would connect to other proposed trails. The final new trail segment would begin near the proposed 13400 South trail and continue into Utah County. These trail segments would improve trail system connectivity and connectivity between and within communities, which would enhance community cohesion.

This alternative would require 90 acres of right-of-way from the of the 1,253 acre Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education. Additionally, an access road for the Center would need to be relocated, as would a utility corridor. The area from which the right-of-way would be acquired is an open field east of the shooting range that contains no physical facilities used by the Center. The open field is occasionally used as overflow when the main training facility is being used for other events. The main dog-trial training area (known as the upper dog-trial training area) at the Center would not be affected by this alternative. The loss of land from the open field east of the shooting range would not affect the overall function of the Center or reduce the amount of social interaction that occurs there.

About 1.4 acres of a grass athletic field at Hillside Elementary would be acquired under this alternative as a result of the utility corridor realignment. This could reduce the interaction among local residents who use this area for recreation. The impact would be limited to the nearby residential area. Similarly, about 0.4 acre of Hunter High School and 1 acres of Hunter Park would be acquired, which could also reduce the interaction among nearby residents who use this area for recreation.

Hunter Park is used by the community for recreation activities and social interaction. The alternative could discourage access to the park and reduce community cohesion; however, during the final design phase of the project, UDOT would consider a pedestrian underpass to reconnect the community.



Residents living along this segment have raised concerns about the installation of noise walls, which could further separate communities in addition to the impacts from the freeway itself (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2003). Bangerter Highway was used as an example. See Chapter 13, Noise, for more information about the impacts of noise walls.

5400 South to the Utah County Line. South of 5400 South, this alternative continues to follow the power corridor through agricultural but developing areas. The power corridor already creates an edge that could isolate any new development. As in West Valley City, installation of a new road would increase the separation and/or isolation of residents who move into these developing areas. However, these developments are new and have not yet established the cohesiveness that is associated with older neighborhoods or larger, well-established communities. The elements that make the communities cohesive, such as main streets, churches, and parks, would not be affected since they largely do not yet exist.

This segment of the alternative passes by Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park, Foothill Park, and Monarch Meadow Park, but would not affect these facilities. UDOT has been working with Salt Lake County and Riverton City to plan the MVC along with the development of Western Springs Park. This coordination has resulted in plans to build the park so that no facilities would be affected once the MVC is constructed. According to Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation, the freeway would not affect the baseball diamonds or the soccer fields and would not affect opportunities for social interaction at the park.

Summary of Impacts to Community Cohesion. Relocations associated with this alternative could reduce the cohesiveness of the areas around the alignment but are not expected to affect the community as a whole. For the communities and portions of the community cohesion impact analysis area that are located more than a few blocks east or west of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, the alternative would have little, if any, influence on patterns of community cohesion.

Given the relatively high proportion of long-term residents living in homes in the community cohesion impact analysis area, many relocated residents would experience adjustment difficulties. However, since a majority of the residents in the community cohesion impact analysis area are young (55% of the Dan Jones & Associates survey respondents were between 26 and 45), most relocated residents would likely establish new patterns of involvement in community life through church participation, community organizations, and interactions with new neighbors.



For the most part, the new freeway would not be likely to alter existing boundaries of churches or school districts. Patterns of participation in community and neighborhood organizations and activities among people living east and west of the freeway would not change substantially from current conditions. However, residents in households immediately east or west of the new freeway could experience reduced interactions with and ties to their immediate neighbors due to increased traffic and noise that would make their outdoor environment less attractive.

In summary, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would not divide communities enough to change the cohesive nature of the area. Residential neighborhoods east of the existing power corridor might be further separated from the larger residential area, and other localized impacts could occur from the alteration of community gathering places such as Hunter Park, Hillside Elementary, and Hunter High School. Such impacts could reduce cohesiveness of the immediate neighborhood but are not expected to affect the larger community.

Quality of Life

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would improve travel into and out of the communities along the corridor. The alternative would also improve travel within the communities and provide more access to nearby services, thus enhancing quality of life.

During public meetings for the project, many residents identified safety as an element that contributes to their quality of life. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would improve safety and remove some traffic from local and neighborhood streets, which would also improve neighborhood safety.

Recreation is an important part of quality of life. There are several recreation facilities along the 5800 West Freeway Alternative in Salt Lake County.

Construction of this alternative would require land from the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education, Hunter Park, Hillside Elementary School, Hunter High School fields, West Ridge Golf Course, and USANA Amphitheatre (a small portion of parking). However, the land acquired would not substantially alter the availability of these facilities for recreation. Trails would be added along segments of the alternative, which would add important recreation resources.

Although some natural resources would be affected (see Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources), the overall natural environment that is experienced by residents and that contributes to quality of life would not substantially change if the alternative is constructed.

Relocations and potential relocations (see page 6-54) can also change the quality of life for affected residents and businesses. Some of the businesses and residents



would relocate near this alternative alignment and so might experience only temporary inconvenience. Others who have to relocate outside the area could experience quality of life effects such as adjusting to a new neighborhood or establishing new relationships with neighbors and local businesses.

According to comments received during public meetings and through the MVC project Web site, many people are concerned about their “lifestyle” being changed, which equates to effects on their quality of life. Many people, especially in southern Salt Lake County, chose to move to this area because of the rural feel of the community, which is characterized by fewer residences and lower noise levels. Growth is occurring in these areas and is likely already affecting the lifestyle there. This growth is expected to occur with or without the MVC project. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative could contribute to a sense that this lifestyle is being lost, but the alternative would not be the sole cause.

Recreation Resources

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would affect five recreation facilities (Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education, Hunter Park, West Ridge Golf Course, USANA Amphitheater, and Western Springs Park) and would pass near several other facilities (West View Park, Hunter Ridge Park, Lodestone Park, Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park, Monarch Meadows Community Park, Foothill Park, and Welby BMX Track Park). Direct effects would be as follows:

- **Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education.** This alternative would require acquisition of about 90 acres of the Center for right-of-way. As described in the section titled Community Cohesion on page 6-46, the area acquired would be from an open field east of the shooting range that is occasionally used for dog-trial training. The main dog-trial training area at the Center (the upper dog trial training area) would not be affected by this alternative. The loss of the open field east of the shooting range would not affect the overall function and use of the Center.
- **Hunter Park.** About 1 acre of Hunter Park would be acquired under this alternative for right-of-way, placement of fill slopes, and a freeway on ramp. This impact would affect a grass area underneath the existing power lines and would not affect any of the park’s amenities. The impact would occur within a utility corridor easement owned by Rocky Mountain Power (Pyle 2005). The park is used by the community for recreational activities and social interaction. The alternative could discourage access to the park from residential areas east of the alternative; however, during the final design phase of the project, UDOT



would consider a community crossing to reconnect the community on the east side of the alternative.

- **Western Springs Park.** This alternative would directly affect Western Springs Park, but such effects were anticipated during the park planning process. As part of the park development, Salt Lake County and Riverton City have agreed to reserve the right-of-way needed to construct the MVC.
- **West Ridge Golf Course.** About 19.5 acres of the 18-hole golf course operated by West Valley City would be acquired under this alternative. The alternative would affect the function of the golf course. However, UDOT has coordinated with West Valley City, which has determined that there is enough remaining land that the 18-hole course could be redesigned around the alternative with UDOT providing an underpass to connect the west and east sides of the course. West Valley City has determined that, with the redesign of the course, the overall function of the 18-hole golf course would not be lost.
- **USANA Amphitheatre.** The west portion of the parking lot of this private facility would be affected by the alternative. The impact would affect less than 10% of the parking and would increase noise levels at the facility. Traffic noise associated with the 5800 West alignment at this location would be about 58 dBA and would not exceed the NAC. It is unlikely that traffic noise from the road would interfere with events at the USANA Amphitheatre (see Chapter 13, Noise). UDOT would coordinate with USANA to ensure that the operation of the facility is maintained.

Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education is primarily used for firearm safety training, which is not a noise-sensitive use (firearm training at the facility typically requires the use of ear protection due to gun noise). Noise levels at the Center would not exceed 66 dBA or increase by at least 10 dBA. Noise levels at Hunter Park, which supports active sports such as softball, would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. Western Springs Park's primary facilities support active sports such as soccer and softball, though there are some picnicking facilities. Under this alternative, noise levels at the park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels.

There are a number of parks near this alternative that would not have property impacts but might have noise impacts. Noise levels at West Ridge Golf Course and Welby BMX Track Park would increase by at least 10 dBA. Noise levels at Hunter Ridge Park would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels and would also exceed 66 dBA. The primary uses of these recreation facilities



include golf, bicycle motocross, softball, soccer, and playgrounds. The remaining parks—West View Park, Lodestone Park, Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park, Monarch Meadows Community Park, and Foothill Park—would not experience substantial noise impacts because noise levels at these parks would not exceed 66 dBA or increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels.

Community Facilities

This alternative would affect three community facilities, Hillside Elementary School, Hunter High School, and Copper Hills Youth Center, as follows:

- **Hillside Elementary School.** About 1.4 acres of an open grass athletic field would be acquired. No buildings or playground structures would be affected.
- **Hunter High School.** About 0.4 acre of a grass field and softball diamond at this school would be acquired. The acquired area would be used for the relocated utility corridor, and the utilities could likely be placed within the utility corridor in a way that would allow continued use of the sports facilities. UDOT would coordinate with the school during the final design phase of the project to ensure that the overall function of the sports facilities is not lost.
- **Copper Hills Youth Center.** About 4.1 acres used for a utility easement would be acquired. The land is undeveloped except for some utilities. None of the facilities or functions of the youth center would be affected.

Public Services and Utilities

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would result in 19 utility conflicts. [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County, shows the locations and types of these conflicts. Because this alternative would have a greater impact on utilities, some concerns about the cost of relocating the utilities and the impact of the relocations were raised by the utility companies during the Draft EIS comment period. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. The additional right-of-way required for utility relocations has been analyzed for all appropriate resources in this EIS.

For the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, Rocky Mountain Power and Kern River Gas Transmission Company (Willbros Engineering/EPC 2008) have provided UDOT with a cost estimate for relocating their infrastructure, and this estimate has been included in the overall alternative cost estimate. The estimates include



\$64,471,100 for Rocky Mountain Power and \$78,507,300 for Kern River. These estimates are slightly higher than what was provided by the utility companies because UDOT uses higher contingencies and different assumptions regarding design costs. The estimate to relocate Questar utilities was about \$3,681,200 for this alternative. Because the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would require the relocation of an interstate natural gas pipeline, UDOT through Kern River Gas Transmission Company would need to coordinate with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as part of relocating utilities.

Eleven of the conflicts would be with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines. Rocky Mountain Power also has substation facilities at 7800 South and at 10200 South and a proposed substation at 11800 South. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would not affect these substations.

There would also be seven conflicts along the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with the Kern River pipeline as shown in [Table 6.6-1](#) above. Because a portion of the pipeline would require relocation, UDOT would need to coordinate with Kern River Gas Transmission Company to obtain the necessary approvals from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviews applications for the construction and operation of natural gas pipelines. In its application review, the Commission ensures that the applicant will comply with the Department of Transportation safety standards and other applicable requirements. This process would require Kern River Gas Transmission Company to submit the application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for relocating the gas pipeline. The process would require that the necessary environmental documents be prepared for the gas pipeline relocation. If the 5800 West Freeway Alternative is approved in the Record of Decision, Kern River Gas Transmission Company along with UDOT would obtain the necessary approvals.

Under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, there would be one conflict with Questar gas facilities. This conflict would require realigning the pipeline to the east side of the alternative from 9500 South to 8900 South.

The Provo Reservoir Canal is north of Camp Williams (this canal is not listed in [Table 6.6-1](#) because it is not owned by a major utility provider). This alternative would likely require piping of a portion of this canal. The length of the canal that would be affected would be determined during the final design phase of the project.

Construction of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative could cause temporary disruptions in utility service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to



ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized.

Public Safety

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would improve travel into and out of the communities along the corridor. It would also improve emergency response providers' access to the communities. As mentioned in the Quality of Life section on page 6-49, safety is important to many residents. This alternative would improve safety on roads within the communities and would in turn mean fewer trips for emergency response providers.

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative could limit student and pedestrian access to Hillside Elementary School and Hunter High School for students on the west side of this alternative. UDOT is coordinating with the Granite School District to maintain safe student access to the schools. The changes to maintain safe student access could include the following:

- Maintain residential street crossings at Cape Cod Drive and 4300 South.
- Add a new street crossing at Cilma Drive that connects to 5600 West.
- At the 4100 South interchange, provide a grade-separated pedestrian crossing of the southbound on ramp and widen the interchange to better accommodate pedestrian movement.
- Provide a community crossing at Hunter Park.

Relocations

The relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property acquisition process. Construction could require 175 total relocations consisting of 160 residential properties, nine commercial properties, five industrial properties, and one government-owned property. In addition, there could be 10 potential relocations of residential properties. See [Table 6.6-2](#) above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County, and Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, for a listing of relocations. The 10 potential residential relocations include one duplex.

The future availability of real estate in the relocations impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. But, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. Homes are available in all communities, but



the largest concentrations of homes are found in West Valley City, Magna, West Jordan, and Salt Lake City.

A few relocations would affect renters. A search of rental properties found that there is a variety of rental properties ranging in rent from \$450 to \$1,200 per month in West Valley City, Magna, Riverton, and West Jordan.

A number of commercial properties are currently available in the relocations impact analysis area, and the cities along the corridor are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate relocated businesses. The affected businesses would be able to relocate along or near the corridor.

Combined Impacts of 5800 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be implemented with one of the two 5600 West Transit Alternative options. The combination of the freeway alternative with each of the transit options would cause different community impacts.

Impact Summary. Overall, this combination of alternatives would result in localized community cohesion impacts but would not substantially affect the general social environment of the MVC study area. The direct impacts to recreation resources, community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary

table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this combination would be about the same as that required under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, which means that the number of relocation impacts would be lower than that required by the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.

Combined Impacts of 5800 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives		
Community Resource	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option	Mixed-Traffic Option
Community cohesion	Increased separation among neighbors along existing power corridor; localized impacts associated with right-of-way takes	
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility	
Recreation resources	7 ^a	7 ^a
Community facilities	6 ^b	6 ^b
Utilities	22	22
Public safety	No adverse impacts	
Relocations ^c	183	177
Potential relocations ^c	32	25

^a Counts two different impacts to the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education separately.

^b Counts two different impacts to Hunter High School separately.

^c See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

***5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option***

Community Cohesion. As described for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, some neighborhoods would be separated in West Valley City along the 5800 West Freeway Alternative on both sides of the power corridor. The addition of the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would not further separate residents or decrease community cohesion. It could, however, enhance the general mobility of residents in the area.

For that portion of the alternative south of 5400 South, the cohesion of communities that the alignment passes through would not be affected. The newer, developing neighborhoods could be separated by the freeway and transit alignment (depending on the extent of development at the time of construction), but other community elements such as families, community leadership, and churches would also be factors in determining the future cohesion of the communities and developing neighborhoods.

Quality of Life. The combination of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would not further diminish the quality of life for Salt Lake County residents. Transit could improve the quality of life by offering an additional option for mobility and reducing some of the traffic associated with urbanization.

Recreation Resources. The recreation resources that would be affected by this combination are the same as those for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. Affected recreation resources include the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education (two separate impacts, one from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option and one from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative), Centennial Park, Hunter Park, West Ridge Golf Course, USANA Amphitheatre, and Western Springs Park.

