

Chapter 35: Comments on the Draft EIS

	Summary of Comments.....	35-3
35.1	Chapter 1 – Purpose of and Need for Action	35-7
35.1.1	Section 1.3 – Summary of Purpose and Need	35-7
35.2	Chapter 2 – Alternatives	35-19
35.2.1	Section 2.1 – Alternatives Development Process (Screening)	35-19
35.2.2	Section 2.2.1 – No-Action Alternative	35-34
35.2.3	Section 2.2.2.1 – 5600 West Transit Alternative.....	35-34
35.2.4	Section 2.2.2.2 – 5800 West Freeway Alternative	35-39
35.2.5	Section 2.2.2.3 – 7200 West Freeway Alternative	35-44
35.2.6	Section 2.2.3.1 – Southern Freeway Alternative	35-45
35.2.7	Section 2.2.3.2 – 2100 North Freeway Alternative	35-47
35.2.8	Section 2.2.3.3 – Arterials Alternative	35-55
35.2.9	Section 2.1.5.2 – 4800 North Freeway Alternative	35-55
35.2.10	Section 2.2.4 – Tolling Options for the MVC Alternatives.....	35-62
35.2.11	Section 2.2.5 – Implementation of the MVC Alternatives (Construction Phasing).....	35-64
35.2.12	Section 2.3 – Land Acquired to Date (Including Right-of-Way Questions)	35-65
35.2.13	Section 2.4 – Summary Comparison of Alternatives (Cost, Daily Delay, Travel Time, and Environmental Impacts)	35-65
35.3	Chapter 3 – Growth Choices	35-66
35.4	Chapter 4 – Land Use.....	35-70
35.5	Chapter 5 – Farmlands	35-71
35.6	Chapter 6 – Community Impacts.....	35-72
35.6.1	Section 6.1 – Community Impacts, Quality of Life, and Safety.....	35-72
35.6.2	Section 6.2 – Recreation Resources	35-74
35.6.3	Section 6.3 – Relocations	35-74
35.6.4	Section 6.4 – Public Services and Utilities.....	35-77
35.7	Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice	35-92
35.8	Chapter 8 – Transportation.....	35-92
35.9	Chapter 9 – Economics	35-94
35.10	Chapter 10 – Joint Development.....	35-97
35.11	Chapter 11 – Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists.....	35-97
35.12	Chapter 12 – Air Quality	35-99
35.12.1	Section 12.1 – General Air Quality	35-99
35.12.2	Section 12.2 – Conformity	35-102
35.12.3	Section 12.3 – Carbon Monoxide and Particulate Matter	35-103
35.12.4	Section 12.4 – Mobile-Source Air Toxics (MSATs).....	35-104
35.13	Chapter 13 – Noise.....	35-111
35.14	Chapter 14 – Water Quality	35-114
35.15	Chapter 15 – Ecosystem Resources.....	35-120
35.15.1	Section 15.1 – General Ecosystems	35-120
35.15.2	Section 15.2 – Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat, and Migratory Birds ..	35-121
35.15.3	Section 15.3 – Endangered Species Act.....	35-128
35.15.4	Section 15.4 – Wetlands and Section 404	35-129



35.16	Chapter 16 – Floodplains	35-130
35.17	Chapter 17 – Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources.....	35-131
35.18	Chapter 18 – Hazardous Waste Sites.....	35-131
35.19	Chapter 19 – Visual Resources.....	35-131
35.20	Chapter 20 – Energy	35-132
35.21	Chapter 21 – Construction Impacts.....	35-132
35.22	Chapter 22 – Short-Term Uses versus Long-Term Productivity	35-132
35.23	Chapter 23 – Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.....	35-132
35.24	Chapter 24 – Indirect Effects	35-133
35.25	Chapter 25 – Cumulative Impacts	35-137
35.26	Chapter 26 – Permits, Reviews, and Approvals.....	35-140
35.27	Chapter 27 – Mitigation Summary	35-140
35.28	Chapter 28 – Section 4(f) Evaluation.....	35-141
35.29	Chapter 29 – Sequencing	35-143
35.30	Chapter 30 – Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination	35-150
35.31	Other Comments	35-151
35.32	References	35-153

This chapter contains the responses to comments, both oral and written, that were received on the Mountain View Corridor (MVC) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) from members of the public, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations during the 90-day public comment period from October 26, 2007, to January 24, 2008. Individuals and agencies who commented on the Draft EIS are listed alphabetically in Appendix 35A, Commenter and Response Matrix, along with their associated comment number. To find the response to your comment, first find your name in Appendix 35A, then find the associated response section numbers, which indicate the sections of this chapter that address your comment.

Appendix 35B, Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS, presents reproductions of written comments and transcriptions of comments that were submitted orally. Each comment document is identified in Appendix 35B by its comment number, and each statement or question regarding a separate environmental issue is labeled with an associated response section in this chapter.

The sections below present the responses to comments on the Draft EIS that were received. The section numbers in this chapter correspond to the chapters and sections in the Draft EIS (for example, Section 35.12 in this chapter corresponds to Chapter 12 in the Draft EIS).



Summary of Comments

About 2,500 comment submissions were received on the Draft EIS from individuals, organizations, and government agencies, which resulted in about 4,000 specific comments. The comment submissions took the form of letters, e-mails, phone messages, Web site submissions, and public hearing testimonies. The number of comments shows a strong interest by the public in the Mountain View Corridor project.

It is important to note that the process established by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is not based on vote-counting. The public involvement efforts of NEPA are intended to gather information and ideas from the public on a proposed action and alternatives in order to provide the decision-maker and the public with a clear basis for choosing among various options. An analysis of public comments helps the decision-maker make better decisions, not simply count up pros and cons.

It's tempting for a proponent or opponent of a particular alternative to "stuff the ballot box" in support of their view. However, even though the decision-maker gathers quantitative information that is important in assessing attitudes and concerns about particular issues, this is only part of the information that the decision-maker analyzes. The *reasons* for people's concerns, preferences, and criticisms are also sought in this process. Therefore, this chapter doesn't usually mention the total number of comments on a particular issue but instead focuses on more qualitative information that indicates the trends in public opinion.

The following sections summarize the main comments on the Draft EIS by topic. Topics that received numerous comments are included in this summary.

Purpose of and Need for Action (Section 35.1.1 – 137 comments). The majority of comments on this topic questioned the need for north-south improvements in Salt Lake County and suggested that there was a greater need for east-west improvements. Others commented that the project purpose favored building roads versus implementing transit. A number of comments stated that the MVC project is a possible violation of Title 1, Section 101 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4331[b][2]) of NEPA, which states that the responsibility of the federal government is to "assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings."

Alternatives Development Process (Section 35.2.1 – 262 comments). A number of comments questioned the results of the alternatives screening. Common questions included:

- Why were alternatives along the west bench in Salt Lake County eliminated?
- Why were alternatives along the west side of Utah Lake eliminated?
- Why weren't more alternatives north of 2100 North in Utah County considered, and why were some of those that were considered eliminated?

A number of commenters stated that the MVC project used an outdated version of the regional travel demand model (Version 5.0) and that the project should have used the latest version (Version 6.0) to develop and screen the alternatives. These commenters stated that, because Version 5.0 of the regional travel demand model was used, the project has a bias toward roads and does not give transit enough consideration. Some commenters said that, if Version 6.0 were used and some adjustments were made to land uses, the screening process might have a completely different outcome, namely alternatives that involved improvements to arterials and transit instead of building a freeway. The commenters also stated that the set of decision criteria used in screening the alternatives tended to predetermine the outcome rather than supporting a full and fair consideration of a wider range of reasonable alternatives.

5600 West Transit Alternative (Section 35.2.3 – 183 comments). Many commenters suggested that the MVC project should consider a transit-only alternative without roadway improvements and that transit should be implemented before the roadway alternatives. Other commenters stated that there is no funding for the transit alternative for over 23 years, so the transit alternative in the EIS is not a real alternative. Other commenters stated that the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) travel demand model used in the Draft EIS (Version 5.0) under-counts transit ridership and that actual transit use would be much higher than what is shown in the EIS.

5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives (Section 35.2.4 and Section 35.2.5 – 363 comments). Because the 5800 West Freeway Alternative was announced as the Utah Department of Transportation's (UDOT) Preferred Roadway Alternative for Salt Lake County in the Draft EIS, most comments on the Salt Lake County freeway alternatives focused on this alternative. Many commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would cost more and would have a greater impact on the community, traffic congestion, access for

motorists and pedestrians, safety, and schools than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative and that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative should be implemented instead.

Some commenters stated that an interchange on the 5800 West Freeway Alternative at 4100 South in West Valley City is too close to Hunter High School and Hillside Elementary School and is a safety concern for students who walk or drive to school. Students who walk from the west side of this alternative would have to cross under the freeway at the interchange, and commenters felt that this would be unsafe.

2100 North Freeway Alternative (Section 35.2.7 – 1,481 comments). Of all the MVC alternatives, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative received the most comments both for and against an alternative. Lehi City and many Lehi residents opposed this alternative because they felt that it would have substantial impacts to the community, while comments from residents of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain supported the alternative.

Many of the commenters who were against this alternative expressed concerns about or opposed the alternative because of the expected impacts to air quality, economic development, noise, property values, groundwater, wetlands and wildlife, relocations, congestion, community cohesion, quality of life, and safety. Others were concerned that the alternative did not address trips to the Orem and Provo areas by residents of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs and that the alternative would increase congestion on Interstate 15 (I-15).

Numerous commenters stated that UDOT should consider Lehi City's 4800 North Freeway Alternative and that such an alternative would have fewer impacts to residential and commercial areas, air quality, noise, community cohesion, and the natural environment than would the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. Others who opposed the 4800 North Freeway Alternative said it would increase travel times for residents in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain and would not be used.

Tolling of the MVC Alternatives (Section 35.2.10 – 149 comments). Many commenters stated that they oppose tolling because it would place a burden on residents on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley and that tolling should also be considered in other areas of the state. Others commented that tolls should be placed only on trucks or single-passenger cars and that property taxes or new development could pay for the project. Some commenters stated that tolling the MVC freeway alternatives would increase the use of local streets because motorists would be unwilling to use a toll facility.



Community Impacts (Section 35.6.1 – 20 comments). Commenters stated that the action alternatives would further divide communities, decrease the quality of life, and be a nuisance to the public. Others felt that school impacts were not addressed. The majority of comments regarding community impacts were focused on UDOT’s Preferred Roadway Alternatives (5800 West Freeway Alternative in Salt Lake County and 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Utah County).

Relocations (Section 35.6.3 – 89 comments). Commenters wanted information about how property would be acquired; specifically, does UDOT pay for only minor impacts to property, when will property be acquired, how much time would residents have to move out, and does UDOT compensate for a decrease in property value for homes that are left remaining near an alternative?

Public Services and Utilities (Section 35.6.4 – 25 comments). The major utility companies (Questar Gas, Kern River Gas Transmission Company, and Rocky Mountain Power) felt that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have substantial impacts to their facilities and that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative should be selected in Salt Lake County. The companies also commented that the Draft EIS failed to adequately analyze the actual cost of moving the utilities and that more utilities would need to be moved than what was stated in the Draft EIS.

Economics (Section 35.9 – 24 comments). Commenters stated that property values will decrease in areas near the action alternatives.

Air Quality (Section 35.12.1, Section 35.12.3, and Section 35.12.4 – 309 comments). Commenters expressed concerns about the increase in air pollution from the action alternatives and the health effects of the pollutants. Specifically, comments noted that scientific studies have shown that children who live near freeways are at “extreme risk” for severe health problems. For instance, the commenters said studies have found that children who live within 250 yards of a freeway are 8 times more likely to develop leukemia and 6 times more likely to develop other cancers, and that children who live within 500 yards of a freeway are at “the highest risk” for permanent lung deformities. The commenters also stated that the proposed eight-lane freeway for the MVC along 5800 West in Salt Lake County would place several neighborhoods and schools in this “deadly zone” near the new freeway. Some of the increased health risks include cancer (leukemia), asthma, respiratory illness, premature and low-weight births, heart disease, and stroke. These commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be a “significant impact” to public health, and the lack of analysis is a violation of NEPA.



Indirect Effects (Section 35.24 – 15 comments). Commenters stated that the action alternatives would cause more urban sprawl and so would result in other resource-related indirect impacts. Others commented that the project would change the nature of land uses around the action alternatives.

Sequencing (Section 35.29 – 22 comments). Commenters stated that the 5600 West Transit Alternative should be implemented before the roadway alternatives. Commenters stated that giving transit a chance to succeed before implementing a road would allow a shift toward a more balanced regional transportation system and that this approach would reduce traffic rather than continuing the unsustainable pattern of accommodating it. They also commented that “transit first” is a reasonable alternative that should be considered and compared to the highway-dominated alternatives. Commenters also stated that the MVC sequencing analysis fails to meet the basic purpose of exploring the longer-term effects on future land-use patterns and travel behaviors associated with alternate forms of transportation.

35.1 Chapter 1 – Purpose of and Need for Action

35.1.1 Section 1.3 – Summary of Purpose and Need

- A. *Commenters stated that the project should have looked at east-west roadway improvements in Salt Lake County instead of north-south improvements.*

As discussed in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, the purpose of the MVC project is to improve regional mobility for automobile, transit, and freight trips by reducing roadway congestion compared to the No-Action Alternative conditions on roads serving the major north-south travel movements in Salt Lake County. The need for improvements to north-south mobility was based on an origin-destination analysis conducted by the MVC team. This analysis determined that, in 2030, most trips in the MVC study area (65%) would travel in a north-south direction toward Salt Lake City and between the cities in the study area. Improving north-south capacity would reduce congestion on east-west roads because traffic would travel north on the MVC to State Route (SR) 201 or Interstate 80 (I-80) before heading east.

Improving east-west roads would not meet the project purpose and therefore was not evaluated in the EIS. However, east-west capacity improvements are included as independent projects in the Wasatch Front Regional Council’s Regional Transportation Plan for Salt Lake County. For example, the plan includes improvements to 3500 South and 10400 South (see Section 8.3.2.1, Roadway Systems).



One commenter (Hexcel) stated that the North Valley Connectors Study and the Porter Rockwell Corridor Study recommended an east-west arterial system in Salt Lake County. The North Valley Connectors Study recommended east-west arterials in Utah County and did not address Salt Lake County. The Porter Rockwell Corridor Study area was in Salt Lake County but was limited in scope to Porter Rockwell Boulevard in Bluffdale.

- B. Commenters stated that our state legislation or Constitution should be changed to improve roadway repair, to improve transit use, to put the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) under the control of UDOT, and to change auto license fees.*

Changes to state legislation are outside the scope of this EIS.

- C. A commenter stated that alternatives that do not affect homes should be considered.*

As discussed in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, a study area was developed based on the project need. Within this study area, numerous alternatives were considered. All of the alternatives identified that would meet the project purpose would require the relocation of homes.

- D. Commenters stated that the MVC project favored the building of roads versus transit.*

As discussed in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, one of the purposes of the MVC is to “improve regional mobility by supporting increased transit availability.” This includes improving regional mobility by supporting increased availability of transit compared to the No-Action conditions as an alternative to automobile trips for the major north-south travel movements in the Salt Lake County part of the study area and the major east-west and north-south travel movements in the Utah County part of the study area. This project purpose resulted in a thorough evaluation of transit alternatives.

- E. A commenter stated that I-15 should be realigned at Point of the Mountain to the west to provide a shorter crossing between the MVC and I-15.*

Potential realignments to I-15 are outside of the scope of the MVC EIS and would not be necessary to meet the project purpose. Reconstruction of I-15 is being evaluated in a separate environmental impact statement (I-15 Corridor Utah County to Salt Lake County Final EIS, released in 2008).

- F. Commenters stated that SR 73 (Lehi Main Street) either should be converted into a three-lane road with reversible lanes for peak-hour travel or should be included as part of a one-way street alternative.*

Lehi Main Street is a historic district. The roadway has a narrow right-of-way, and there is a limited ability to widen the road without substantial impacts to



businesses and residents. Although making improvements to SR 73 could immediately reduce congestion, the proposed improvements to SR 73 would not meet the project purpose of reducing east-west congestion in 2030. To reduce congestion in 2030, much more capacity would be required. This alternative was eliminated during level 1 screening. See Section 2.1, Alternatives Development Process.

G. Commenters asked why the MVC project was being considered.

The MVC study area is projected to experience tremendous growth in the next 30 years with a 122% increase in population, a 208% increase in employment, and a 153% increase in households. This growth will cause many of the major north-south and east-west roads in the Salt Lake County part of the study area and many of the major east-west and north-south roads in the Utah County part of the study area to operate at a level of service (LOS) of E or F. The needs assessment determined that the study area, both now and in 2030, would have a lack of adequate north-south transportation capacity in western Salt Lake County, a lack of adequate transportation capacity in northwest Utah County, increased travel time and lost productivity, lack of transit availability, reduced roadway safety due to increased roadway congestion, and lack of continuous pedestrian/bicycle facilities.

H. Commenters stated that the MVC project is a possible violation of Title 1, Section 101 (42 U.S.C. 4331[b][2]) of NEPA, which states that the responsibility of the federal government is to “assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.”

42 U.S.C. 4331(b) states that, “In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the federal government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate federal plans, functions, programs and resources.” To meet this goal, Congress directed that the environmental impacts of federal actions be considered in the decision-making process. The MVC EIS will be used by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in its decision-making process when it decides whether to implement the MVC and, if FHWA decides to implement the project, which action alternative to select.

I. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) acknowledges FHWA and UDOT’s response to concerns and comments regarding the purpose of and need for the project. Elimination of “supporting local growth objectives” as a primary goal addresses EPA’s concern that this goal could eliminate alternatives that would be considered “reasonable and practicable” (with respect to avoiding or minimizing impacts to waters of the U.S.). This change appears to have led to the addition of 2100 North in Utah County as a viable alternative, and this



alternative appears to be the least environmentally damaging preferred alternative (LEDPA) for the three Utah County alternatives.

Thank you for the comment. For further information on the changes to the project purpose that are referenced in this comment, see Section 1.7, Public and Agency Involvement in Developing the Project's Purpose and Need.

- J. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the first project purpose is stated as improving north-south mobility in Salt Lake County. This is really more of a combination of a purpose and a project and has the effect of constraining the alternatives into only major north-south facilities. Given that the documented patterns of travel are as much east-west as north-south in Salt Lake County, it would be appropriate to broaden the alternative to consider east-west arterial and transit options, as they might actually improve regional mobility. The second table more appropriately states "regional mobility," yet the analyses are still constrained to include only the immediate area around the MVC. Given that much travel extends beyond the corridor, this limitation is not appropriate, and analysis should be conducted for the entire region. Many of the effects of the alternatives will be felt outside the immediate study area.*

The purpose for the MVC did not identify a specific project but identified a purpose for the project that would solve a transportation need. One of the needs identified was reducing north-south congestion. The need for improvements to north-south mobility was based on an origin-destination analysis. The purpose of the analysis was to confirm that there is a need for transportation improvements in a north-south direction in Salt Lake County in the study area. The results of the analysis showed that, in 2005, 41% of the trips that originated in the Salt Lake County part of the study area traveled in a north-south direction between the cities of West Valley City, West Jordan, South Jordan, and Herriman. An additional 29% of the overall trips had their destination in the downtown Salt Lake City area. These are considered northeast-southwest trips. In 2030, these north-south and northeast-southwest trips are expected to account for 65% of the overall trips in the study area. Therefore, the MVC purpose was developed to address the majority of north-south trips. As stated in Chapter 8, Transportation, by addressing the north-south travel demand, congestion on most east-west arterials would be reduced (see Section 8.4, Environmental Consequences).

The limits of the study area for the needs assessment were developed based on the projected travel demand. These limits considered influencing factors such as growth and development outside the study area. In the Salt Lake County part of the study area, the northern boundary of the transportation network is just north of I-80 because the Great Salt Lake limits growth north of I-80. Travel model



sensitivity testing demonstrated that transportation improvements west of SR 111 (at the foot of the Oquirrh Mountains) would not serve the projected traffic because most of the traffic in this part of the study area is oriented toward Salt Lake City (eastward) and travel toward SR 111 would be out of direction (westward). Bangerter Highway is the eastern boundary of the study area because transportation improvements east of this highway would not relieve the north-south traffic in the study area.

The travel that extends beyond and that could affect the study area was taken into account in developing the MVC action alternatives as this area is included in the regional travel demand model that was used to evaluate and develop the MVC alternatives. As part of the alternatives development process, transit options were considered, and this process resulted in the 5600 West Transit Alternative being evaluated in detail. The MVC team also looked at widening existing arterials as part of the alternatives development process, but this alternative was eliminated because it did not provide enough capacity to meet the project purpose.

- K. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the original goal for transit (as stated in a Draft Purpose and Need circulated in June 2004) was to increase transit availability. The revised purpose (as stated in the Draft EIS) is to increase transit to “support financial investment,” which is vague at best and, at worst, puts transit on an unequal footing. Smart Mobility asked, Shouldn’t road improvements also provide enough benefits to support financial investment? The objective for transit availability should be straightforward and meaningful measures such as to increase transit ridership and mode share.*

The purpose of transit was not changed; the purpose is still to improve regional mobility by supporting increased transit availability. The transit alternatives were screened in part based on whether each alternative would have enough ridership to support a financial investment by UTA in constructing and operating that transit alternative. To develop such a transit alternative, UDOT and UTA asked Envision Utah to conduct the Growth Choices process with the local cities to determine what land uses would support transit ridership, and this process meets the objective stated in the last sentence of the comment. As a result of this process, the 5600 West Transit Alternative was developed. As shown in the EIS, in 2030 the roadway components of the MVC would be heavily used, and this use demonstrates the need for the financial investment.

- L. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that, while the original purpose was to increase the availability of bicycle and pedestrian options, the revised statement seems to limit the bicycle/pedestrian objective to connecting with regional trails. Trails generally play a*



minor role in utilitarian pedestrian transportation, and this objective is not adequate to measure the success of an alternative toward this goal. A goal of this project, given the clear direction set by the communities in the Growth Choices process, should be to increase the mode share of walking and biking for transportation.

The original purpose was not changed; the purpose is still to increase bicycle and pedestrian options. The alternatives were screened based on whether they would facilitate a trail system that connects to other regional trails to provide better mobility throughout the study area. If the MVC alternatives connect to other trails, this could increase bicycle use as a transportation option, which would increase mode share. UDOT has been working with the communities to ensure that regional connectivity is provided.

- M. Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that they have several concerns about how the transportation system performance was measured, which they felt resulted in a bias toward new freeway investments. The first concern was that the measure of “miles of roads operating with heavy congestion” is a cruder way of getting at the idea of delay than the “vehicle-hours of delay” measure. Since transportation infrastructure is for people, the focus of congestion measures should be the people and not the roadway miles. If the people benefit from less-congested roadway miles, these benefits will show up in reduced vehicle-hours of delay (VHD) and reduced vehicle-miles traveled (VMT). Overall, Smart Mobility felt that VMT should be used as the transportation performance measure in the MVC EIS, with a goal of reducing VMT. The Wasatch Front Regional Council has recognized that the growth of VMT is one of the most significant contributors to air pollution. In addition, VMT provides a better representation of direct out-of-pocket expense for travelers, which has a more direct economic effect.*

One purpose of the project is to improve regional mobility by reducing roadway congestion. To measure the effectiveness of the alternatives in meeting this purpose, the “daily hours of delay” were calculated for all of the alternatives considered in the Draft EIS. As shown in Section 2.4, Summary Comparison of Alternatives, daily hours of delay were used to determine whether the alternatives met the purpose of improving regional mobility. See Section 2.4.1, Daily Delay.

Vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) were not used in evaluating alternatives’ ability to meet the purpose of reducing roadway congestion because VMT would not directly show how much an alternative would reduce the amount of delay. When comparing alternatives, a lower VMT does not necessarily correlate with lower congestion, and a higher VMT does not necessarily correlate with higher congestion. The level of congestion depends not only on VMT but also on the ability of



the road system to accommodate that VMT. The measure used in the Draft EIS—daily hours of delay—was used because it directly measures the alternatives' ability to achieve the desired outcome of reducing roadway congestion.

Although VMT was not used to measure the ability of the alternatives to meet the project purpose of relieving congestion, the Draft EIS did report VMT data for a range of scenarios as part of the sequencing analysis. See [Table 29.2-4](#), 2015 Sequencing Scenario Transit Trips, Transit Boardings, Transit Share, VMT, and Delay Results in the MVC Study Area, and [Table 29.2-6](#), 2030 Sequencing Scenario Transit Trips, Transit Boardings, Transit Share, VMT, and Delay Results in the MVC Study Area. For VMT data, see Section 12.4.3, Salt Lake County Alternatives, and Section 12.4.4, Utah County Alternatives.

The economic benefit of the alternatives was based on hours of delay. As stated in the comment, an increase in VMT does correlate with an increase in the total cost of vehicle travel for users of the highway system. But the increase in user costs (with higher VMT) does not reflect higher congestion; it reflects the fact that, with lower congestion, there is somewhat more travel. This is because, with less congestion, drivers are more likely to make more discretionary trips, which would cost the driver more money because of the increase in miles driven. However, during peak periods (work trips), there would be less delay and a cost benefit to the driver when comparing the time and cost for any individual trip.

- N. Hexcel Corporation commented that the purpose and need does not include potential growth on the west bench, asked whether the project is related to Legacy Highway Phase II, commented that the socioeconomic data were provided by WFRC and MAG independent of infrastructure limitations, questioned how growth projections were determined, questioned the safety data, commented that transit ridership could lower vehicle dependency, commented that local growth objectives should not be included as a secondary objective, and commented that environmental sensitivities and community values should be included in the project purpose.*

The EIS planning period is for the year 2030. The population and growth projections used to plan the project were based on the expected population and employment in 2030, including potential growth on the west bench. Full build-out of the west bench is expected to occur after 2030. For more information about future growth in the MVC study area, see Chapter 24, Indirect Effects, and Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts. Also see Section 2.1.7.1, Revised Travel Demand Modeling for the Final EIS.

The MVC project is an independent project and is not part of the Legacy Parkway project currently being built. The Legacy Parkway project parallels I-15



north of Salt Lake City. The MVC parallels I-15 south of Salt Lake City. The two projects are not connected to one another.

Transit ridership could lower vehicle dependency; that is why one of the project purposes is to improve regional mobility by supporting increased transit availability. This purpose resulted in the development of the 5600 West Transit Alternative. As discussed in Chapter 29, Sequencing, transit use would represent about 4.7% of the 2030 peak-hour trips in the study area under the MVC action alternatives compared to 2.7% under the No-Action Alternative.

The project purpose of “support local growth objectives” was moved to a secondary objective at the request of EPA. As a secondary objective, it was not used to screen out alternatives but was used to refine alignments based on local land-use plans. The safety data were provided in the EIS to support the need for the project but were not used to screen alternatives. Even without the safety data, there was a need to reduce congestion.

WRFC and MAG use population projections provided by the Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget for 2030. The projections are then reviewed by each city and in coordination with WFRC and MAG and then allocated to specific zones (traffic analysis zones) within each city where they expect future growth. The population and employment projections provided by the State are considered the official source of such data and are the standard to use in transportation planning. The Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget considers limitations of infrastructure and natural resources in the growth projections. It is outside the scope of the MVC EIS to determine if existing infrastructure or resources can support the growth envisioned by the cities and the State of Utah.

The purpose of the project was based on solving a transportation need. Preserving environmental resources and community values is not part of the project purpose; however, FHWA and UDOT do consider these issues when developing alternatives and evaluating impacts. Some of the criteria used in the alternative screening process included impacts to wetlands, impacts to threatened and endangered species, and impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas.

- O. Lehi City commented that, under applicable law, each NEPA effort must be performed within an area large enough to encompass and include all reasonably related and connected traffic improvements pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1508.25. A large number of related and connected transportation improvements underway in northern Utah County are being reviewed independently under separate and, in some cases, competing NEPA efforts. Many of these NEPA efforts share noticeably similar purposes and needs and rely on the results of other ongoing or recently completed NEPA processes*



to move forward. We believe that this is not a proper approach. These NEPA efforts are designed to study impermissibly small increments of related and connected transportation elements when these elements should be studied within the framework of a larger NEPA effort that focuses on the review of all rationally related and connected transportation improvements. Therefore, we request that the MVC Draft EIS be tabled and, excluding the I-15 effort, the other related and connected efforts be reviewed together in a document of logical scope that is issued for public review and comment in the form of a new Draft EIS.

Pursuant to 23 CFR 771.111(f), all projects currently under study in northern Utah County (1) connect logical termini and are sufficient in length to address environmental matters on a broad scope, (2) have independent utility, and (3) do not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonable foreseeable transportation projects. Therefore, it is the opinion of FHWA that a regional EIS as recommended is not required. Multiple projects in a region are appropriately addressed in the metropolitan planning process; decisions made in the planning process are not subject to NEPA review. For more information, see 23 U.S.C. 134(o).

- P. Lehi City commented that the need for the project appears to be poorly understood and defined and inadequately supported. One fundamental example in this regard is that it is impossible to discern what portion of the traffic demand in the current study area is actually east-west in nature versus north-south traffic forced into an east-west pattern. It may be that the east-west routes need not be so wide once the northbound and southbound traffic destined for I-15 has access to the alternate route contemplated under the MVC project. We assume that is one of the purposes of the MAG East-West Corridor Study. We also question who are the roads being built for since employment is increasing in the study area, which means less travel.*

The purpose for the MVC did not identify a specific project but identified a purpose for the project that would solve a transportation need. As stated in Section 1.3, Summary of Purpose and Need, one of the project purposes was to “improve regional mobility by reducing roadway congestion.” For Utah County, this was defined as improving regional mobility for automobile, transit, and freight trips by reducing roadway congestion compared to the No-Action conditions on roads serving the major east-west and *north-south* travel movements in the Utah County part of the study area. Therefore, the analysis looked at both directions of travel, not just east-west travel as stated in the comment.

The need for improvements to east-west mobility was based on an origin-destination analysis. The purpose of the analysis was to confirm that there is a need for transportation improvements in both a north-south and an east-west



direction in the Utah County portion of the study area. An examination of average daily work trips (see Section 1.6.2.2, Utah County Portion of the Study Area, of the Draft EIS) shows that about 36% of the 2030 east-west trips traveling on SR 73 (the main road in the area) from Cedar Fort, Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Lehi would stay on SR 73 heading toward I-15 and about 42% would go north on SR 68 (Redwood Road) toward Salt Lake County. Of the 36% of trips that reach I-15, most would head south toward the Provo-Orem area. This is consistent with MAG driver surveys, which have shown that the split of east-west traffic that travels either south to the Provo-Orem area or north to Salt Lake County is about 50/50. These analyses support the need for transportation improvements in both the east-west and north-south directions in northwest Utah County and the finding that 36% of the traffic would need to travel east-west before heading south on I-15.

One purpose of the MVC project is to reduce roadway congestion. As stated in the comment, both population and employment are projected to increase dramatically in northern Utah County during the planning period. The projected growth in employment both locally and regionally is taken into account in the regional travel demand model. Modeling results show that, even with local employment growth, there is still a substantial increase in travel and a need for the MVC project.

Q. Lehi City commented that the entire effort is far too oriented toward construction of more and wider roads, and a fundamental paradigm shift is required. The surveys and scoping effort under the umbrella of the Growth Choices process revealed that the residents of Utah County are very concerned about, among other attributes, air quality, open space, and community cohesion and livability. The Draft EIS focuses far too much on the construction of wide roads in the future that would be antithetical to these important values and desires. Lehi City requests that these “needs” be placed back at the forefront where they belong (and were during the Growth Choices process), that only roads that are absolutely necessary be constructed, and that they be constructed only in a manner that preserves and protects the various attributes of the quality of life in the area.

The purpose of the project was based on solving a transportation need. The alternatives were developed to meet this need and are the necessary requirements to meet the project purpose. As explained in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS, the Growth Choices Vision defined the basic project concepts—in terms of the need for a road in a new location, transit improvements, and land-use changes—but it did not dictate a specific route for the new road. In particular, the Growth Choices process was not used as a vehicle for selecting a specific roadway alignment or facility type in Utah County; those issues were left open for more



detailed analysis in the NEPA process, which included consideration of a range of potential road locations in Utah County. The Mountain View Corridor Vision map shows a freeway in Salt Lake County extending to SR 73 in northern Utah County along with a series of east-west arterial roads in northern Utah County that connect the MVC freeway to I-15. To ensure that a range of alternatives was considered in the EIS, an Arterials Alternative was developed based on the Growth Choices Vision. The Arterials Alternative was considered in Utah County, in addition to the alternatives that provided an east-west freeway connection to I-15 (the 2100 North Freeway and Southern Freeway Alternatives).

Preserving air quality, open space, and community cohesion and livability are important attributes, and FHWA and UDOT have carefully considered these resources when developing alternatives and evaluating impacts. Some of the criteria used in the alternative screening process included relocations (community impacts), impacts to wetlands, impacts to threatened and endangered species, and impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas. However, in keeping with standard FHWA practice, the purpose and need statement focuses on the underlying transportation needs that are being addressed by the proposed action. Therefore, while environmental and community resources are extensively considered, they are not incorporated into the purpose of and need for the project.

- R. *Lehi City commented that another fundamental problem is that these conclusions are frequently supported by reliance on outdated information. For instance, the 2003 long-range transportation plan is used when a newer version was or would shortly be available. In addition, they request that a new Draft EIS not be released until the current Utah County East-West Transportation Study has been completed and the results of that study included in the Draft EIS for the MVC project.*

Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, in the Draft EIS was based on a travel demand model that was based on the 2003 WFRC and 2005 MAG long-range plans. However, as stated in the Draft EIS on page 1-9, both the WFRC and MAG 2007 regional plans were reviewed to ensure that the Draft EIS accurately reflected the MVC project purpose and need. The Final EIS was updated to use the WFRC and MAG 2007 Regional Transportation Plans. See Section 2.1.7.1, Revised Travel Demand Modeling for the Final EIS.

In Utah County, the main difference between the 2005 and 2007 MAG long-range transportation plans was the identification of more lanes for I-15. The Final EIS has been updated using the 2007 Regional Transportation Plans from WFRC and MAG and Version 6.0 of the regional travel demand model.