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option are physically separated enough that they would not combine to increase noise levels at nearby recreation facilities. In addition, most noise associated with the transit option would be within the background noise levels of traffic on 5600 West.

Community Facilities. Under this combination, there would be six impacts to the following community facilities: West Jordan Fire Station 54, Hunter High School (two separate impacts, one from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option and one from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative), Copper Hills Youth Center, West Ridge Academy, and Hillside Elementary School. The impacts would be the same as those described separately for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.



Public Services and Utilities. This combination would result in 11 conflicts with the Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, nine conflicts with the Kern River pipeline, two with Questar Gas (see Table 6.6-1 above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County), and a possible conflict with the Provo Reservoir Canal.

Public Safety. This combination would positively contribute to transportation accessibility, which could enhance emergency service providers' response times and mobility.

Relocations. The combined 5800 West Freeway Alternative and Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would require 183 relocations and 32 potential relocations. As discussed for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, there are replacement properties available in the affected communities.

5800 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

Community Cohesion. This combination's impact to community cohesion would be the same as that from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Quality of Life. This combination's impact to quality of life would be the same as that from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Recreation Resources. The recreation resources that would be affected by this combination are the same as those for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Community Facilities. The community facilities that would be affected by this combination are the same as those for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Public Services and Utilities. This combination's impacts to public services and utilities would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (22 conflicts).

Public Safety. This combination's impacts to public safety would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Relocations. The combined 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would require 177 relocations and 25 potential relocations. As discussed for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, there are replacement properties available in the affected communities.



5800 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

The impacts from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.

There is an additional consideration associated with the Tolling Option related to emergency response vehicles passing through toll stations. To ensure that impacts to public safety are minimized, special accommodations for emergency vehicles would be made so that response times are not diminished and so that no financial burden is placed on the emergency providers.

6.6.3.3 7200 West Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from I-80 to the Utah County line.

Impact Summary. In summary, this alternative would result in localized community cohesion impacts and would result in the loss of one community facility (a Jehovah’s Witnesses Meeting Hall). The direct impacts to recreation resources and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of

relocations and potential relocations required under this alternative would be the highest of the two freeway options in Salt Lake County (see [Table 6.6-2](#) above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County, for a comparison).

7200 West Freeway Alternative Impacts	
Community Resource	Impacts
Community cohesion	Separation (isolation) of homes near 4100 South
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility
Recreation resources	3
Community facilities	2
Utilities	12
Public safety	No adverse impacts
Relocations ^a	280
Potential relocations ^a	16

^a See [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

Community Cohesion

I-80 to SR 201. Communities along this segment of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative include Magna, Salt Lake City, and West Valley City. The land along this segment is primarily agricultural and industrial. There is no cohesive community between I-80 and SR 201.

SR 201 to 5400 South. Residents of the communities of Magna and West Valley City enjoy the lower cost of living and the distance from the metropolitan center that these communities offer (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2003). If one considers civic



participation to be an indicator of community cohesiveness, then these two communities have shown cohesiveness by willingly participating in the public meetings for the MVC project.

Even though these cities share a municipal boundary, residents feel that they are a resident of either Magna or West Valley City, which indicates that each community has its own identity apart from the other and from other cities in the Salt Lake Valley. Each community has its own districts, nodes, and community leadership. The proposed 7200 West freeway alignment also follows two existing edges: 7200 West and the political boundary between Magna and West Valley City.

This alternative would require the acquisition of up to 253 homes. Acquiring and removing these homes would not divide any established neighborhoods or downtown districts that create physical areas of community cohesiveness. However, the homes in a small area near 4100 South would be separated from other homes because the existing 7200 West would border the homes on the front and the 7200 West freeway would border the homes on the back. These homes would become isolated from the rest of the community because they would have a major road on both the east and west sides.

With this alternative, there would be more residential and commercial relocations compared to the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. This could lead to slightly greater community cohesion impacts. However, the individual communities would continue to have strong leadership, as documented in existing community plans, and churches and schools would continue to enhance residents' feelings of cohesion. Greater mobility in the area would further reduce the separation effects of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative and thus the negative effects on community cohesion for these communities.

5400 South to the Utah County Line. From 5400 South to the Utah County line, the impacts to community cohesion from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.

Summary of Impacts to Community Cohesion. The overall impact to community cohesion related to relocation, religious affiliation, and schools under this alternative would be similar to that from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. The required relocations could reduce the cohesiveness of the areas around the alternative but are not likely to affect the community as a whole.

For the communities and the portions of the community cohesion impact analysis area located more than a few blocks east or west of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, the alternative would have little influence on patterns of community cohesion. Because the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would be placed in the existing 7200 West roadway alignment in the most developed areas, it would not



divide communities or affect the cohesive nature of the area. However, this alternative could reduce the cohesiveness of immediately adjacent neighborhoods, especially the area near 4100 South, which would be further divided (and isolated) from the larger residential area by this alternative.

Quality of Life

The impacts on transportation accessibility, safety, and lifestyle from this alternative would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would affect two community facilities (Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall and Copper Hills Youth Center) and three recreation facilities (Western Springs Park, West Ridge Golf Course, and the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education). Although these impacts would result in localized effects, they would not alter the quality of life community-wide. Similarly, commercial relocations associated with this alternative would result in localized effects but would not negatively affect the local lifestyle.

Recreation Resources

The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would directly affect three recreation facilities.

- **Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education.** This alternative would require the acquisition of about 1.8 acres of this facility for right-of-way. The impact would be confined to an open field that is occasionally used for dog-trial training. The loss of this land would not affect the function of the facility.
- **Western Springs Park.** This alternative would directly affect Western Springs Park, but these effects were anticipated during the park planning process. As part of the park development, Salt Lake County and Riverton City have agreed to reserve the right-of-way needed to construct the MVC.
- **West Ridge Golf Course.** About 5 acres of the 18-hole golf course operated by West Valley City would be acquired under this alternative. The alternative would affect the function of the golf course. However, UDOT has coordinated with West Valley City, which has determined that there is enough remaining land that the 18-hole course could be redesigned around the alternative with UDOT providing an underpass to connect the west and east sides of the course. West Valley City has determined that, with the redesign of the course, the overall function of the 18-hole golf course would not be lost.



Noise levels at the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education would not exceed 66 dBA or increase by at least 10 dBA over current levels. Western Springs Park's primary facilities support active sports such as soccer and softball, though there are some picnicking facilities. Under this alternative, noise levels at the park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels.

Other facilities in the area that could be indirectly affected include West View Park, West Ridge Golf Course, Lodestone Park, Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park, Monarch Meadows Community Park, Foothill Park, and Welby BMX Track Park. Noise levels at West Ridge Golf Course and Welby BMX Track Park would increase by at least 10 dBA. The primary uses of these recreation facilities include golf and bicycle motocross. The remaining parks—West View Park, Lodestone Park, Ron Wood Wash Baseball Park, Monarch Meadows Community Park, and Foothill Park—would not experience substantial noise impacts because noise levels at these parks would not exceed 66 dBA or increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels.

Community Facilities

This alternative would affect two community facilities: a Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall on 7200 West just north of 3500 South and the Copper Hills Youth Center. Construction of this alternative would require a complete relocation of the meeting hall, and the impact to the Copper Hills Youth Center would be the same as that from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. Other community facilities near this alternative would not experience changes that would affect their operations.

Public Services and Utilities

The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would result in 12 utility conflicts. Seven of the conflicts would be with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, four would be with the Kern River pipeline, and one would be with Questar Gas (see [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County). Construction of the alternative could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized. In addition to the conflicts shown in [Table 6.6-1](#), this alternative would have the same impact on the Provo River Canal as the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

Public Safety

The increased transportation accessibility and safety from this alternative would be similar to that from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. In a letter dated October 8, 2004, Assistant Chief Max Berry of the Unified Fire Authority stated that there is a fire station west of the proposed 7200 West Freeway Alternative at 8609 West 2700 South. According to Chief Berry, it is important that there are crossings over or under the freeway at least every 0.25 mile to allow emergency vehicles to access areas east of 7200 West (Berry 2004).

Access across the freeway would be maintained at all major arterials in the same configuration as what is currently present along 7200 West. Major arterials cross the roadway about every four blocks, which is slightly greater than 0.25 mile (four blocks equals about 1,800 feet, which is 0.34 mile). Future access would not be much different from current conditions along major arterials.

Relocations

The relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property acquisition process. Construction could require 280 total relocations consisting of 253 residential properties, 23 commercial properties, three industrial properties, and one church property (Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall). In addition, there could be 16 potential relocations consisting of 15 residential properties and one industrial property. See [Table 6.6-2](#) above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Salt Lake County, and Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, for a listing of relocations.

The future availability of real estate in the relocations impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. However, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. Homes are available in all communities, but the largest concentrations of homes are found West Valley City, Magna, West Jordan, and Salt Lake City.

A few relocations would affect renters. A search of rental properties found that there is a variety of rental properties ranging in rent from \$450 to \$1,200 per month in West Valley City, Magna, Riverton, and West Jordan.

A number of commercial properties are currently available in the relocations impact analysis area, and the cities along the corridor are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate relocated businesses.



Combined Impacts of 7200 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives

As with the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would be implemented with one of the two 5600 West Transit Alternative options. The combination of the freeway alternative with each of the transit options would cause different community impacts.

Combined Impacts of 7200 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives		
Community Resource	Dedicated Right-of-Way Option	Mixed-Traffic Option
Community cohesion	Separation of homes near 4100 South	
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility	
Recreation resources	5 ^a	5 ^a
Community facilities	5	5
Utilities	15	15
Public safety	No adverse impacts	
Relocations ^b	288	282
Potential relocations ^b	38	31

Impact Summary. In summary, this combination of alternatives would result in localized community cohesion impacts and would result in the loss of one community facility (a Jehovah’s Witnesses Meeting Hall). The direct impacts to recreation resources, the remaining community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this combination would be the highest of all alternatives and combinations of alternatives for the Salt Lake County portion of the MVC study area.

^a Counts two different impacts to the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education separately.
^b See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option

Community Cohesion. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative, in combination with the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option, would not further change the cohesive nature of the communities in the community cohesion impact analysis area. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would remove some residential units on each side the proposed freeway and would create a larger road than what currently exists along 7200 West. However, this alternative would not disrupt the districts or nodes that make Magna and West Valley City cohesive. The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option by itself would not affect Magna’s community cohesion and, as discussed in Section 6.6.3.1, 5600 West Transit Alternative, would improve mobility and could increase community cohesion in West Valley City.





Quality of Life. The combination of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would further promote quality of life through increased transportation accessibility and mobility. This would enable residents to get into and out of the community and to reach services more easily. The impacts to safety and lifestyle from this combination would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Recreation Resources. The recreation resources that would be affected by this combination are the same as those described separately for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option. This combination would have five impacts to the following recreation facilities: Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education (two separate impacts, one from the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option and one from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative), Western Springs Park, West Ridge Golf Course, and Centennial Park.

The 7200 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option are physically separated enough that they would not combine to increase noise levels along either route. In addition, most noise associated with the transit option would be within the background noise levels of traffic on 5600 West.

Community Facilities. Under this combination, five community facilities would be affected: Hunter High School, West Jordan Fire Station 54, West Ridge Academy, Copper Hills Youth Center, and the Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall on 7200 West. The impacts would be the same as those described separately for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative and the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Public Services and Utilities. This combination would result in seven conflicts with Rocky Mountain Power transmission lines, six conflicts with the Kern River pipeline, and two conflicts with Questar Gas (see [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County). There would be one conflict with the Provo River Canal.

Public Safety. This combination's impacts on public safety would be the same as those from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. This combination would increase accessibility and safety and would provide access across the new freeway as desired by the Unified Fire Authority (Berry 2004).

Relocations. The combined 7200 West Freeway Alternative and Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option would require 288 relocations and 38 potential relocations. As discussed for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, there are replacement properties available in the affected communities.



7200 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

Community Cohesion. This combination's impact to community cohesion would be the same as that from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Quality of Life. This combination's impact to quality of life impacts would be the same as that from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Recreation Resources. The recreation resources that would be affected by this combination are the same as those for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Community Facilities. The community facilities that would be affected by this combination are the same as those for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Public Services and Utilities. This combination's impacts to public services and utilities would be the same as those from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option (15 conflicts).

Public Safety. This combination's impacts to public safety would be the same as those from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Relocations. The combined 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Mixed-Traffic Transit Option would require 282 relocations and 31 potential relocations. As discussed for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, there are replacement properties available in the affected communities.

7200 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

The impacts from the 7200 West Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option would be the same as those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. There is an additional consideration associated with the Tolling Option related to public safety. To ensure that impacts to public safety are minimized, special accommodations for emergency vehicles would be made so that response times are not diminished and so that no financial burden is placed on the emergency providers.



6.6.4 Utah County Alternatives

In Utah County, three alternatives are under consideration: the Southern Freeway Alternative, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and the Arterials Alternative. In addition, a tolling option was evaluated for each Utah County alternative. Impacts under each combination of alternatives and options are discussed in the following sections.

6.6.4.1 Southern Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from the Utah County line to Interstate 15 (I-15) at Lindon.

Impact Summary. Overall, this alternative would not substantially affect the general social environment of the MVC study area. The direct impacts to recreation resources, community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this alternative would be the highest of any of the Utah County alternatives (see [Table 6.6-4](#), Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County, on page 6-69 for a comparison).

Southern Freeway Alternative Impacts	
Community Resource	Impacts
Community cohesion	No effect
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility
Recreation resources	2
Community facilities	0
Utilities	3
Public safety	No adverse impacts
Relocations ^a	137
Potential relocations ^a	17

^a See [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

Community Cohesion

The cohesiveness that has historically bonded the agricultural community in the Utah County portion of the community cohesion impact analysis area is expected to continue even as the region grows, since it is not based on physical layout but more on leadership and shared goals.

The north-south portion of the freeway would follow the power corridor along Camp Williams and Redwood Road. Once past Camp Williams, the freeway would be located primarily on agricultural land and some rural residential properties. As the alignment moves into an east-west orientation, it would pass through agricultural land and some rural residential properties, though higher-



density residential developments are rapidly being built in the area. Community identity in these areas is split between that associated with the newer residential subdivision and the older, more established agricultural uses.

Overall, the Southern Freeway Alternative would not divide established communities in Utah County. The impacts of the freeway on community cohesion would be minor but most evident near the new subdivisions along 1900 South. This alternative would cross through planned developments or developing areas.

Quality of Life

As in Salt Lake County, residents in Utah County are concerned about transportation and lack of travel convenience. The Southern Freeway Alternative would provide an additional north-south route with the addition of the freeway and would enhance east-west travel north of Utah Lake. Both of these components would improve travel convenience and, therefore, the aspects of quality of life associated with that convenience.

Utah County residents also identified cleanliness and natural beauty as elements important to quality of life (Utah County 2002). The natural beauty of the area can come from features of the physical environmental such as Utah Lake, the Jordan River, or views of the Wasatch and Oquirrh Mountains. None of these features would be affected by the Southern Freeway Alternative. Beauty can also come from the rural, agricultural lifestyle in Utah County. People currently living this agricultural lifestyle are experiencing change as a result of urbanization and know that such change will continue regardless of transportation improvements such as the MVC. Therefore, although the Southern Freeway Alternative could contribute to a degradation of residents' quality of life, the agricultural lifestyle is already changing and would continue to do so with or without the project.

Employment conditions would not change as a result of the Southern Freeway Alternative. However, the alternative could increase transportation access, which could provide more employment opportunities. This could positively affect quality of life.