The Utah County East-West Transportation Study involves the proposed construction of a five-lane, limited-access road in Lehi and Saratoga Springs at



about 1000 South that would connect Redwood Road to I-15 at the American Fork interchange. The planning period for that study extended to 2040. The results of the study should be available in September 2008. The proposed East-West Connector project has independent utility and is included in the MAG 2030 long-range plan. Because it is included in the 2030 plan, the East-West Connector has been assumed as part of the future 2030 transportation network for the purpose of the traffic forecasts in the MVC EIS; the same assumption is made for other projects that are included in the 2030 long-range plan. The ongoing environmental study for the East-West Connector does not call into question the assumptions made in the traffic forecasts for the MVC EIS; instead, it indicates that the East-West Connector is likely to move forward and therefore supports the decision to assume completion of that project for the purpose of the traffic forecasts in the MVC EIS.

- S. *Lehi City commented that the boundaries of the study area for the Utah County part of the MVC are artificial. The boundary divides Lehi, American Fork, and Lindon despite the fact that traffic flows over and through I-15. Many impacts such as air quality are not so bounded, nor are the needs and desires of the people of the area bounded in that fashion. Certainly population increase, housing increase, and employment increase occur over the entire northern part of Utah County. It is clear that the study area needs to be broadened to include at least part of the area east of I-15 and likewise needs to be broadened to include all of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. In addition, they commented that many of the resource-specific study areas are too small to capture the true nature of impacts.*

The limits of the study area for the needs assessment were developed based on projected travel demand. These limits consider influencing factors such as growth and development outside the study area in communities such as Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. In addition, the travel demand modeling used for the needs assessment takes into account the growth outside the study area, including the area east of I-15. For the Utah County part of the study area, there will not be enough traffic by 2030 south of Saratoga Springs, which is north and west of Utah Lake, to warrant major transportation improvements. In addition, about 50% of the trips from the Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain areas are to the Provo-Orem area (southeast) and would not be served with an I-15 connection at the southern end of Utah Lake because of the out-of-direction travel (south and then north). Therefore, the study area in Utah County was established from the northern end of Utah Lake to the eastern edge of the city of Eagle Mountain (although growth in Eagle Mountain was accounted for in looking at transportation solutions). The eastern limit of the study area is I-15 because this facility is the major north-south highway in the region.



For each resource evaluated in the EIS, a specific impact analysis area was developed that might be different from the needs assessment study area. Please see the responses to specific comments for each resource in this chapter regarding the resource impact analysis areas.

35.2 Chapter 2 – Alternatives

- A. *Commenters stated that public input is not considered when selecting an alternative and wanted to know when a final decision would be made.*

Public input is considered throughout the EIS process from the initial scoping that determines which alternatives to consider through the final selection of the alternative to implement. The final decision regarding which alternatives to implement will be made by FHWA in its Record of Decision, which will be released after the Final EIS sometime in 2009.

- B. *Commenters stated that the MVC project area needs more roads to accommodate the area growth.*

Thank you for the comment.

35.2.1 Section 2.1 – Alternatives Development Process (Screening)

- A. *Commenters stated that a roadway alternative on SR 111 or west of 7200 West should be considered because it would have fewer impacts on existing homes.*

As described in Section 2.1.3.5, Re-evaluation of the SR 111 Freeway Alternative, an alternative west of 7200 West on SR 111 was considered. This alternative consisted of widening SR 111 into a freeway or an arterial street and was based on 2030 growth projections from the State of Utah that included potential development on the west bench. After a review of the analysis for the SR 111 Alternative, FHWA decided to eliminate the alternative from further study. This alternative was eliminated because it would provide the least reduction in north-south traffic congestion in the study area, would require more relocations (between 23 and 95 more than the 7200 West Freeway and 5800 West Freeway Alternatives) and would affect substantially more historic homes (between 150 and 155 more Section 4(f) properties) than the other alternatives (see [Table 2.1-10](#), Comparison of Impacts from the SR 111 Alternatives and Other Alternatives). In addition, as a result of the high number of impacts to historic buildings, the alternative is not likely to be approved under Section 4(f) regulations administered by FHWA. Although some commenters stated that the road could be narrower to reduce impacts, it would still not provide enough reduction in north-south congestion.



Alignments west and east of SR 111 were also reviewed but were eliminated from consideration because of the high number of historic sites in the Magna area and between SR 111 and 7200 West. The evaluation also considered planning studies conducted apart from the MVC EIS process; these planning studies concluded that SR 111 was too far west to serve the majority of north-south travel demand in western Salt Lake County.

- B. Commenters stated that an alternative along the west side of Utah Lake should be considered, while other commenters suggested that the road should connect farther south on I-15 in the Provo area.*

Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, provides an overview of the MVC study area, which was based on the need for transportation improvements. A new road west of Utah Lake was outside the MVC study area. However, to address public comments, an alternative west of Utah Lake was considered as part of the alternatives development process (see Chapter 2, Alternatives). The alternative was eliminated because there was not enough travel demand in 2030 to warrant a major transportation improvement. This analysis of this alternative also included all of the projected 2030 growth identified in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan for Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Cedar Valley.

A connection of the MVC facility to Center Street or University Parkway would be outside the study area. In addition, during the alternatives development process, several connections to I-15 in Utah County were considered, and, based on regional transportation plans and local city planning, a connection south of the Pleasant Grove interchange was eliminated from evaluation.

- C. Commenters stated that the MVC should have less right-of-way, such as a six-lane highway, and the travel lanes should use the minimum width allowed. Other commenters stated that more right-of-way should be acquired and that the freeway should have more lanes.*

The number of general travel lanes required for both the MVC freeway and the arterials was based on a 2030 level of service of LOS D as modeled in the regional travel demand model. If a six-lane facility resulted in a level of service of LOS E or F, then an eight-lane roadway was implemented. For the MVC project non-tolled alternatives, UDOT would purchase only enough right-of-way to reach the LOS D goal in 2030. Lane widths are based on safety standards from UDOT and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). The same right-of-way would be acquired for the tolled alternatives. See Section 2.2.4.1, Right-of-Way Considerations for the Tolling Options.



- D. Commenters stated that an alignment at about 1000 South near the Lehi utility corridor should be considered.*

In early 2007, UDOT decided to undertake a project for an arterial on about 1000 South in Lehi, which was one of the MVC arterial alignments for the Arterials and Northern Freeway Alternatives. Therefore, 1000 South was removed from consideration from the MVC alternatives and was included as part of the No-Action Alternative. The 1000 South project would be a five-lane arterial. There are no plans to make this road a freeway, since this would cause substantial relocations and wetland impacts.

- E. Commenters stated that there were too many or too few interchanges and wondered how the interchange locations were selected.*

As discussed in Chapter 2, Alternatives, several guidelines were considered to evaluate the location of interchanges along the freeway alternatives. These guidelines included considering the cross street where the interchange would connect (can it handle the extra traffic from an interchange?), determining whether the interchange was compatible with local plans and community future land-use plans, and calculating the distance between interchanges according to highway design standards. To improve the level of service, maintain safety, and be consistent with the MVC as a regional facility, the interchange spacing was evaluated to provide enough distance between interchanges to meet AASHTO requirements and to minimize conflicts between vehicles entering and exiting the roadway. In order to accommodate vehicle merging and weaving and improve safety, an attempt was made to keep interchanges spaced at every 1.5 to 2 miles rather than the minimum allowable 1-mile spacing. The locations of the interchanges developed in the EIS could change based on future growth, land development patterns, and financial considerations.

- F. Commenters stated that some of the Utah County alternatives should be combined to provide for more roadway capacity, such as building the Southern Freeway Alternative with an arterial or freeway on 2100 North or Porter Rockwell Boulevard.*

Only one of the Utah County alternatives would be selected for implementation. All of the Utah County alternatives would substantially reduce travel delay and meet the project purpose. Combining alternatives would provide more capacity than necessary and would increase the cost more than what is required to meet the project purpose. Implementation of one of the MVC alternatives does not preclude the development of other roadway projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan.



- G. Commenters stated that the MVC project should consider a roadway alternative across Utah Lake.*

Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, provides an overview of the MVC study area, which was based on the need for transportation improvements. A new road across Utah Lake would be outside the MVC study area. However, to address public comments, an alternative across Utah Lake was considered as part of the alternatives development process (see Chapter 2, Alternatives). The alternative was eliminated for the MVC project because there was not enough travel demand in 2030 to warrant a new crossing of Utah Lake and because the alternative could have numerous environmental impacts. This analysis of this alternative also included all of the projected 2030 growth identified in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan for Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Cedar Valley. This study does not rule out the possibility of developing a road across Utah Lake in the future as development increases on the west side of Utah Lake.

- H. Commenters stated that east-west or other transit should be considered in Utah County to connect to the proposed commuter rail line or that a north-south line into Salt Lake County should be considered. Lehi City commented that transit in Utah County was an afterthought and that the analysis does not take into account the likely responses of vehicle users to rising gas prices, facilitated transit ridership, transit-oriented development, and willingness to telecommute. With more employment in the area, people might not need to travel as far, so who will be using these roads?*

A bus rapid transit alternative on SR 73 in Utah County was analyzed to evaluate potential ridership. A demand analysis showed that the ridership numbers for bus rapid transit on SR 73 in Utah County would be less than 2,000 daily riders in 2030. This analysis included potential ridership from areas west of Lehi including Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. The daily ridership numbers would not support a major transit investment even with the implementation of the land uses assumed by the Growth Choices Vision Scenario, and therefore the bus rapid transit alternative on SR 73 was not evaluated in detail. As a comparison, the threshold for adding a local bus route would be around 1,800 riders per day. In order to support a large capital investment such as bus rapid transit, ridership on a given route needs to be between 5,000 and 6,000 daily riders (see Section 2.1.2.2, Alternatives Screening – Level 2).

UDOT, UTA, and MAG have been working together in northern Utah County to determine the location for implementing east-west bus transit that will provide the greatest benefit to the area. To address east-west transit in northern Utah County, UDOT and UTA are planning to implement transit on the proposed East-West Connector project at about 1000 South in Lehi. MAG has included transit



on this route as part of its Regional Transportation Plan. The reasons for including transit on this route versus other roads in Northern Utah County are that it better serves the communities of Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Lehi by providing direct access to a proposed commuter rail station at the American Fork Main Street/I-15 interchange and that the road would be a limited-access facility to facilitate traffic movement.

One purpose of the MVC project is to reduce roadway congestion. As stated in the comment, both population and employment will increase dramatically in northern Utah County during the planning period. The growth in employment both locally and regionally is taken into account in the regional travel demand model. Modeling results show that, even with local employment growth, there is still a substantial increase in travel and a need for the MVC project. The travel demand model also takes into account proposed future land uses as developed by the cities. It would be speculative to consider transit-oriented developments that are not currently shown in the cities' plans or in the Growth Choices Vision.

Gas prices have been rising for the past several years, as noted by the commenter. There is some recent evidence that rising gas prices have reduced the rate of growth in travel demand on a national level. The cumulative travel for 2008 has shown a nationwide reduction in VMT of -2.1% and -2.8% in the western United States (FHWA 2008). The most recent available data for Utah showed a 71% increase in VMT between 1990 and 2007 while population increased by only 47% during that same period (UDOT 2008). Since 1970, there have been two periods (1974 and 1979–1980) when VMT has declined as a result of spikes in gas prices and gas shortages (Polzin 2006). These declines have been followed by subsequent years of increases in VMT. For example, since the decline in VMT in 1980, there has been an increase in VMT until the recent gas price increase. These historical data show that rising gas prices will tend to encourage the use of more fuel-efficient vehicles or alternative-fuel vehicles, which over time would diminish the impact of higher gas prices on travel behavior.

In addition, many factors other than gas prices influence travel demand—for example, population growth, employment growth, and differences in the availability and cost of housing in different parts of a metropolitan area. Therefore, while rising gas prices might tend to reduce the growth in travel demand, at least in the short term, it is likely that travel demand will continue to increase, especially in rapidly growing regions such as the Wasatch Front. Given these factors, the recent increase in gas prices does not warrant the development of new traffic forecasts based on the assumption of lower travel demand. Instead, this EIS continues to use traffic forecasts generated from the current, approved travel demand models from WFRC and MAG for the MVC study area.



- I. *Commenters stated that an alternative farther west near Cedar Fort or a mile west of the current alignment should be considered.*

Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, provides an overview of the MVC study area, which was based on the need for transportation investment. A new road west near Cedar Fort and Eagle Mountain would be outside the MVC study area. However, to address public comments, an alternative in this area was considered as part of the alternatives development process (see Chapter 2, Alternatives). The alternative was eliminated because there would not be enough travel demand in 2030 to warrant a major transportation investment. An alignment slightly farther west would affect the Camp Williams air strip and helicopter landing areas.

- J. *A commenter stated that the MVC in Utah County near Camp Williams should be on the east side of Redwood Road. Another commenter stated that Redwood Road should be widening instead of building MVC in Utah County.*

An alignment on the east side of Redwood Road would go through the main base at Camp Williams and would affect most of its facilities and several homes just north of Camp Williams. There would be no home relocations from the alignment on the west side of Redwood Road.

Redwood Road is planned to be widened from 2 two lanes to 5 lanes in 2009. Even with a widened Redwood Road there is a need for MVC. Redwood Road could not be widened further without substantial impacts to businesses and residential properties in Utah County. As noted above, the north-south MVC alignment in Utah County would not have any relocations. In addition, Redwood Road is needed to provide continued local access.

- K. *Commenters stated that an alternative connecting Redwood Road and I-15 should be considered that passes just south of the Camp Williams main base, passes through the Utah Law Enforcement site, and connects to I-15 at SR 92. Other commenters stated that MVC should connect to SR 92 because there would be fewer impacts.*

An alternative was considered south of the Camp Williams main base that connected to I-15 at SR 92. The alternative was eliminated because it would need to go through the Thanksgiving Point development and would remove commercial facilities and a golf course that are important to Lehi City. Therefore, an alternative connection about 1 mile north of Thanksgiving Point was considered. However, the alignment was eliminated for three reasons: it would affect wildlife migration areas; it would cross an area of the Jordan River that is considered to have important marsh and wildlife habitat by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the Utah Division of Wildlife



Resources; and Camp Williams opposed the alternative because of the increased security risk and because the area might be used for future base expansion.

- L. Commenters stated that the EIS looked at old population data or population growth data from 2003 to 2006 but not in the future. How will the recent downturn in the economy affect the EIS? Other commenters stated that the EIS used outdated 2001 population numbers that do not account for growth trends.*

The EIS used existing data to establish baseline populations (existing conditions), and the analysis for the planning year 2030 was based on State-produced future growth projections. The analysis included travel demand modeling and population projections using population and economic data published by the Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, which is the State's official resource for such data. The future-year projections produced by the State take into account current and future economic trends and input from individual cities. The growth projections provided by the Governor's Office are updated on a regular basis to account for recent economic trends. The Draft EIS used 2001 data as the baseline for projecting population and employment growth. The Final EIS used 2005 as the baseline for population and employment growth (see Section 1.4, Growth Trends).

- M. A commenter stated that Bangerter Highway should be improved instead of building the MVC alternatives on 5800 West and 7200 West.*

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, an alternative on Bangerter Highway was considered. However, the alternative was eliminated because it would not relieve traffic congestion in the MVC study area due to being too far east and due to substantial impacts to existing residential and commercial areas.

- N. The City of Herriman commented that they would like the MVC alignment to continue as planned to Utah County instead of considering an alignment connecting to Bangerter Highway between 13400 South and 13600 South.*

The regional transportation plan shows a freeway connection between the MVC and Bangerter Highway. This connection is an independent project in the WFRC regional plan and is not part of the MVC project. The MVC project continues past this connection into Utah County where it connects with I-15.

- O. A commenter stated that, instead of a freeway alternative in Salt Lake County, an arterial similar to Bangerter Highway should be built on the west bench.*

As described in Section 2.1.3.5, Re-evaluation of the SR 111 Freeway Alternative, an alternative west of 7200 West on SR 111 was considered. This alternative, which is on the west bench, consisted of widening SR 111 into a freeway or an arterial street and was based on State-produced 2030 growth projections including potential development on the west bench. After a review of



the analysis for the SR 111 Alternative, FHWA decided to eliminate the alternative from further study. This alternative was eliminated because it would provide the least reduction in north-south traffic congestion in the study area, would require more relocations (between 23 and 95 more than the 7200 West Freeway and 5800 West Freeway Alternatives), and would affect substantially more historic homes (between 150 and 155 more Section 4(f) properties) than the other alternatives evaluated (see [Table 2.1-10](#), Comparison of Impacts from the SR 111 Alternatives and Other Alternatives).

- P. *Utahns for Better Transportation, the Sierra Club, and Lehi City commented that the Draft EIS uses an outdated model (Version 5.0) to measure the performance of the transportation system resulting in “a bias toward new freeway investments” as well as a biased and results-oriented statement of project purpose and a set of decision criteria that tend to predetermine the outcome rather than supporting a full and fair consideration of a wider range of reasonable alternatives. (See comments on the MVC Draft EIS submitted by Smart Mobility, Inc., on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation.) The newest model (Version 6.0), which is an improvement over Version 5.0, must be used consistently throughout the Draft EIS to determine the most accurate numbers possible, to comply with the requirements of NEPA. Lehi City commented that, by using Version 6.0, there would be a completely different outcome of the alternatives screening process, and therefore a new NEPA effort in Utah County is justified.*

See Response S on page 35-28 of this section for details on the use of travel demand models Version 5.0 and Version 6.0 and the screening of alternatives.

- Q. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that a combination of wise transportation and land-use improvements in the western part of Salt Lake County will better accommodate population growth by developing 5600 West as a transit corridor linked to east-west TRAX and bus lines. In addition, the efficiency and safety of the arterial road system needs to be improved with possible road capacity additions on existing corridors such as 7200 West and SR 111 as western Salt Lake County grows.*

The EIS evaluates 5600 West as a transit corridor under the 5600 West Transit Alternative, which assumes a connection to the currently proposed east-west TRAX lines. The alternative suggested by the commenter—constructing a 5600 West transit line along with a freeway or arterial on SR 111—was eliminated because the alternative would provide the least reduction in north-south traffic congestion in the study area, would require more relocations (between 23 and 95 more than 7200 West Freeway and 5800 West Freeway Alternatives), and would affect substantially more historic homes (between 150 and 155 more Section 4(f)



properties) than the other alternatives (see [Table 2.1-10](#), Comparison of Impacts from the SR 111 Alternatives and Other Alternatives).

In addition, as stated in Chapter 2, Alternatives, a “widen existing arterials” alternative that included roads such as those noted in the comment was considered in combination with transit on 5600 West. The alternative was eliminated because it would not provide enough capacity in the study area. Note that the No-Action Alternative would widen a number of arterials including 5600 West, Redwood Road, SR 111, 3500 South, 4700 South, 7800 South, Old Bingham Highway, 9000 South, 11400 South, and 12600 South and would include implementation of east-west TRAX lines. However, even with these improvements, an alternative that combines 5600 West transit with widening existing arterials would not meet the project purpose. Also, the above improvements were in the backdrop of the transit-only alternative developed for the MVC, which also did not provide enough capacity to meet the project purpose without an additional freeway component.

- R. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality’s (CEQ) regulations that implement NEPA require that the Quality Growth Strategy, Wasatch Choices 2040, and Mountain View Vision documents be considered fully in analyzing a full range of alternatives to meet the project purpose and in comparing the impacts of those alternatives on regional growth patterns and quality of life. In addition, they commented that the Draft EIS fails to fulfill the most important requirement of NEPA because it fails to seriously consider alternatives that would achieve the main project purpose of improving regional mobility by reducing VMT rather than the traditional, futile efforts to meet growing VMT with additional road capacity.*

Certainly, a full range of alternatives must be examined under NEPA, but analyzing every possible alternative is not required. NEPA requires that the EIS be sufficiently inclusive and informative in its description and discussion of alternatives to allow the decision-making agency to make an informed choice to proceed with the project or not. In the case of the MVC project, the EIS evaluated a number of alternatives within a reasonable range. In general, over 25 alternatives were evaluated, including land-use changes only, transit only, transit and land-use changes only, and widening existing arterials. An agency needs to consider only alternatives that are reasonable under the circumstances that are expected to exist. An alternative must meet the purposes of the project in order to be considered reasonable.

As stated in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, the EIS analyzes the impacts of the action alternatives on quality of life. Regional growth patterns were considered in



the MVC project as part of the Growth Choices process, which led to the Mountain View Vision that was accepted by the cities in the corridor. The Vision was used in evaluating all of the alternatives. Finally, one of the primary project purposes is to improve regional mobility by reducing congestion. This purpose does not require that an alternative reduce vehicle-miles traveled.

- S. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the Draft EIS relies on Version 5.0 of the travel demand model and related future socioeconomic projections and future roadway and transit networks rather than on the current Version 6.0. Each of these areas biases the Draft EIS analyses. The difference in the model versions could eliminate the need for a future north-south corridor. The substantially lower growth on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley in the latest forecasts indicates that the entire alternatives screening should be conducted again in a supplemental Draft EIS. The results of this step could be substantially different for a number of alternatives with the new model and new forecasts. The freeway alternatives might no longer be warranted, and alternatives that focus more on local and regional transit and development of arterials or parkways for addressing vehicle travel might be more appropriate, be more cost effective, and have lower environmental impacts. The updated forecasts also could affect the timing and sequencing of investments.*

During preparation of the Draft EIS, the latest version (5.0) of the WFRC/MAG travel demand model was used to evaluate transit and roadway alternatives. Version 6.0 was not available until after the analysis had been completed for the Draft EIS, so UDOT and FHWA decided to publish the Draft EIS and update the Final EIS using Version 6.0. Before using Version 6.0 of the model, UDOT and FHWA performed an evaluation of the population, household, and employment projections used by WFRC for the travel forecasting. This evaluation, which was conducted by Resource Systems Group, Inc. (RSG), in March 2008, included an evaluation of the following factors that affect future growth:

- Historic growth trends
- Vacant land and land-use plans
- Current development densities in Salt Lake County
- The likely build-out of current vacant and developable land

The RSG evaluation of the WFRC population, household, and employment projections in Version 6.0 found that the WFRC projections on the west side of Salt Lake County did not match the actual growth in this area. RSG determined that the population, household, and employment projections used in the Draft EIS more closely reflect the actual growth trends and more closely reflect the stated intentions of major land developers in the area. Therefore, RSG recommended



basing Version 6.0 traffic forecasts on population, household, and employment projections that closely reflect those used in the Draft EIS.

The RSG evaluation was given to WFRC for review and comment in April 2008, and WFRC concurred with the evaluation. WFRC agreed that the population, household, and employment projections should be used in developing the traffic forecast for the Final EIS and would be considered in the next update of the travel demand model. Because WFRC's travel demand model will not be updated until 2009, UDOT ran Version 6.0 of the travel demand model in April 2008 with the population, household, and employment projections recommended by RSG. WFRC concurred with this approach. Based on this analysis, the screening process described in the Draft EIS is still valid, and there is no need for a Supplemental EIS. For further information, see Section 2.1.7.1, Revised Travel Demand Modeling for the Final EIS.

- T. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the objectives for transit and bicycle/pedestrian transportation should be measured by mode share.*

One of the primary project purposes is to improve regional mobility by supporting increased transit availability. Based on this purpose, the 5600 West Transit Alternative was developed. The viability of a transit alternative was measured not by mode share (percentage of trips on transit versus highway versus other), but instead by ridership (total number of boardings per day). Ridership was used to assess the viability of transit alternatives because ridership correlates with fare revenue. Fare revenue is a key factor in determining the financial feasibility of a transit project. Higher transit mode share generally means higher ridership, but a transit project can still be viable even with a low mode share. Therefore, mode share was not used to determine whether a transit alternative was reasonable. However, mode share data were presented in the EIS. See [Table 29.2-3](#), 2015 Daily Regional Trips by Purpose and Mode, and [Table 29.2-6](#), 2030 Sequencing Scenario Transit Trips, Transit Boardings, Transit Share, VMT, and Delay Results in the MVC Study Area.

A pedestrian and bicycle facility is included as part of the MVC freeway alternatives. Increasing bicycle and pedestrian use was a secondary project objective, not a primary purpose. Because this was not a purpose of the project, there is no need to develop a measure to determine if the alternative produced a specific level of improvement. Instead, UDOT and FHWA developed a pedestrian/bicycle facility that would increase options by ensuring that the trail system would provide regional connectivity and would allow the system to function as an alternative to vehicle or transit use.



- U. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the latest modeling tools and land-use forecasts should be used. These represent the most accurate and highly developed tools. The forecasts are the result of extensive public and analytic process using UrbanSim.*

The WFRC/MAG travel demand model (Version 6.0) represents the state of the practice in transportation modeling and is the best tool available for that purpose and the MVC project. As described in Section 2.1.7.1, Revised Travel Demand Modeling for the Final EIS, the MVC team concluded, based on the recommendations of an expert consultant, that it was necessary to modify the land-use assumptions approved by WFRC and MAG for use with Version 6.0. Therefore, the traffic forecasts presented in the Final EIS are based on Version 6.0 but incorporate land-use assumptions similar to those used in the Draft EIS. The land-use assumptions used in the Draft EIS were based on WFRC's and MAG's previous forecasts (those used with model Version 5.0) but were adjusted slightly to reflect the results of the Growth Choices process. This process was directed by Envision Utah and represents the land uses that the cities are likely to implement if the MVC project is built. The land use developed in the Growth Choices process was the result of a 9-month effort, and it would not be reasonable to assume other land uses that were not developed as part of this coordinated effort.

- V. *The Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District commented that they have some concern regarding how the MVC alignment would affect their facilities.*

UDOT will continue to work with the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District during the final design of the MVC to evaluate their facilities.

- W. *Hexcel Corporation and Lehi City provided specific comments on the range of alternatives that should have been evaluated in the Draft EIS. Hexcel had the following comments: UDOT and UTA should have funds or identify fund sources for the alternatives; the project purpose should include community values and environmental sensitivities; on [Figure 2-1.1](#), the refinement of alternatives appears twice and it is not clear if this is repetitive or iterative; and the travel demand model should have included socioeconomic and land-use input collected during the scoping process. Lehi City commented that, in addition to the 4800 North Alternative, other reasonable alternatives are available and should be considered.*

Certainly, a full range of alternatives must be examined under NEPA, but analyzing every possible alternative is not required. NEPA requires that the EIS be sufficiently inclusive and informative in its description and discussion of alternatives to allow the decision-making agency to make an informed choice to proceed with the project or not. In the case of the MVC project, the EIS



evaluated a number of alternatives within a reasonable range. In general, over 25 alternatives were evaluated, including land-use changes only, transit only, transit and land-use changes only, and widening existing arterials.

In determining the scope of alternatives to be considered, the emphasis is on what is “reasonable” rather than on whether the project proponent or applicant likes or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative. The CEQ document “NEPA’s Forty Most Asked Questions” defines reasonable alternatives as those “alternatives that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant” (CEQ 1981, question 2a).

FHWA, as the lead agency, has determined that the existing Salt Lake County and Utah County alternatives offer a reasonable range of alternatives for study in the Draft EIS for the MVC project.

NEPA does not require a project to have funds available or identified to be studied since, in many cases, NEPA is conducted early in the planning process. The refinement of alternatives shown in [Figure 2-1.1](#), Mountain View Corridor Alternatives Development Process, is meant to be iterative. See Response N on page 35-13 of Section 35.1.1 regarding input into the travel demand model and community values and environmental sensitivity.

- X. *Hexcel Corporation commented that the sensitivity analysis also shows that SR 111 is too far west to meet north-south travel demand. Travelers, however, could use the improved Bangerter Highway for north-south travel if they do not want to travel that far. A combination of a freeway at SR 111 and an improved Bangerter Highway could be a reasonable alternative. There is no indication in the Draft EIS that this alternative was studied.*

As stated in Chapter 2, Alternatives, a “widen existing arterials” alternative that included roads such as those noted in the comment was considered. The alternative was eliminated because it would not provide enough capacity in the study area and because widening arterials would have substantial impacts. Also, as noted in the analysis, converting SR 111 to a freeway would have more impacts to the communities than either of the MVC freeway alternatives in Salt Lake County, and improving SR 111 along with Bangerter Highway would have substantially more impacts and therefore would not be reasonable. It also would not reduce congestion in the MVC study area as much as either of the freeway alternatives considered in the EIS for Salt Lake County. See Section 2.1.3.5, Re-evaluation of SR 111 Freeway Alternative.

- Y. *Hexcel Corporation commented that highway alternatives include only freeway and arterial systems. It is not clear whether an expressway system (combination*



of freeway and arterial) was considered in the development of alternatives. However, there is no indication that a traffic analysis was conducted for an arterial system that can accommodate less growth than that predicted by WFRC and MAG. These huge growth projections might not take place. In any event, the Draft EIS does not provide any discussion of the financial and infrastructure required to sustain the growth.

An “improve arterials only” alternative was considered and was eliminated from study because it did not meet the project purpose of improving regional mobility by reducing congestion. The arterials considered in this analysis included limited-access facilities that are similar to an expressway. Based on the analysis conducted, only a freeway would provide enough capacity to meet the project purpose in Salt Lake County. WFRC and MAG use population projections provided by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget for the year 2030. The projections are then reviewed by each city government and, in coordination with WFRC and MAG, the population data are put into specific zones within each city where the cities expect future growth. The population and employment projections provided by the State are considered the official source of such data and are the standard to use in transportation planning.

- Z. *Hexcel Corporation commented that the highway networks are the only components within the travel demand model that varied among alternatives. For an urban area with normal growth, this approach might be appropriate. But for an area with 500% growth, different land-use and population scenarios should be considered. Therefore, for the No-Action Alternative, there should be a scenario that shows little or no growth for the planning year. They also commented that compact growth should have been considered as an alternative and that growth could slow in the future.*

See Response N on page 35-13 of Section 35.1.1 for a discussion about growth projections and how they were used in the development of alternatives. It would be speculative to develop different population scenarios when there would be no basis for the different growth rates used. The population forecast came from the State of Utah and is based on historic growth trends and available land. UDOT and FHWA did meet with the cities in the study area to create a consensus land use to be used to evaluate alternatives as part of the Growth Choices process. The cities agreed to consider those land uses if the MVC project is implemented to support transit use. Regional planning is a local responsibility, according to the Utah state constitution. NEPA does not require examination of unrealistic or speculative alternatives, nor does it permit federal decision-makers to ignore the local planning process. Also, a compact growth scenario was considered in the Growth Choices process. Local governments with responsibility for land use in the MVC study area declined to endorse the compact growth scenario and instead



adopted a vision that was essentially a hybrid of the compact and trend scenarios. See Section 3.2.2, Scenario Development.

AA. The North Shore Land Owners provided an alternative that consisted of widening and extending SR 92 to Redwood Road, widening and extending 2100 North in Lehi to Redwood Road from 1750 West through Eagle Mountain, widening 2300 West north to 2100 North in Lehi, widening 1200 East north to SR 92, widening the Alpine Highway from American Fork to SR 92, widening Timpanogos Boulevard from American Fork to SR 92, and widening Canyon Road from Pleasant Grove to SR 92.

Some of the above improvements are outside the MVC study area, such as improvements east of I-15, and would not reduce congestion on east-west roads north of Utah Lake. Other suggested improvements are north-south arterials that again would not help meet the project purpose of improving east-west mobility. See Response K on page 35-24 of this section regarding a connection to SR 92. An improvement in this area (SR 92) would go through Thanksgiving Point and cause substantial impacts to this important Lehi commercial center. In addition, widening the number of suggested arterials would require substantial relocations to existing homes and businesses. The alternative is also similar to the MVC Arterials Alternative, which provides east-west connections at Porter Rockwell Boulevard, 2100 North, and 1900 South.

BB. Lehi City commented that the Level 1 screening process for alternatives included a criterion to eliminate alternatives that did not support local planning policies. This criterion was in place prior to the late revision of the project's purposes to allow the inclusion of 2100 North as an alternative. Several of the Utah County alternatives were eliminated because of this criterion and other factors in the screening table on p. 2-13. The Draft EIS states that alternatives were reconsidered in Section 2.1.6, but it does not appear that all of the alternatives eliminated in Table 2.1-5 were reconsidered in Section 2.1.6.

Of the Level 1 alternatives, only the location of transit or a highway-only alternative were eliminated solely because they did not meet the purpose of supporting local planning policies. The highway-only alternative would not meet the project purpose of providing a multi-modal solution and therefore was not reconsidered. The location of transit was based on the Growth Choices process and the optimum location to develop ridership; therefore, there was no need to reconsider the Level 1 screening for transit.

CC. Lehi City commented that all of the criteria in the Level 2 screening effort are weighted without explanation. Transportation Performance is given 40%, Environmental Impacts are given 30%, Compatibility with Local and Regional Plans is given 20%, and Cost is given 10%. Within each category, criteria are



also weighted, so within environmental impacts, wetlands is given 50% of the score and endangered species are given only 10% of the score. This weighting system appears arbitrary and weighted to ensure that the 2100 North Alternative scores higher than the other alternatives.

In the Level 2 screening process, FHWA and UDOT employed a weighting and scoring system as a tool for understanding the strengths and weakness of the various alternatives. The scoring system did not dictate the screening decisions; it was simply a tool for comparing the alternatives' strengths and weaknesses. In addition, while the Draft EIS did include a table that reflected a specific assignment of scores and weights, the table presented only one possible set of assumptions for scoring the alternatives. As explained in the Draft EIS, “[d]uring the weighting and scoring process, the MVC EIS team was able to answer a number of ‘what if’ questions by adjusting the weighting and scoring numbers. This enabled the MVC EIS team to determine the most desirable or undesirable aspect of each alternative.” In the context of a screening process that involved a large number of potential alternatives, the scoring system was a helpful tool but was not used as a basis for decision-making.

As shown in [Table 2.1.8](#), Level 2 Screening Results – Utah County Roadway Alternatives, some alternatives were eliminated as a standalone alternative, but elements of each alternative were considered as part of the Utah County alternatives that were carried forward. During Level 2 screening, alternative UT-4 (freeway on 2100 North) was eliminated as a standalone alternative because it did not meet the planning objectives of Lehi City. At this point in the alternatives development process, meeting planning objectives was a project purpose. However, after this stage in the alternatives development process, EPA requested that meeting planning objectives be removed as a primary purpose, which allowed FHWA and UDOT to reconsider a freeway on 2100 North in Lehi. See Section 1.7, Public and Agency Involvement in Developing the Project’s Purpose and Need.

35.2.2 Section 2.2.1 – No-Action Alternative

- A. *Commenters stated that the MVC should not be built.*

The No-Action Alternative is evaluated in the EIS.