Crime rates are low in Utah County. The reasons for low crime are directly related to strong crime-prevention programs in the Utah County portion of the quality of life impact analysis area. This alternative would not affect these programs or existing crime rates.

Overall, the Southern Freeway Alternative would improve the quality of life by improving travel mobility in the quality of life impact analysis area.

Recreation Resources

The Southern Freeway Alternative would directly affect two recreation facilities:

- **Jordan River Parkway Trail.** The Southern Freeway Alternative would cross the Jordan River and the associated Jordan River Parkway Trail. The proposed bridge over the river would fully accommodate the river, but about 1,500 feet of the trail would need to be realigned to cross under the new bridge. This impact would not affect the continuity of or use of the parkway. See Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, and Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, for more information.
- **Spring Creek Ranch Park.** About 3.44 acres of this 28-acre private park would be affected. The park is currently a natural area with no developed facilities.

Noise along the Jordan River Parkway at the Southern Freeway Alternative crossing would increase by at least 10 dBA and would exceed 66 dBA adjacent to the alternative. The increase in noise levels would change the quiet nature of the recreation activities of biking, jogging, and nature observation at the parkway. Noise levels at Northlake Park would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. The activities at this park include playgrounds, basketball, and tennis. Similar increases in noise would occur at Spring Creek Ranch Park.

Other parks in the recreation resources impact analysis area might be indirectly affected by this alternative, including Spring Creek Ranch, Inlet Park, Jordan River Parkway, Parkview Park, Saddle Ridge Park, and Wetlands Park. Noise levels at Inlet Park, Wetlands Park (used for flying radio-controlled model airplanes), and Parkview Park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. Of these parks, Inlet Park provides a natural environment and is used as an access to the Jordan River Parkway. Saddle Ridge Park is part of a housing development and could experience an increase in noise levels.

Community Facilities

This alternative would not affect any community facilities.

Public Services and Utilities

As shown in Table 6.6-3, there would be three utility conflicts under this alternative. These include two crossings of Rocky Mountain Power lines and one crossing of a Kern River natural gas line. Construction of this alternative could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and service disruption is minimized. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

Table 6.6-3. Utility Crossings by Alternative for Utah County

Utility Type	Conflict Location	Type of Conflict (for Power Line)	Proposed Resolution ^a	Alternative(s)
Rocky Mountain Power	500 East, and 1500 South in American Fork	Crossing	Adjust the power lines vertically as necessary to go over the MVC.	Arterials Alternative and Southern Freeway Alternative
Rocky Mountain Power	2100 North and 10400 West (Utah County System)	Crossing	Adjust the power lines vertically as necessary to go over the MVC.	Arterials Alternative and 2100 North Freeway Alternative
Rocky Mountain Power	Near Camp Williams	Relocation and crossing	Re-route the power lines to reduce length of crossing and adjust vertically to cross over the MVC.	Arterials Alternative, Southern Freeway Alternative, and 2100 North Freeway Alternative
Kern River Natural Gas Line	Near Camp Williams	NA	Expose the pipes, inspect, and then backfill the pipes to protect them.	Arterials Alternative, Southern Freeway Alternative, and 2100 North Freeway Alternative

^a The proposed resolution has not yet been determined for every conflict. Final disposition of utility conflicts would be handled during the final design phase of the project.

Public Safety

The Southern Freeway Alternative would provide a new north-south travel route while preserving existing major east-west travel routes. The new route would provide better mobility for emergency service providers, which would positively affect response times. The enhanced mobility would also improve overall roadway safety by improving traffic flow. The Southern Freeway Alternative would positively affect public safety.



Relocations

The Southern Freeway Alternative could require 137 total relocations consisting of 115 residential properties, 18 commercial properties, two industrial properties, and two government-owned properties (see [Table 6.6-4](#)). In addition, there could be 17 potential relocations including eight residential properties and nine commercial properties. Note that the relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property acquisition process. See Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, for a listing of relocations.

Table 6.6-4. Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County

Type of Relocation ^a	Southern Freeway Alternative	2100 North Freeway Alternative	Arterials Alternative
<i>Residential</i>			
Relocations	115	10	59
Potential relocations	8	2	9
<i>Commercial</i>			
Relocations	18	3	5
Potential relocations	9	0	0
<i>Industrial</i>			
Relocations	2	0	0
Potential relocations	0	0	0
<i>School</i>			
Relocations	0	0	0
Potential relocations	0	0	0
<i>Government</i>			
Relocations	2	2	2
Potential relocations	0	0	0
Total	154	17	75

^a See [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.



The future availability of real estate in the relocations impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. However, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. Table 6.6-5 summarizes for-sale housing availability as of January 2007. The homes are available in all communities, but the largest concentrations of homes are found in the ZIP code that includes Lehi and Saratoga Springs, which is where most of the relocation impacts would occur.

A search of rental properties found that there are numerous rental homes available in these areas, with rents ranging from \$800 to \$1,800 per month and averaging about \$1,200 per month (Daily Herald 2007).

A number of commercial properties are currently available in the relocations impact analysis area, and the cities along the corridor are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate relocated businesses. The affected businesses would be able to relocate along or near the corridor.

Table 6.6-5. Available (For-Sale) Single-Family Housing in Utah County

Home Value	American Fork ZIP 84003	Lehi and Saratoga Springs ZIP 84043
Less than \$130,000	0	0
\$130,000–\$149,000	2	1
\$150,000–\$199,999	5	12
\$200,000–\$249,999	9	52
\$250,000–\$299,999	11	81
\$300,000–\$349,999	4	51
\$350,000–\$399,999	15	83
\$400,000 and over	26	87
Single-family housing availability as of January 16, 2007. Source: Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service 2007		



Camp Williams. This alternative would affect property and facilities at the Camp Williams National Guard training site. In 2004 and 2005, meetings were held between UDOT, Camp Williams staff, and representatives from the U.S. National Guard to discuss the MVC project and impacts to training facilities (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2004, 2005). Based on information from these meetings, the following facilities would be both directly and indirectly affected by the Southern Freeway Alternative:

- **Ammunition Supply Point.** The alternative encroaches into the 1,250-foot explosive safety quantity distance, which would require relocation of the facility.
- **Runway.** About 650 feet of the airstrip would be affected, and up to eight helicopter pads would be eliminated.
- **Aircraft Operations Building.** The alternative would separate the aircraft operations building from the runway, which would require reconfiguration of the facilities.
- **Aircraft Control Tower.** The alternative would separate the aircraft control tower from the runway, which would require reconfiguration of the facilities.
- **Access.** The alternative would eliminate east-west access between the administrative and training facilities.

A total of 137 acres of land at Camp Williams would be acquired. About 91 acres are located in Salt Lake County and about 46 acres are located in Utah County. Of this total, 102 acres are lands administered by the State of Utah and 35 acres are under the control of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Appropriate transfer documents would have to be obtained to allow the MVC to be built on Camp Williams property.

Southern Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

The Southern Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option would be built within the same right-of-way footprint as the non-tolled alternative. Even though the lane configuration of the Tolling Option would be different, the impacts would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway Alternative because the lane configuration would remain within the same footprint.

There is an additional consideration associated with the Tolling Option related to public safety. To ensure that impacts to safety are minimized, special accommodations for emergency vehicles would be made so that response times are not diminished and so that no financial burden is placed on the emergency providers.



6.6.4.2 2100 North Freeway Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a freeway extending from the Utah County line to State Route (SR) 73 in Saratoga Springs and a lateral freeway extending east along 2100 North to I-15 in Lehi.

Impact Summary. Overall, this alternative would not substantially affect the general social environment of the MVC study area, but some residents of Lehi felt that the alternative would divide the community and isolate some residential areas north of 2100 North. The direct impacts to recreation resources and utilities shown in this

summary table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this alternative would be the lowest of any of the Utah County alternatives (see Table 6.6-4 above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County, for a comparison).

Community Cohesion

The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would cross sparsely developed agricultural land on the west side of the Jordan River and would connect into the existing 2100 North east of the river in Lehi. There is little residential development along the proposed alignment west of the Jordan River, several new housing developments north of the alignment east of the Jordan River, and some scattered residences south of the alignment. The proposed alignment would not bisect these new developments but would separate them from the remainder of Lehi. Lehi’s community cohesion is primarily due to the community’s long history, its leadership through the planning process, and its main street. None of these elements would be affected by this alternative. However, during public meetings regarding this alternative, some comments were received that expressed concern about how this alternative would divide the community and result in community cohesion impacts.

2100 North Freeway Alternative Impacts	
Community Resource	Impacts
Community cohesion	Some effects to residents north of 2100 North
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility from the west, but some quality of life impacts in Lehi
Recreation resources	0
Community facilities	1
Utilities	3
Public safety	No adverse impacts
Relocations ^a	15
Potential relocations ^a	2

^a See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.



During the preparation of the Final EIS, numerous meetings were held between UDOT and Lehi City to address the City's concerns. As a result, the City endorsed, in concept, efforts by Lehi City staff, UDOT, and FHWA to revise the 2100 North Freeway Alternative (to reduce impacts to the community and make it more consistent with the City's land-use plans) and to phase the implementation of the alternative. See Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS, and Section 36.2.2, Implementation Phases in Utah County. Also see Chapter 35, Comments on the Draft EIS, regarding responses to concerns raised by the public regarding this alternative.

Quality of Life

In general, the impacts to quality of life from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway Alternative. However, because the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would travel through a developing portion of Lehi (east of the Jordan River), residents could feel that their quality of life was negatively affected by the presence of a new freeway. Although these localized impacts would be evident to residents of the immediate area, the new freeway would also provide improved travel in and accessibility to Lehi, which some residents might feel is an improvement in quality of life.

Recreation Resources

The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would cross the Jordan River and the associated Jordan River Parkway Trail. The proposed bridge over the river would fully accommodate the river and the trail (will require minor trail modification) and would allow continued recreation, so the alternative would not directly affect these recreation resources. The noise impacts to the Jordan River Parkway would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway Alternative. See Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, and Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, for more information.

Noise levels at Pointe Meadow would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. The activities at this park include playgrounds, basketball, and tennis.

Other parks in the area that could be indirectly affected by this alternative. These include Wildlife Park, Gateway Park, Greens Park, North Entrance Park, Cranberry Farms Park, Olympic Park, Thanksgiving Point Golf Course, and Scottfield Acres Park. Noise levels at Gateway Park, North Entrance Park, and Cranberry Farms Park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. Noise levels at Scottfield Park and Greens Park



would increase by at least 10 dBA. The activities at these parks include playgrounds, basketball, and tennis. Although noise levels at Wildlife Park, Olympic Park, and Thanksgiving Point Golf Course could increase, this increase should not affect park operations.

Community Facilities

This alternative would affect one LDS church at 2150 N. Pointe Meadow Drive in Lehi. About 0.09 acre of the park strip along the existing road would be affected. No parking, access, or facilities at the church would be affected.

Public Services and Utilities

As shown in [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County, there would be three utility conflicts under this alternative. These include two crossings of Rocky Mountain Power lines and one crossing of a Kern River natural gas line. Construction of this alternative could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and service disruption is minimized. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

Public Safety

The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would provide a new north-south connection into Salt Lake County and an additional east-west travel route by freeway. The new routes would provide better mobility for emergency service providers, which would positively affect response times. The enhanced mobility would also improve overall roadway safety by improving traffic flow.

Relocations

The 2100 North Freeway Alternative could require 15 total relocations consisting of 10 residential properties, three commercial properties, and two government-owned properties. In addition, there would be two potential residential relocations for this alternative (see [Table 6.6-4](#) above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County). See Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, for a listing of relocations. Note that the relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property acquisition process.

The future availability of real estate in the relocations impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. However, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. [Table 6.6-5](#) above, Available (For-Sale) Single-Family Housing in Utah County, summarizes for-sale housing availability as of January 2007. The homes are available in all communities, but the largest concentrations of homes are found in the ZIP code that includes Lehi and Saratoga Springs, which is where most of the relocation impacts would occur.

A search of rental properties found that there are numerous rental homes available in this part of Utah County, with rents ranging from \$800 to \$1,800 per month and averaging about \$1,200 per month (Daily Herald 2007).

This alternative would have the same impacts to Camp Williams as the Southern Freeway Alternative.

2100 North Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option

The impacts from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative with Tolling Option would be the same as those for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. There is an additional consideration associated with the Tolling Option related to public safety. To ensure that impacts to safety are minimized, special accommodations for emergency vehicles would be made so that response times are not diminished and so that no financial burden is placed on the emergency providers.

6.6.4.3 Arterials Alternative

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, this alternative would consist of a series of arterial roadways throughout northern Utah County. The combination of arterials includes a freeway segment from the Utah County line to SR 73 and arterial roadways at Porter Rockwell Boulevard, 2100 North, and 1900 South.

Arterials Alternative Impacts	
Community Resource	Impacts
Community cohesion	No effect
Quality of life	Improved travel accessibility
Recreation resources	2
Community facilities	2
Utilities	4
Public safety	No adverse impacts
Relocations ^a	66
Potential relocations ^a	9

Impact Summary. Overall, this alternative would not substantially affect the general social environment of the project area. The direct impacts to recreation resources, community facilities, and utilities shown in this summary table would not result in a complete loss of the resources or services and would not affect their long-term function and availability. The number of relocations and potential relocations required under this alternative would be higher than for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative but lower than for the Southern Freeway Alternative (see Table 6.6-4 above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County, for a comparison).

^a See Figure 6-7, Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

Community Cohesion

This alternative would have limited impacts to community cohesion because most of the community cohesion impact analysis area is either undeveloped or newly developed (and therefore not as cohesive as older, more established urban areas). Improved arterials would provide better traffic circulation for the communities in the future, which could promote community cohesion by improving mobility, access, and interaction.

Quality of Life

The impacts to quality of life from the Arterials Alternative would be similar to those from the Southern Freeway Alternative.

Overall, the area that would be crossed by this alternative is undergoing rapid urbanization. Residents whose quality of life depends on the agricultural feel of the area would be most sensitive to the effects of the project, but it is likely that



their quality of life would change with or without the project. For residents who moved into the area to take advantage of the new housing, quality of life could improve because this alternative would improve travel mobility.

Recreation Resources

The Arterials Alternative would directly affect two recreation facilities, the Jordan River Parkway trail (along the 1900 South segment), and Spring Creek Ranch Park as follows:

- **Jordan River Parkway Trail.** The Arterials Alternative would cross the Jordan River and the associated Jordan River Parkway Trail in three locations. Bridges along the Porter Rockwell and 2100 North arterial segments would fully accommodate the river and the trail and would allow continued recreation, so these segments would not directly affect the resource. The proposed bridge over the river at 1900 South would fully accommodate the river, but about 1,500 feet of the trail would need to be realigned to cross under the new bridge. This impact would not affect the continuity of or use of the parkway. See Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, and Chapter 28, Section 4(f) Evaluation, for more information.
- **Spring Creek Ranch Park.** About 4.1 acres of this 28-acre private park would be affected. The park currently is a natural area with no developed facilities.

Noise along the Jordan River Parkway at the Arterials Alternative crossing would increase by at least 10 dBA and would exceed 66 dBA adjacent to the alternative. The increase in noise levels would change the quiet nature of the recreation activities of biking, jogging, and nature observation at the parkway. Noise levels at Pointe Meadow Park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. The activities at these parks include playgrounds, basketball, and tennis. Similar increases in noise would occur at Spring Creek Ranch Park.