35.2.3 Section 2.2.2.1 – 5600 West Transit Alternative

- A. *Commenters suggested that the MVC project should consider transit as part of the solution, that a transit-only alternative without roadway improvement should be considered, and that transit should be implemented before the roadway alternatives. Other commenters stated that there is no funding for the transit*



alternative for over 23 years. Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that building a new freeway at 5800 West goes against the will of the people who live and work along the Wasatch Front who overwhelmingly voted to raise their own taxes to speed up the implementation of additional TRAX lines—a clear demonstration of the public’s commitment to transit. A new freeway also goes against the advice of the Governor’s Blue Ribbon Advisory Council (BRAC), whose report to the governor in October 2007 supported the development and implementation of an aggressive mass-transit strategy.

Transit Considered in the MVC EIS. As discussed in Section 2.2.2.1, 5600 West Transit Alternative, a transit alternative is being considered on 5600 West in Salt Lake County as part of the MVC EIS process. To address the concerns of the public regarding more transit, one of the project purposes is to improve regional mobility by supporting increased transit availability. The proposed 5600 West Transit Alternative along with other light-rail and commuter lines is considered by UTA to be an aggressive mass-transit strategy.

The proposed 5600 West Freeway Alternative would operate from about Herriman (Herriman Parkway and 5600 West) to the Salt Lake City International Airport. The alternative would be implemented with the roadway alternative selected for Salt Lake County. The 5600 West Transit Alternative was considered along with changes in land use as part of the Growth Choices process to support increase transit usage.

Transit Funding. Since the release of the Draft EIS, more information on transit funding has become available. The Preferred Transit Alternative (5600 West Transit Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Option) would be built in phases as funding became available, consistent with the following phasing timeframes identified in WFRC’s Regional Transportation Plan:

- In Transit Phase 1, UTA would construct bus rapid transit in a fixed guideway (Type 3 bus rapid transit) along 5600 West from 2700 South to 6200 South. As part of Phase 1 activities, UTA also would acquire the necessary right-of-way to construct a fixed-guideway transit system along 5600 West from 11800 South to Interstate 80 (I-80) and along I-80 from 5600 West to the Salt Lake City International Airport.
- In Transit Phase 2, UTA would extend bus rapid transit in a fixed guideway along 5600 West from 6200 South southbound to 11800 South and from 2700 South northbound to I-80 and continuing along I-80 to the airport.
- In Transit Phase 3, UTA would implement a rail transit system along the entire length of 5600 West extending from the airport on the north to Herriman to the south.



The funding plan for the transit system will be based on funding sources such as federal grants from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), public/private investments and possible enterprise zones related to transit-oriented development, future tax revenue included in the current WFRC Regional Transportation Plan, and funds that are already available in the 2030 WFRC finance plan.

Transit-Only Alternative. As part of the alternatives development process, a transit-only alternative (no MVC roadway improvements) was considered but eliminated from detailed consideration because such an alternative did not provide enough capacity to meet the project purpose of improving regional mobility by reducing roadway congestion (see Section 2.1.2.1, Alternatives Screening – Level 1).

Transit First. Chapter 29, Sequencing, provides an analysis of implementing transit before the roadway alternatives. The analysis evaluated five sequencing scenarios for the MVC project in 2015 and seven sequencing scenarios for 2030. This analysis demonstrated that there was little difference in regional daily transit use whether transit operated without an MVC roadway or whether transit operated with an MVC roadway in place in 2015 or in 2030. In most cases, there was little difference in daily transit trips between the transit-only scenarios and the scenarios in which transit operated with an MVC roadway. The transit-only scenarios resulted in substantially greater roadway delay compared to the roadway and transit operating at the same time in 2015 and in 2030. The greatest factor that affected transit use was land-use densities, not whether the MVC freeway was operating with transit in 2015 or in 2030.

Blue Ribbon Advisory Council. The Governor’s Blue Ribbon Advisory Council recommends an aggressive mass-transit strategy, but it does not recommend that new roads should not be built. The 5600 West Transit Alternative includes implementation of new transit service in combination with more transit-oriented development and is consistent with the Advisory Council’s objective of an aggressive mass-transit strategy.

- B. *Commenters stated that the WFRC and MAG travel demand model used in the EIS under-counts transit ridership and that actual transit use would be much higher than what is shown in the EIS.*

It is true that the WFRC/MAG travel model underestimated ridership on the original north-south TRAX light-rail line, which opened in 1999. However, that model was developed without the advantage of an operating rail system along the Wasatch Front. Since that time, WFRC and MAG have upgraded the model several times to better reflect current transit use and to incorporate ridership data from the TRAX system. Additionally, the model has been reviewed extensively



by FTA and has been deemed acceptable. The WFRC/MAG travel model represents the state of the practice in transit modeling and is the best tool available for that purpose.

- C. *A commenter opposed the 5600 West Transit Alternative because it will not be used and stated that a transitway on 5600 West would increase safety risks to the students who use the numerous schools along 5600 West.*

As discussed in Section 2.2.2.1, 5600 West Transit Alternative, the estimated daily transit boardings in 2030 would be about 6,800 for the Preferred Transit Alternative (Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option), which is enough to support a transit option. The transit alternative would operate down the middle of 5600 West, which would reduce conflicts with pedestrians walking on 5600 West. In addition, appropriate safety measures would be in place to minimize the risk to pedestrians who cross 5600 West at intersections.

- D. *Commenters stated that the 5600 West Transit Alternative should be placed alongside the 5800 West Freeway Alternative instead of in the 5600 West roadway or that transit should be placed in an alignment separate from 5600 West.*

Placing the transit alignment along the proposed freeway alignment would substantially increase the right-of-way required for the project and increase the number of relocations. As designed, the 5600 West Transit Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option results in eight relocations and 22 potential relocations because most of the alternative can be placed within the existing right-of-way of 5600 West. In addition, to promote transit use, the alternative needs to allow easy access. Transit stations need to be placed near commercial and residential developments so that people can walk to transit instead of driving to a transit station.

- E. *Commenters stated that they oppose transit.*

Thank you for the comment.

- F. *Kennecott Land commented that they prefer the 5600 West Transit Alternative with the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option with a separate structure north of the 11400 South interchange and that the alternative should interline with the proposed Mid-Jordan light-rail line.*

The Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option is UTA's Preferred Transit Alternative. The proposed alternative is proposed to cross the MVC on a structure that would be shared with vehicles at 11800 South. The alternative would operate within the same right-of-way as the Mid-Jordan line for part of the project.



G. The City of Herriman requested that the transit alignment be modified to include the crossing at 11800 South, end the alignment at the city's proposed town center, and eventually bring the alignment south to a proposed TRAX station east of Redwood Road at about 14400 South.

UDOT will continue to work with the City of Herriman during the design of the MVC and evaluate their request. The 5600 West Transit Alternative would not preclude the alignment from being extended farther south to 14400 South in the future.

H. A commenter stated that they prefer the Mixed-Traffic Transit Option.

Thank you for the comment.

I. Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the transit analyses indicated only small benefits from transit on traffic congestion, but the analyses are badly flawed for two reasons. First, construction of the transit system without the freeway would lead to an entirely different future land-use pattern than if the freeway were constructed—particularly if the freeway were constructed many years before the transit system. Second, the transit modeling was not done properly. In addition, model Version 5.0 has errors that cause it to underestimate rail ridership even if it is applied correctly. Third, the Draft EIS modeling fails to model rail correctly. We have confirmed that these issues are present not only in the sensitivity analysis modeling files but also in the Draft EIS model files. In brief, the issues include:

- *Failure to code light rail on separate links, instead taking the short-cut of coding it on roads*
- *Failure to recalculate walk access areas to account for the new rail line*
- *Failure to add support links to provide access to the rail line*

An analysis of the transit system without the freeway but with a different land-use pattern is described in Chapter 29, Sequencing. The sequencing analysis was updated for the Final EIS using model Version 6.0. The MVC network coding used in the Final EIS incorporates the specific transit coding recommendations that were mentioned in this comment.

J. Commenters stated that they prefer the Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option.

Thank you for the comment.

K. The City of South Jordan commented that they preferred the Herriman design option 2. They also commented that the transit line will follow Grandville Avenue, not the main street in the Daybreak development, and that there are two stations south of 11400 South shown in the figures but only one listed in the text.



The Herriman design option 2 was one of the design options considered for the 5600 West Transit Alternative. This option had the transit line crossing the MVC roadway north of the 11400 South interchange. This option is not included in the Preferred Transit Alternative. As decided by UTA, the Preferred Transit Alternative has the transit cross through the 11400 South interchange. There is one station south of 11400 South, and the EIS figures were updated to reflect this. The EIS states that the transit alignment will follow the “main street” in the Daybreak development but does not give the specific name of the street.

35.2.4 Section 2.2.2.2 – 5800 West Freeway Alternative

- A. *Commenters stated that they prefer the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- B. *Commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative costs more and has a greater impact on the community including residence and business relocations, traffic congestion, access for motorists and pedestrians, safety, and more school impacts than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative should be implemented instead.*

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative has been identified as a Preferred Alternative in this Final EIS. See Section 2.4.5, Preferred Alternatives. A final decision will be made in the Record of Decision.

As stated in Section 2.4, Summary Comparison of Alternatives, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have a higher cost but would have 111 fewer residential and business relocations and potential relocations than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. As stated in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, both Salt Lake County freeway alternatives would affect the surrounding communities. The analysis concluded that the overall impacts to community cohesion due to relocations under the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would be similar to those from the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be a limited-access freeway that would allow the current east-west roads to maintain connections under or over the freeway with appropriate sidewalks. The freeway would be fenced with appropriate safety zones to ensure the safety of pedestrians. As discussed in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would require the acquisition of about 1 acre of Hunter Park; however, none of the park facilities such as ball diamonds or parking would be affected. This alternative would also affect Hillside Elementary School and Hunter High School. At Hillside Elementary, about 1.4 acres of a grass athletic field would be acquired. No buildings or playground structures would be affected. At Hunter High School,



about 0.4 acre of a grass field and softball diamond 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. See Response A on page 35-104 of Section 35.12.4 for a discussion of air quality impacts near schools.

As discussed in Chapter 8, Transportation, people would use the MVC freeway instead of local surface streets, so congestion on arterials would improve compared to the No-Action Alternative. The reduced congestion could improve safety on 5600 West.

Finally, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have substantially fewer secondary impacts to important playa wetlands—55.14 acres of impacts compared to 141.08 acres for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.

- C. *Commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative is too close to Bangerter Highway to reduce congestion, and the road should be placed farther to the west.*

As part of the Western Transportation Corridor study, a freeway spacing analysis was conducted. The purpose of the analysis was to determine the best location for a freeway west of Interstate 215 (I-215). The analysis concluded that a new highway should optimally be placed between 5700 West and 6000 West, although a highway within 0.5 mile of this location could also be justified. As shown in Section 2.4, Summary Comparison of Alternatives, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would result in a 42% reduction in daily travel delay on all roads compared to the No-Action Alternative, and the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would result in a 43% decrease in daily travel delay on all roads. The analysis shows that locating the alternative farther west would not result in any substantial additional benefit in reducing congestion.

- D. *Commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would cut off local road access and create new intersections at interchanges and thus increase east-west travel time because of the potential for increased congestion at the interchanges.*

The MVC project would be a limited-access freeway with interchanges. East-west roads would go over or under the freeway where there is no interchange on the MVC. Seven minor streets would be terminated in a cul-de-sac at the freeway. At interchange locations, there would be intersections similar to I-15. Under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, east-west roads that intersect the MVC at interchanges would have less congestion in the PM (afternoon) peak period compared to the No-Action Alternative except for California Avenue and 13400 South between 5600 West and Bangerter Highway. The reason for the



reduced congestion is that more traffic would be using the MVC than the surface streets.

- E. *Commenters asked why the MVC roadway was below-grade in some locations and not others. For example, the MVC roadway is above-grade in West Valley City and below-grade in West Jordan. Others commented that the MVC roadway should be below-grade but is above-grade because of the Kern River pipeline.*

The freeway was placed below-grade in areas where it was technically feasible. A below-grade freeway was not typically considered in the following areas: areas with high groundwater tables, areas near creeks, areas with flat topography, and areas where lift stations would be required to drain stormwater. For example, the topography in West Valley City is flat, and it would be difficult to drain stormwater from the roadway using gravity if the section were depressed.

The Kern River natural gas line was not a factor in placing the MVC roadway below grade; rather, the factors included topography, stream crossings, and the nature of adjacent land uses such as commercial and industrial. Between 7800 South and 9000 South there are several stream crossings, and it would be difficult to drain stormwater from a below-grade freeway section in this area.

- F. *Commenters stated that an interchange on the 5800 West Freeway Alternative at 4100 South in West Valley City is too close to Hunter High School and Hillside Elementary School and is a potential safety concern for students walking and driving to school. Students walking from the west side of the MVC alternative would have to cross under the freeway at the interchange, and this would be unsafe.*

UDOT has met with the Granite School District to discuss the safety of students who attend schools adjacent to the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. Based on this coordination, UDOT will make adjustments to the MVC project during the final design phase of the project. The proposed adjustments could include a bridge at Cape Cod Drive, a modified interchange at 4100 South to improve pedestrian safety, and possibly extending Cilma Drive to 5600 West to improve access. UDOT will continue to coordinate with the Granite School District to ensure that student safety issues are addressed.

- G. *Commenters wanted to know if interchanges are planned at New Bingham Highway, Old Bingham Highway, 13400 South, 9000 South, or 11800 South. Others commenters asked whether the interchange designs are final.*

No interchange is planned at New Bingham Highway, Old Bingham Highway, or 11800 South as part of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. Diamond interchanges would be located at 9000 South and 13400 South. The interchange



designs shown in the EIS are provided for reference but could be modified during the final design phase of the project to take specific conditions into account.

- H. *Commenters stated that they oppose the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- I. *Commenters stated that traffic on 4100 South would substantially increase with an interchange on the MVC, and they would no longer be able to access their development.*

Access to developments along 4100 South would be maintained. As discussed in Chapter 8, Transportation, the level of congestion on 4100 South would decrease under the MVC action alternatives compared to the No-Action Alternative in 2030. Based on the results of the travel demand model, the levels of congestion in 2030 on 4100 South with an MVC interchange would be similar to the current conditions.

- J. *A commenter felt that traffic would increase on 4300 South as a result of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and 5600 West Transit Alternative and thus would increase safety risks to pedestrians. The commenter felt that 4300 South should not be a through street, in order to discourage its use.*

To maintain local access, 4300 South would pass under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. There are no plans to build an interchange on 4300 South.

- K. *Commenters stated that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would block access to their development.*

UDOT would maintain access to all developments along the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. If access could not be maintained, the property would be purchased by UDOT.

- L. *A commenter asked why the 5800 West Freeway Alternative could not be aligned to use the empty fields near Bills Drive and take out the few homes on Bills Drive.*

The alignment needs to shift west in this area to avoid affecting Hunter High School. If the alignment kept going straight, there would not be enough space to transition the road to the west to avoid the high school.

- M. *A commenter stated that the MVC action alternatives in Salt Lake County should be built west of the Western Springs development in the empty field away from homes.*

With the current alignment, only a couple homes would be taken in the area of 12600 South. Moving the alignment to the west in the empty field would require the relocation of numerous homes in the subdivisions just south of 13400 South.



- N. The City of West Jordan provided specific comments to the design element of the MVC project. These comments included missing creek names on plan sheets as well as comments about how they would prefer specific elements of the project to be developed in their city.*

UDOT will continue to work with the City of West Jordan during the design of the MVC and will evaluate their requests.

- O. Kennecott Land commented that they would like the MVC roadway to be below-grade through the Daybreak development and that they would like interchanges at 11400 South, 10400 South, and Old Bingham Highway. An interchange at Old Bingham Highway was also requested by the City of South Jordan. Kennecott Land would also like overcrossings at Silver Mine Road (11000 South) and 10200 South. Finally, Kennecott Land would like the natural nature of Bingham Creek maintained, and the design should accommodate floodplain requirements and pedestrian and equestrian uses.*

The proposed 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be depressed (below grade) through the Daybreak development. An interchange is proposed for 11400 South, but no interchanges are planned for 10400 South or Old Bingham Highway. As stated in the EIS, the potential locations of interchanges could be revised in the future depending on how development occurs along the project. 10200 South is proposed to cross under the alternative, and an interchange is proposed for 11000 South. Bingham Creek would cross under the MVC roadway, and the design would accommodate floodplain requirements and the proposed pedestrian and equestrian uses along the creek.

- P. The City of Herriman commented that they would like the MVC alignment revised from adjacent to Redwood Road to the Camp Williams property. This shift to the west would provide a buffer for Camp Williams from further development. In addition, the City commented that they would like Midas Creek and Juniper Creek to pass under the MVC to allow trail crossings. The City of Bluffdale commented that they were opposed to the Herriman alignment shift because it would reduce developable land along the east side of Camp Williams.*

UDOT has coordinated with Herriman, Bluffdale, Camp Williams, property owners, and utility companies on the alignment shift noted in the comment. The Salt Lake County alternatives have been revised to include shifting the alignment to the west (see Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS).

As stated in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, UDOT would maintain the current and proposed trail facilities crossing the



MVC. Midas Creek and Juniper Creek are proposed to cross under the MVC roadway, which would provide east-west trail connectivity.

- Q. The Suburban Land Reserve commented that they plan a large development in the northwest quadrant of Salt Lake City that will cause increased traffic at the existing 7200 West and 5600 West interchanges. They request that UDOT should incorporate interchange designs into the MVC project at I-80 so that a proposed arterial could be added without traffic disruption in the future.*

UDOT will continue to work with Salt Lake City and the Suburban Land Reserve during the final design phase of the project to evaluate the potential development project.

- R. A commenter stated that their property would experience most of the impact from 7000 South to 7800 South and the alignment should be moved to the east or west at this location. They also commented that they would prefer the design option shown on sheets 79 and 80 in Volume 5 of the EIS.*

Moving the alignment either east or west at this location would make it difficult to maintain radius safety standards. Moving the alignment to the east or west would affect major housing developments south of 8200 South. Moving the alignment to the east would also affect a housing development north of 7000 South. The design option is under consideration and will be evaluated as part of the final design of the project.

35.2.5 Section 2.2.2.3 – 7200 West Freeway Alternative

- A. Commenters stated that they prefer the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- B. Commenters stated that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would have fewer relocations, would have fewer impacts to farmlands, and would be used more because it is farther west and thus would reduce congestion more than the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.*

The 7200 West Freeway Alternative is being evaluated as part of the EIS. The evaluation of alternatives considers the expected future growth to the year 2030 and showed that the 5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives would result in similar levels of reduction in congestion overall. However, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have 111 fewer residential and business relocations and potential relocations than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.

As stated in Chapter 5, Farmlands, both Salt Lake County freeway alternatives would affect some farmlands. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have the following impacts: irrigated cropland, 120 acres; non-irrigated cropland,



770 acres; prime farmland, 23 acres; and state important farmland, no impacts. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would have the following impacts: irrigated cropland, 74 acres; non-irrigated cropland, 546 acres; prime farmland, 30 acres; and state important farmland, 33 acres. The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would have more impacts to prime farmland and state important farmland.

- C. *Commenters stated that they oppose the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- D. *Utah Moms for Clean Air and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment commented that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative should be selected because there is less potential for hazardous air pollutants to affect children in adjacent schools than with the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.*

Many factors, including air quality, were considered when identifying the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as a Preferred Alternative in this EIS. FHWA has considered the potential air quality impacts on schools as well as air quality impacts on homes and other community facilities in proximity to both the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. FHWA also has considered other environmental and community impacts, such as the fact that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative has greater impacts on playa wetlands that environmental agencies consider irreplaceable. Based on full consideration of all the information, FHWA has concurred in the identification of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as a Preferred Alternative. A final decision will be made in the Record of Decision based on the full administrative record. See Response A on page 35-104 of Section 35.12.4 for a discussion of mobile-source air toxics.

35.2.6 Section 2.2.3.1 – Southern Freeway Alternative

- A. *Commenters stated that they prefer the Southern Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- B. *Commenters stated that they oppose the Southern Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- C. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that the Southern Freeway Alternative should be eliminated from consideration because it can't be permitted under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The alternative does not avoid wetlands or wetlands of high functional value, and the area is part of a larger hemispheric migration route for several breeds of waterfowl, shorebirds, and marine birds.*

The alternatives identified in the EIS were based on public, agency, and local government input. The Final EIS identifies the 2100 North Freeway Alternative,



not the Southern Freeway Alternative, as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Utah County. Therefore, while the Southern Freeway Alternative has been fully studied in the Final EIS, UDOT does not intend to seek a permit for that alternative based on this study.

Once a permit application is filed with USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, USACE will evaluate the proposed project according to the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. Those guidelines require USACE to approve the practicable alternative that would cause the least damage to the aquatic environment, unless that alternative would have other substantial adverse environmental consequences. Practicability is assessed by taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of the overall project purpose. Further, USACE will have to make sure that the applied-for alternative is not contrary to the public interest. Based on coordination with USACE, FHWA and UDOT anticipate that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is permissible according to the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.

- D. Commenters stated that the Southern Freeway Alternative should be selected or that a southern corridor should be placed closer to Utah Lake than the current alignment in the EIS in order to limit development near the lake shore and prevent further division of the communities.*

The alternatives identified in the EIS were based on public, agency, and local government input. Placing the Southern Freeway Alternative or Arterials Alternative (1900 South) closer to Utah Lake would cause substantially more wetland impacts than the current alignments in the EIS and would place the roadway within the floodplain of the lake. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, alternative alignments should first be developed to avoid wetland impacts. During the development of this EIS, the Southern Freeway Alternative was modified to avoid and minimize impacts on numerous wetlands near Utah Lake. These modifications were made with the involvement of USACE and other environmental resource agencies and took into account many factors including the potential for future development along the lake.

UDOT does not intend to make any further adjustments to the Southern Freeway Alternative as part of this study because the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, not the Southern Freeway Alternative, has been identified as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Utah County. A transportation project along the northern boundary of Utah Lake, similar to the Southern Freeway Alternative, could be considered as a separate project in the future,



35.2.7 Section 2.2.3.2 – 2100 North Freeway Alternative

- A. *Commenters expressed concerns about or opposed the 2100 North Freeway Alternative because of the expected impacts to air quality, economic development, noise, property values, wetlands and wildlife, relocations, congestion, community cohesion, quality of life, and safety. Others were concerned that the alternative did not address trips to the Orem and Provo areas by residents of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs and that the alternative would increase congestion on I-15. Some commenters opposed the alternative and preferred Lehi City's proposal for an alignment on 4800 North. Others commented that the Draft EIS understates the width of the road.*

The expected impacts from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative are analyzed in detail in the Draft EIS by environmental resource. The results of the analysis are summarized below. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would be a six-lane freeway with frontage roads to provide local access. Local access would also be provided through the interchange at I-15. For information regarding Lehi City's proposal, see Response A on page 35-55 of Section 35.2.9. This alternative would be implemented in phases. The initial phase would involve construction of an arterial within a right-of-way that allows expansion to a freeway. See Chapter 36, Project Implementation (Phasing).

Right-of-Way Width. The right-of-way for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative as shown in the Draft EIS varied in width. The baseline version of this alternative included a six-lane freeway with interchanges. The design option for this alternative included a six-lane freeway with frontage roads and slip ramps. The design option included a consistent right-of-way width of about 400 feet. The baseline had a narrower mainline but greater width at interchanges (600 feet or more). The Draft EIS used the baseline version to calculate the impacts of this alternative. It also estimated the potential changes in impacts with the design option. After the Draft EIS was released, UDOT coordinated with Lehi City to address a range of concerns regarding this alternative. In the Final EIS, the design was modified to address the City's concerns as discussed in Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS. The Preferred Roadway Alternative in Utah County includes a six-lane freeway with one-way frontage roads and slip ramps. The right-of-way width is generally 400 feet west of the Jordan River and 450 feet east of the river. The impact analysis in the Final EIS has been updated based on the modifications to this alternative.

Air Quality. The expected impacts to air quality are analyzed in Chapter 12, Air Quality. As stated in Chapter 12, none of the MVC alternatives would cause any federal or state air quality standard to be exceeded, and all of the MVC



alternatives would be in compliance with the carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan. Some studies have linked mobile-source air toxics (MSATs) from vehicle emissions to a broad spectrum of health concerns in adults and children. The ability to evaluate the environmental and health impacts of MSATs from the MVC alternatives is limited by technical shortcomings and scientific uncertainty that prevent a more complete determination of the health impacts of these pollutants. A quantitative evaluation of MSAT emissions from the MVC alternatives is included in the Draft EIS. This evaluation acknowledges that the MVC alternatives could cause increased exposure to MSATs, although the concentrations and duration of these exposures are uncertain. See Response A on page 35-104 of Section 35.12.4 for a more detailed discussion of air quality impacts from the MVC alternatives.

Noise. Chapter 13, Noise, includes an analysis of noise impacts and an evaluation of potential noise barriers that could be implemented with the MVC action alternatives. For the analysis, the local topography and elevation of the freeway (whether above-grade or below-grade) were considered in the analysis. The background noise level for the area was assumed to be that of a typical quiet residential neighborhood to ensure that the potential for noise increases was not underestimated. The noise analysis took into account other existing noise sources such as I-15.

For the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, UDOT estimated that 134 residences would have noise levels that would approach or exceed FHWA's noise-abatement criteria, compared to 135 residences for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 218 residences for the Arterials Alternative. The evaluation of noise barriers for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative determined that a barrier between about 2300 West and 1900 West and east of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks would meet UDOT's noise-abatement criteria. Noise levels along the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would increase at levels similar to the other MVC action alternatives—between 2 dBA and 20 dBA (A-weighted decibels). The proposed noise walls would block the views of the residents that are adjacent to the walls. See Response A on page 35-111 of Section 35.13 for a more detailed discussion of noise impacts from the MVC alternatives.

Property Values. Chapter 9, Economics, provides an overview of various studies on the effects of a new highway or road on adjacent residential areas. Depending on the location of the residential area, a new highway or road could lead to increased property values and improved access or to decreased property values if the residential area has increased noise levels as a result of the new road. The impact of highway noise on residential property values was examined by Nelson (1982), who concluded that: (1) for every 1-dBA increase in noise, there is a



corresponding reduction in residential property value of about 0.40%; (2) noise levels above 50 dBA to 60 dBA, or conversation levels, were considered most likely to cause intrusion, with resulting impacts to property values; and (3) it takes longer to sell a property near a highway (about 4 days longer on average) according to a realtor survey. The above property value impacts would be similar for all of the MVC action alternatives.

Wetlands and Wildlife. Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources, provides an overview of the expected impacts from the MVC alternatives on wetlands and wildlife. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have a primary impact on wetlands of about 12.87 acres, compared to 93.43 acres for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 55.71 acres for the Arterials Alternative. Of these wetland totals, the primary impacts to high-functioning wetlands would be about 12.86 acres for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, compared to 101.85 acres for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 80.16 acres for the Arterials Alternative. The analysis also determined that, of the Utah County alternatives, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have the least amount of impacts in terms of wildlife fragmentation and roadway mortality and would create the fewest barriers to wildlife movement. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would affect about 131 acres of high-quality habitat for mule deer and 117 acres of high-quality habitat for Brewer's sparrow. These impacts would be similar to those from the other Utah County alternatives.

Relocations. The expected property impacts from the MVC alternatives are discussed in Chapter 6, Community Impacts. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative right-of-way would require about 17 relocations and potential relocations, compared to 154 for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 75 for the Arterials Alternative. The above relocations and potential relocations include developments that are approved but not built. Under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, no churches, schools, or parks would be relocated. In addition, no homes in the Pointe Meadow subdivision would be acquired for the alternative. Moving the proposed alignment farther from this subdivision to the south would affect the property proposed for a school. UDOT would compensate for all relocations and property takes (see Section 35.6.3).

Community Impacts. Chapter 6, Community Impacts, provides an overview of the impacts to Lehi residents from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. Overall, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would not substantially affect the general social environment along the alignment, but some residents of Lehi felt that the alternative would divide the community and isolate some residential areas north of 2100 North. Under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, no recreation resources, community services (such as churches), or utilities would be eliminated, and the alternative would not affect their long-term function or availability. In addition,



the alternative would provide access for emergency vehicles via cross streets and frontage roads, which would maintain acceptable emergency vehicle response times for all of Lehi. Finally, the proposed alternative would not cause snow deposits to increase in residential areas near the alignment.

Travel Destinations, Travel Time, and Congestion. Within the Utah County portion of the study area, most trips from the Cedar Fort, Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and Lehi areas are on east-west roads. Of the trips that reach I-15, about half go north toward Salt Lake City and about half go south toward the Provo-Orem area. All of the Utah County alternatives would substantially reduce travel times and meet the purpose of the project, which is to improve regional mobility by reducing congestion. Section 2.4, Summary Comparison of Alternatives, provides a comparison of the hours of delay each day under each Utah County alternative. Compared to the No-Action Alternative, the Southern Freeway Alternative would reduce daily delay in the MVC study area on all roads by 53%, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would reduce daily delay by 47%, and the Arterials Alternative would reduce daily delay by 53%. Another measure of travel time is the length of the evening commute from Utah Valley State College to Eagle Mountain. Such a commute would take 36 minutes with the Southern Freeway Alternative, 40 minutes with the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and 37 minutes with the Arterials Alternative.

Travel on I-15 would be heaviest under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative compared to the other Utah County alternatives but would operate at an acceptable level of service and at similar congestion levels as the other MVC alternatives. The interchange of I-15 and 2100 North would be designed to accommodate the expected level of traffic in 2030 to reduce overall congestion. The final roadway design will account for the traffic movements on 1200 West and State Street. Finally, the alternative's grade and access to I-15 will be designed to safety standards to safely accommodate both automobile and truck traffic.

Jordan River Trail. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would cross the Jordan River and the associated Jordan River Parkway Trail. This would require that the Jordan River Trail be placed on a bridge over the 2100 North Freeway Alternative to allow continued recreational use of the trail. Noise along the Jordan River Parkway would increase by at least 10 dBA. The increase in noise levels would change the quiet nature of the recreation activities of biking, jogging, and nature observation at the parkway.

Economic Development. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have frontage roads east and west of the Jordan River, which would allow new businesses to locate along the frontage roads as they could with an arterial street.



Some commercial land would be converted to roadway use for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative; however, commercial land uses could be promoted along the frontage roads.

Visual Resources. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have a strong to moderate impact on the visual environment. The area west of the Jordan River would change from agricultural use to that of a freeway. The freeway would be depressed east of the Jordan River to reduce both the noise and visual impacts. The interchange at I-15 would be consistent with the urban nature of this area. As discussed in Chapter 19, Visual Resources, UDOT would use directional lighting to reduce light impacts to nearby residents.

Alpine School District. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would not affect the property owned by the Alpine School District.

Implementation. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative could be constructed first as an arterial street until travel demand warrants the need for a full freeway. At the time of construction, UDOT would purchase all of the land required for the full freeway to minimize the impacts to adjacent property owners. If the arterial were constructed, it would be limited access and would cross under the railroad similar to the freeway alternative.

- B. *Commenters expressed concerns that the groundwater levels along 2100 North are very high and that depressing the alternative below ground could cause local flooding or affect the alternative.*

The freeway was placed below-grade in areas where it was technically feasible. A below-grade freeway was not typically considered in the following areas: areas with high groundwater tables, areas near creeks, areas with flat topography, and areas where lift stations would be required to drain stormwater. However, a depressed highway section can be designed and constructed in an area such as the 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Lehi that has a high groundwater table. The design and construction could be similar to the depressed section of Bangerter Highway between 700 West and the Jordan River in Bluffdale. The shallow groundwater table could require flatter-than-typical cut slopes with erosion protection. It could also require the addition of a drainage layer below the pavement section. Design and construction costs could be greater if soft soils are encountered and subgrade soil stabilization is required. Surface drainage could also be required to prevent runoff from flowing down and eroding the cut slopes. Appropriate measures would be implemented to ensure that no localized flooding occurs.



- C. *Some commenters stated that they prefer the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, while others commented that they prefer the 2100 North Freeway Alternative and oppose Lehi City's proposal on 4800 North.*

Thank you for the comment. See Response A on page 35-55 of Section 35.2.9 for a description of Lehi City's proposal on 4800 North.

- D. *Commenters stated that they oppose the 2100 North Freeway Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- E. *Commenters wanted to know if an interchange at 2300 West would be part of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative and, if so, whether traffic would increase on 2300 West.*

An interchange would be included at 2300 West. Travel demand modeling showed that congestion on 2300 West would decrease with implementation of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative compared to the No-Action Alternative in 2030. Overall, traffic on 2300 West near 2100 North would be similar under all of the MVC action alternatives considered.

- F. *Commenters wanted information about why the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was brought forward as an alternative late in the environmental process. Others asked why the alternative was first eliminated and then was considered a reasonable alternative. Lehi City said that removing "local growth objectives" from a primary purpose to secondary was not acceptable because it allowed the 2100 North Freeway Alternative to become a reasonable alternative.*

An alternative (UT-4) was initially considered with a freeway on 2100 North in Lehi during Level 2 screening. UT-4 was initially eliminated because it was not compatible with Lehi City's growth objectives. See [Table 2.1-8](#), Level 2 Screening Results – Utah County Roadway Alternatives. Supporting local growth objectives was a primary project purpose for considering the MVC alternatives. EPA provided comments on a draft version of Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, on October 11, 2004. In its comments, EPA was concerned about including the goal of "supporting local growth objectives" as a primary purpose of the project. EPA expressed the concern that this goal could eliminate alternatives that otherwise would be considered reasonable and practicable alternatives for avoiding or minimizing impacts to wetlands. Based on those comments and further discussion with EPA, FHWA and UDOT agreed to include "supporting local growth objectives" as a secondary objective of the project, which means that this goal was not used as a basis for screening alternatives. See Section 1.7, Public and Agency Involvement in Developing the Project's Purpose and Need. Because "supporting local growth objectives" was changed to a secondary objective, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was determined to be a



reasonable alternative. Therefore, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is now being considered as one of the Utah County alternatives. The EIS includes a full evaluation of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative to the same level of detail as the other Utah County alternatives.

- G. *Lehi City suggested that a depressed roadway in some locations along the 2100 North Freeway Alternative will obviously affect the area's groundwater. Also, the City commented that the alternative would not allow water to pass through, and groundwater levels south of the alignment would be reduced.*

Chapter 14, Water Quality, analyzes the effects of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative on groundwater levels. As stated in the EIS, the alternative is not expected to impede groundwater flows to the south. In addition, before a depressed freeway is constructed, a more detailed analysis of local groundwater conditions would be conducted to address any local groundwater issues.

- H. *Lehi City stated that they were not forewarned about the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and instead the City was just told that it was UDOT's Preferred Alternative.*

UDOT coordinated with all affected cities and the public during the alternatives development process. This included holding meetings with Lehi City in early 2007 regarding the proposed 2100 North Freeway Alternative prior to its being announced as UDOT's Preferred Roadway Alternative in Utah County.

- I. *The Lehi City mayor commented that the EIS states that the alternatives are to be compatible with local and regional land-use and transportation plans (p. 1-6). On page 1-7 of the EIS, it refers to American Fork land-use and transportation plans, but not Lehi's. Page 4-43 shows a concern with meeting American Fork's and Lindon's land-use and transportation plans, which is appropriate. Why not a concern for being consistent with Lehi's plan for 2100 North?*

The Draft EIS states on page 1-6 that compatibility with local and regional land-use plans is a secondary objective. Based on those comments and further discussion with EPA, FHWA and UDOT agreed to include "supporting local growth objectives" as a secondary objective of the project, which means that this goal was not used as a basis for screening or eliminating alternatives but was used to make minor alignment shifts. The cities listed on page 1-7 are those that stated a need for a major regional transportation facility. As stated on page 1-15, Lehi's transportation plan showed the need for three local east-west arterials.

The goal of the analysis discussed in Chapter 4, Land Use, was to determine if an alternative was consistent with local and regional land-use and transportation plans, not whether it addressed a concern of a specific city. As stated in that chapter, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would not be consistent with Lehi's



transportation plan, but the Arterials Alternative would be consistent. The chapter also stated that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would not be consistent with American Fork's and Lindon's plans. The chapter also stated that Lehi City expressed strong opposition to the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. See Section 4.3.5.2, 2100 North Freeway Alternative.

- J. *The City of Saratoga Springs provided specific comments to design elements of the MVC project. These comments focused on the interchange of the MVC and SR 73 and also Redwood Road.*

UDOT will continue to work with the City of Saratoga Springs during the design of the MVC and will evaluate their requests.

- K. *A commenter stated that there are repeated references to addresses in Lehi that appear to be based on the Utah County address grid. This is very confusing for local residents who are accustomed to the Lehi address system. This should have been obvious to the authors and is obviously misleading to local residents.*

To determine impacts to specific residents and to identify property owners, Utah County tax records were used as the official source of information.

- L. *A commenter stated that the "Lehi North Interchange Memorandum of Understanding" agreement specifies both short- and long-term development characteristics of the 2100 North alignment. This agreement between Lehi City, Gilad Development, the Utah Division of the Federal Highway Administration, the Utah Department of Transportation, and the Mountainland Association of Governments was created to "allow each party to volunteer transportation planning obligations" and to "eliminate some of the uncertainty of all other parties to this agreement." The agreement also refers to the North Valley Connectors Study and designates the planning for 2100 North as a five-lane arterial street. It seems that, with the development of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, this agreement was broken.*

The Lehi North Interchange Memorandum of Understanding was entered into on September 6, 2001, before this study began. It was intended to clarify the type of interchange, access, and right-of-way required at the 2100 North interchange with I-15. The memorandum assumed completion of 2100 North as an arterial because that is what was shown in the Lehi Transportation Plan. NEPA requires that reasonable alternatives be considered, even those that might differ from existing transportation plans.



35.2.8 Section 2.2.3.3 – Arterials Alternative

- A. *Commenters stated that they prefer the Arterials Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- B. *Commenters stated that they oppose the Arterials Alternative.*

Thank you for the comment.

- C. *Commenters stated that one of the Utah County MVC alternatives should have multiple east-west arterials.*

The Arterials Alternative is evaluated in detail in the MVC EIS. This alternative includes an arterial at Porter Rockwell Boulevard in Bluffdale, an arterial on 2100 North in Lehi, and an arterial at 1900 South just north of Utah Lake.

- D. *The City of Bluffdale commented that they have concerns with the alignment of Porter Rockwell Boulevard as it connects with I-15 under the Arterials Alternative. The City's plan for this connection is a "T" intersection with 14600 South rather than the flyover interchange proposed with the Arterials Alternative. As planned for the MVC, the alignment would affect planned commercial and residential development in this area and would be detrimental to the City of Bluffdale and its residents. Overall, the concept of the Porter Rockwell Boulevard is preferred by the City if impacts could be minimized near I-15.*

The MVC team has worked with the City of Bluffdale to minimize impacts to the area near I-15. The design shown in the EIS is the optimum for meeting traffic needs in terms of traffic flow and level of service while minimizing impacts. If the Arterials Alternative is selected, the MVC team will continue to coordinate with the City to minimize impacts.

35.2.9 Section 2.1.5.2 – 4800 North Freeway Alternative

- A. *Commenters stated that UDOT should consider Lehi City's 4800 North Freeway Alternative and that such an alternative would have fewer impacts to residential and commercial areas, air quality, noise, community cohesion, and the natural environment than would the 2100 North Freeway Alternative.*

Methodology. In August 2007, UDOT and FHWA received a report from Lehi City recommending consideration of a new alternative along 4800 North in Utah County. This report included engineering drawings and impact estimates for a 4800 North alternative. As proposed by Lehi City, this alternative included the following key elements:

- An eight-lane freeway-to-freeway connection between the MVC roadway and I-15 with system-to-system interchanges at each end.



- Service interchanges on the MVC roadway at Redwood Road and 4800 North. The local interchange at Redwood Road would be a partial interchange.
- An 1,800-foot-long bridge with a maximum height of 240 feet spanning the Jordan Narrows area.

Lehi City estimated the cost of its alternative at \$437 million in 2007 dollars. This estimate included only the east-west freeway at 4800 North. The estimate did not include the cost of the north-south section of the MVC from the Utah County line to SR 73. It also did not include the cost of the 2100 North arterial. For consistency with the analysis of all other Utah County alternatives, these two elements must be included as part of the 4800 North alternative for the purpose of the MVC EIS. Including these elements allows an “apples to apples” comparison of the 4800 North alternative with the other Utah County alternatives considered in the Draft EIS.

In October 2007, FHWA and UDOT shared with Lehi City a work plan that outlined in detail the agencies’ approach to evaluating the reasonableness of the 4800 North alternative and to determining whether this alternative should be further evaluated in a Supplemental EIS. The work plan outlined the following key points:

- The 4800 North alternative will be evaluated initially as proposed by Lehi City in its August 2007 report.
- If the alternative as proposed by Lehi City is not a reasonable alternative, FHWA and UDOT will consider modifications that could help make it a reasonable alternative. For example, these modifications could include additional capacity if needed to accommodate forecasted traffic volumes.
- If there is a reasonable alternative at 4800 North, it will be evaluated in a Supplemental EIS. If it is not possible to develop a reasonable alternative at this location, a Supplemental EIS will not be prepared; instead, FHWA and UDOT will document the basis for determining that a Supplemental EIS is not required.
- The proposed 4800 North alternative will be evaluated in a manner consistent with the alternatives screening and refinement process used for other alternatives in the Draft EIS. The work plan noted that this would include “consideration of purpose and need, environmental impacts, and cost, as well as compatibility with the applicable operational and design standards for freeway connections to the interstate system.”



- The assessment of the 4800 North alternative will include a “concept-level Interstate Justification Report.” The purpose of this report is to determine whether an interchange connecting the 4800 North alternative to I-15 could meet FHWA’s standards for connections to the interstate system.

The review process included appropriate FHWA experts from the Utah Division office, the FHWA Resource Center, and FHWA headquarters.

Refinement of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative. In accordance with the work plan, UDOT and FHWA initially reviewed the 4800 North Freeway Alternative as proposed by Lehi City and concluded that it was not reasonable. In the course of this review, FHWA identified several key drawbacks with the City’s version of this alternative, including left-hand exits, capacity and weave concerns associated with the lack of braided ramps, and insufficient lane-drop distances. Therefore, FHWA and UDOT developed modifications to the 4800 North Freeway Alternative to meet minimum AASTHO and federal requirements. These changes resulted in a revised set of engineering plans for a 4800 North Freeway Alternative. The revised version of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative included the following major elements:

- A 12-lane freeway section between MVC and I-15 with system-to-system interchanges at each end. The number of lanes is dictated by ramp capacity, since there is not enough distance between system interchanges to taper the lanes.
- Service interchanges at Redwood Road (partial interchange) and 4800 North (full interchange).
- Additional lanes on ramps as needed to accommodate 2030 traffic volumes. This includes the need for four three-lane ramps.
- Addition of several bridges and retaining walls to facilitate crossing of the Jordan Narrows and to minimize the footprint required to widen I-15.
- Braided ramps to address the weave issues identified during micro-simulation.
- Addition of auxiliary lanes both north and south of the 4800 North connection along I-15.
- A five-lane 2100 North arterial.
- A six-lane freeway extending from Salt Lake County to SR 73.



After developing the engineering plans based on Version 5.0 of the regional travel demand model, the MVC study team developed additional traffic forecasts based on Version 6.0 of the regional travel demand model and then updated the engineering for the 4800 North Freeway Alternative based on the revised (lower) traffic forecasts. Based on the Version 6.0 traffic forecasts, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative still includes all of the elements described above *except* there would be no three-lane ramps and the roadway would have a 10-lane mainline cross-section rather than 12 lanes.

Evaluation Results. This section compares the cost and environmental impacts of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative and the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. As explained above, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative was first evaluated based on Version 5.0 of the regional travel demand model, which was consistent with the assumptions used for evaluating alternatives in detail in the Draft EIS. Then, an additional assessment was completed using traffic forecasts based on Version 6.0 of the travel demand model, which was used for evaluating alternatives in the Final EIS. The results of both analyses are summarized in [Table 35.2-1](#) below.

For this analysis, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative was compared to the 2100 North Freeway Alternative as proposed in the Draft EIS and was also compared to a modified version of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative that includes relocating detention ponds and adding retaining walls near the Jordan River to minimize wetland impacts. The minimized version of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is used in the Final EIS. Minimization of wetland impacts is required, where practicable, in accordance with the wetlands permitting requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Southern Freeway and Arterials Alternatives have also been included in [Table 35.2-1](#) below for comparison to the 2100 North Freeway and 4800 North Freeway Alternatives.

Based on these data, UDOT and FHWA reached the following conclusions:

- **Ability To Meet Purpose and Need.** The 4800 North Freeway Alternative (including the 2100 North arterial) would be similar to the 2100 North Freeway Alternative in terms of its ability to reduce roadway congestion in Utah County. (See the “Reduction in travel delay” item in [Table 35.2-1](#) below.) This includes congestion relief on east-west roads in Utah County (such as Lehi Main Street and 1000 South). Therefore, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would meet the project’s purpose.
- **Environmental Impacts, Including Wetlands.** With regard to environmental impacts, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would have lower impacts on wetlands—about 3 acres less—than the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. However, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act does



not automatically require selection of the alternative with the least impact to wetlands. Regulations issued under Section 404, known as the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines, require selection of the “practicable” alternative that has the least impact to the aquatic ecosystem, including wetlands. The term “practicable” means “available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes” (40 CFR 230.3[q]). In this instance, the extreme additional cost of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative makes it “impracticable” for the purpose of Section 404 permitting.

- **Relocations and Community Disruption.** The 4800 North Freeway Alternative also would have somewhat lower relocations: 20 relocations would be needed under the 4800 North Freeway Alternative compared to 33 relocations under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. In addition, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would cause less community disruption in Lehi. The 4800 North Freeway Alternative includes a five-lane arterial on 2100 North, while the 2100 North Freeway Alternative includes a six-lane freeway at that location. A five-lane arterial on 2100 North would cause less community disruption than a six-lane freeway at the same location and would be more consistent with Lehi City’s land-use plans.
- **Cost.** Although the 4800 North Freeway Alternative does have several advantages, it would be far more costly than the 2100 North Freeway Alternative and the other Utah County alternatives. The cost of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would be about \$950 million, while the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would cost about \$1,473 million (\$1.47 billion). Therefore, the additional cost of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would be about \$523 million. If the Version 6.0 traffic forecasts are used, the cost of the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would be \$1.39 billion; the additional cost would be \$440 million.

[Table 35.2-1](#) below provides a more comprehensive comparison of the costs and impacts of the Utah County alternatives.

▲ ▲

Table 35.2-1. Summary of Costs and Impacts of the Utah County Alternatives

Parameter ^a	Southern Freeway	2100 North Freeway	Arterials	4800 North Freeway (with 2100 Arterial)	
				Version 5.0	Version 6.0
Reduction in travel delay	60%	47%	60%	49%	47%
Home/business relocations	136	33	74	20	20
Section 4(f) impacts					
Public parks					
Not <i>de minimis</i>	1	0	0	0	0
<i>De minimis</i>	1	1	1	1	1
Historic properties					
Not <i>de minimis</i>	2	4	5	4	4
<i>De minimis</i>	4	6	12	8	8
2007 cost (in millions) ^b	\$1,126	\$950	\$984	\$1,473	\$1,390
Wetland impacts (acres)					
Primary	78.3	14.7 ^c /10.4 ^d	52.9	7.4	7.4
Peteetneet soil	12.4	0	5.5	0	0

^a The impacts in this table were based on analysis conducted in January 2008. Slight revisions to the MVC action alternatives since that time have changed the numbers presented in the table but do not change the result of the analysis.

^b The estimated cost has been updated since the documentation submitted to FHWA in March 17, 2008, to be consistent with the cost estimates developed for the MVC action alternatives. The cost initially submitted to FHWA was based on 2004 unit prices projected forward to 2007. The revised costs shown in this Final EIS are based on most recent available 2006 and 2007 unit costs. The revised cost estimates are higher for all alternatives. The relative differences in costs are similar or have increased from those initially presented in March 2008.

^c Original wetland impacts from the Draft EIS.

^d Reduced wetland impacts for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative are due to relocating the detention pond outside the floodplain and adding retaining walls inside the floodplain. This methodology was applied to Lehi City's 4800 North Freeway Alternative and to the 2100 North Freeway Alternative.

Operational Considerations. The 4800 North Freeway Alternative would require numerous merging and weaving movements of traffic within a short distance. To accommodate all of these movements, this alternative would include braided ramps. The braided ramps could be designed to meet minimum AASHTO requirements, but they conflict with drivers' expectations (a driver must exit to the south in order to go north). In this type of situation, freeway signs are critical for helping drivers find their way. However, the short distance between the MVC and I-15—about 1 mile—allows only a short time for a driver to see the signs, react to the message on the signs, and move into the correct lane if needed. This challenge is complicated by freeway-to-freeway and local-access interchanges because the combination of those movements requires more information on the freeway signs and thus requires the driver to absorb more information over the 1-mile distance. This roadway configuration is not prohibited, but it does raise safety and operational concerns.

▼ ▼

The length and height of the bridge required with the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would involve greater long-term operational and maintenance issues than an at-grade freeway section such as that for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. For example, in severe weather, the elevated roadway would be more likely to become hazardous due to ice, wind, and snow. In addition, maintenance of this lengthy structure would have higher costs than an at-grade freeway section over the long term.

There are also serious challenges related to the construction of the 4800 North freeway connector, including relocation of a railroad track east of I-15, relocation of major aqueducts and associated infrastructure near the I-15 system interchange, and the construction of a 12-lane bridge nearly 230 feet above the sensitive Jordan Narrows area. These challenges raise serious constructability questions for the 4800 North freeway compared to the relative simplicity of constructing the 2100 North freeway.

Conclusion. The 4800 North Freeway Alternative has been thoroughly analyzed and compared to the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. In some respects, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative is preferable. For example, it would have fewer relocations, would cause less community disruption, would have lower wetland impacts, and would be more consistent with Lehi City's desired future land use. In addition, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative appears to be roughly equal to the 2100 North Freeway alternative in terms of its ability to meet the project's purpose.

However, there are two significant drawbacks to the 4800 North Freeway Alternative. The first is cost; the 4800 North Freeway Alternative would involve an additional expenditure of about \$523 million. The *additional* cost of this alternative is equivalent to the *entire* cost of many large transportation projects in the Salt Lake City area and elsewhere. Secondly, although this alternative could be designed to meet minimum design requirements, FHWA has determined that it is less desirable from an operational and safety standpoint. Given the many competing priorities for transportation funds in Utah, FHWA and UDOT have concluded that it would not be prudent to spend an additional \$523 million to construct the 4800 North alternative. It is highly unlikely that UDOT would seek to move a 4800 North Freeway Alternative forward under any circumstances.

Based on all of these considerations, the 4800 North Freeway Alternative is not a reasonable alternative for the purpose of NEPA analysis and also, in FHWA and UDOT's judgment, should not be considered a practicable alternative as that term is used under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, FHWA and UDOT concluded that the 4800 North Freeway Alternative should not be advanced for detailed study in the MVC EIS process.



- B. *Commenters stated that they prefer the 4800 North Freeway Alternative (Lehi City's alternative).*

Thank you for the comment.

- C. *Commenters stated that they oppose the 4800 North Freeway Alternative (Lehi City's alternative).*

Thank you for the comment.

35.2.10 Section 2.2.4 – Tolling Options for the MVC Alternatives

- A. *Commenters stated that tolling the MVC alternatives would place a burden on residents on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley or that the project should not be tolled at all. Others commented that tolls should be placed only on trucks or single-passenger cars and that property taxes or new development could pay for the project. In addition, some commented that a tolling decision can't be made until thorough research and disclosure of the risks of privatizing the MVC is made.*

Section 2.2.4, Tolling Options for the MVC Alternatives, analyzes tolling of the Salt Lake and Utah County roadway alternatives in order to address different options for funding the MVC. The tolling analysis included in this EIS was performed to disclose the expected impacts of tolling that would differ from the impacts of the non-tolled alternatives. The final decision on whether to implement one of the MVC toll options would be made by the Utah Transportation Commission. This decision would be based on the analysis contained in the EIS and more detailed evaluation of the tolling option.

Increasing taxes on property or gasoline to pay for roadway improvements is a state legislature and local government (city and county) decision that is outside the scope of this EIS to consider. If a decision is made to toll the MVC, a specific plan would be announced including which vehicles would pay tolls and the cost of the toll. The analysis in the EIS assumes that all vehicles would be tolled. If a decision is made to toll the MVC, the State of Utah will study the various options including privatization and a state-operated facility and will weigh the risks associated with both.

For a detailed description of how a tolling system would operate, see Section 2.2.4, Tolling Options for the MVC Alternatives.

- B. *Commenters stated that tolling the MVC freeway alternatives would increase the use of local streets because motorists would be unwilling to use a toll facility.*

As stated in Chapter 8, Transportation, the tolling of the MVC would result in slightly improved congestion levels on local surface streets compared to the No-



Action Alternative of not building the MVC. Levels of congestion on surface streets under the tolling option would be greater than under the non-tolled options.

- C. *Commenters stated that, if the MVC is tolled, then other existing roads such as I-215 on the east side of the Salt Lake Valley should be tolled.*

Tolling other state roads is outside the scope of the MVC's project purpose, which is to improve north-south mobility in the western part of Salt Lake County and north-south and east-west mobility in northwest Utah County. Because travel on Utah's highways is growing almost twice as fast as the state's population, federal and state funding cannot keep up with the cost of transportation operations and maintenance. New roads, regardless of location, need innovative financing strategies to address transportation needs. In Salt Lake and Utah Counties, new roads are needed on the west side due to its tremendous growth. Tolling could deliver the MVC project sooner, which would relieve the high level of congestion.

- D. *Commenters stated that they favor tolling.*

Thank you for the comment.

- E. *The Utah Trucking Association stated that there is no comprehensive report showing the cost of electronic tolling system in terms of catching, reporting, and collecting against those that evade the tolling system. These costs must be included in the tolling analysis to properly inform industry and the public of the true cost of toll collection.*

The capital cost estimate for the MVC included a state-of-the-art toll-collection system. The cost estimate was based on experiences with other toll roads around the U.S. that have implemented fully automated toll-collection systems. The tolling analysis also addressed ongoing annual costs for operation, maintenance, and periodic replacement of the toll-collection system as well as costs for accounting, administration, and staffing of customer support services similar to those used on other toll roads.

Today's automated toll-collection systems photograph the rear license plate of all vehicles that pass through the toll plaza. The system can then identify vehicles without a valid toll tag or users with insufficient funds in their account to pay for the toll. These tolls are collected from the owner of the vehicle by mail with an administrative fee to cover the increased cost of processing. If the toll and fee aren't paid, a citation can be issued which then includes a fine. If the fine is not paid, the state can put a hold on the vehicle registration until the fine is paid. Even with these processes, some tolls go unpaid. For most toll roads in the U.S.,



the administrative fees and fines cover the full cost of toll evasion, but, if not, the net loss is an insignificant amount compared to annual toll revenues.

35.2.11 Section 2.2.5 – Implementation of the MVC Alternatives (Construction Phasing)

- A. *Commenters wanted to know how the project would be constructed and when construction would take place.*

The Preferred Transit Alternative (5600 West Transit Alternative with Dedicated Right-of-Way Option) would be built in phases as funding becomes available consistent with the phasing timeframes identified in WFRC's long-range transportation plan. The Preferred Roadway Alternatives (5800 West Freeway Alternative and 2100 North Freeway Alternative) also would be built in phases. The Utah Transportation Commission has identified partial funding for the north-south portions of the MVC in Salt Lake County and the east-west portions in Utah County. For more details on construction phasing, see Chapter 36, Project Implementation (Phasing).

- B. *Riverton City was concerned about the impacts in their city if the MVC project's first phase of construction ended at 12600 South or 13400 South.*

UDOT will work with Riverton City during the final design of the project to ensure that the project functions with the local street network.

- C. *Lehi City commented that the project will be phased in by the number of lanes required to meet future traffic conditions. Where are the impacts calculated and discussed from the seemingly endless construction and the costs of building then adding lanes over and over again? Are the residents going to face 30 to 40 years of construction on this project? What are the impacts thereof?*

Because the funding that will be available at the start of construction is not known, it is difficult to determine the actual construction phasing. Chapter 21, Construction Impacts, mentions the impacts of construction phasing. In addition, the impacts discussed in that chapter would occur during any phase of construction, whether initial construction or future widening. To minimize the impacts of phased construction, UDOT would purchase the right-of-way for the entire project prior to construction, including any necessary property acquisitions. This would reduce the impacts of phased construction to local residents since construction would occur within the right-of-way owned by UDOT. Depending on the length of time between construction projects and potential future design changes, additional environmental documentation might be prepared.



35.2.12 Section 2.3 – Land Acquired to Date (Including Right-of-Way Questions)

- A. *A commenter asked how the 5800 West Freeway Alternative can be “proposed” when UDOT has already begun acquiring property. It seems that the alternative has already been selected.*

As shown in Section 2.3, Land Acquired to Date, UDOT has purchased property with state funds along all of the MVC action alternatives, not just the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. UDOT has purchased several parcels of land since the initiation of this EIS. These purchases were made in cases where (1) owners said that they couldn’t sell their property because of the proposed project, and this was causing them economic hardship, or (2) a property was about to be developed, which would increase the number of residential or business relocations due to the project. UDOT might sell the land that was purchased along the alternatives that are not built. These state-funded advance acquisitions are permissible under FHWA right-of-way acquisition and NEPA regulations and do not affect the alternatives analysis or decisions made in the NEPA process.

35.2.13 Section 2.4 – Summary Comparison of Alternatives (Cost, Daily Delay, Travel Time, and Environmental Impacts)

- A. *Commenters stated that not all of the Utah County alternatives would relieve congestion or improve commute times. For example, many commenters stated that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would involve out-of-direction travel and increased travel time for those traveling from Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain toward the Provo-Orem area and therefore would not provide any travel benefit. Other commenters stated that one alternative would have less impacts to homes than another.*

All of the Utah County alternatives would substantially reduce travel delay and meet the project purpose. Section 2.4, Summary Comparison of Alternatives, provides an overview of how each Utah County alternative performs. Compared to the No-Action Alternative, the Southern Freeway Alternative would reduce daily delay in the MVC study area on all roads by 53%, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative by 47%, and the Arterials Alternative by 53%. Another comparison is the length of the evening commute from Utah Valley State College to Eagle Mountain. Such a commute would take 36 minutes under the Southern Freeway Alternative, 40 minutes under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, and 37 minutes under the Arterials Alternative.

The expected property impacts from the MVC alternatives are discussed in Chapter 6, Community Impacts. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would require about 17 relocations and potential relocations, compared to 154 for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 75 for the Arterials Alternative.



- B. *Commenters wanted to know why the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was selected as UDOT's Preferred Alternative.*

The 2100 North Freeway Alternative was identified as UDOT's Preferred Roadway Alternative in Utah County based on a comprehensive consideration of many factors. The reasons for identifying the 2100 North Freeway Alternative as a Preferred Alternative are described in Section 2.4.5, Preferred Alternatives. As described in that section, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative had several advantages. The number of relocations required under this alternative would be the lowest of any of the Utah County alternatives (Southern Freeway Alternative, 154 relocations and potential relocations; 2100 North Freeway Alternative, 17 relocations and potential relocations; Arterials Alternative, 75 relocations and potential relocations). As discussed in Chapter 13, Noise, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have the fewest noise impacts to residents. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have the fewest impacts to the natural environment with 12.87 acres of wetland impacts compared to 93.43 acres for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 55.71 acres for the Arterials Alternative. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative also would be the lowest-cost alternative and would provide a similar level of benefit as the other Utah County alternatives. For more information, see Section 2.4.5.2, Utah County Alternatives.

35.3 Chapter 3 – Growth Choices

- A. *A commenter stated that a "smart-growth alternative" should be considered as part of the MVC EIS process.*

As discussed in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, as part of the MVC EIS process, UDOT requested that Envision Utah facilitate a process referred to as the Growth Choices Study. Envision Utah is a non-profit organization based in Salt Lake City, Utah, that has been working with local jurisdictions since 1997 to link land use and transportation planning. The Growth Choices process was intended to help the cities in the MVC study area understand the relationship between land-use policy changes and transportation choices and to facilitate agreement on a vision of future development with unified land-use and transportation policies. The process included a stakeholder committee that consisted of representatives from Salt Lake and Utah Counties, 14 cities, four nongovernmental organizations, a school district, two chambers of commerce, and five landowners in the study area.

The result of the process was a Vision Scenario that was developed collaboratively by the members of the Stakeholder Committee. It reflects their consideration of public input and traffic modeling results as well as their assessment of the feasibility of adopting changes to existing land-use plans. This scenario includes



a balanced mix of roadway improvements, transit improvements, and land-use changes. The land-use changes included the use of large town centers with employment centers, village centers with mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, and denser residential development near planned transit stations. The Vision Scenario was used to develop the MVC action alternatives including using the land uses from the scenario in the travel demand modeling. The land uses developed during the Growth Choices process concentrated transit-oriented developments along 5600 West to support transit use.

Rather than study a single “smart-growth alternative,” FHWA and UDOT decided to incorporate the elements of the transit and land-use elements of the Growth Choices Vision into *all* of the action alternatives. See Section 3.4.2, Incorporation into the Alternative Development Assumptions.

- B. Commenters stated that they were disappointed that the MVC project (UDOT) moved away from or ignored the Growth Choices Vision Voluntary Agreement of a balanced transportation system involving pedestrian-oriented developments, increased transit use, and sequencing with transit first.*

The Growth Choices process has played an important role in the development of the MVC project. The Growth Choices process was conducted jointly with the scoping process for the MVC EIS. The results of the Growth Choices process—as reflected in the Growth Choices Vision agreement—have been taken into account in refining the project’s purpose and in determining the range of alternatives carried forward for detailed study in the EIS. The goals reflected in the Growth Choices Vision were also considered when conducting the impact analysis and identifying a Preferred Alternative.

The Growth Choices Vision reflects the local communities’ desire for a combination of roadway improvements, transit improvements, and land-use changes in the MVC study area. These elements of the Vision were considered when developing the MVC purpose statement, which lists two primary purposes: reducing roadway congestion and supporting increased transit availability. The three secondary objectives are increasing roadway safety, supporting increased bicycle and pedestrian options, and supporting local growth objectives “including the principles reflected in the Growth Choices Vision.”

The Growth Choices Vision calls for the consideration of the main elements of that vision—freeway improvements, transit improvements, and land-use changes—as an alternative in the MVC EIS. In this EIS, the spirit of this recommendation has been followed by incorporating elements of the Vision into all of the action alternatives considered. During the development of the alternatives, the MVC EIS team concluded that the land-use and transit elements of the Vision would complement any of the potential locations for a roadway in



the MVC study area. Therefore, rather than developing a single Vision alternative, the EIS team incorporated the transit and land-use elements of the Vision into *all* of the action alternatives. This approach recognizes that the land-use and transit elements of the Vision could be combined with any of the potential locations for the roadway improvements. This approach also ensures that the traffic forecasts used in the EIS reflect the maximum level of transit use that could be obtained in the study area if the Growth Choices Vision is fully implemented. See Section 3.4.2, Incorporation into the Alternative Development Assumptions.

Regarding sequencing of transit first, the fourth Principle of the Voluntary Agreement states:

The phasing and implementation of transportation investments over the next decade will affect land-use development patterns, future travel needs, and the availability and effectiveness of other viable transportation choices. The sequencing of transportation investments should be studied to recommend the most cost-efficient way to meet future travel needs, reduce the rate of growth of vehicle-miles traveled, and improve air quality.

The above paragraph notes that sequencing should be “studied,” but it does not state that transit should be implemented first. Sequencing was evaluated in Chapter 29, Sequencing. A copy of the Voluntary Agreement is included in Appendix 3B, Mountain View Vision Voluntary Agreement.

- C. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that the Mountain View Vision called for implementing more transportation choices, reducing the rate of growth of vehicle-miles traveled, and improving air quality. The Preferred Alternative proposed in the Draft EIS does not meet these objectives.*

As discussed in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, the Growth Choices Vision agreement states that there is a desire for a balanced transportation system that will provide more transportation choices. Additionally, it states that the sequencing of transportation investments needs to be “studied” to recommend the most effective and cost-efficient way to meet future travel needs, reduce the rate of growth of vehicle-miles traveled, and improve air quality through a balance among automobile, transit, and walking and bicycling trips. As a result of this principle, the Vision Scenario was developed. This scenario included transit along 5600 West, which is an alternative that is evaluated in detail in the EIS. The EIS alternatives do include transit, roadway, and pedestrian facilities as transportation choices. In addition, the land-use recommendations in the Vision were used in the EIS to develop the action alternatives. Finally, the Vision states that the transportation investment needs to be “studied” to recommend the most



effective and cost-efficient way to meet future travel needs. The transportation investment was studied in Chapter 29, Sequencing, which concluded that implementing “transit first” as recommended by the commenter—that is, building the transit line but deferring the MVC roadway improvements until 2030 or later—would not meet the project purpose.

- D. *Hexcel Corporation commented that there are three development scenarios: trend, expansive, and compact. The Draft EIS does not indicate the appropriate balance among the three scenarios, nor how each scenario would reduce personal vehicle dependency. Given that local governments approve land-use plans, there is no assessment of the prospects that a particular scenario will eventually be the approved plan. They also commented that the process predetermined the outcome because any alternative would need to be a freeway or transit alternative.*

As discussed in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, as part of the MVC EIS process, UDOT requested that Envision Utah facilitate a process referred to as the Growth Choices Study. The Growth Choices process was intended to help the cities in the MVC study area understand the relationship between land-use policy changes and transportation choices and to facilitate agreement on a vision of future development with unified land-use and transportation policies. Based on public input, three scenarios were developed: Trend, Expansive, and Compact. After these scenarios were developed, the Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee modified and refined them over an 8-month period.

After this period, the Stakeholder Committee decided to create a composite scenario that blended the Trend and Compact Scenarios. This composite was called the Vision Scenario. It reflects their consideration of public input and traffic-modeling results as well as their assessment of the feasibility of adopting changes to existing land-use plans. The Vision Scenario provides a balanced mix of roadway improvements, transit improvements, and land-use changes. Therefore, by endorsing the Vision Scenario, the Stakeholder Committee decided the appropriate balance of the Trend, Compact, and Expansive Scenarios. Chart 3-6 on page 3-16 of the Draft EIS shows the number of expected transit trips per scenario, and these trips would help reduce vehicle dependency. As shown in Chart 3-6, the Vision Scenario generates the greatest number of transit trips.

The Growth Choices process concluded with a voluntary agreement in which the signatories agreed to “support the implementation of the Mountain View Vision to coordinate the activities, policies, and investments of state, regional, and local governments.” Finally, the Growth Choices process did not predetermine the outcome of the EIS. The process was used to help develop a range of alternatives. This was done by taking the land uses and transit elements from the Vision



Scenario to help develop the action alternatives. The overall screening process used in the EIS was the basis for determining the specific roadway and transit elements of the action alternatives.

- E. *Lehi City commented that transit ridership numbers were generated using the regional travel demand model. No data were available for existing transit trips in the study area. How can that be? Are there no bus routes now?*

For the purpose of the Growth Choices process, transit ridership was projected for 2030 in the MVC study area using the regional travel demand model (see Section 3.3.5, Transit Ridership). Although data are available for specific bus routes, it is not possible to segregate the existing ridership for the MVC study area. The northern portion of the MVC study area in Utah County is served by bus routes along State Street and I-15. No bus routes serve the cities of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, about 1.4% of the people in Utah County use transit to commute to work.

35.4 Chapter 4 – Land Use

- A. *A commenter stated that area cities should develop to be more community-centered in a way that does not require the use of mass transit but allows homes, businesses, and jobs to be located in close proximity.*

As discussed in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, UDOT and FHWA worked with the cities in the study area to help them develop a better understanding of the effects of land use on transportation. The result of the Growth Choices process was the development of land uses that would support transit use. The cities in the study area agreed to implement these land uses if the MVC is built. Note that UDOT and FHWA do not have control over regional or local planning; this is the responsibility of the cities and counties according to the Utah state constitution.

- B. *A commenter stated that the figure on page 74 of Volume 4 of the Draft EIS is incorrect because it shows the property as residential when it should be agricultural.*

The figures were based on aerial photographs and city land-use plans. At the scale of the figures, it is difficult to discern the specific land uses for each parcel; therefore, an approximate boundary for the land uses was generated. The parcel in question is planned for residential uses in the city plans.



- C. *A commenter stated that UDOT should work with the City of West Jordan on proper planning techniques near freeways.*

UDOT does coordinate with the cities regarding access issues for adjacent properties. UDOT does not have the authority to require cities to develop specific land uses near their facilities.

- D. *Lehi City commented that the land-use totals are skewed by the use of I-15 as an artificial boundary, despite the fact that it divides several cities. The most fundamental problem with this section is that, since the insertion of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, there is no consistency with local land-use plans.*

The land-use analysis is based on the conversion of land use to a roadway use and the consistency with local plans. As stated in Chapter 4, Land Use, about 717 acres of land, or 2.7% of the land in the impact analysis area, would be converted to roadway use. If the land on the other side of I-15 were included, this would reduce the percentage of impacts. In addition, the land east of I-15 would not be directly affected. Chapter 4 states that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is not consistent with the plans of Lehi City and that the City is opposed to the alternative.