The alternative would indirectly affect parks within 0.5 mile of the alignment. Noise levels at Inlet Park, Parkview Park, Gateway Park, Spring Creek Ranch Park, and Wetlands Park would exceed 66 dBA and would increase by at least 10 dBA over existing levels. Noise levels at the remaining nearby parks—Northlake Park, Saddle Ridge Park, Cranberry Farms, and Olympic Park—would increase by at least 10 dBA. The activities at these parks include playgrounds, basketball, and tennis. Noise levels at Thanksgiving Point Golf Course could increase, but this increase should not affect operation of the golf course.



Community Facilities

The Arterials Alternative would affect two community facilities. The alternative would affect one LDS church at 2150 N. Pointe Meadow Drive in Lehi. About 0.03 acre of the park strip along the existing road would be affected. No parking, access, or facilities at the church would be affected. The alternative would also affect about 0.7 acre of the Genesis Youth Center in Draper. The alternative would not affect any of the center's facilities or the function of the center.

Public Services and Utilities

This alternative would result in four utility conflicts (see [Table 6.6-1](#) above, Utility Crossings by Alternative Segment in Salt Lake County). These include three crossings of Rocky Mountain Power lines and one crossing of a Kern River natural gas line. Construction could cause temporary disruptions in service; however, all utility relocations would be coordinated with the utility owner during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and service disruption is minimized. The costs of utility relocations have been included in the overall cost of each alternative shown in Section 2.4.3, Cost. The relocations are shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

Public Safety

The impacts from this alternative would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway and 2100 North Freeway Alternatives.

Relocations

The Arterials Alternative would require 66 total relocations consisting of 59 residential properties, five commercial properties, and two government-owned properties. In addition, there would be nine potential residential relocations (see [Table 6.6-4](#) above, Summary of Relocations by Alternative in Utah County). See Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, for a listing of relocations. Note that the relocations, potential relocations, and strip takes described in this chapter are based on preliminary engineering. The actual property impacts could change and would be determined during the final design phase of the project and during the property acquisition process.

The future availability of real estate in the relocations impact analysis area cannot be reliably predicted. However, given the large residential market in the region and within each individual city, it is likely that there would be available housing in all price ranges for displaced residents. [Table 6.6-5](#) above, Available (For-Sale) Single-Family Housing in Utah County, summarizes for-sale housing availability as of January 2007. The homes are available in all communities, but



the largest concentrations of homes are found in the ZIP code that includes Lehi and Saratoga Springs.

A search of rental properties found that there are numerous rental homes available in this part of Utah County, with rents ranging from \$800 to \$1,800 per month and averaging about \$1,200 per month (Daily Herald 2007).

A number of commercial properties are currently available in the relocations impact analysis area, and the cities along the corridor are planning for new commercial development, which could also accommodate relocated businesses. The affected businesses would be able to relocate along or near the corridor.

This alternative would have the same impacts to Camp Williams as the Southern Freeway Alternative.

Arterials Alternative with Tolling Option

The impacts from the Arterials Alternative with Tolling Option would be similar to the impacts from the Arterials Alternative because the alternatives would have the same footprint. However, the lane configuration within the footprint could differ.

There is an additional consideration associated with the Tolling Option related to public safety. To ensure that impacts to safety are minimized, special accommodations for emergency vehicles would be made so that response times are not diminished and so that no financial burden is placed on the emergency providers.

6.6.5 Mitigation Measures

6.6.5.1 Community Cohesion

5800 West Freeway Alternative. Hunter Park is used by the community for recreation activities and social interaction. The alternative could discourage access to the park; however, during the final design phase of the project, UDOT will consider a community crossing to reconnect the community.

7200 West Freeway Alternative. The homes in a small area near 4100 South would be separated from other homes because they would be bordered by both the existing 7200 West and the 7200 West freeway. These homes would become isolated from the rest of the community. UDOT might be able to purchase all of these isolated homes under the provisions of the Utah Relocation Assistance Act. The individual residents and UDOT would jointly decide if these houses are purchased.

No other mitigation measures are proposed.



6.6.5.2 Quality of Life

All Alternatives. For areas currently that are developed with residential and commercial uses, UDOT will work with the affected communities to identify measures to lessen project-related impacts to quality of life. These measures might include noise barriers, special landscaping and lighting, and accessibility considerations (such as separated walkways). The responsibility for implementing these measures would be negotiated between the affected communities and UDOT during the final design phase of the project.

No other mitigation measures are proposed.

6.6.5.3 Recreation Resources

Any loss of land from recreation facilities due to the proposed alternatives would be compensated under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for the loss of property and facilities. The following facilities are subject to property losses and compensation:

1. Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education (all Salt Lake County Alternatives)
2. Centennial Park (5600 West Transit Alternative)
3. Hunter Park (5800 West Freeway Alternative)
4. West Ridge Golf Course (5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives)
5. USANA Amphitheater (5800 West Freeway Alternative)
6. Jordan River Parkway Trail (Southern Freeway Alternative, 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and Arterials Alternative)
7. Spring Creek Ranch Park (Southern Freeway and Arterials Alternatives)

Most impacts would be limited to undeveloped land only, with the exception of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education (relocation of an access road), West Ridge Golf Course (direct impacts to the golf course), USANA Amphitheater (a small portion of parking), and the Jordan River Parkway Trail (relocation of 1,500 feet of trail under the Southern Freeway Alternative).

If the 5800 West Freeway Alternative is selected, UDOT will work with the Division of Wildlife Resources to ensure the safety of motorists and the continued operation of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education. UDOT has entered into a memorandum of agreement with the Division of Wildlife Resources that addresses the Division's concerns regarding this facility.

UDOT has coordinated with West Valley City regarding impacts to the West Ridge Golf Course. UDOT will compensate West Valley City by reconstructing



the course back to 18 holes in the same area as the existing course. The mitigation will include UDOT providing access under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative to allow the course to be used on both sides of the alternative. Based on this mitigation, West Valley City has determined that, with the redesign of the course, the overall function of the 18-hole golf course would not be lost.

UDOT will coordinate with USANA Amphitheater to ensure that enough parking is available for events and that noise concerns are addressed. Finally, UDOT will ensure that any impacts to the Jordan River Parkway are mitigated by maintaining the trail connectivity along the river.

6.6.5.4 Community Facilities

Any loss of land from community facilities due to the proposed alternatives would be compensated under the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act and the Utah Relocation Assistance Act for the loss of property and facilities, as appropriate. The following facilities are subject to property losses and compensation:

1. Fire Station 54 in West Jordan (5600 West Transit Alternative)
2. Hunter High School (5800 West Freeway and 5600 West Transit Alternatives)
3. West Ridge Academy (5600 West Transit Alternative)
4. Hillside Elementary School (5800 West Freeway Alternative)
5. Copper Hills Youth Center (5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives)
6. Jehovah's Witnesses Meeting Hall (7200 West Freeway Alternative)
7. LDS Meeting House (Arterials and 2100 North Freeway Alternatives)
8. Genesis Youth Center (Arterials Alternative)

In addition, under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, UDOT will purchase land for the Granite School District within or near the current student assignment boundary for Hillside Elementary School for the purpose of relocating that school, if the school district decides it is necessary to do so. Granite School District might use the proceeds from the sale of the existing Hillside Elementary property to help fund construction of a relocated elementary school.

6.6.5.5 Public Services and Utilities

All Alternatives. Most conflicts with utilities could be resolved through traditional means (such as relocating aboveground utility poles, placing the utility



underground, or adjusting the height of utility poles to accommodate the roadway crossings). When a relocation or adjustment of the power lines is necessary for construction of the MVC, UDOT could, depending on the situation, acquire the right-of-way and pay the cost necessary to relocate the utilities.