35.5 Chapter 5 – Farmlands

- A. *Holbrook Farms commented that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would divide a portion of their farm into four parcels, which would make it difficult to farm due to restricted access. They also commented that the cut and fill from the roadway would cause additional impacts to their property.*

Chapter 5, Farmlands, provides a detailed analysis of the potential direct and indirect impacts to farmland and farming operations. As discussed in the chapter, UDOT and the landowner would determine the viability of each remaining farming operation on a case-by-case basis. Owners of farmland would be compensated for impacts to their property. The cut and fill for the roadway is required as part of constructing the alternative.

- B. *Lehi City commented that the “farmland impact analysis area” consists of the non-urban areas inside the MVC study area. Only farmland within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives is shown in the figures. This approach captures only a portion of the impacts.*

All of the impacts from the MVC project were captured in the EIS. The EIS considered *direct* impacts to farmland as a result of MVC project construction. The analysis also considered *indirect* impacts to specific farms by determining if any farms or parcels would no longer be farmable as a result of being bisected by

the project. This analysis of indirect impacts was not limited to the farmlands within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives, as shown in the figure. The 0.5-mile buffer on the figures was used to show the farmlands that would be directly affected by project construction. Chapter 24, Indirect Effects, and Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, analyze the potential indirect impacts to farmland from induced development caused by the MVC and the potential cumulative impacts to farmland in northern Utah County and the region.

- C. *Lehi City commented that there are 10 Agriculture Protection Areas (APAs) in the Utah County portion of the MVC study area, but only 1,146 acres in the “farmland impact analysis area.” It appears that the environmental impact analysis for these areas is split. If the farmland is within 0.5 mile of a road, a hard look at impacts was taken, but if the same APA or farmland is located 0.6 mile away, it was not studied, even though it is within the project study area. This does not make sense considering the resource, as the parcels are connected and most are under common ownership.*

As stated in Chapter 5, Farmlands, there are 10 APAs in the impact analysis area. The Utah law regarding APAs does not consider the amount of land affected but simply whether an APA is affected. The farmland analysis does consider the amount of farmland affected, the farmland ownership by parcel, and whether a farm or parcel would no longer be farmable as a result of being bisected by the project (even if the connected parcel is more than 0.5 mile from an alternative). Therefore, the analysis does consider common ownership and connected parcels.

35.6 Chapter 6 – Community Impacts

35.6.1 Section 6.1 – Community Impacts, Quality of Life, and Safety

- A. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would further divide communities, decrease the quality of life, and be a nuisance to the public. Some commenters also felt that school impacts were not addressed.*

Chapter 6, Community Impacts, analyzes impacts to community cohesion and quality of life from the MVC action alternatives. For all of the MVC action alternatives, the required relocations could reduce the cohesiveness of the areas around the alternative but are not likely to affect the community as a whole. In addition, residents in the area immediately adjacent to an alternative could experience a reduced quality of life from increased noise levels and visual impacts, while residents of the cities as a whole could experience an improved quality of life due to reduced congestion and better access. Some Lehi residents along the proposed 2100 North Freeway Alternative felt that the alternative

would substantially reduce the cohesive nature of Lehi and decrease their quality of life.

Impacts to schools were analyzed in the EIS. One alternative, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, would have an impact on schools. This alternative would affect Hillside Elementary School and Hunter High School. At Hillside Elementary, about 1.4 acres of a grass athletic field would be acquired. Because no buildings or playground structures would be affected, the impacts are not expected to substantially affect the use of the school. At Hunter High School, about 0.4 acre of a grass field and softball diamond 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.

- B. A commenter stated that placing the gas lines and electrical lines both underground or next to one another could increase the safety risk and potentially cause an explosion. Other commenters were concerned that the road would increase vibration and could cause gas and water lines to break, which would increase the safety risk.*

Utilities such as gas and electrical lines are placed close to one another in utility corridors across the country. Many of these lines are placed under highways. The existing 5800 West utility corridor includes natural gas lines and electrical lines in close proximity. All safety standards would be followed during the siting and construction of utilities that are relocated as a result of the MVC project. The proposed 5800 West Freeway Alternative is based on coordination with the utility companies to ensure that safety requirements are met.

- C. Commenters stated that placing the MVC close to schools could increase the risk to students if a driver loses control and the vehicle leaves the freeway and enters the school grounds.*

The MVC action alternatives would be designed to meet safety standards. There would be appropriate safety distances between the travel lanes and the end of the right-of-way to ensure that vehicles would not leave the freeway clear zone. This zone is typically 32 feet for a freeway such as the MVC.

- D. The Utah Trucking Association stated that the MVC will improve trucker safety by reducing car/truck conflicts. They stated that the MVC will be a better highway for trucks, which would reduce safety issues on secondary roads and on I-15.*

Freeways have lower accident rates than arterial streets. By shifting traffic from arterial streets to a freeway, the MVC project could improve safety.

- E. Lehi City commented that the impact analysis area is too small. They also commented that the impacts from the 2100 North Freeway Alternative are*



conclusory, and necessary detail is lacking. Section 6.1 ignores the planned future of the area and the impacts to the vision of Lehi City.

Chapter 6, Community Impacts, explains why the impact analysis area was selected for specific resources such as recreation facilities and public facilities. For general community impacts, the entire community such as the city of Lehi was considered. To provide an equal comparison of the MVC action alternatives, the same approach to the impact analysis was used for all of the alternatives. The analysis for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative states that Lehi City and residents of the city feel that the alternative would divide the community, isolate residential areas, result in community cohesion impacts, and negatively affect the quality of life in this developing area.

35.6.2 Section 6.2 – Recreation Resources

- A. *The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources commented that the Draft EIS does not adequately address indirect impacts to the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education. Specifically, the Division is concerned about the potential for ricochet bullets from the facility to affect MVC traffic, which could potentially require the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education to close.*

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be located east of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education in an area where the Division of Wildlife Resources currently allows public access. 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 resolves the Division's concerns regarding this facility.

35.6.3 Section 6.3 – Relocations

- A. *Commenters wanted information on how property would be acquired; specifically, does UDOT pay for only minor impacts to property, when will property be acquired, how much time would residents have to move out, and does UDOT compensate for a decrease in property value for homes that are left remaining near an alternative?*

Information about property impacts is included in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, and the actual properties affected are listed in Appendix 6A, Property Impacts. When property acquisitions are necessary, 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 laws provide for uniform and



equitable treatment of all persons displaced from their homes, businesses, and farms without discrimination on any basis. UDOT will provide compensation for the acquisition of any private property including minor impacts to the property when no structures are taken. A UDOT property acquisition specialist will work with each property owner and consider items such as existing mortgage rates and relocation fees. UDOT does not compensate for any decrease in property values as a result of a project if no property is acquired.

If FHWA decides to build the project, the location and timing of construction would be based on available funding. Currently, there is not enough funding to construct the entire project. If funding is made available, the earliest that construction could occur is 2010, with property acquisition starting in 2009. At a minimum, residents would have 90 days to relocate once the property is purchased by UDOT. If the property is not immediately needed for construction, that period could be extended.

- B. *Commenters stated that the impacts listed in the EIS are under-counted and that multiple properties are listed more than once. Also, some residential properties are listed as LLC (limited liability corporation) and are included in the business impacts instead of the residential impacts.*

The information including owner names and property boundaries was obtained from county tax records. Any errors in these data are the responsibility of the county. It would not be possible for the MVC team to meet with every property owner to obtain any changes to these data. If a property needs to be acquired, UDOT would obtain a legal description of the property. The data provided by the county tax records allow an equal comparison between the MVC action alternatives.

- C. *Commenters stated that some of the relocation data in Appendix 6A, Property Impacts, were missing from the EIS.*

In preparing the MVC EIS for publication, the MVC team made an error in printing out the relocation information in Appendix 6A. A revised appendix with the complete information was sent out shortly after the release of the Draft EIS.

- D. *Hexcel Corporation commented that the impacts to their facility were not adequately analyzed in the EIS and that UDOT did not coordinate with Hexcel prior to the release of the Draft EIS. They stated that the MVC project could affect future expansion of their facility and could affect the direct operations of the facility through impacts such as loss of qualified positions, loss of production, cost to re-qualify production, inability to supply materials, and potential safety issues. They also noted the potential for indirect impacts such as dust invasion and vibration impacts on equipment and stated that UDOT would need to*



establish a monitoring program. They also commented that, under the 5600 West Freeway Alternative, the facility would need to be relocated. Hexcel said that, to minimize or avoid impacts, the 5600 West Freeway Alternative alignment in the Draft EIS would need to be shifted 300 to 600 feet to the east, and 5400 South would also need to be realigned. Hexcel felt that a broader range of alternatives could have been considered in the EIS to avoid their property.

Impacts to Hexcel's property were considered in the EIS as part of the cost of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative associated with the acquisition of land. The specific details of an acquisition are typically handled during the final design phase and during the actual property purchase by UDOT. During the acquisition process, UDOT right-of-way specialists will consider loss of production, future expansion, and other operational requirements. UDOT will work with Hexcel about monitoring potential construction- and operation-related impacts to the facility as part of the final design of the project.

After receiving comments from Hexcel on the Draft EIS, UDOT held a meeting with Hexcel on February 15, 2008, to discuss the company's concerns about the MVC's effects on their business operations. Based on discussions with Hexcel, ATK, and West Valley City, the Salt Lake County alternatives were shifted to move the alignment farther east as suggested in the Hexcel comment, which would minimize impacts to the Hexcel property (see Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS). In addition, the Final EIS was updated to address concerns raised by Hexcel in its comments (see Section 9.5.4.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative). UDOT held an additional meeting with Hexcel on June 13, 2008 to discuss the proposed alignment shift. Hexcel felt the alignment shift addressed their concerns about the MVC project.

All of the alternatives were evaluated in the same way to provide an equal comparison between the alternatives. Given the number of property impacts from the MVC project, it is not possible to analyze each impact in detail. Rather, the EIS considers each impact as a relocation or strip take and includes the cost of the impact in the total cost for each alternative. See Response W on page 35-30 of Section 35.2.1 regarding a reasonable range of alternatives.

Impacts from construction vibration were analyzed in Chapter 21, Construction Impacts. FTA's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* suggests a damage threshold for fragile buildings (such as historic structures) of 5 mm/sec (millimeters per second), or 0.2 in/sec (inches per second) (Miller 2006). Based on this study, a threshold of 5 mm/sec (0.2 in/sec) for isolated vibration events such as trucks passing by or pile driving is a conservative standard to apply to the MVC project. A study by the City of Jacksonville monitored vibration levels from truck traffic (gravel trucks, logging trucks, and commercial trucks). The



monitors were placed on buildings that were located only a few feet from the edge of the road. In most cases, the vibration levels associated with truck traffic were less than 1 mm/sec (0.04 in/sec) and in all cases were less than 2 mm/sec (0.08 in/sec) (Hee 1994, Executive Summary, page 1). The MVC project would be located about 800 feet from the nearest building on the Hexcel property. Based on these data, any vibration impact from the MVC traffic would be less than the damage threshold used for fragile historic buildings.

Vibration impacts from pile driving during construction could be higher than those from traffic on the MVC. However, vibrations from impact pile-driving activities generally do not exceed the threshold for damage to historic buildings of 5 mm/sec (0.2 in/sec) farther than 200 feet from the pile driver, even with poor soil conditions. The MVC project would be about 800 feet from the nearest building. In addition, there is an active gravel pit about 200 to 500 feet south of several Hexcel buildings. It is reasonable to assume that any vibration impacts from MVC construction would be less than the vibration from the gravel pit, given the greater distance separating the road from the Hexcel buildings (see Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS).

35.6.4 Section 6.4 – Public Services and Utilities

- A. *Questar Gas Company commented that they prefer the 7200 West Freeway Alternative over the 5800 West Freeway Alternative because it would have less impact on their facilities and the surrounding communities. They also oppose the southern Salt Lake County and northern Utah County segments because they have not been adequately analyzed and because no alternatives have been considered. In addition, it might not be possible to relocate some of their facilities, and the cost estimate of the possible relocations underestimates the actual cost.*

An analysis of the utility impacts of the project as well as impacts to the community was conducted in the EIS. Based on the analysis, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative was identified by UDOT as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Salt Lake County. The identification was based on close coordination with the affected cities and the public and consultation with resource agencies. The cities in the MVC study area preferred the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, and the resource agencies felt that this alternative would have fewer impacts to wetlands and wildlife resources. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative also had fewer impacts to homes and farmland and had better overall transportation performance than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.



The southern Salt Lake County and northern Utah County segments were developed in close coordination with the cities in that area. The segments analyzed in the EIS were developed to minimize impacts to the communities and require the fewest number of home relocations. In working with the cities, UDOT considered minor alignment shifts that resulted in the optimized alignments shown in the EIS. Other potential alignments in that area could cause greater impacts to the communities and homes.

UDOT met with Questar on numerous occasions to discuss potential utility relocations. Based on those meetings, UDOT prepared preliminary cost estimates to relocate the utilities. These estimates have been included in the cost estimate presented in the Draft EIS. UDOT will continue to coordinate with Questar during the final design phase of the project to address any issues associated with the selected alternative (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities).

Questar provided the following specific comments on the EIS (in italics).

1. *Although the applicable regulations require the agencies to engage in a “diligent effort to involve the public” and despite the fact that the EIS states that there has been an “extensive outreach program . . . to receive input from the public,” Questar Gas has not been included in any meaningful conversations about the conflicts between the MVC and Questar Gas’ facilities. Questar Gas attempted to engage in such a dialogue and was told that its concerns would be better dealt with during the design phase. These conflicts should be evaluated now, not after the route has been determined.*

UDOT has coordinated with Questar about relocation of its facilities both before and after the Draft EIS. Meetings occurred on the following dates:

- April 26, 2005
- June 4, 2007
- March 21, 2008

As part of the analysis of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, additional right-of-way for utility relocations was analyzed in the EIS to account for the impacts of moving the utilities. This analysis was performed to ensure that all impacts to the natural and human environments were accounted for to provide an equal comparison of the MVC action alternatives.

2. *The EIS fails to address the social and environmental effects that would arise if the Questar Gas facilities were relocated. The EIS itself acknowledges that “physical impacts to public services and utilities can affect the social environment. . . .” (EIS at p. 6-7, paragraph 6.3.5).*



Despite these requirements and the acknowledgment in the EIS, it is wholly silent with regard to the direct and indirect effects that the MVC project would cause as a result of forcing the relocation of Questar Gas facilities. The EIS is equally lacking in its consideration of the cultural, economic, and social impacts that these relocations would cause to Questar Gas' customers and the community surrounding the MVC. The EIS makes no effort to identify a proposed new location for the facilities, to determine whether the relocations required by the preferred route are feasible, to determine whether such utility relocations would require the relocation of residents outside of the MVC, to determine whether such placement would have adverse environmental impacts outside the MVC footprint, or to determine what such relocations might cost.

As part of the analysis of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, additional right-of-way and cost for utility relocations were analyzed in the EIS to account for the impacts of moving the utilities. This analysis was performed to ensure that all impacts to the natural and human environments were accounted for to provide an equal comparison of the MVC action alternatives. The impacts evaluated included resources such as home and business relocations, community-related impacts, wetlands, cultural resources, and wildlife. Page 2-66 of the Draft EIS states that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would encroach on an existing utility corridor from just south of California Avenue to 4700 South, from 7800 South to New Bingham Highway, and at 11000 South. It notes that the utility corridor contains high-pressure gas lines and overhead electrical lines, that these utilities would have to be relocated, and that the right-of-way for these relocations has been included in the MVC right-of-way. The impact of this total right-of-way for both the roadway and the utilities was analyzed throughout the EIS for all of the resources studied.

3. *The EIS contains no discussion of any alternatives to the proposed southern Salt Lake County section and northern Utah County section, despite the fact that each of these routes would cause substantial impacts to Questar Gas, its customers, and the surrounding communities. The EIS must “[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and, for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.”*

The southern Salt Lake County and northern Utah County segments were developed in close coordination with the cities in that area. In this area where there is a single alignment, the alternatives are located in a corridor that was preserved for a roadway by the local governments. The segments analyzed in the EIS were developed to minimize impacts to the



communities and require the fewest number of home relocations. In working with the cities, UDOT considered minor alignment shifts that resulted in the optimized alignments shown in the EIS. Other potential alignments outside the preserved corridor would cause greater impacts to the communities and homes (see Appendix A, Roadway Plans). See Response W on page 35-30 of Section 35.2.1 regarding the reasonable alternatives evaluated in the MVC EIS.

4. *Additionally, the EIS contains a number of erroneous statements and omissions, including at least the following:*
 - *On page 2-40, the EIS indicates that “[e]ach utility provider . . . was contacted to determine whether utilities would be relocated or would pass through the right-of-way.” As noted above, the agencies had very cursory communication with Questar Gas and indicated that any discussion of the scope of the utility relocations was premature.*

Meetings were held with Questar Gas during the development of the Draft EIS. After the release of the Draft EIS, UDOT held additional meetings with Questar Gas to discuss each of the feeder lines that would be affected by the construction of the MVC. UDOT also provided the most up-to-date alternative alignments. The intent of the discussion was to determine the presence of any fatal flaws in the conceptual design assumptions. The particular details of each crossing and/or relocation will be addressed during the development of the final roadway design when detailed decisions are made regarding utility relocations. The final design process will include meetings with Questar Gas regarding their facilities. UDOT also requested that Questar Gas provide any additional conflicts not addressed in the Draft EIS and to provide UDOT with a conceptual cost estimate of the Questar conflicts.
 - *On page 2-81, the EIS suggests that the relocation of the Hunter Tap, two Kern River natural gas pipelines, and Rocky Mountain Power high-voltage electrical lines could be relocated at a cost of \$8 million. There is no mention of the Questar Gas high-pressure natural gas pipeline that connects to the Kern River pipeline at the Hunter Tap. Moreover, there is no reasonable basis for the cost estimate. As described above, such costs will be substantially more than \$8 million.*

[Table 2.1-18](#), Design Options for the MVC Alternatives, includes information on potential alignment shifts to minimize impacts. The specific design option mentioned in the comment would move the



5800 West Freeway Alternative alignment between 2700 South and 3500 South to avoid impacts to Questar's facilities; it would not move the Questar facilities. UDOT estimated that, by shifting the alignment to avoid the impacts, \$8 million would be saved from the total project cost.

UDOT has decided to implement the above design option, so there will be no impact to the Hunter Tap station. Regarding the costs to Kern River Gas Transmission Company, UDOT has paid Kern River to develop a cost estimate for impacts to their facility. This cost estimate was received in the spring of 2008 (after the Draft EIS comment period) and is included in the final cost estimate in the Final EIS (see Section 2.4.3, Cost).

- *On page 2-66, the EIS indicates that the utility relocations required would include the relocation of two high-pressure gas lines (presumably those belonging to Kern River), as well as some power facilities. There is no mention of Feeder Line 10, Questar Gas' 12-inch high-pressure line in that area.*

A route for this 12-inch high-pressure line is shown in the Final EIS (see Appendix A, Roadway Plans). UDOT was already aware of Questar's 12-inch Feeder Line 10 and had already identified a proposed location. Feeder Line 10 was discussed in detail with Questar during a coordination meeting in March 2008 that included discussion about a potential relocation corridor within the MVC right-of-way. UDOT will coordinate with Questar during the final design phase of the project to develop final details regarding the relocation of Feeder Line 10 (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities). In addition, as mentioned above, UDOT requested that Questar provide UDOT with an updated cost estimate for associated impacts to Feeder Line 10, which is included in the final cost estimate in Section 2.4.3, Cost.

- *On Page 6-18, the EIS erroneously states that Questar Gas' Feeder Line 10 (the 12-inch natural gas line) runs from 6200 South to Old Bingham Highway. Feeder Line 10 actually runs from 3500 South to 13400 South, with a portion from 7200 South to 11400 South that conflicts with the proposed MVC.*

The EIS has been revised to include the appropriate location of Feeder Line 10 (see Section 6.4.5, Public Services and Utilities).



- *On page 6-33, Questar Gas is not mentioned despite the fact that it has high-pressure natural gas facilities running parallel to the MVC in this area, as well as several high-pressure utility crossings in this vicinity.*

UDOT met with Questar Gas in March 2008 to coordinate utility relocation and is aware of the parallel high-pressure line as well as the high-pressure crossings. The Final EIS has been revised to include information about Questar's facilities (see Section 6.6.1, Methodology).

- *On page 6-46, the EIS fails to take into consideration the potential impacts and residential relocations that could be necessitated by the relocation of the Questar Gas facilities.*

Although it is impossible to predict every potential impact or cost, those that have been identified, including those to Questar Gas facilities, have been included in the cost and impact estimates for each alternative and have been included in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. In particular, the impact estimates for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative include the residential relocations resulting from relocation of the utilities. UDOT will continue to work with Questar Gas to determine the impacts due to relocating Questar facilities.

- *Pages 6-52 and 6-55 fail to make any reference to major Questar Gas facilities in the area.*

The Final EIS has been revised to include information about impacts to major Questar Gas facilities.

5. *The EIS fails to advance any plan for where all of these utility facilities would be placed if the MVC is built. Consequently, there is no discussion of the environmental impacts of those new utility locations, of whether residents would have to be relocated from those new utility locations, or what other impacts would occur as a result of such relocations.*

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

6. *The EIS contains inadequate consideration of the effect of the proposed project on the community and, specifically, the impact to the natural gas service of the residents and businesses in those communities. The relocation of the Questar Gas facilities could have a substantial impact*



on whether or not the surrounding communities receive reliable natural gas service.

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. Also, as stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities).

- B. *Rocky Mountain Power commented that the Draft EIS fails to fully consider the impacts that the proposed highway would have on high-voltage transmission lines and the customers who rely on these assets. In addition, the EIS fails to look at alternatives that would have less impact on these facilities. Rocky Mountain Power would prefer the selection of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.*

An analysis of the utility impacts as well as impacts to the community from any utility relocations was conducted in the EIS. Based on the analysis, UDOT identified the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Salt Lake County. The identification was based on close coordination with the affected cities and the public and consultation with resource agencies. The cities in the MVC study area preferred the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, and the resource agencies felt that this alternative would have fewer impacts to wetlands and wildlife resources. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative also would have fewer impacts to homes and prime and state important farmland, and the overall transportation performance would be similar to that of the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. The EIS does evaluate in detail the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, which would have fewer impacts on utilities.

Rocky Mountain Power provided the following specific comments to the EIS below (in italics).

- *The Draft EIS discusses utility conflicts in general terms, leaving vital and impact-determinative details to final design. The MVC project will require extensive relocation of utilities, some onto private property which may cause removal of existing structures including homes and businesses. The relocations will cause extensive line outages, and the loss of revenue resulting from the outages would be considerable.*

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The extra right-of-



way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. As stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities).

- *The MVC project will cause utility relocations which will require larger and taller transmission lines and therefore more visual impact. These relocations will have indirect and cumulative impacts to the surrounding communities which are not analyzed in the EIS.*

The EIS analyzes the visual impact from the proposed project. Although new transmission lines would be required to replace the ones within the roadway construction footprint, they would be similar in nature to the ones removed. Additional analysis was added to the visual resources chapter in the Final EIS to address larger transmission towers. See Section 19.6.3, Salt Lake County Alternatives.

- *The Draft EIS fails to evaluate the cost of relocating the transmission lines including engineering to keep the system operable, land acquisition, and relocations. These costs should be used to compare the alternatives.*

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The cost of the relocations has been included in the total cost of the MVC action alternatives to ensure a fair comparison of the alternatives (see Section 6.6.1, Methodology). The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

- *The Draft EIS fails to evaluate the need to bury existing and future transmission lines. UDOT has proposed to reduce the width of the utility corridor to minimize home relocations and school impacts, which will require that a major transmission line be buried rather than the typical overhead construction. The Draft EIS fails to evaluate the cost of burying the line. In addition, the reduced utility corridor width will preclude construction of a second phased transmission line. Rocky Mountain Power fully expects to be compensated for the loss of the ability to construct the second transmission line, relocation of transmission lines, and increased maintenance and repair cost.*



UDOT has been working with Rocky Mountain Power on a regular basis regarding their utility corridor in the MVC study area since the summer of 2004, as demonstrated by the following list of meetings:

- September 2, 2003
- July 27, 2004
- September 23, 2004
- November 8, 2004
- April 15, 2005
- May 18, 2005
- September 30, 2005
- January 6, 2006
- January 25, 2006
- March 16, 2006
- April 26, 2006
- June 15, 2006
- June 29, 2006
- June 30, 2006
- July 28, 2006
- August 23, 2006
- September 1, 2006
- September 11, 2006
- September 19, 2006
- October 6, 2006
- October 30, 2006
- November 7, 2006
- November 28, 2006
- December 20, 2006
- May 17, 2007
- May 31, 2007
- June 9, 2007
- June 19, 2007
- July 26, 2007
- August 2, 2007
- February 11, 2008
- March 4, 2008
- May 15, 2008

Currently, Rocky Mountain Power has a 345-kV line and 138-kV line in this corridor. The concept of moving the 138-kV (kilovolt) line underground was developed with Rocky Mountain Power as a way to reduce the impacts to existing homes and Hillside Elementary School. The undergrounding concept was part of a larger plan that specified a 160-foot-wide utility corridor in West Valley City. Many factors were considered when determining the width of the corridor, including the width of the existing power easement, future Rocky Mountain Power capacity needs, impacts to schools and residents, and the ability to construct a second 345-kV double-circuit line. During these discussions with Rocky Mountain Power, representatives from the company stated that it could move the 138-kV line underground, thus freeing up width in the 160-foot-wide corridor to allow a second double-circuit 345-kV line. Rocky Mountain Power will be reimbursed by UDOT for relocation and maintenance costs according to current law and in accordance with existing and future agreements between the State of Utah and Rocky Mountain Power.

- *The Draft EIS fails to provide a comparison between alternatives. Because the direct and indirect impacts of relocating the transmission lines and other major utilities were not considered, it is impossible to adequately compare the alternatives, particularly in regard to the cost of burying the transmission line, the loss of the ability to construct additional transmission lines, and the expense of relocating existing transmission lines.*



The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations, as well as the cost of relocating the utilities to that land. These costs were included in the total project cost for each alternative to ensure a fair comparison. The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

- *The proposed system interchange at SR 201 will have extensive impacts to the existing transmission lines. Based on unofficial preliminary information, Rocky Mountain Power estimates that pole heights could exceed 175 feet. Since Rocky Mountain has equipment to reach only 150 feet, maintenance will require special equipment and procedures. Access to the structure would be occasionally required from the MVC facility, which would interrupt traffic and create safety issues. The Draft EIS fails to address these issues.*

Since the Draft EIS was released, UDOT has incorporated a design option to shift the power lines to the west of the SR 201 interchange, thus eliminating need for transmission towers higher than 150 feet. Therefore, special equipment and procedures would not be needed. As stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities). Maintenance of utilities from UDOT right-of-way and the maintenance of the roadway itself are part of the normal operation procedures that are expected on projects such as the MVC. UDOT has standard operating procedures to handle these maintenance activities.

- *Placement of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative directly within the utility corridor would require the relocation of transmission lines within this segment. The Draft EIS concludes that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative will not “result in a complete loss” or affect the “long-term function and availability” of utility resources. Rocky Mountain Power disagrees. The “long-term function and availability” of Rocky Mountain Power’s utility resources will be preserved only to the extent that UDOT provides an equivalent substitute corridor to replace the transmission lines. The proposed relocations will result in crossing spans of approximately 900 feet, which will require line structures that are significantly larger in diameter to hold conductor tensions and other loads and taller to maintain safe conductor clearances over roads and*



other obstructions. The Draft EIS has not considered the effect of larger and taller structures on visual resources. The Draft EIS has not considered the effect of the required spans or the amount of right-of way required. Because additional right-of-way may be necessary, the conclusion that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative will require only 44 fewer residential acquisitions than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative appears optimistic and premature. Furthermore, the proposed narrowing of the utility corridor to 160 feet will eliminate Rocky Mountain Power's ability to construct a second additional 345-kilovolt double-circuit line within the utility corridor as has been planned for many decades.

The Final EIS has been updated to include a discussion of the visual impacts from larger transmission towers (see Section 19.6.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative). In addition, the EIS includes the impacts to homes and businesses as a result of relocating utilities. According to Rocky Mountain Power, the 160-foot width, as described in the EIS, would accommodate a second 345-kV line by moving the 138-kV line underground. This proposed corridor width was developed in coordination with Rocky Mountain Power. Rocky Mountain Power and UDOT have agreed that, in total, the 160-foot-wide utility corridor will accommodate the 138-kV underground line, two 345-kV lines (one existing and one to be constructed), and the existing Kern River gas lines. According to Rocky Mountain Power, the corridor will not accommodate a third 345-kV line. Any issues relating to compensation owed to Rocky Mountain Power will be addressed as part of the utility reimbursement agreement.

- *The 5800 West Freeway Alternative will eliminate the Rocky Mountain Wasatch Restoration Center. Monetary restitution alone would not be sufficient to replace the property. Any replacement facility would have to be central to the Salt Lake Valley.*

As stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities). This would include the relocation of any affected facilities and the cost of the relocation to an appropriate location in the Salt Lake Valley.

- *The utility crossings at 8200 South and 9400 South would require reconfiguration of existing transmission lines and require conductor spans of greater than 900 feet. The visual impacts of the larger transmission lines to support the greater span have not been analyzed.*



The larger spans would also require additional right-of-way, which has not been evaluated.

The Final EIS has been updated to address the visual impact of larger transmission lines. The home and business relocations resulting from any utility relocations have been included in the impact analysis presented in the EIS to ensure a fair comparison of the MVC action alternatives.

- *The MVC will add to the congestion and will create enormous coordination risk for the various facilities near the Oquirrh substation. In addition, an interchange constructed at Old Bingham Highway may not be feasible because of utility conflicts.*

As stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized. An interchange at Old Bingham Highway was considered but is not part of the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Salt Lake County.

- *Location of the MVC project near the Camp Williams substation may have tremendous impacts to operation of that facility. The location of the MVC may make relocation of the transmission lines not feasible or safe, require larger and taller structures and additional right-of-way, and limit the ability of future facility expansion.*

The MVC alignment has been shifted to the west at this location, which moves the proposed freeway interchange outside the area of concern (also see Section 2.1.7.4, Additional Changes to the Alternatives between the Draft EIS and Final EIS).

- *The Draft EIS conceptually describes elevated and depressed portions of the MVC at various locations throughout the alignment, although not fully designed. In addition, retention and detention basins are planned adjacent to the MVC. While it is not clear at this point the precise location, elevations, or order of magnitude of these design elements, such improvements create significant and unknown access concerns to Rocky Mountain Power for maintaining its transmission lines.*

The exact locations of elevated and depressed sections of the roadway and stormwater retention and detention basins will be determined during the final design phase of the project in keeping with standard FHWA and UDOT practice. As stated in the EIS, UDOT would coordinate with the utility companies during the final design phase of the project to ensure that utilities are properly maintained and that service disruption is minimized (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities).



- *The EIS fails to evaluate the numerous conflicts with smaller 12.5-kilovolt transmission lines.*

Due to the routine nature of relocating 12.5-kV distribution lines, Rocky Mountain Power decided to focus the coordination on the 138-kV and 345-kV transmission lines. UDOT recognizes that there are several locations where the 12.5-kV distribution lines will need to be relocated. These routine relocations will be coordinated with Rocky Mountain Power during the final design phase of the project, and UDOT anticipates that these 12.5-kV lines can be relocated within the footprint identified in the EIS (see Section 6.6.5.5, Public Services and Utilities).

- *The Southern Freeway Alternative presents crossing issues similar to those for the Salt Lake County crossings. The crossing angles proposed by UDOT will require the installation of larger and taller structures with associated visual impacts and the acquisition of additional right-of-way.*

In Utah County, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is the Preferred Roadway Alternative. If the Southern Freeway Alternative is selected, UDOT would work with Rocky Mountain Power to address any conflicts. Conflicts of the Southern Freeway Alternative with utilities have been included in the cost estimate for this alternative.

C. *Kern River Gas Transmission Company provided the following comments on the Draft EIS:*

- *Kern River commented that the direct and indirect impacts to Kern River's interstate gas transmission pipeline were neither quantified nor estimated. The direct and indirect costs of these impacts are likewise material to a full and fair evaluation of the alternatives. Kern River is concerned that portions of the EIS do not meet minimum standards or address significant resource concerns of Kern River, local officials, and members of the public.*

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The cost of the relocations and the associated environmental impacts has been included in the analysis for the MVC action alternatives to ensure a fair comparison of the alternatives. The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans.

- *Kern River commented that the EIS does not clearly define the impacts of each alternative. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have much greater impacts on Kern River facilities. The EIS should have considered*



the differences in cost and relocations of utilities between the two Salt Lake County alternatives. The EIS fails to address the direct impact to Kern River facilities but also the indirect impacts resulting from moving major utilities located in close proximity while maintaining service. The approach in the EIS does not satisfy the NEPA requirements to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives.

The right-of-way considered in the EIS for the MVC action alternatives includes the extra land needed for utility relocations. The cost of the relocations and the associated environmental impacts has been included in the analysis for the MVC action alternatives to ensure a fair comparison of the alternatives. The extra right-of-way was evaluated for its impacts to both the natural and built environments. The proposed relocation of the utilities is shown in Appendix A, Roadway Plans. UDOT will work with the utility companies to minimize service disruption during utility relocations.

- *Kern River commented that the EIS does not adequately compare the alternatives. NEPA regulations dictate that alternatives be evaluated in comparative form that sharply defines the issues and provides a clear basis for choice among alternatives. For example, the cost to relocate facilities associated with the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would not be less than \$64,300,000; in comparison, the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would not be less than \$17,400,000.*

As stated in the response directly above, the cost of relocating the utilities, including the extra right-of-way required and any associated relocations, was included in the analysis for each MVC action alternative to ensure a fair and equal comparison of the alternatives. The unit costs shown in the Draft EIS were costs provided by Kern River and were accurate as of 2004. In 2008, UDOT received an updated estimate from Kern River for their utility relocation costs, and this revised cost was used in the Final EIS. See Section 2.4.3, Cost, and Section 6.6.1, Methodology. Finally, UDOT will continue to work with Kern River to look for opportunities to minimize costs and impacts to Kern River's facilities associated with the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.

- *Kern River commented that UDOT did not involve all the necessary cooperating agencies and that the Draft EIS fails to meet Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and FHWA regulations. In order to relocate pipeline facilities as proposed in the Draft EIS, Kern River would need to receive FERC approval, which could take 2 years and involves a thorough review designed to satisfy NEPA. Kern River*



commented that FERC should have been a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS. As such, the EIS will not satisfy FERC certificate requirements.

UDOT did coordinate with Kern River during the development of the Draft EIS in meetings on the dates listed below:

- September 8, 2003
- July 21, 2004
- September 20, 2004
- December 13, 2004
- April 15, 2005
- January 25, 2006
- February 6, 2007
- July 25, 2007
- February 20, 2008
- May 12, 2008

UDOT will continue to coordinate with Kern River and, if necessary, FERC to ensure that all permit requirements are met before the project is constructed.

- *Kern River commented that UDOT should prepare and issue a revised Draft EIS which includes a cost-benefit analysis of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative versus the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. This should include the full cost of relocating all utilities. In addition, Kern River request that all of the comments raised be evaluated in any subsequent draft or final version of the EIS.*

The cost of relocating the utilities was included in the total cost of the MVC action alternatives. Because this cost was included in the Draft EIS, a revised Draft EIS is not necessary. The comments provided on the Draft EIS are presented in this chapter in the Final EIS. Also, under the CEQ regulations, a cost-benefit analysis is not required as part of an EIS.

- *UDOT has selected the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as the Preferred Alternative without full consideration of the impacts of disrupting the existing utility corridor. For this reason, Kern River prefers the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.*

An analysis of the utility impacts as well as impacts to the community was conducted in the EIS. Based on the analysis, UDOT identified the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Salt Lake County. The identification was based on close coordination



with the affected cities and the public and consultation with resource agencies. The cities in the MVC study area preferred the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, and the resource agencies felt that this alternative would have fewer impacts to wetlands and wildlife resources. The 5800 West Freeway Alternative also had fewer impacts to homes and farmland and had better overall transportation performance than the 7200 West Freeway Alternative.

35.7 Chapter 7 – Environmental Justice

- A. *Commenters stated that the tolling alternative would place a high burden on low-income communities.*

An evaluation of the impacts of tolling on environmental justice communities was conducted in Chapter 7, Environmental Justice. In summary, the available data show that toll facilities do not attract only moderate-income or high-income users and that the value of time is often as great a consideration as the actual cost (toll) associated with using a tolled facility. Residents of the area also have alternate options for traveling to their destinations. No disproportionately high and adverse effects on any environmental justice populations are expected as a result of a tolled MVC project. A tolled MVC would be used less than a similar but non-tolled alternative.

35.8 Chapter 8 – Transportation

- A. *Commenters stated that building a north-south project such as the MVC would increase congestion on existing east-west roads.*

As discussed in Chapter 8, Transportation, implementing the MVC roadway alternatives would reduce delay on east-west arterials in Salt Lake County by between 57% and 58% (daily hours of delay) compared to the No-Action Alternative. As part of the MVC EIS analysis, an origin-destination analysis was conducted. This analysis demonstrated that a large percentage of work trips (38%) in the MVC study area are heading northeast-southwest to and from the downtown Salt Lake City area. Because there are currently no major north-south roads in the study area, traffic first heads east-west in order to go north on I-15. The MVC project would provide a north-south connection to SR 201 and I-80, which would reduce traffic on east-west arterials in the MVC study area.



- B. *Commenters stated that, at MVC interchanges in Salt Lake County, the connecting arterial road would become more congested due to all of the traffic entering and exiting the highway. One example would be at the interchange with 6200 South and the MVC.*

Chapter 8, Transportation, evaluates how all of the roads in the study area would operate under the MVC action alternatives. Under the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, east-west roads that intersect the MVC at interchanges would have less congestion in the PM peak period than under the No-Action Alternative, except for California Avenue and 13400 South between 5600 West and Bangerter Highway. Under the 7200 West Freeway Alternative, east-west roads that intersect the MVC at interchanges would have less congestion in the PM peak period than under the No-Action Alternative, except for California Avenue, 2700 South, 3500 South, and 13400 South between 5600 West and Bangerter Highway.

- C. *A commenter stated that ending the freeway portion of the project at SR 73 under the 2100 North Freeway Alternative and Arterials Alternative would substantially increase congestion on Lehi Main Street and at the intersection of Lehi Main Street and Redwood Road.*

Chapter 8, Transportation, evaluates how all of the roads in the study area would operate under the MVC action alternatives. As discussed in the analysis, congestion levels in 2030 on Lehi Main Street from the MVC to I-15 would improve under the MVC action alternatives that end on Lehi Main Street compared to the No-Action Alternative. This is because traffic would be using the MVC instead of Lehi Main Street.

- D. *A commenter stated that the EIS did not address the effects of the MVC action alternatives on roads more distant than a fraction of a mile from the corridor and that secondary roads would have a substantial increase in traffic due to the MVC action alternatives.*

As discussed in Chapter 8, Transportation, the area evaluated for transportation impacts was the MVC study area, which includes a much greater area than a fraction of a mile from the action alternatives. This area is bounded on the west by the Oquirrh Mountains, on the east by Bangerter Highway, and on the north by I-80 in Salt Lake County; the area is bounded on the south by Utah Lake, on the west by the Eagle Mountain city limits, and on the east by I-15 in Utah County. As discussed in Chapter 8, traffic would decrease on most arterial streets as a result of the action alternatives compared to the No-Action Alternative because more traffic would use the MVC versus the arterial streets.



- E. *A commenter stated that, in Chapter 8, the 2003 long-range transportation plan is used as a basis for the draft document. MAG has completed updates for the year 2005 and the year 2007. Why are these not being used for this study?*

When the Draft EIS was prepared, the 2003 MAG long-range plan was used for development of the No-Action Alternative to describe the background road network. However, travel demand modeling was conducted using Version 5.0 of the regional travel demand model, which was released in 2005. The model was used to develop the results of the analysis and was based on the transportation plans in place at that time. UDOT has revised the analysis for the Final EIS using Version 6.0 (2007) of the travel demand model, which includes the current projects identified in the 2007 regional transportation plans. This version of the model is calibrated using recent traffic count information.

- F. *Lehi City commented that UTA said it would have an updated transit plan in August 2007 and that the plan should be incorporated into this document.*

As stated in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, UTA's August 2007 updated transit plan involved only changes to bus routes being considered by UTA. The changes to the bus routes would not change the results of the analysis in the EIS since no new routes were being added to the northern Utah County area considered in the analysis.

35.9 Chapter 9 – Economics

- A. *Commenters stated that property values will decrease in areas near the MVC action alternatives.*

Chapter 9, Economics, provides an overview of literature on the effects of a new highway on adjacent residential areas. Depending on the location of the residential area, there could be increased property values with improved access or a decrease in value if the residential area has increased noise levels as a result of the new road. The impact of highway noise on residential property values was demonstrated by Nelson (1982), who concluded that: (1) for every 1-dBA increase in noise, there is a corresponding reduction in residential property value of about 0.40%; (2) noise levels above 50 dBA to 60 dBA, or conversation levels, were considered most likely to cause intrusion, with resulting impacts to property values; and (3) it takes longer to sell a property near a highway (about 4 days longer on average) according to a realtor survey.

Being close to transit stations and stops would have beneficial impacts to adjacent properties and other properties close to the facilities. This proximity reduces transportation costs for nearby households and increases the visibility of and accessibility to adjacent businesses. In a survey of eight previous studies,



Diaz (1999) demonstrated a positive relationship between the proximity of rail transit and property values, particularly residential property values.

- B. *The Utah Trucking Association commented that the EIS fails to address how the growth of truck transportation on less-congested roads would support economic growth in the project area.*

Chapter 9, Economics, analyzes the benefit of less congestion on roads as a result of building the MVC. This analysis was based on user delay and showed, for example, that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would result in a reduction of 6.6 million hours of delay per year and an annual savings benefit of \$121 million compared to the No-Action Alternative. This savings benefit includes truck traffic. In addition, as noted in Chapter 9, Economics, in the Draft EIS:

An improved regional transportation system promotes commerce by moving goods and services more efficiently and by reducing production costs for all businesses, but particularly the businesses that depend the most on the transportation system. Though these cost reductions vary by the type of business, they could increase profitability and could lower the costs of these goods and services to consumers. Reduced consumer costs could increase the demand for these goods and services, which would encourage existing businesses to expand and encourage new businesses to locate in the region. Further, increased profitability encourages reinvestment in businesses in the project area.

- C. *The Utah Trucking Association and specific trucking companies oppose tolling and commented that the EIS should analyze the economic impact of trucks that would bypass the toll road. Trucking companies run on low profit margins and cannot afford tolls, and shippers will not pay the toll charge added to the freight bill. If tolls are added, this will cause trucks to use secondary roads and will increase the safety risk.*

Chapter 9, Economics, analyzes the economic impact of tolling based on user delay. As stated in the analysis, there would be less congestion on surface streets under the MVC roadway alternatives compared to the No-Action Alternative, which would benefit the trucking industry. The analysis showed, for example, that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative with tolling would result in an annual savings benefit of \$82 million in user delay compared to the No-Action Alternative. This savings benefit includes truck traffic.

Freeways have lower accident rates than arterial streets. By shifting traffic from arterial streets to a freeway, the MVC project could improve safety.



- D. *A commenter stated that the document claims that the largest employer in Utah County is Huckleberry's Restaurant with 600 employees. This is an obvious error, as there are larger employers such as the proposed Gehry development.*

Chapter 9, Economics, correctly states that Huckleberry's Restaurant is the largest existing employer in the economic impact analysis area. The other companies mentioned are outside the impact analysis area or are still proposed.

- E. *A commenter stated that home values discussed in the EIS appear to be based on 2003 levels. There have been substantial increases to home values in the past few years, and it would seem prudent to use current data here, especially when these values affect evaluations of impacts.*

The Final EIS has been updated to include 2005 median home values, which were the latest available at the time the Final EIS was prepared. Home values in the Draft EIS were based on the latest information at the time the Draft EIS was prepared. The changes in home values would not have an effect on the analysis between the alternatives evaluated in the EIS because all of the alternatives used the same median home values. An increase in the values would be reflected across all of the alternatives.

- F. *Lehi City commented that the economic impact analysis area is defined as the local municipalities, communities, and economic sectors that would likely be affected by construction and operation of the project. For the most part, the municipalities and communities are adjacent to the proposed alternatives. More analysis is required.*

The same economic analysis was conducted for each of the MVC action alternatives to provide a fair comparison between the alternatives. The analysis considered impacts to local revenue, property values, construction impacts, and impacts to commerce and employment so that the decision-maker could have enough information to make an informed decision. The economic impact analysis area included the cities and counties where there would be an MVC alternative and included data from Salt Lake and Utah Counties.

- G. *Lehi City asked why the analysis of Utah County assumed that all of the land in the cities is developed.*

The analysis of government revenue assumed that all of the land used for the roadway is or would be developed. If developed land is converted to a roadway use, the project would reduce future government revenues. Therefore, from the standpoint of estimating impacts on future government revenues, the assumption that all of the land was developed was a conservative assumption in that it could overstate the project's impact on government revenues. The analysis notes that



the actual impact to revenues could be less if some of the land affected by the project is not developed.

35.10 Chapter 10 – Joint Development

- A. *Lehi City commented that the joint development analysis regarding transit-oriented development is very thin and this opportunity was lost. Much more needs to be done in this section and throughout the document in this regard.*

The discussion in Chapter 10, Joint Development, focuses on how UDOT worked with the cities in developing potential transit station locations so that they could plan for transit-oriented development. Chapter 3, Growth Choices, explains how the cities were encouraged to change land uses to be more transit-oriented so that a major transit investment could be supported.

35.11 Chapter 11 – Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists

- A. *Commenters stated that pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be built either as part of the MVC project or in place of the project. Other comments wanted the MVC project to build a continuous bicycle path instead of the proposed discontinuous segments and said that the MVC trail should be coordinated with cities and developers.*

As discussed in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, a secondary objective of the MVC project is to support increased bicycle and pedestrian options. See Section 2.1.4.4, Other Considerations, for information about how the trail alignments were developed, and Section 2.2.2.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative, for the locations of the trail segments.

Three trail segments in Salt Lake County (4700 South to 7800 South, 11400 South to 12600 South, and 13400 South to the Utah County line) would be part of any of the action alternatives in Salt Lake County. These trails tie into major existing and proposed east-to-west trail segments in Salt Lake County to help form a connected trail system. These three segments would be Class 1 trails requiring between 12 feet and 50 feet of additional right-of-way. The uses associated with the proposed trail segments would be determined during the final design phase of the project. Overall, the proposed MVC trail would improve the connectivity of the regional trail system. UDOT would continue to coordinate with the local municipalities, private land owners, and other planning organizations during the final design phase of the project regarding the location



of the trail and to ensure that existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facility crossings are accommodated.

Finally, building only bicycle and pedestrian facilities instead of the proposed MVC action alternatives would not meet the purpose of the project of improving regional mobility for automobile, transit, and freight trips by reducing roadway congestion compared to the No-Action Alternative conditions on roadways.

- B. *The City of West Jordan commented that the EIS does not address the complex multiple-purpose trail system that runs west to east along all of the creeks and dry washes. In addition, the City of West Jordan stated that appropriate consideration is requested for access for the plan trailways under the highway including Bingham Creek in South Jordan.*

The EIS focused on major trails in the pedestrian and bicyclist impact analysis area. As stated in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, UDOT would continue to coordinate with the local municipalities and other planning organizations during the final design phase of the project to ensure that existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facility crossings are accommodated. The City of West Jordan was contacted in February 2008 to obtain updated trail information for the Final EIS. South and North Barney's Creek trails and the New Bingham Highway bicycle path were added to the analysis.

- C. *The City of West Jordan commented that, in [Table 11.4-2](#), Facility 56 has an incorrect trail description for the power corridor trail. It runs from 10200 South to 6600 South.*

[Table 11.4-2](#), Proposed Facilities in Salt Lake County within 0.5 Mile of the Proposed Alternatives, in the Final EIS has been revised as noted. See Section 11.4.2, Proposed Facilities.

- D. *A commenter stated that the EIS does not reflect canal and trail crossings across the MVC and that pedestrian and trail crossings should not be directed or channeled to major intersections such as 3500 South or 4500 South.*

As discussed in Chapter 11, Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists, a secondary objective of the MVC project is to support increased bicycle and pedestrian options. The EIS focused on major trails in the pedestrian and bicyclist impact analysis area based on data obtained from WFRC, county and city planning organizations, and other regional trail planning documents. The EIS lists the trails noted in these documents that would be crossed by the MVC but does specify how each trail would be accommodated. As stated in Chapter 11, UDOT would continue to coordinate with the local municipalities and other



planning organizations during the final design phase of the project to ensure that existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facility crossings are accommodated.

- E. *Lehi City commented that the pedestrian and bicyclist chapter analysis is thin, and it doesn't appear that much effort was exerted in the review. They also commented that the pedestrian and bicyclist impact analysis area of 0.5 mile on either side of the proposed alternatives is too small because people on bikes and on foot who originated trips outside of the 0.5-mile area would also be affected. Finally, they asked why the analysis relied on the 1996 Lehi Master Plan rather than the latest version (2004).*

The pedestrian and bicyclist analysis includes the potential impacts to known facilities in the pedestrian and bicyclist impact analysis area and provides an equal comparison between the MVC action alternatives. The analysis looked at all facilities within 0.5 mile of the MVC alternatives because those are the *facilities* that are likely to be directly affected. Although trips on trails could originate outside this area, the impact would still be on the trail next to the MVC project. Because the MVC project would preserve all current and future trails crossed by the proposed road, there would be no impacts to trail users or people originating trips from outside the impact analysis area.

The Final EIS has been updated to include information from the 2005 Lehi City Trail Plan.

35.12 Chapter 12 – Air Quality

35.12.1 Section 12.1 – General Air Quality

- A. *Commenters expressed concerns about the increase in air pollution from the MVC alternatives.*

The expected impacts to air quality are analyzed in Chapter 12, Air Quality. As stated in Chapter 12, none of the MVC alternatives would result in any federal or state air quality standard being exceeded, and all of the MVC alternatives would be in compliance with the carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan. UDOT expects that, with the MVC project (as a non-tolled facility), regional CO emissions in 2030 would be about 4% higher than under the No-Action Alternative, and regional PM₁₀ emissions would be less than 1% higher than under the No-Action Alternative. With the tolling option, the increase in CO and PM_{2.5} emissions would be less. See [Table 12.4-6](#), Regional Mesoscale Air Quality with the Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives in 2030. For the purpose of the Salt Lake County air quality analysis, “regional emissions” include emissions in Salt Lake County, and regional emissions for Utah County include Utah County.



- B. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would increase greenhouse gases.*

To date, no national standards have been established regarding greenhouse gases, and EPA has not established criteria or thresholds for assessing the potential impact of greenhouse gas emissions. The climate impacts of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions are global in nature, and analyzing how alternatives evaluated in an EIS might vary in their relatively small contribution to a global problem will not better inform decisions regarding the MVC project. Further, due to the interactions between elements of the transportation system as a whole, project-level emission analyses would be less informative than ones conducted at regional, state, or national levels. Nonetheless, for informational purposes, CO₂ emissions for the MVC alternatives have been included in the Final EIS. See [Table 12.4-9](#), Greenhouse Gas Emissions (All Alternatives). The CO₂ emission estimates are based on generalized emission rates from EPA and vehicle-miles traveled analyses used in the MVC traffic analyses. This analysis assumed that the MVC would be a non-tolled facility.

FHWA is actively engaged in many activities with the U.S. Department of Transportation Center for Climate Change and Environmental Forecasting to develop strategies to reduce the contribution of greenhouse gases from transportation projects, especially CO₂ emissions, and to assess the risks to transportation systems and services from climate change. FHWA will continue to pursue these efforts to address this issue. FHWA will review and update its approach to climate change at both the project and policy levels as more information emerges and as policies and legal requirements evolve.

- C. *EPA requested that a windrose figure be inserted in the EIS so that nearby residents can visualize the frequency with which they are downwind from the MVC.*

An additional figure is not necessary to characterize winds in the vicinity of the proposed MVC. The predominant winds in the vicinity of the project corridor are out of the north and northwest about 40% of the year and out of the south and southwest about 37% of the year. The predominant winds generally follow the north-south orientation of the MVC corridor.

- D. *EPA commented, “A discussion of greenhouse gases should be included. Recent court cases suggest that EISs, even if they reduce greenhouse gas emissions, should address this issue. Where possible, please disclose any energy reduction efforts/technologies or other emission-reduction strategies that have been, or could be, considered for this project.”*

As stated in Response B on page 35-100 of this section, no national standards have been established for greenhouse gas emissions. Modeling greenhouse gases,



including CO₂, and assessing the impacts associated with an increase in greenhouse gas emissions at the project level are not currently possible. However, FHWA has been working with EPA on specific analysis to include in EIS regarding greenhouse gas emissions. The Final EIS has been revised to include a more detailed discussion of greenhouse gases based on this coordination. See Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative, including [Table 12.4-9](#), Greenhouse Gas Emissions (All Alternatives).

E. *EPA commented, “The Office of the Federal Environmental Executive released a new Executive Order on January 24, 2007, entitled, ‘Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management’ (Executive Order 13423), which requires, among other things, that all federal agencies:*

- *Reduce energy intensity 30% by 2015*
- *Reduce greenhouse gas emissions through energy savings by 3% annually or 30% by 2015*
- *Build Performance: Construct or renovate buildings in accordance with sustainability strategies, including resource conservation, reduction, and use; citing [sic]; and indoor environmental quality.”*

The requirements of Executive Order 13423 do not apply to this project. The goals of Executive Order 13423 apply to federal agencies (not individual transportation projects) and how they conduct their day-to-day activities to meet the environmental and energy efficiency goals of the Executive Order.

For example, the Executive Order directs the head of each agency by the end of fiscal year 2015 to improve energy efficiency by 30% over baseline energy use in fiscal year 2003. Similarly, for those agencies with at least 20 motor vehicles, the Executive Order requires that each agency reduce the vehicle fleet’s total consumption of petroleum products by 2% annually through the end of 2015.

The following Web sites have additional information about the objectives and goals of Executive Order 13423:

ofee.gov/eo/EO_13423.pdf

ofee.gov/eo/EO_13423FactSheet.pdf

ofee.gov/eo/eo13423_instructions.pdf

F. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented, “A new north-south freeway will encourage more traffic, resulting in increased air pollution, which is a growing problem along the Wasatch Front and one that our governor has determined is one of his top three priorities to address during his term. A new freeway would not support this initiative to clean up our air and, in fact, would do the opposite and make the problem worse. A special concern is the*



proximity of several schools to the proposed road and the negative health impacts on schoolchildren who would breathe dirtier air.”

The expected impacts to air quality are analyzed in Chapter 12, Air Quality. With the MVC action alternatives (assuming a non-tolled facility), regional vehicle-miles traveled would increase by less than 4% compared to the No-Action Alternative in 2030. See [Table 12.4-6](#), Regional Mesoscale Air Quality with the Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives in 2030. As stated in Chapter 12, none of the MVC alternatives would result in any federal or state air quality standard being exceeded, and all of the MVC action alternatives would be in compliance with the CO and PM₁₀ emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan. See Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative. UDOT expects that, with the MVC project (assuming a non-tolled facility), regional CO emissions in 2030 would be about 4% higher than under the No-Action Alternative, and regional PM₁₀ emissions would be less than 1% higher than under the No-Action Alternative. See [Table 12.4-6](#). However, even with a substantial increase in vehicle-miles traveled compared to 2006 conditions (a more than 50% increase in 2030), CO, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and total PM emissions would decrease in 2030 due to improvements in vehicle emission-control technologies. As described in Section 12.4.5, Mitigation Measures, UDOT has committed to establishing an air quality working group and implementing an air quality monitoring program and an air quality mitigation program to evaluate emissions along the MVC.

- G. Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that recent court decisions have indicated that agencies are now obligated to consider the climate change implications of their decisions under NEPA and other statutes.*

See Response D on page 35-100 of this section. Climate change impacts have now been addressed in Chapter 12, Air Quality, as suggested by EPA in its Draft EIS comments, which were based in part on recent court decisions.

- H. The Utah Division of Air Quality commented that an Approval Order will be required for construction activities that involve rock-crushing plants, asphalt plants, or concrete batch plants. In addition, the MVC project would likely require a fugitive-dust-control plan.*

Prior to construction of the MVC project, all appropriate air quality permits will be obtained by the construction contractors.

35.12.2 Section 12.2 – Conformity

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.



35.12.3 Section 12.3 – Carbon Monoxide and Particulate Matter

- A. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that WFRC anticipates that Salt Lake and Utah Counties will fail to meet the new PM_{2.5} requirements during the next metropolitan planning organization (MPO) transportation planning cycle when the new standards go into effect. The MVC and its future vehicle traffic should be accountable under the new PM_{2.5} standard to determine if the MVC will generate future violations.*

When the Draft EIS was published in October 2007, it acknowledged that parts of Salt Lake and Utah Counties would likely be designated as non-attainment areas for PM_{2.5}. On December 18, 2007, Utah proposed three areas for designation as PM_{2.5} non-attainment areas:

- Northern Wasatch Front, including all of Salt Lake and Davis Counties and portions of Weber County
- Utah Valley, including most of Utah County
- Most of the Cache Valley in northern Utah

Based on the state recommendations, EPA intends to make official attainment and non-attainment designations by December 2009, and those designations would become effective in April 2010.

If these areas are designated as non-attainment areas for PM_{2.5}, WFRC and MAG will need to demonstrate that projects such as the MVC meet the PM_{2.5} project-level conformity requirements 1 year after the effective date of non-attainment designations.

Project-level conformity determinations would be required after the 1-year grace period for new non-attainment areas expires, which would be expected in April 2011 for PM_{2.5}. Project-level conformity requirements already apply in the MVC project area for CO and PM₁₀, and the Record of Decision for the MVC will include a project-level conformity determination for these two pollutants.

Since additional federal approvals for this project are expected after April 2011, conformity will eventually apply to this project (assuming that the area is designated non-attainment for PM_{2.5}), and UDOT will comply with whatever PM_{2.5} conformity requirements apply at that time.

A PM_{2.5} discussion was included in the Draft EIS following the approach described in the March 29, 2006, EPA and FHWA guidance, *Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analysis in PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ Non-attainment and Maintenance Areas*. See Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West



Freeway Alternative. FHWA has not yet released guidance on how to address the revised PM_{2.5} standard in NEPA documents.

- B. *Moms for Clean Air and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment commented that PM_{2.5} is of particular concern. These groups stated that PM_{2.5} is among the most health-threatening types of emissions and can penetrate deep into the lungs and pass into the bloodstream. Studies show that it can increase cancer risk, fatal heart attacks, strokes, and respiratory diseases. Therefore, UDOT has an obligation to fully consider this evidence and disclose to the public the adverse health effects of emissions from the highway.*

FHWA and UDOT recognize the implications of vehicle emissions on public health. The potential health effects associated with vehicle emissions were acknowledged in the EIS and based on the best available information to date (see Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative)

In July 2006, EPA released a survey and assessment of more than 700 studies on the health effects of particulate matter exposure. EPA concluded that the survey and provisional assessment of new studies “does not materially change any of the broad scientific conclusions regarding the health effects of PM exposure made in the 2004 PM AQCD [Air Quality Criteria Document]” (EPA 2006, 38).

In addition, FHWA has considered recent studies issued since July 2006, including those cited by the commenters, such as the Gauderman study published in early 2007. FHWA has concluded that these studies expand the scientific literature concerning the effects of air pollutants near roads but do not represent new information that fundamentally alters the previous assessment of the potential health impacts of MSATs. For additional information, see Response A of Section 35.12.4 below.

35.12.4 Section 12.4 – Mobile-Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

- A. *Commenters expressed concerns about the increase in air pollution from the MVC alternatives and the health effects of the pollutants. Specifically, one comment noted that “scientific studies have shown that children living near freeways are at extreme risk for severe health problems. For instance, children living within 250 yards from a freeway are 8 times more likely to develop leukemia and 6 times more likely to develop other cancers. In addition, children living within 500 meters from a freeway are at the highest risk for permanent lung deformities. The proposed eight-lane freeway for the MVC would travel along 5800 West in Salt Lake County. It will place several neighborhoods and schools in this deadly zone near this new freeway.” Utahns for Better Transportation, the Sierra Club, Utah Moms for Clean Air, and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment commented that there is a very strong correlation of*



severe health problems associated with people living near high-volume roads (freeways). Some of the increased health risks include cancer (leukemia), asthma, respiratory illness, premature and low-weight births, heart disease, and stroke. These groups commented that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative is a “significant impact” to public health, and the lack of analysis is a violation of NEPA. Numerous peer-reviewed studies were referenced in the comment on the health effects of roads on nearby populations. In addition, the comment from Utah Moms for Clean Air attached a statement from Dr. John Balbus, Health Program Director for the Environmental Defense Fund, dated April 10, 2006, which reviewed the scientific literature and recommended performing a localized analysis of the impacts of fine particulate matter and a health risk assessment for MSATs.

EPA is the lead federal agency for administering the Clean Air Act and has specific responsibilities for determining the health effects of MSATs. On March 29, 2001, EPA issued a Final Rule on Controlling Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources (66 Federal Register 17229). In its rule, EPA examined the impacts of existing and newly promulgated mobile-source control programs, including its reformulated gasoline program, its national low-emission vehicle standards, its Tier 2 motor vehicle emissions standards and gasoline sulfur-control requirements, and its proposed heavy-duty engine and vehicle standards and on-highway diesel fuel sulfur-control requirements. Between 2000 and 2020, FHWA expects that, even with a 64% increase in vehicle-miles traveled, these programs will reduce on-highway emissions of benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde by 57% to 65% and will reduce on-highway diesel particulate emissions by 87%.

Evaluating the environmental and health impacts of MSATs from a proposed highway project would involve several key considerations, including emissions modeling, dispersion modeling to estimate ambient concentrations resulting from the estimated emissions, exposure modeling to estimate human exposure to the estimated concentrations, and then a final determination of health impacts based on the estimated exposure. Each of these steps is limited by technical shortcomings or scientific uncertainty that prevents a more complete determination of the health impacts of MSATs from the MVC project.

Because of these uncertainties, a quantitative assessment of the effects of MSATs on human health cannot be made at the project level. Although available tools do allow for reasonable predictions of relative emission changes between alternatives for large projects, the amount of MSAT emissions from each of the project alternatives and MSAT concentrations or exposures created by each of the project alternatives cannot be predicted with enough accuracy to be useful for estimating health impacts.



A summary of the potential health impacts associated with MSATs was included in the EIS. In addition, a comparative analysis of MSAT emissions was conducted for the MVC alternatives that showed the differences in MSAT emissions between the No-Action Alternative and the action alternatives (see [Table 12.4-8](#), Mobile-Source Air Toxics Emissions from the Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives in 2030, and [Table 12.4-12](#), Mobile-Source Air Toxics Emissions from the Utah County Alternatives in 2030, in Chapter 12, Air Quality). The comparative analysis also showed a reduction in MSAT emissions between 2006 and 2030 for all alternatives. Because MSAT emissions will be lower in the future, the potential health impacts from MSAT emissions in the air quality impact analysis area are likely to be less in the future regardless of the alternative selected for the MVC project.

Many of issues raised in these comments regarding both fine particulate matter and MSATs were addressed recently by FHWA in response to a request for supplemental NEPA analysis on another project (the Intercounty Connector). That response includes technical analyses by FHWA experts of the recent scientific literature as well as the capability and limitations of existing air quality and health risk assessment methods. That response also addressed the statement of Dr. John Balbus. As stated in that response, FHWA has concluded, based on the advice of its experts, that, while the scientific literature concerning the effects of air pollutants near roads continues to expand, it does not yet represent new information that fundamentally alters the previous assessment of the potential health impacts of MSATs. In addition, FHWA has concluded, based on the advice of its experts, that current techniques are not capable of providing a quantitative health risk assessment for road projects for use in the NEPA process. See the memorandum from Daniel W. Johnson to Nelson J. Castellano dated October 5, 2007 (Environmental Reevaluation: Environmental Defense/Sierra Club Petition for a Supplemental EIS). A copy of this memorandum has been included in the MVC project file.

To better assess the possible health impacts of air pollution and air quality effects near roads, FHWA is working with the Health Effects Institute to assess current literature that could serve as the basis for future assessments under NEPA.

As described in Section 12.4.5, Mitigation Measures, UDOT has committed to establishing an air quality working group and implementing an air quality monitoring program and air quality mitigation program to evaluate emissions along the MVC.

- B. *The Utah Trucking Association commented that the EIS inadequately addresses the impacts of trucks as major users of the MVC. The association states that the claims of harmful emissions from trucks are not backed up by scientific or*



medical proof. In addition, EPA has mandated new diesel engines for trucks, and this mandate has reduced tailpipe emissions. The reduction in tailpipe emissions should be included in the EIS.

The EIS analysis includes the reduction of diesel engine emissions over the next 20 years. As stated in Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative, “Between 2000 and 2020, FHWA projects that, even with a 64% increase in vehicle-miles traveled, these programs will reduce on-highway emissions of benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde by 57% to 65% and will reduce on-highway diesel particulate emissions by 87%.” These reductions were factored into the future-year modeling analyses included in the EIS.

- C. *EPA commented regarding the MSAT analysis, “EPA acknowledges the emissions inventory conducted for all alternatives in both counties. This inventory indicates minor emission differences between the action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. However, given the serious health impacts of MSATs, EPA recommends that the Final EIS include a table of all sensitive receptors in close proximity or within the project area of the freeway or arterials. Impacts from construction near these receptors should be considered in the development of best management practices.”*

Chapter 6, Community Impacts, provides a general overview of schools, community facilities, and recreation facilities within 0.5 mile of the project alternatives. This chapter also explains which facilities would be adjacent to the alignments. Chapter 21, Construction Impacts, discusses the best management practices that would be used to reduce air emissions during construction. These practices include developing a fugitive dust emission-control plan; street sweeping; shutting off equipment when it is not in use; using newer, cleaner-emitting equipment; rerouting truck traffic away from schools when possible; and using alternate engines and fuels that reduce hazardous emissions. The chapter also recommends that any diesel equipment should meet EPA’s 2007 regulations.

- D. *EPA commented that they have “significant concerns about the MSAT language used in the Draft EIS. Other comments from Region 8 have also reflected this position. We will schedule a meeting within the next month to facilitate further discussions regarding the EPA’s position on MSATs.”*

The MSAT discussion included in the EIS was consistent with FHWA’s *Interim Guidance on Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents* (February 2006). In response to this comment, FHWA met with EPA Region 8 on March 5, 2008, to discuss EPA’s concerns regarding the MSAT language in the EIS. Discussions between FHWA and EPA are ongoing regarding potential updates to the interim guidance. However, at this time, the interim guidance remains in effect.



Therefore, the MSAT discussion in the Final EIS continues to follow the recommendations in the interim guidance.

- E. This comment number is not used.
- F. *Utahns for Better Transportation, the Sierra Club, Utah Moms for Clean Air, and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment commented that there are several known quantitative factors involving concentrated freeway air pollution health impacts, such as projected traffic volumes, speeds, populations, distances from schools and homes, etc. This significant public health threat requires an in-depth quantitative analysis and risk assessment. Given the serious potential impacts to health documented in the above-cited studies, the Draft EIS treatment of localized air toxics and other air pollution impacts on schools and other locations is cursory and unacceptable. NEPA requires that all reasonably foreseeable impacts of project alternatives be evaluated and disclosed fully, so that the decision agencies, other affected decision-makers, and the public at large can make fully informed choices. Contrary to the assertion in the Draft EIS, sound methods are available to evaluate and to disclose these impacts, and to compare them to the impacts of transit-first alternatives. NEPA therefore requires that these analyses and effects be performed and disclosed fully.*

See Response A on page 35-104 of Section 35.12.4.

- G. *A commenter stated that an air filtration system should be installed on schools adjacent to the roadway to make sure that any problems with air quality do not adversely affect students.*

The expected impacts to air quality are analyzed in Chapter 12, Air Quality. As stated in Chapter 12, none of the MVC alternatives would result in any federal or state air quality standard being exceeded, and all of the MVC alternatives would be in compliance with the carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan.