For most pipeline conflicts, there are a number of possible mitigation measures. For the pipelines that are exposed but do not need realignment, the pipelines would be backfilled after construction is complete. If realignments are required in order to build the MVC, the affected pipeline(s) would be realigned within the utility corridor.

Final design details, final costs, or final agreements regarding relocations of Rocky Mountain Power, Kern River Gas Transmission Company, Questar Gas, and other utility company facilities located within the project area will be determined during the final design phase of the project. UDOT will enter into subsequent written agreements with the utility companies at a later date to address each conflict point. UDOT will ensure that any necessary approvals from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission are obtained for the relocation of interstate natural gas pipelines.

6.6.5.6 Public Safety

All Alternatives. Proper access will be provided across the new facility near existing and future emergency access providers. UDOT will work with emergency personnel to remove obstacles in the roadway design that could hinder emergency response times. Additionally, if the freeway becomes a toll facility, emergency providers would not have to pay the toll.

5800 West Freeway Alternative. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative could cut off student and pedestrian access to Hillside Elementary School and Hunter High School for students on the west side of this alternative. UDOT is coordinating with the Granite School District to maintain safe student access to the schools. The changes to maintain safe student access could include the following:

- Maintain residential street crossings at Cape Cod Drive and 4300 South.
- Add a new street crossing at Cilma Drive that connects to 5600 West.
- At the 4100 South interchange, provide a grade-separated pedestrian crossing of the southbound on ramp and widen the interchange to better accommodate pedestrian movement.
- Provide a community crossing at Hunter Park.



6.6.5.7 Relocations

All Alternatives. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be completed according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners and qualified renters. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

Utah County Alternatives. Camp Williams will be compensated for impacts to property and facilities as follows:

1. Reimburse for actual incurred cost for design and relocation/construction of the ammunition supply point, aircraft operations building, aircraft control tower, and helicopter pads.
2. Include a grade-separated freeway crossing at Beef Hollow accessible to Camp Williams, and two access roads connecting the freeway crossing to existing roads on the west side of the alternatives servicing the western portions of Camp Williams.

Because training and facility requirements at Camp Williams could change, specific terms of the mitigation will be developed during the final design phase of the project prior to construction.

6.6.6 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts were analyzed for local and regionally important issues (farmlands, air quality, water quality, and ecosystems) as developed with resource agencies and the public during scoping. See Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, for a more detailed discussion of cumulative impacts.



6.6.7 Summary of Impacts

Overall, none of the project alternatives would substantially affect the general social environment of the MVC study area. The 5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives in Salt Lake County could cause localized community cohesion impacts. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Utah County could cause community cohesion and quality of life impacts to Lehi residents. [Table 6.6-6](#) summarizes the other community impacts related to recreation resources, community facilities, utilities, and relocations for each combination of alternatives and options in Salt Lake County and Utah County. Complete relocation information can be found in Appendix 6A, Property Impacts.

Table 6.6-6. Summary of Impacts to Community Resources

Alternative ^a	Recreation Resources	Community Facilities	Utilities	Relocations ^b	Potential Relocations ^b
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Southern Freeway</i>					
Dedicated Transit	9	8	25	320	49
Mixed Transit	9	8	25	314	42
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / 2100 North Freeway</i>					
Dedicated Transit	7	7	25	198	34
Mixed Transit	7	7	25	192	27
<i>5800 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Arterials</i>					
Dedicated Transit	9	8	26	249	41
Mixed Transit	9	8	26	243	34
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Southern Freeway</i>					
Dedicated Transit	7	7	18	425	55
Mixed Transit	7	7	18	419	48
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / 2100 North Freeway</i>					
Dedicated Transit	5	6	18	303	40
Mixed Transit	5	6	18	297	33
<i>7200 West Freeway / 5600 West Transit / Arterials</i>					
Dedicated Transit	7	7	19	354	47
Mixed Transit	7	7	19	348	40

The results in the table summarize the combined total impact for both the Salt Lake County and Utah County alternatives. The total impact includes both roadway and transit.

^a Dedicated Transit = Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option; Mixed Transit = Mixed-Traffic Transit Option

^b See [Figure 6-7](#), Property Relocation Descriptions, and the relocation discussion in Section 6.6.1, Methodology, for information about the difference between relocations and potential relocations.

6.7 References

Barlow, Steve

- 2005 Personal communication between Sgt. Steve Barlow of Camp Williams and Nicole Donegan of HDR Engineering regarding emergency response at Camp Williams. July 5.

Berry, Max

- 2004 Letter from Assistant Chief Berry of the United Fire Authority to Laura Lutz-Zimmerman of HDR Engineering regarding potential emergency response impacts of the Salt Lake County alternatives. October 13.

City of Lehi Emergency Services

- 2004 Personal communications with Laura Lutz-Zimmerman of HDR Engineering regarding emergency response in Lehi. September 21.

City of Magna

- 2004 City of Magna web page. www.magnautah.org. Accessed September 9, 2004.

Daily Herald

- 2007 Online classified advertisements. www.heraldextra.com/component/option,com_marketplace. Accessed January 16.

Dan Jones & Associates

- 2003 Public opinion survey of residents in southwest Salt Lake County and northwest Utah County. March.

[FDOT] Florida Department of Transportation

- 2003 Project Development and Environmental Manual: Part 2, Chapter 9, Community Impact Assessment.

Frame, Stacey

- 2004 Personal communication between Stacey Frame, Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office, and Laura Lutz-Zimmerman of HDR Engineering regarding emergency response in Salt Lake County. October 8.

Freitag, Scott

- 2004 Personal communication between Scott Freitag, Public Information Officer for Salt Lake City Police Department, and Laura Lutz-Zimmerman of HDR Engineering regarding emergency response in Salt Lake City. September 21.

Kasarda, J.D., and M. Janowitz

- 1974 Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review* 39(3): 328–339.

Lucas, Mary Kay

- 2004 Personal communication between Mary Kay Lucas of the Utah Highway Patrol and Laura Lutz-Zimmerman of HDR Engineering regarding emergency response in the project region. September 21.

Lynch, Kevin

1960 Image of the City. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[NCHRP] National Cooperative Highway Research Program

2001 Guidebook for Assessing Social and Economic Effects on Transportation Projects. Report 456.

Parsons Brinckerhoff

2003 Final MVC EIS Scoping Summary Report. November 20.

2004 Meeting with UDOT, William Stringer and Jason Bleyl of Parsons Brinckerhoff, and Camp Williams representatives regarding possible impacts to Camp Williams facilities. September 5.

2005 Meetings with UDOT, William Stringer and Jason Bleyl of Parsons Brinckerhoff, and Camp Williams representatives regarding possible impacts to Camp Williams facilities. August 22 and September 29.

Pyle, Wayne

2005 Letter from West Valley City Manager Wayne Pyle to Terri Newell of UDOT regarding impacts to Hunter Park. February 16.

Salt Lake County, Public Works Department, Planning and Development

2004 Copperton Township General Plan.

State of Utah

2001 Utah Facts 2001: Quality of Life. dced.utah.gov/Factbook/quality_.pdf. Accessed April 9, 2004.

[UDOT] Utah Department of Transportation

2008 UDOT Policy 08A2-1, Noise Abatement. Updated January 31, 2008.

United Way of Salt Lake

2001 A Study of Human Needs in Salt Lake, Summit, and Tooele Counties.

United Way of Utah County

2001 Community Assessment.

Utah County

2002 Quality of Life. www.utahcountyonline.org/dept/UVEDA/QualLife/index.asp. Accessed April 9, 2004.

Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service

2007 Utah Real Estate. www.utahrealestate.com. Accessed January 16, 2007.

West Valley City, Community and Economic Development Department

2005 West Valley City General Plan: Vision 2020.

Willbros Engineering/EPC

2008 Mountain View Corridor Impact Study Prepared for Kern River Gas Transmission Company and Utah Department of Transportation. January 30.

▲ ▲

This page is intentionally blank.

▼ ▼