A summary of the potential health impacts associated with MSATs was included in the EIS. In addition, a comparative analysis of MSAT emissions was conducted for the MVC alternatives that showed the differences in MSAT emissions between the No-Action Alternative and the action alternatives. The comparative analysis also showed a reduction in MSAT emissions between 2006 and 2030 for all alternatives. Because MSAT emissions will be lower in the future, the potential health impacts from MSAT emissions in the air quality impact analysis area are likely to be less in the future regardless of the alternative selected for the MVC project. To better assess the possible health impacts of air pollution and air quality effects near roads, FHWA is working with the Health Effects Institute to assess current literature that could serve as the basis for future



assessments under NEPA. As described in Section 12.4.5, Mitigation Measures, UDOT has committed to establishing an air quality working group and implementing an air quality monitoring program and an air quality mitigation program to evaluate emissions along the MVC. The mitigation program includes UDOT providing \$3,100,000 in funding for air filters in the following schools: Hunter High, Hillside Elementary, Whittier Elementary, West Valley Elementary, and Hunter Junior High. Pending approval by the Granite School District, filters will be placed before construction of the Phase 1 project in the area adjacent to these schools. Funds are to cover placement of filtration systems and ongoing maintenance until the funds are depleted.

UDOT's agreement to provide funding for this Mitigation Program does not represent, and should not be construed as, a determination by UDOT that the MVC or any other road will cause measurable adverse health effects on populations near the road. UDOT is providing these mitigation funds in recognition of the potential for adverse health effects, not because UDOT has identified a definitive causal linkage.

H. Utah Moms for Clean Air and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment commented that the EIS fails to evaluate the economic costs related to the health effects of the freeway, and these costs should be considered in the decision process.

The EIS provides a comparison of the MSAT emissions between the action alternatives. As shown in [Table 12.4-8](#), Mobile-Source Air Toxics Emissions from Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives in 2030, there are small differences in MSAT emissions between the Salt Lake County action alternatives. [Table 12.4-8](#) also shows that MSAT emissions will be substantially lower in 2030 for all alternatives compared to 2006 emission levels.

The land uses adjacent to the Salt Lake County action alternatives are similar and are a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional land uses. Although there are several schools directly adjacent to the 5800 West Freeway Alternative, any economic health cost analysis that might be prepared would not show substantial differences between the alternatives because the alternatives are surrounded by similar residential land uses and would have similar MSAT emissions.

Finally, it would be difficult to predict any health impacts and the associated cost of those impacts when there are no established criteria for evaluating MSAT emissions and no definitive studies on the health effects at specific distances from the pollution source. The EIS states that some studies show a link between MSATs and health impacts but notes that there are scientific uncertainties in the data, which limits the ability to evaluate adverse health impacts. Without a



consensus on how to evaluate the impacts, it would be speculative to develop an economic cost associated with potential health impacts. In the absence of such information, the EIS evaluated potential health impacts according to CEQ's regulation at 40 CFR 1502.22 for evaluating impacts when information is incomplete or unavailable (see Section 12.4.3.2, 5800 West Freeway Alternative).

- I. *Lehi City commented that the MVC must be included in the MAG regional transportation plan in order to be built in an air quality maintenance area or non-attainment area. The transportation plan must conform to the State Implementation Plan. The EIS does not address the issue that the MVC is not in the MAG regional transportation plan.*

The following text is included on pages 12-14 and 12-15 in Chapter 12, Air Quality, in the Draft EIS and is also included in Section 12.4.1.1, Mesoscale Evaluations for Regional Air Quality.

Regional conformity analyses are conducted by the appropriate metropolitan planning organization (in this case, WFRC for Salt Lake County and MAG for Utah County) as part of the conformity determinations of the transportation plans and transportation improvement programs. Both WFRC and MAG have included the MVC project as a "regionally significant" project in their most recent transportation conformity analyses.

Salt Lake County. The most recent mesoscale evaluation for Salt Lake County is the *Conformity Analysis for the WFRC 2030 Regional Transportation Plan* (WFRC 2007). This conformity analysis found that the regionally significant transportation projects included in the analysis would conform to the CO and PM₁₀ emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan. The plan included the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and was approved by FHWA on June 27, 2007.

Utah County. The most recent mesoscale evaluation for Utah County is the *Conformity Determination Report: Mountainland MPO [Metropolitan Planning Organization] 2030 Regional Transportation Plan* (MAG 2007). This conformity analysis found that the regionally significant projects included in the analysis would conform to the PM₁₀ emission budgets in the State Implementation Plan. The plan included a freeway alignment for the Mountain View Corridor project alternative (a north-south alignment from the Salt Lake County line to SR 73) (Regional Transportation Plan Project No. 12) and an east-west alignment from Saratoga Springs to Lehi (Regional Transportation Plan Project No. 13). The conformity determination for the MAG 2030 Regional Transportation Plan was approved by FHWA on June 27, 2007.



35.13 Chapter 13 – Noise

- A. *Commenters stated that noise levels will increase and that noise barriers should be considered to reduce noise levels. Other commenters wanted to know what is the process for considering noise mitigation and where would noise walls be located. Other comments asked how was topography taken into account in the modeling process.*

Chapter 13, Noise, includes an evaluation of potential noise barriers for the MVC action alternatives and includes the locations where noise walls would meet UDOT's criteria for implementing noise walls during project construction. This analysis included the local topography and whether the alternative was depressed (below ground) or at ground level. Depressed freeway sections have reduced noise levels. Note that UDOT would not construct noise walls for new developments that are platted or built after the EIS for the MVC project is completed or for undeveloped parcels.

As stated in Chapter 13, noise levels would increase in areas adjacent to the MVC action alternatives. According to UDOT's Noise-Abatement Policy (UDOT 08A2-1), noise abatement will be considered for new highway construction where noise impacts are identified. The two relevant criteria to consider when identifying and evaluating noise-abatement measures are feasibility and reasonableness. Noise abatement will be provided by UDOT only if UDOT determines that noise-abatement measures are *both* feasible and reasonable according to UDOT's noise-abatement policy.

In order to determine whether affected residents want noise-abatement measures to be implemented at locations that meet the criteria, UDOT will conduct a survey of residents before building any noise-abatement measures. To conduct the survey, UDOT will send a ballot to the current owner of record for each residence that is determined to be affected by the project and that would benefit from noise abatement. Each ballot will be marked with the deadline by which the ballot must be returned. UDOT will send these ballots by regular mail and will consider this due diligence in notifying the affected residents of possible noise-abatement measures in their area.

Noise abatement will be recommended only if 75% of the following groups of residents and land owners vote, through balloting, in favor of the abatement:

- Front-row (adjacent) residences
- Residences that would be affected by the project and would benefit from noise abatement



The denominator used to calculate this percentage will be the total number of completed ballots returned. At least 50% of the total number of mailed ballots must be returned for UDOT to determine whether noise-abatement measures are desired by residents and land owners. If less than 50% of the mailed ballots are returned, then noise-abatement measures will not be considered.

- B. *Commenters stated that noise walls should be considered with the 5600 West Transit Alternative.*

Chapter 13, Noise, provides an analysis of noise impacts from the 5600 West Transit Alternative. The 5600 West roadway is a well-traveled transportation corridor with average daily traffic volumes ranging from about 21,000 to 45,000 vehicles per day, depending on location. The traffic on 5600 West results in higher average noise levels at residential developments near the road. The operation of a center-running, light-rail transit system with two cars per train operating at about 30 mph (miles per hour) would have a minor impact on noise levels along 5600 West. Because there would be no moderate or severe impacts from the 5600 West Transit Alternative according to Federal Transit Authority noise guidance, no mitigation would be required.

- C. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would increase noise levels at schools located next to the alternatives and would affect students.*

Chapter 13, Noise, provides an analysis of noise impacts from the MVC action alternatives. Noise levels at schools adjacent to any MVC action alternative would increase. Those schools adjacent to the 5800 West Freeway Alternative such as Hillside Elementary School and Hunter High School would have noise levels between 70 dBA and 75 dBA. For people outside, this noise level would be considered intrusive. Hearing damage typically starts to occur for people exposed to noise levels of 85 dBA for an 8-hour period. Noise barrier 5 would reduce noise impacts along Hunter High School and Hillside Elementary School.

- D. *A commenter stated that the Salt Lake County alternatives are under the flight path to the Salt Lake City International Airport, and the combined noise impact of the MVC action alternatives and aircraft should be evaluated.*

Forty noise measurements were taken throughout the noise impact analysis area over several weeks to characterize the existing noise environment. If there were aircraft overflights during the monitoring period, noise from the aircraft would have been reflected in the measured noise levels and included in the noise model. In addition, traffic noise would be a more constant, nearby noise source that would contribute more to the overall noise environment than aircraft noise would.



- E. *The City of West Jordan stated that the locations for the noise analysis were inadequate, and more points of study should be included.*

Noise monitoring was conducted throughout the noise impact analysis area at key sensitive receptors to identify the general noise conditions in the noise impact analysis area. These general conditions were applied to similar land-use types. The noise impacts for the MVC project looked at the entire corridor and analyzed the noise impact at all adjacent sensitive receptors. Once final design of the project is complete, additional and more-detailed noise analysis will be conducted along the alignment, and the potential noise-abatement locations will be updated.

- F. *Lehi City asked why and how the noise sampling sites were selected. It does not appear that noise was sampled in the Jordan River Parkway, which one would assume would have a low existing decibel level and a large increase once it is traversed by a freeway.*

Noise monitoring was conducted throughout the noise impact analysis area at key sensitive receptors to identify the general noise conditions in the noise impact analysis area. These general conditions were applied to similar land-use types. For example, the background conditions at the residential areas along 2100 North were assumed to be those of a typical suburban neighborhood, and the background conditions around the Jordan River were assumed to be those of an undeveloped area. As stated in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, the project would increase noise levels by over 10 dBA at the Jordan River and would change the quiet nature of the recreational activities of biking, jogging, and nature observation at the parkway.

- G. *Lehi City commented that there is insufficient detail regarding noise impacts at 2100 North, and this alternative was not reviewed in the same manner as others, such as by segment. There appears to be no Jordan River Parkway data.*

All of the alternatives were analyzed using the same methodology. As stated in Chapter 13, Noise, the noise impacts to areas near the other segments of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative (from the Utah County line to SR 73) would be the same as those from the Southern Freeway Alternative. This area was divided into two segments. The 2100 North east-west freeway alignment was analyzed as one segment in a similar manner as the Southern Freeway Alternative segment from SR 73 to I-15. The noise analysis for the Jordan River was included in Chapter 6, Community Impacts, under the recreation analysis. The analysis concluded that the project would increase noise levels at the Jordan River by over 10 dBA and would change the quiet nature of the recreational activities of biking, jogging, and nature observation at the parkway.

35.14 Chapter 14 – Water Quality

- A. *EPA commented that the MVC project cannot further impair a Clean Water Act 303(d)-listed water body. Portions of the Jordan River within the project area are 303(d)-listed waters. Where stormwater discharges from the project and enters portions of the Jordan River from the Jordan Narrows to Bluffdale, the project would contribute to the existing water quality impairment for temperature and phosphorous. Both new impervious surfaces and detention ponds will increase the temperature of discharges to the Jordan River. In the absence of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) analysis, UDOT must demonstrate that mitigation could be implemented that would reduce temperature and phosphorous loadings to the Jordan River from the existing condition or else the construction of new impervious surfaces cannot be permitted due to the potential water quality impacts. Options available include infiltration galleries (provided they don't affect shallow drinking water wells), use of detention vaults, rain gardens, bioswales, porous concrete retrofits for the nearby parking areas, downspout disconnection retrofits, green roof retrofits, etc. There are also numerous options and numerous models available for calculating the existing vs. post-construction loading. EPA recommends using impervious surfaces wherever possible and resolving the mitigation issue by the time the Final EIS is published.*

The Utah Division of Water Quality has requested a TMDL analysis for the Jordan River. The 303(d)-listed area of the Jordan River that is impaired with regard to temperature is in the upstream part of the river between the Jordan Narrows and Bluffdale. This segment does not meet the numeric temperature criterion for beneficial-use classification 3A (classified to protect cold-water fish). Because the TMDL analysis is currently in progress, the cause of the elevated temperature in this segment of the river is not known. The final TMDL analysis will determine the cause of the elevated temperature and what mitigation, if any, will be required.

According to the TMDL analysis in progress, the temperature of the Jordan River decreases as it flows downstream through the urbanized areas of northern Utah County and Salt Lake County. This suggests that stormwater runoff (both natural and urban runoff) might help lower the temperature in the river. The TMDL analysis indicates that the average summer temperature in this section of the Jordan River is about 71.6 °F (degrees Fahrenheit), which is above the temperature criterion for beneficial-use classification 3A (68 °F).

The segment of the Jordan River between the Jordan Narrows and Bluffdale has exceeded the temperature criterion for beneficial-use classification 3A only during the hottest part of the year (July and August). At this time of year, this part of the river is at its lowest flow levels because most of the water that enters

the river from Utah Lake is diverted into irrigation canals. Additionally, Utah has experienced moderate to severe drought for most of the last decade, and this has also reduced the amount of flow in the river. The TMDL analysis will determine whether the violations of the temperature criterion were caused by the drought conditions.

It is also important to note that the segment of the river from Utah Lake to the Jordan Narrows is classified to protect warm-water fish (3B), but the segment from the Jordan Narrows to Bluffdale is classified to protect cold-water fish (3A). Given that much of the water in the river is being diverted to irrigation facilities and no perennial cold-water streams enter the river between Utah Lake and the Narrows, it might be impossible for both segments to meet their temperature criteria at the same time. Because of this, the result of the TMDL analysis could be a reclassification of this segment of the river.

The literature generally finds that the first inch of precipitation from a storm has a higher temperature as runoff than does later precipitation because it absorbs heat from the air and from pavement. After the first inch of precipitation has fallen, pavements and air temperatures have cooled enough that they don't increase the temperature of stormwater runoff. Temperature impairment is a new focus of best management practices (BMPs) for stormwater, and the research on temperature impairment is new as well. Because of this, there is no research available for this part of the country. However, studies at North Carolina State University indicate that runoff temperatures don't continue to increase beyond the first inch of runoff. This 1-inch (or "first-flush") rule also applies to most other pollutants that are commonly associated with stormwater runoff including oil and grease, phosphorus, nitrogen, and suspended solids. Coincidentally, the 1-year storm in this area has a precipitation depth of 1.06 inches, so stormwater BMPs can be designed to accommodate the 1-year storm.

A simple heat-balance calculation ($Q_1T_1 + Q_2T_2 = Q_3T_3$) shows that, in order for the flow coming out of the detention basin on the west side of the Jordan River along the 2100 North Freeway Alternative to increase the temperature in the Jordan River by 0.5% (0.36 °F), the outflow of the detention basin would have to be at least 84 °F. Based on the characteristics of the drainage system for this detention basin, it is very unlikely that the outflow from this detention basin would reach this temperature. This conclusion is based on the following factors:

- Stormwater on the roadway will sheet-flow off the asphalt quickly (within about 5 minutes) to vegetated side slopes and ditches or will be captured in inlets and buried pipes. Both the vegetated ditches and side slopes help reduce the temperature of the runoff before it enters the detention basins. Buried pipes have been shown to reduce runoff



temperatures by as much as 10 °F when water passes through as little as 550 feet of pipe.

- The first inch of precipitation (first flush) is the highest-temperature urban runoff, but since the detention basin is designed to detain much higher flows, the first flush drains out through the culvert at the bottom of the basin fairly quickly. For a 1-year storm, the detention basin would be completely drained within 6 hours from the beginning of the storm. During this short period of time, solar radiation would not significantly heat the stormwater in the detention basin.
- Finally, during the summer months, the largest storms along the Wasatch Front are short-duration, high-intensity thunderstorms. These storms generally occur in the evening, which makes it even more unlikely that stormwater would be heated in the detention basins.

Because of these factors, the outflow from the detention basin would likely be 75 °F to 80 °F. These temperatures would increase the temperature of the Jordan River by a very small amount (from 71.7 °F to 71.8 °F).

Note that these calculations ignore the effects of the storm itself on the Jordan River base flows and assume a constant base flow rate of 400 cubic feet per second. In reality, during a large storm, runoff from adjacent parcels and natural drainage channels would increase the flow of the Jordan River, which would further reduce the effects of highway stormwater runoff on the overall temperature of the river. Additionally, almost all of the detention basins along the MVC will drain into smaller, intermittent streams, not directly into the Jordan River. Because of this, the intermittent streams would help to reduce the temperature of the outflow from the detention basins before the outflow reaches the Jordan River. The only basins that would drain directly into the Jordan River are those along the Utah County alternatives where they cross the Jordan River.

If the final Jordan River TMDL analysis determines that additional BMPs should be used to mitigate these potential small increases in temperature, any of the BMPs mentioned in the analysis would likely be effective. Infiltration galleries, detention vaults (underground detention facilities), and rain gardens would provide the most measurable impact, since these BMPs would be directly related to project runoff. Any of these BMPs could be incorporated into the detention basin design so that the first-flush volumes would be treated in the rain garden or infiltration basin and the additional water of the larger storms would be detained.

Rain gardens have also been shown to decrease phosphorous levels in stormwater as long as the infiltration rates of the basin are greater than 1 inch per hour and the phosphorous index in the infiltration soil is between 10 and 30. Infiltration



soil with a phosphorous index greater than 30 can increase the phosphorous levels in the outflow. Phosphorus is considered a pollution indicator, not an impairment constituent, unless a linkage analysis has been performed that defines the cause-and-effect relationship between water quality targets and pollutant sources. This has not yet been established for the Jordan River, and therefore the river is not impaired for phosphorus. However, according to the TMDL analysis, phosphorous levels in the area of the Jordan River upstream from the South Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant are less than 150 micrograms per liter. North of the treatment plant, the phosphorous levels increase to over 1,000 micrograms per liter for almost the entire remaining length of the river.

Retention basins can be designed as infiltration basins. Because of this, they will not contribute to temperature increases in the Jordan River. As the runoff percolates into the basin, the underground temperature of the soil will cool the water as it migrates into the groundwater.

- B. *EPA recommends using alternative treatment mechanisms as opposed to retention or detention for all areas of the project corridor where the temperature of receiving water bodies is of concern. Several treatment technologies are available that employ either infiltration or centrifugal force (for example, vortex settling) for the purpose of settling solids and related pollutants. In choosing appropriate treatment technologies, the location of groundwater wells should be considered.*

The effect of detention basins on the temperatures of receiving waters is addressed in the previous response. EPA is opposed to retention basins but recommends the use of infiltration technologies. Retention basins can be designed as infiltration basins. Detention basins could be designed in a way that would allow the first flush (which has the greatest impact on temperature) to be infiltrated, while larger flows could be detained and discharged for flood-control purposes. Infiltration technology to increase infiltration surface area and effectiveness should be evaluated once soil characteristics and infiltration rates are known (during the final design phase of the project). These technologies will improve the effectiveness of the retention basins and will not require additional space. Although typical BMPs are designed to treat only the first flush of stormwater (typically the first inch of precipitation), the flood-control requirements mandate that peak flows from much larger storms be reduced to predevelopment levels (defined by the UDOT Manual of Instruction as 0.2 cubic feet per second per acre of development). Although BMPs such as vortex settling can effectively remove suspended solids, they do not meet the flood-control requirements to reduce the peak flows. Because of this, detention basins are still necessary. BMPs can be incorporated into the design of these basins to mitigate the effects of temperature as described in the response above.



- C. *EPA recommends that the Final EIS include details of the construction stormwater permits and the design and maintenance requirements of all post-construction treatment technologies for stormwater runoff. In addition, these details should also be shared with all affected regulated municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) operators.*

The needed construction stormwater permits are identified in Chapter 26, Permits, Reviews, and Approvals. Construction stormwater requirements are typically covered in the UDOT Standard Specifications and Standard Drawings combined with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. These guidelines are adequate until specific construction methods and construction phasing are determined. Specific construction-related plans and details will be created before construction is started (erosion-control sheets).

Specific post-construction treatment technologies should not be specified until the design phase of the project. Specific details cannot be adequately designed until the drainage system has been designed and more precise flow rates and storage volume requirements are known. These calculations should be done in the design phase of the project when all the roadway design elements have been determined and are not likely to change significantly. It would be appropriate to indicate that specific BMPs could be considered to mitigate specific pollutants such as temperature and phosphorous, but specific details should be determined in the design phase of the project and when the TMDL analysis is complete.

- D. *A commenter stated that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative should not have been compared to the Arterials Alternative for the potential impacts to the Jordan River. The 2100 North Freeway Alternative will have far greater impacts because the alternative would require a drainage ditch. This ditch would collect all of the salts, minerals, and old fertilizers and put them into the Jordan River.*

The EIS compared the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, the Arterials Alternative, and the Southern Freeway Alternative because those are the three alternatives that were carried forward for detailed study in Utah County. The comparison showed that the Arterials Alternative would cross the Jordan River three times versus once with the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, so the Arterials Alternative could contribute more roadway pollutants to the river. As stated in the analysis, the Arterials Alternative would not affect the beneficial-use classification of the Jordan River. A depressed highway section could be designed and constructed in an area with a shallow groundwater table. In the case of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Lehi, the design and construction could be similar to the depressed section of the Bangerter Highway between 700 West and the Jordan River in Bluffdale. The shallow groundwater table could require flatter-than-typical cut slopes with erosion protection. It could also require the



addition of a drainage layer below the pavement section. Surface drainage could also be required to prevent runoff from flowing down and eroding the cut slopes. Appropriate measures would be implemented to ensure that no localized flooding occurs and that appropriate water quality standards are met. These measures include the use of detention basins to allow sediments to settle out of the runoff instead of being released into the Jordan River.

- E. *Lehi City commented that they question the size of the impact analysis area and the analysis is conclusory and lacking in support. For instance, no studies have been undertaken to accurately predict the impacts to groundwater associated with depressing 2100 North or the impacts to privately owned water rights.*

The impact analysis area includes the MVC study area, adjacent water bodies such as Utah Lake and the Great Salt Lake, and associated watersheds and is large enough to account for all impacts from the proposed project. Chapter 14, Water Quality, states that the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is not expected to impede groundwater flows. Prior to construction, a geotechnical analysis will be conducted for the selected action alternative to ensure that no localized impacts would occur from either a depressed or elevated freeway section. The Final EIS has been updated to include more information on groundwater impacts (see Section 14.4.4.3, 2100 North Freeway Alternative).

The EIS states that 14 wells will be affected by the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. UDOT would either purchase water rights and land associated with the water right or negotiate an agreement with the water right owner to replace the well.

- F. *Lehi City commented that the cumulative impacts are poorly reviewed. The Draft EIS fails to look at or list past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the area. It simply states as a general proposition that development will occur and it will increase stormwater runoff. This sort of analysis violates NEPA.*

Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, lists the other projects that were considered in the cumulative impact analysis. For the analysis, 10 roadway and transit projects were considered, six major new development projects were considered, and the analysis states that the MVC study area would likely have 40,000 additional acres converted to urban uses including associated infrastructure. The analysis also reviews how past and current development have impaired water quality in the watersheds and examines how specific land uses have contributed to this impairment. The MVC team feels that this is a comprehensive list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

35.15 Chapter 15 – Ecosystem Resources

35.15.1 Section 15.1 – General Ecosystems

- A. *The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has been a cooperating agency on this project and appreciates the extensive coordination with UDOT and FHWA. USFWS acknowledges the effort that UDOT and FHWA have made to maintain the flow of information and dialogue throughout the planning process and support UDOT's selection of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative in Salt Lake County and the 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Utah County. As indicated by the wetland functional assessment and the wildlife habitat assessments, these alternatives will have the least impact on fish and wildlife resources.*

Thank you for the comment.

- B. *Lehi City commented that maps demonstrating the location of each of the resources are necessary. Otherwise, one cannot tell where they are and how they are being affected. The impact analysis area appears to be too small. Also, the result is simply quantitative and not qualitative and the latter is the standard to be applied to review these sorts of resources. UDOT needs to prepare and study impacts to delineated wetlands.*

The impact analysis area includes much of the Salt Lake Valley and Utah Valley, including the Great Salt Lake and Utah Lake and the Oquirrh and Wasatch Mountains. This area is large enough to account for the impacts from the project. In addition, the ecosystem impact analysis area was developed in close coordination with USFWS and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. The EIS figures include the location of the different wildlife habitats, habitat blocks, and wetlands in the project area, and the text of the EIS discusses the types of wildlife and threatened and endangered species that are found in those habitat types (see Section 15.4, Affected Environment). The only information not shown is the specific location of threatened and endangered species. This information is considered sensitive and is not generally provided to the public. The EIS states that only the Southern Freeway and Arterials Alternatives could affect an endangered species (Ute ladies'-tresses).

The EIS provides both a quantitative analysis and a qualitative analysis of ecosystem resources. For example, a quantitative analysis was provided for wetland impacts and habitat fragmentation, and a qualitative analysis was provided for the potential noise impacts to wildlife. The analysis provided was developed in close coordination with USFWS, USACE, and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

As discussed in Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources, the MVC team coordinated with USACE, USFWS, and EPA to develop a systematic approach for analyzing wetlands. This approach consisted of using aerial photographs, existing maps of wetlands, and delineations that have been completed in the project area. Once these data were collected, a field verification was conducted that included walking the areas that could be potential wetlands and digging some test pits. The data-gathering effort encompassed all areas potentially affected by the alternatives and gave UDOT and FHWA the ability to make a consistent comparison among the alternatives.

35.15.2 Section 15.2 – Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat, and Migratory Birds

- A. *The City of West Jordan commented that there was no consideration of wildlife access under the highway.*

Wildlife crossings were considered along the entire length of the MVC project (see Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources). In coordination with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, wildlife access was provided in wildlife migration areas and in areas where the Division wanted wildlife to have access into urban areas. Based on this coordination, no wildlife access was included with the project in West Jordan.

- B. *The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources commented that the Draft EIS provides an evaluation of habitat fragmentation and the potential for roadway mortality. The Division recommends constructing wildlife crossing structures (and associated fencing and escape ramps), which will reduce roadway mortality. The Division will work with UDOT during project planning to identify potential wildlife crossing structure designs and locations.*

Wildlife crossings are evaluated in Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources. Section 15.5.5, Mitigation Measures, lists the wildlife crossings (along with fencing and escape ramps) that were initially discussed with the Division during development of the project. The mitigation section notes that additional analysis of wildlife crossing features will be conducted during the final design phase of the project in coordination with the Division of Wildlife Resources and USFWS.

- C. USFWS provided the following specific comments on the Draft EIS (in italics). A response is provided following each comment. To address USFWS's comments, UDOT coordinated with USFWS on March 27, 2008, to ensure that the Final EIS was revised according to their comments and to ensure that UDOT and USFWS agreed on the revisions.

Page 15-14, Section 15.4.2.3 – This paragraph on springs should be its own section rather than incorporated into the Jordan River section. We understand



that a survey for springs has not yet been conducted but will be done as part of the Section 404 permitting process. Although a spring survey was not done at the early planning stage, we do recommend a continued emphasis on avoidance of impacts to these important resources. This will require that UDOT retain some degree of flexibility in road design and alignment that could permit modifications to be made. If springs are located, we recommend that UDOT work with the resource agencies to determine appropriate steps to take regarding assessment, biotic surveys, and establishing suitable avoidance and minimization measures.

The Final EIS has been updated to include a separate section on springs (see Section 15.4.2.5, Springs).

*Page 15-15, Table 15.4-2 – The fish species listed in this table should include the Utah sucker, *Catostomus arden*. Also, the list of bird species does not represent a comprehensive list of all the bird species that use the habitats along American Fork Creek and Spring Creek. We recommend that UDOT change the last sentence on page 15-14 and the title of Table 15.4-2 to reflect this as a sample of species, or list all the species that use these stream and riparian habitats.*

The Final EIS has been updated based on the above comment, and the fish species has been added. The table has been revised to state that the species list is representative of bird species along American Fork and Spring Creeks (see Table 15.4-2, Representative Wildlife Species That Use American Fork and Spring Creeks).

Page 15-25, Table 15.4-3 – It is unclear if this table identifies federally listed species in Salt Lake County or in both Salt Lake and Utah Counties. It appears to be listing both, but the text describes only those found in Salt Lake County. Please edit the title of the table and the text accordingly.

As stated in the text, this table lists all species in the MVC project area. Since the table is introduced in the section on the Salt Lake County affected environment, only those species found in that county are discussed in this part of the chapter. The Utah County affected environment section references this table and discusses those species that are relevant to Utah County. The text in the Final EIS has been revised to provide additional clarification to the reader about the content of the table. See Table 15.4-3, Federally Listed Species in the Ecosystem Impact Analysis Area (Salt Lake and Utah Counties).

Page 15-26, Table 15.4-4 – There is potential habitat, albeit a low probability of occurrence, for bobolinks and grasshopper sparrows within the study area; Appendix 15A lists the bobolink as a species with a historical incidence within the study area. Also, the four bats listed have potential for occurrence in the study area. Specific surveys were not conducted for these species. Therefore, we



recommend editing the table to reflect potential occurrence wherever suitable habitat exists.

The table in the Final EIS has been revised regarding the probability of occurrence for bobolink, grasshopper sparrow, fringed myotis, and western red bat from none to low, and the impact analysis was changed from “no impact” to “may impact, but not adversely.” The table was not revised for Townsend’s big-eared bat or spotted bat because there is no habitat for these species in the analysis area. See [Table 15.4-4](#), State of Utah Species of Concern in the Ecosystem Impact Analysis Area (Salt Lake and Utah Counties).

Page 15-28, Section 15.4.3.3 – The document states that the playas south of I-80 provide poor-quality habitat for long-billed curlew. The HSI (habitat suitability index) wildlife habitat assessment was applied specifically to black-necked stilts and American avocets and might not directly apply to curlew; in fact, curlews have been sighted in these playa areas. In addition, the playa areas south of I-80 increase in importance during high-water years when many other Great Salt Lake-associated playa wetlands are inundated and the higher-elevation habitats function as wildlife refugia. We recommend that this section add a discussion to this effect.

The Final EIS has been revised according to the comment regarding the long-billed curlew and to note the importance of the playa wetlands as refugia during high-water years (see Section 15.4.3.3, Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species).

Page 15-28, Section 15.4.3.4 – The migratory birds listed here appear to be a subset of the USFWS birds of conservation concern (BCC) list. Please confirm the source of the bird species list. The BCC list identifies those avian species that, without additional conservation actions, are likely to become candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act. We recommend that species on the BCC list that could occur in the study area be evaluated to determine the potential for effects from the project.

The migratory bird list is not from the USFWS BCC list. However, species identified in the Draft EIS include some bird species listed in Regions 9 and 16 from the BCC list. Impacts to threatened, endangered, and sensitive species and migratory birds have been addressed in Section 15.5, Environmental Consequences, and include such species as burrowing owl, golden eagle, ferruginous hawk, short-eared owl, long-billed curlew, black swift, and Lewis’s woodpecker, which are included on the BCC list (see Section 15.4.3.4, Migratory Birds).

Page 15-28, Section 15.4.3.4 – In the Migratory Birds section is the phrase, “...some nesting habitat could exist within or near the impact analysis area.”



Without a doubt, many birds do nest within the impact analysis area. We recommend changing this sentence to read: “Nesting habitat for many other migratory bird species exists within the impact analysis area.”

The Final EIS has been revised as suggested in the comment (see Section 15.4.3.4, Migratory Birds).

Page 15-60, Table 15.5-7 – We recommend that UDOT reconsider its “No effect” determination for the June sucker for the Southern Freeway and Arterials Alternatives in Utah County, given the possibility of indirect adverse effects from contaminated roadway runoff into tributaries to Utah Lake. The UDOT Preferred Alternative at 2100 North would remain a “No effect” for June sucker. We suggest modifying the text on page 15-61 accordingly.

UDOT discussed this determination with USFWS in March 2008. Based on the additional water quality analysis provided, USFWS agreed to the “no effect” determination for the June sucker. The Final EIS has been updated to reflect this finding (see Section 15.5.3.1, General Impact Information).

Page 15-62, Table 15.5-8 – See our comment for Page 15-26, Table 15.4-4. We recommend editing the table to reflect the potential impacts for species that could occur in the study area, including those mentioned in our comment on Table 15.4-4.

The table in the Final EIS has been revised regarding the effect on bobolink, grasshopper sparrow, fringed myotis, and western red bat from “no impact” to “may impact, but not adversely.” The table was not revised for Townsend’s big-eared bat or spotted bat because there is no habitat for these species in the analysis area (see Table 15.5-8, State of Utah Species of Concern in the MVC Study Area).

Page 15-85, Section 15.5.3.4 – The 7200 West Freeway Alternative would effectively bisect a large playa complex that is of moderate quality and has particular value during high-water years as refugia for wildlife. Fragmentation of this relatively contiguous block of playa habitat would be detrimental to wildlife species that use this area, such as American avocet, long-billed curlew, and black-necked stilt, and could preclude these species during high-water years when these playas are of particular value. Furthermore, we disagree with the statement, “...most species that use the ecosystem impact area are probably already adapted to these noise levels.” While some species do persist in more disturbed environments, it is likely that the wildlife population would be larger, with greater reproductive success, and a greater diversity of species without the disturbance. We recommend this statement (also found in Wildlife Noise Impacts sections throughout the document) be removed. We also recommend that the



Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species section address the potential for effects to long-billed curlew, a state sensitive species, and that the Migratory Birds section address potential effects to other migratory birds including shorebirds.

The EIS states that the 7200 West Freeway Alternative would bisect larger playa complexes than would the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. The difference in impacts on playa wetlands was an important consideration in the decision to identify the 5800 West Freeway Alternative as the Preferred Roadway Alternative in Salt Lake County. See Section 2.4.5.1, Salt Lake County Alternatives. The Final EIS has been updated to include more information on noise impacts to wildlife, and the statement regarding species having adapted to urban noise has been removed. The EIS has also been revised regarding the effects to the long-billed curlew and the impacts to migratory bird species (see Section 15.5.3.4, 7200 West Freeway Alternative).

Page 15-92, Section 15.5.3.5 – The Draft EIS states, “Noise disturbance ... would be the same for both (5800 West and 7200 West) alternatives.” We believe that noise disturbance to existing wildlife would be greater for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative because the playa habitat is currently less disturbed, less fragmented, and of higher quality than that of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative. Given the distance to which birds are affected by noise disturbance (over 3,500 feet for some species), construction of a road at 7200 West would introduce a new level of disturbance and would likely deter many species that currently use this area. Other effects of noise disturbance include population density declines and negative effects to reproductive success in bird species.

The text in the Final EIS has been revised to remove the statement that noise disturbance would be the same for the 5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives.

Page 15-97, Section 15.5.4.1 – The Draft EIS states, with regard to the Southern Freeway Alternative: “...due to the constant urban background noise ... most species that use the ecosystem impact analysis area are probably already adapted to these noise levels.” We disagree with this statement. The Southern Freeway Alternative proposes a new six-lane freeway through a largely agricultural, albeit developing, suburban area. The HSI model assessed wildlife habitat as being of moderate to high quality through much of the corridor (page 15-94). We recommend that the Draft EIS discuss this potential for impact, specifically relative to migratory birds and sensitive wildlife species.

The text in the Final EIS has been revised to include more information on the impacts of project-related noise on wildlife species including migratory birds.



The statement regarding species having adapted to noise levels has been removed from the Final EIS (see Section 15.5.4.1, Southern Freeway Alternative).

Page 15-99, Section 15.5.4.1 – As mentioned in the comment above (Page 15-97, Section 15.5.4.1), this Migratory Birds section would be improved by expanding discussion of the indirect impacts of the project (that is, noise, disturbance, and fragmentation). In addition, the birds of conservation concern are referenced here, but it is not clear if the list was used to identify birds to specifically evaluate. We recommend that species on the BCC list that could occur in the study area should be evaluated to determine the potential for effects from the project.

The Final EIS has been revised to include more information on the impacts from noise, disturbance, and fragmentation. In addition, the information includes more detail on impacts to migratory birds (see Section 15.5.4.1, Southern Freeway Alternative).

Page 15-119, Section 15.5.5.1 – In addition to the mitigation described in this section, USFWS provided a list of additional mitigation to consider.

- 1. Time tree and shrub removal to occur during the non-nesting season (approximately September 1–April 30). If this is not possible, conduct preconstruction surveys to determine whether active bird nests are present; active nests found in the area should be left untouched until the young have fledged.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment (see Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat).

- 2. Raptor nests within the range of disturbance of project activities (refer to the USFWS Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances [2002]) will be surveyed prior to construction activity if the construction will occur during the nesting season. We recommend identifying nests prior to trees leafing out and surveying again after nesting has begun to determine which nests are active and what species are utilizing them. If an active raptor nest is identified, UDOT will coordinate with USFWS and/or the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to determine appropriate buffer distances and duration given the species and nest location.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment (see Section 15.5.5, Mitigation Measures).

- 3. Removal of riparian vegetation, including willow and cottonwood, will be avoided where possible. UDOT will mitigate for riparian vegetation*



that must be removed by replacing or enhancing with an equivalent riparian acreage.

UDOT discussed this comment with USFWS in March 2008. The agencies agreed that UDOT would restore any riparian vegetation that is disturbed by construction activity that is not within the roadway footprint or clear zones. The mitigation section in Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources, has been updated accordingly. See Section 15.5.5, Mitigation Measures.

4. *Many bat species utilize bridges and culverts, particularly as natural roost structures are diminishing. We recommend UDOT consider opportunities to promote and encourage bat roosts under bridges (particularly over waterways) as a low-cost means of benefiting wildlife. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources may also be helpful in this conservation effort.*

UDOT discussed this comment with USFWS in March 2008. The agencies agreed that UDOT would continue to work with USFWS on a program to encourage bat roosts under bridges.

Page 15-120, Section 15.5.5.1 – We have three comments on this page:

1. *Regarding mitigation for temporary impacts to vegetation, we recommend that UDOT change the sentence to: “Mitigation would include all of the following measures”.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

2. *The sentence “Direct impacts to nesting migratory birds and other bird species in appropriate habitat near the playa wetlands in Salt Lake County and in Utah County can be avoided by...” should include all habitat types, not just playa. We recommend that UDOT eliminate the portion “in appropriate habitat near the playa wetlands in Salt Lake County and in Utah County”.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

3. *USFWS cannot issue take permits for relocating and potentially taking migratory birds. There is no permitting procedure for incidental take under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.



Page 15-122, Section 15.5.5.1 – We have two comments on this page:

1. *We recommend that gabions or other armoring methods not be used for bank-stabilization purposes. We support the use of bioengineering techniques and live vegetation to the extent possible.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

2. *We recommend that the statement “Seed mixes and plantings should reflect the native species that were present before the area was disturbed” should be changed to “Seed mixes and plantings will be comprised of native species.”*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 15.5.5.1, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

Page 27-24, Section 27.12.1.2 – We have two comments on this page:

1. *The sentence “Direct impacts to nesting migratory birds and other bird species in appropriate habitat near the playa wetlands in Salt Lake County and in Utah County...” is confusing. This should include all habitat types, not just playa.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 27.12.1.2, Wildlife.

2. *USFWS cannot issue take permits for relocating and potentially taking migratory birds. There is no permitting procedure for incidental take under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.*

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 27.12.1.2, Wildlife.

Page 27-26, Section 27.12.1.2 – We recommend that the statement “Seed mixes and plantings should reflect the native species that were present before the area was disturbed” should be changed to “Seed mixes and plantings will be comprised of native species.”

The Final EIS text has been revised according to the comment. See Section 27.12.1.2, Wildlife.

35.15.3 Section 15.3 – Endangered Species Act

- A. *The City of West Jordan commented that the EIS analysis does not confirm whether threatened and endangered species occur in the study area.*

The MVC team worked with USFWS and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to determine the locations of threatened and endangered species in the



project area. As stated on page 15-72 of the Draft EIS, “no federally listed, endangered, threatened, or candidate species have been identified within the right-of-way of the 5800 West Freeway Alternative.” Only the Utah County Arterials and Southern Freeway Alternatives have the potential to affect a federally listed species.

35.15.4 Section 15.4 – Wetlands and Section 404

- A. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would affect important wetlands along Utah Lake. Others commented that wetland impacts should be avoided.*

Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources, provides a detailed analysis of wetland impacts from the MVC action alternatives. In Salt Lake County, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would have a primary impact on wetlands of 30.19 acres compared to 30.60 acres for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. Of these wetland totals, the primary impacts to high-functioning wetlands would be about 7.87 functional capacity units (FCU) for the 5800 West Freeway Alternative compared to 38.42 FCU for the 7200 West Freeway Alternative. In Utah County, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would have a primary impact on wetlands of about 12.87 acres compared to 93.43 acres for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 55.71 acres for the Arterials Alternative. Of these wetland totals, the primary and secondary impacts to high-functioning wetlands would be about 12.86 FCU for the 2100 North Freeway Alternative compared to 101.85 FCU for the Southern Freeway Alternative and 80.16 FCU for the Arterials Alternative.

As part of the NEPA process, UDOT developed alignments that first avoided, then minimized, impacts to wetlands. However, given the wetland locations and the locations where transportation improvements are necessary, it is not possible to avoid all wetland impacts. During the Section 404 permit process, UDOT will work with USACE to further avoid and/or minimize impacts to wetlands from the selected alternative.

- B. *Commenters stated that the MVC project should not affect wetlands.*

Thank you for the comment. Due to the size of the project, and given the need to develop alternatives that meet the project purpose, avoiding all wetlands would not be feasible. However, measures were taken to minimize impacts to wetlands, such as shifts in an alignment.

- C. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that all MVC action alternatives will affect valuable wetlands, farmlands, schools, parks, and historic properties. The Clean Water Act Section 404 guidelines and the Section 4(f) guidelines require that narrower footprints that would reduce these impacts*



should be considered. A transit-first approach on a completed 5600 West that would reduce VMT growth and the amount of road capacity needed in these sensitive areas should be considered. In addition, the redesign of the Legacy Parkway in Davis County used roadway meandering and a smaller road footprint to avoid wetland impacts.

Chapter 29, Sequencing, provides an analysis of implementing a transit alternative before the roadway alternatives and determined that implementing transit without a roadway alternative would not meet the project purpose. During the development of the alternatives, avoiding wetland impacts was considered, including changing alignments and narrowing the footprint by using walls. The current analysis provides an equal comparison of the expected wetland impacts from the action alternatives so that an informed decision on the alternative with the least impacts can be made. The roadway designs that were considered were based on current safety standards for the volume of traffic expected on the MVC. During the Section 404 permit process, UDOT will work with USACE to further avoid and/or minimize impacts to wetlands from the selected alternative.

- D. A commenter stated that it appears that only a reconnaissance-level (windshield) wetland investigation was performed for this document instead of a “survey”-grade delineation. This is inadequate and leaves the findings of wetland impacts of the 1900 South corridor in Lehi suspect and potentially overstated. Yet this alternative seems to have been dismissed as a result of the windshield investigation findings.*

As discussed in Chapter 15, Ecosystem Resources, the MVC team coordinated with USACE, USFWS, and EPA to develop a systematic approach for analyzing wetlands. This approach consisted of using aerial photographs, existing maps of wetlands, and delineations that have been performed in the project area. Once these data were collected, a field verification was conducted that included walking the areas that could be potential wetlands and digging some test pits. The data-gathering effort encompassed all areas potentially affected by the alternatives and gave UDOT and FHWA the ability to make a consistent comparison among the alternatives.

35.16 Chapter 16 – Floodplains

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.



35.17 Chapter 17 – Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources

- A. *A commenter asked if the Lehi Main Street area is a historic district.*

The Lehi downtown area is a historic district. It was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1998.

- B. *A commenter stated that it appears that the cultural and historical findings of this document rely on a reconnaissance-level study of only 30% of the corridor area. This is inadequate and does not disclose specific impacts. A full investigation should be required and data released for public comment. In addition, the eligible structures were based on buildings built prior to 1960. The context of the area should have been considered.*

As discussed in Chapter 17, Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources, the MVC team coordinated with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer to develop a systematic approach for analyzing cultural resources. Given the level of past disturbance and ground cover, the State Historic Preservation Officer determined that this approach would allow a consistent evaluation of the MVC action alternatives. Note that the reconnaissance-level survey was for archaeological resources only. A full and complete survey was conducted for historic resources. The evaluation for historic structures took into account the integrity of the structure and the context. This is best demonstrated by the development of a multiple property submission for Utah County, which considered the historic and archaeological landscape and which was used to help determine eligible structures. Other structures were evaluated based on the period in which they were constructed.

35.18 Chapter 18 – Hazardous Waste Sites

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.

35.19 Chapter 19 – Visual Resources

(Note: Comments from utility companies regarding visual impacts are addressed in Section 35.6.)

- A. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would obstruct views of the area mountains and valleys.*

Chapter 19, Visual Resources, provides an analysis of the visual impacts to the area near the MVC action alternatives. For those residents adjacent to the



roadway, the long-term views of the proposed improvements would be of a multi-lane freeway or arterial street, depending on the alternative. The foreground views surrounding the freeway would remain unchanged where they are already developed and would develop according to the land-use plan of the various jurisdictions where they are not developed. Residents who are not next to an MVC action alternative would not have their long-distance views obstructed but would see the freeway or arterial as part of the urban landscape.

35.20 Chapter 20 – Energy

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.

35.21 Chapter 21 – Construction Impacts

- A. *Lehi City commented that there is no construction impact analysis area defined.*

Chapter 21, Construction Impacts, includes an analysis of the impacts from constructing the MVC action alternatives. Because this chapter does not address a specific resource, no impact analysis area was defined. The impacts were not based on a specific area but included a general overview of all expected construction impacts.

35.22 Chapter 22 – Short-Term Uses versus Long-Term Productivity

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.

35.23 Chapter 23 – Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.



35.24 Chapter 24 – Indirect Effects

- A. *Commenters stated that the MVC action alternatives would cause more urban sprawl and thus result in other resource-related indirect impacts. Others commented that the project would change the nature of land use around the action alternatives.*

Chapter 24, Indirect Effects, evaluates how the MVC project could induce growth. The analysis concludes that the MVC project by itself is not expected to cause more growth than what is already projected by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. (The growth projections from the Governor's Office indicate a faster pace of annual growth than recent past trends.) Rather, the MVC project would shift and affect the pace of some of the projected growth in certain locations. Particular land areas would become more accessible due to the MVC project and would likely be developed or redeveloped because market demand is expected to remain strong for continued development. The cities, counties, and developers believe that the MVC project would tend to influence some of this new growth in the form of more mixed-use development at higher densities near the highway interchanges and key transit stations.

- B. *A commenter stated that Chapter 24 focuses on Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. Lehi City has recently issued more building permits than both other cities combined. Once again, Lehi City is being discounted in attempts to downplay impacts.*

See page 24-31 of Chapter 24, Indirect Effects, in the Draft EIS, which provides detailed information on Lehi's past and future growth. In addition, the EIS notes that of the eight largest planned developments, five are in Lehi.

- C. *Lehi City commented that an impact analysis area of a 5-mile radius around MVC project interchanges and 0.5 mile from MVC transit stations is not going to provide a workable picture of the location of all of these impacts. The indirect impacts are far beyond that. Additionally, this chapter seems to rely on outdated data, and the Version 6.0 model needs to be used to determine what the indirect effects will actually be. All the issues discussed above with respect to the high predicted employment numbers become very important here, as does the fact that the Growth Choices process was unraveled and circumvented. That process adopted a vision which respected the integrity of Lehi City's growth management and cohesion. When the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was inserted into the process, that entire process was unraveled and it detrimentally affects the entire indirect effects analysis. The fact that portions of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain are outside the study area is a noticeable oversight. They need to be included.*



The indirect effects analysis area that was defined and used in this analysis is reasonable and sufficient for an EIS-level analysis, and this type of area has been successfully used in other highway project EISs. The limits of the analysis area are based on research by Robert Cervero for the Institute of Transportation Engineers (Cervero 2000). Cervero's research found that, generally, freeway interchanges can attract highway-oriented commercial uses within 1 to 2 miles and residential uses within 5 to 6 miles if travel connections are good. Based on Cervero's research, the indirect effects analysis for the MVC project assumed that the MVC interchanges could induce or accelerate development within about 5 to 6 miles of the interchanges. While development beyond 5 or 6 miles from an MVC interchange is possible, this development might or might not be stimulated by the MVC project. Other factors could be more important for development beyond 5 or 6 miles from the MVC project, such as the quality of the roadway access to the MVC interchange, market demand, the price of land and housing, mortgage availability, and other planning and economic factors. One-half mile is sufficient for the indirect effects analysis for a new transit station because this area is within walking distance from a station and therefore is the area where most transit-oriented development is likely to occur.

The indirect effects analysis was based on the latest data that were available when the research and analysis was conducted in late 2004 and early 2005. Further, the indirect effects analysis was qualitative. A qualitative approach was used because it gives the reader an understanding of the areas that are likely to experience increased development pressures and also avoids the uncertainties and methodological difficulties involved in any attempt to predict quantitatively the exact locations and amounts of future development.

The Final EIS was updated to include Version 6.0 of the travel demand model (see Section 2.1.7.1, Revised Travel Demand Modeling for the Final EIS).

The addition of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative did not detrimentally affect the indirect effects analysis. As noted in Chapter 2, Alternatives, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was included as a reasonable alternative after EPA requested that consistency with local land-use plans be changed from a primary project purpose to a secondary project objective. The indirect effects analysis was based on comprehensive interviews with land owners and city representatives from the Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain areas. The interviews considered growth trends and potential development in the area where the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is located.

The impacts on Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain are sufficiently discussed and were included in the indirect effects analysis.



- D. *Lehi City commented that there is no alternative-by-alternative analysis of indirect effects. Every impact listed will be caused by all three alternatives, and that is unlikely to be the case.*

Section 24.5.2, Indirect Effects on Land Use by Alternative, provides an alternative-by-alternative comparison of the impacts of the No-Action and action alternatives on land use, including land use in Utah County. Overall, the greater increase in mobility provided by the two freeway alternatives (Southern Freeway and 2100 North Freeway Alternatives) is expected to induce more land-use impacts than the Arterials Alternative. The alternatives located near Utah Lake (Southern Freeway and Arterials Alternatives) have a greater potential to induce development that would affect the extensive wetlands in that area (see Section 24.5.5.2, Wetlands and Water Quality).

- E. *Lehi City commented that the induced-growth discussion seems to pertain solely to Salt Lake County, and it will have an effect on growth patterns in Utah County as well.*

Section 24.5.2, Indirect Effects on Land Use by Alternative, provides an alternative-by-alternative comparison of the impacts of the No-Action and action alternatives on land use in Utah County.

- F. *Lehi City commented that the review of the Utah County alternatives does not discuss alterations of the growth patterns and where the specific changes will occur.*

Section 24.5.2, Indirect Effects on Land Use by Alternative, provides an alternative-by-alternative comparison of the impacts of the No-Action and action alternatives on land use in Utah County. As stated in Chapter 24, induced development could occur within 5 to 6 miles from new project interchanges for the freeway alternatives and closer for the Arterials Alternative. Because of Lehi's size, these indirect effects could occur throughout the city in specific areas planned and zoned for development. The City has authority over those land-use decisions. The Final EIS did not include projections of the exact locations of future development because any such analysis would be speculative.

- G. *Lehi City commented that the indirect effects are analyzed only for floodplains, wetlands, cultural resources, water quality, and farmlands. There are no noise and air indirect effects.*

The indirect effects analysis focused on land use. The noise and air quality impacts of the MVC project are discussed in other chapters of the EIS. The air quality analysis looks at the regional airshed, which encompasses potential indirect and direct effects of the MVC and other projects. The noise impacts from the project are generally those that occur next to the proposed roadway and so



have no indirect impacts. Indirect noise would be closely related to changes in land use, which are described in the indirect effects chapter.

- H. *Lehi City commented that the analysis on floodplains is incomplete. The EIS states that the “Southern Freeway Alternative could affect some of these floodplains areas.” How? Why? What will be the effects? Same for the other alternatives. The same general analysis is provided for wetlands, farmlands, and cultural resources. There is no individual analysis, just generalizations.*

The discussion of indirect effects on floodplains, for example, is general because the specific locations of induced land-use development are unknown. The specific locations of such new growth will be controlled by the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan and by current zoning. The City has allowed development in floodplains if the first habitable floor is above the 100-year flood elevation. Typically, such development in floodplains can compromise the flood-absorption capacity of the floodplain and should be compensated for in the area by changing the topography.

- I. *Lehi City commented that the Growth Choices process was intended to integrate transportation and land-use planning, so the transportation decisions supported local land-use choices. This process was completely unraveled by the selection of 2100 North as the Preferred Alternative by UDOT and its late insertion in this study.*

As stated in Chapter 2, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative was included as a reasonable alternative after EPA requested that consistency with local land-use plans be moved from a primary project purpose to a secondary objective. This request by EPA did not change the Growth Choices process or how alternatives were considered. For example, the Arterials Alternative for Utah County is still similar to the alternative identified for Utah County in the Growth Choices process. As explained in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, the Growth Choices Vision defined the basic project concepts—in terms of the need for a new-location roadway, transit improvements, and land-use changes—but it did not dictate a specific route for the new roadway. In particular, the Growth Choices process was not used as a vehicle for selecting a specific roadway alignment or facility type in Utah County; those issues were left open for more detailed analysis in the NEPA process, which included consideration of a range of potential roadway locations in Utah County.

- J. *Lehi City commented that there is no analysis of the anticipated changes in the pattern of land use induced by the MVC in Utah County, no encouragement of transit-oriented development in Lehi or elsewhere in Utah County, and no encouragement for acquisition of open space and the protection of farmland. Once the Growth Choices process was unraveled, regional planning was not*



promoted, nor were any of these other important purposes and needs. UDOT can no longer rely on the Growth Choices process to meet these legal obligations.

The future pattern of development is under the control of Lehi City's General Plan and zoning. The type and location of development induced by the MVC project would be determined by these land-use controls. Transit-oriented development was not discussed since the MVC project does not include transit in Utah County. The commuter-rail station near I-15 is proposed by UDOT and UTA under a separate project. The encouragement of transit-oriented development, acquisition of open space, and more aggressive regional planning are specifically discussed in the mitigation section of Chapter 24 (Section 24.6, Mitigation Measures).

- K. *Lehi City commented that the farmlands appear to have been rated, but the information has not been arrayed. In addition, the ultimate impacts to farmlands, for instance in an induced-growth scenario, are not included in the analysis. This is critically important, and it is not permissible to say that the growth will simply occur with or without the project. Reliance is placed on this sort of conclusion throughout the document, and it is not consistent with applicable law. The actual changes to growth patterns in any given area must be reviewed and discussed in detail. If the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is accepted, there will be significant conversion of farmland to other uses and a ripple effect regarding growth. Those issues are not discussed.*

The conversion of farmland to urban development is under the control of Lehi City. A policy in the City's General Plan is to preserve farmland where feasible. As discussed in Chapter 24, Indirect Effects, any of the MVC action alternatives would induce development and increase development pressures near interchanges and access points. Farmland and other open areas will be the focus of future development opportunities if permitted by the City. Direct impacts to farmlands are discussed in more detail elsewhere in Chapter 5, Farmlands. The farmland impact rating form, which is required under the Farmland Protection Policy Act, is included in Appendix 5A, Farmland Rating Form and Correspondence.

35.25 Chapter 25 – Cumulative Impacts

- A. *A commenter stated that the MVC EIS was disconnected and did not consider the environmental impacts of other UDOT roadway projects in northern Utah County such as SR 92, 1000 South, and I-15.*

Other transportation and development projects were considered in the development of the EIS. Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, provides an overview of the projects considered and the potential cumulative impacts of those projects



when combined with those from the MVC. Several steps were taken to determine potential present and future actions to consider in the cumulative analysis. The first step involved coordinating with UDOT, UTA, WFRC, and MAG to help identify other transit and roadway projects that could result in cumulative impacts when combined with the MVC project. This step included reviewing environmental documents that were recently completed or are in progress. In addition, UDOT held multiple meetings with project managers to identify current and upcoming projects and the scope of the potential impacts. The intent of these meetings was to address region-wide issues related to cumulative impacts. The result of the meeting was the identification of 12 roadway and transit projects in Salt Lake County and 10 in Utah County to consider in conjunction with the MVC. The impacts of these and other reasonably foreseeable projects were summarized in Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts. See [Table 25.3-1](#), Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Transit and Roadway Actions.

- B. Lehi City commented that the important issues identified by the public in scoping were loss of farmlands, the loss of wetlands, impacts to wildlife areas and water bodies, and continued degradation of air and water quality. The failure to promote solutions regarding preservation of the status quo for these resources is a fundamental flaw throughout the entire document, and the failure to review the cumulative impacts to them in adequate detail constitutes another flaw.*

Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts, provides a detailed analysis of the combined impacts on the above resources from the MVC and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. NEPA requires a disclosure of impacts so that an informed decision can be made regarding the reasonable alternatives, but it does not require that solutions regarding the preservation of existing resources be developed as part of the project.

- C. Lehi City asked why only four issues were studied in detail in the cumulative impacts section.*

Section 25.3, Cumulative Impacts Analysis, explains why only four issues were studied in detail. According to CEQ's cumulative impacts guidance, the cumulative impact analysis should be narrowed to focus on important issues at a national, regional, or local level. The analysis should look at other actions that could have similar effects and whether a particular resource has been historically affected by cumulative actions. To ensure that the appropriate resources were analyzed, UDOT and FHWA used the scoping process to determine important issues based on public, local municipality, and resource agency concerns. Based on this input, ecosystems, air quality, water quality, and farmlands were considered for cumulative impacts. This approach and the resources selected were agreed to by EPA, USFWS, and USACE.



- D. *Lehi City asked why the EIS relied on the Office of Planning and Budget report from 2000. Is there no 2005 or later report?*

The information from the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget was used to develop Chart 25-1, Population Growth in Salt and Utah Counties, 1850 to 2000. The purpose of the chart is to show historic growth trends in the counties. Using information published in 2005 would not change the results of the historic growth except for the last few years of the 150-year period shown. This would not change the results of the analysis or the intent of the graph, which was to illustrate the rapid growth in the area.

- E. *Lehi City commented that the scope of the area reviewed appears to change for each resource reviewed. We do not believe this is a proper approach. The failure to review in detail the potential impacts to wetlands and Section 4(f) resources is problematic. Without an adequate review of where these resources exist and their qualitative aspects, together with the willingness to discern practicable and prudent alternatives, it is possible that the NEPA effort could be concluded only to find that the alternatives selected are not acceptable under other applicable law.*

As explained in Section 25.2, Methodology for Determining Cumulative Impacts, the methodology for analyzing cumulative impacts was based on the CEQ handbook *Considering Cumulative Effects under the National Environmental Policy Act*. As recommended in that guidance, FHWA and UDOT identified a different geographic area of influence for each resource analyzed. See Section 25.3.2, Geographic Scope for the Analysis. For example, the scope of the air quality analysis is the airshed and the scope of the water quality analysis is the watershed, each of which has different geographical boundaries. If the same scope of area was used for each resource, this might not capture all of the impacts for some resources. The wetland impacts and Section 4(f) impacts were evaluated in detail using approaches approved by FHWA and USACE, the agencies that oversee the evaluation of these resources. Based on discussion with both agencies, the alternatives are acceptable under applicable laws. In its comments on the Draft EIS, EPA concurred that the 5800 West Freeway Alternative and the 2100 North Freeway Alternative are consistent with Section 404 permitting requirements.

- F. *Lehi City commented that, if there is no direct impact to ecosystem resources, the EIS assumes that there is no cumulative impact. Is UDOT certain there are no cumulative impacts to threatened or endangered species? This is an incorrect approach.*

The analysis does not assume that there would be no cumulative impacts to ecosystem resources. For example, the analysis notes that the MVC would



contribute to 1% of the future impacts to wildlife habitat and that future ongoing development would convert wetlands and wildlife habitat to increasingly denser types of development (see Section 25.4.1.3, MVC Project Impacts). The Utah County Preferred Roadway Alternative, the 2100 North Freeway Alternative, would not cause any impacts to threatened or endangered species; therefore, the MVC project would not contribute to cumulative impacts. USFWS has concurred with this conclusion.

- G. *Lehi City commented that no cumulative impact analysis was done for pedestrians and bicyclists.*

See Response C on page 35-138 of this section.

35.26 Chapter 26 – Permits, Reviews, and Approvals

No comments were received on this resource during the Draft EIS public comment period.

35.27 Chapter 27 – Mitigation Summary

- A. *Lehi City commented that the mitigation section fails because it does not review specific impacts on specific resources. For instance, if the EIS does not include data on population and location of species in the wildlife section, then UDOT will not be able to adequately discuss wildlife mitigation. This is a pervasive flaw in the approach used throughout the Draft EIS.*

Chapter 27, Mitigation Summary, provides only a summary of the mitigation proposed in each resource-specific chapter. The analysis for each resource explains the impacts and the appropriate mitigation measures. The ecosystem analysis was developed in close coordination with USFWS and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

- B. *Lehi City commented that the mitigation measures are non-binding; the review of the actual impacts created by each alternative is very thin, so it is impossible to tell how alignment changes and other variations in routes will avoid impacts.*

The mitigation measures are binding and will be implemented with the MVC project. During the alternatives development process, alignment variations were considered to minimize impacts to resources such as wetlands, relocations, and wildlife.

- C. *Lehi City commented that, as with other chapters, the Growth Choices process was relied on to avoid the need to mitigate impacts of the MVC on local land-use planning efforts. Since that entire process was unraveled in the course of*



selecting 2100 North as an alternative and as UDOT's Preferred Alternative, this is improper.

The Growth Choices process was developed to provide a connection with the local governments between land use and transportation; it was not meant to mitigate the impacts of the MVC project on local land-use planning efforts. As stated in the EIS, at the request of EPA, the project purpose of being consistent with local land-use plans was moved to a secondary project objective, which made the 2100 North Freeway Alternative a reasonable alternative. The Growth Choices process showed arterials in Utah County, which is consistent with the MVC Arterials Alternative. As explained in Chapter 3, Growth Choices, the Growth Choices Vision defined the basic project concepts—in terms of the need for a new-location roadway, transit improvements, and land-use changes—but it did not dictate a specific route for the new roadway. In particular, the Growth Choices process was not used as a vehicle for selecting a specific roadway alignment or facility type in Utah County; those issues were left open for more detailed analysis in the NEPA process, which included consideration of a range of potential roadway locations in Utah County.

- D. Lehi City commented that, as with the indirect impacts and the failure to encourage transit-oriented development, acquisition of open space and farmland and the promotion of regional planning were ignored.*

The promotion of regional planning was considered during the development of the MVC action alternatives. This was done during the consideration of specific alignments. However, being consistent with regional and local planning was not a primary project purpose and so could not be used to determine whether an alternative was reasonable. Throughout the EIS process, the MVC team coordinated with local governments to come up with the best solution considering the natural and built environments.

35.28 Chapter 28 – Section 4(f) Evaluation

- A. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources commented that their goal is to work toward a signed concurrence letter on the Section 4(f) de minimis finding; however, before they can agree to such a finding, they will need to understand how ricochet bullets could potentially affect the MVC and how this could require the closure of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education. If the ricochet bullet issue can be addressed, the Division will be able to support a de minimis finding.*

The 5800 West Freeway Alternative would be located east of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education in an area where the Division of Wildlife Resources currently allows public access. UDOT has entered into a Memorandum of



Agreement with the Division of Wildlife Resources to ensure the safety of motorists and the continued operation of the Lee Kay Center for Hunter Education.

- B. *The Department of the Interior reviewed the Draft EIS and Section 4(f) evaluation in relation to any possible conflicts with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) and the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery programs. They found numerous L&WCF projects that could be affected in Salt Lake and Utah Counties:*

49-00330 – Storm Mountain Park
 49-00331 – Sandy City 30-Acre Park
 49-00333 – Wasatch Mountain–Soldier Hollow
 49-00334 – Willow Ponds Park
 49-00335 – Utah Lake State Park
 49-00336 – Heritage Park
 49-00340 – Bluffdale Park
 49-00351 – Hillman Recreation Area
 49-00360 – Meadows Park

None of the above resources would be affected by the MVC project.

- C. *The Department of the Interior noted that, based on their review of the Section 4(f) evaluation, they concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternatives selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources.*

Thank you for the comment. The Preferred Alternatives in the Draft EIS were identified by UDOT. FHWA identified their Preferred Alternatives in the Final EIS.

- D. *Lehi City commented that, in view of the fact that the Section 4(f) chapter relies on Chapter 17 and the methodology failed there, this chapter fails as well. Throughout this chapter, constructive use has been given short shrift, and the analysis suffers as well.*

A complete evaluation of historic structures was done for the MVC project so that a detailed Section 4(f) evaluation could be conducted. Archaeological resources were surveyed at a reconnaissance level because they are not considered a 4(f) resource, and they are not considered a 4(f) resource because they could provide information if recovered for a project. The 4(f) analysis does consider constructive use for those resources that would not be directly affected. Constructive-use analysis is not required for resources that would be directly affected by the project.



35.29 Chapter 29 – Sequencing

- A. *Commenters stated that the transit alternative should be implemented before the roadway alternatives. Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that giving transit a chance to succeed before implementing a road would allow a shift toward a more balanced regional transportation system which would reduce traffic rather than continuing the unsustainable pattern of accommodating it. They also commented that transit first is a reasonable alternative that should be considered and compared to the highway-dominated alternatives.*

Chapter 29, Sequencing, analyzes the implications of implementing a transit alternative before the roadway alternatives. The analysis in Chapter 29 determined that implementing transit without a roadway alternative would not meet the project purpose. The analysis evaluated five sequencing scenarios for the MVC project in 2015 and seven sequencing scenarios in 2030. This analysis demonstrated that there was little difference in regional daily transit use whether transit operated without an MVC roadway or whether transit operated with an MVC roadway in place in 2015 or 2030. In most cases, there was little difference in daily transit trips between the transit-only scenarios and the scenarios in which transit operated with an MVC roadway. The transit-only scenarios resulted in substantially greater roadway delay compared to the roadway and transit operating at the same time in 2015 and 2030. The factor that most affected transit use was land-use densities, not whether the MVC freeway was operating with transit in 2015 or 2030.

- B. *A commenter stated that, if transit were implemented first, the MVC might not need as many travel lanes.*

Development of the MVC action alternatives included all current transit projects being considered by UTA and proposed transit projects in the WFRC long-range plan for 2030. In addition, the MVC project included the evaluation of the 5600 West Transit Alternative. The projected transit ridership is the most that can reasonably and economically supported by UTA, and, even with this ridership, the MVC action alternatives would still be needed as identified in the EIS.

As stated in Chapter 29, Sequencing, the factor that most affected transit use was land-use densities, not whether the MVC freeway was operating with transit in 2015 or 2030. As demonstrated by 2015 Scenario 2, when there was no transit-oriented land use concentrated along 5600 West, the amount of transit use was the lowest compared to the other 2015 action scenarios. In the 2030 scenarios, the transit use was the highest with more compact land use along 5600 West. In summary, there would be little effect on transit use if the MVC freeway were



operating at the same time as transit in 2015 or 2030. Therefore, transit use would have little effect on the number of lanes for the MVC action alternatives.

- C. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that the MVC sequencing analysis performed by Parsons Brinckerhoff fails to meet the basic purpose of exploring the longer-term effects on future land-use patterns and travel behaviors of alternative transportation strategies. Because the model is not appropriately sensitive to land-use patterns and transit development, potential transit demand was underpredicted. We requested to UDOT that an expert panel or Delphi process be engaged to deal with the modeling deficiencies, but received no response to our request of February 14, 2007.*

The model represents the state of the practice and has been deemed adequate by FTA. Using this model, and as stated in Chapter 29, Sequencing, the factor that most affected transit use was land-use densities. The suggestion of the use of an expert panel or Delphi process in the February 14, 2007, letter was in reference to land-use forecasting, not modeling deficiencies, and therefore is not relevant to this comment.

In the letter dated February 14, 2007, Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation requested that a sequencing analysis consistent with the MVC Growth Choices Voluntary Agreement be performed and that the project consider the health effects of a major freeway near schools and homes. These two requests are addressed below.

Sequencing Analysis

The first issue in the letter concerns the sequencing analysis that was performed for the MVC project pursuant to the Growth Choices Voluntary Agreement. The Voluntary Agreement calls for an analysis of the “sequencing of transportation investments.” In the agreement, the term *sequencing* refers to the order in which highway and transit investments are made.

Time Horizon for the Sequencing Analysis

The February 14, 2007, letter contends that the sequencing analysis is flawed because it does not explore the “longer-term effects on future land-use patterns of alternative transportation investment strategies.” The letter included a memorandum from Smart Mobility, Inc., addressed to the Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation. The Smart Mobility memo reiterated the concern that the sequencing analysis “fails to examine the longer-term effects of alternative transportation investment strategies.” The memo suggested using a time horizon “such as 2030 or 2040.”



At the time of the letter, the MVC team (UDOT, with the assistance of FHWA and UTA) had prepared a sequencing analysis focused on alternative scenarios in 2015 and had shared that analysis with the Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee, which included Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation. The MVC team initially adopted a 2015 time horizon as a means of testing the potential land-use effects of transportation investments “over the next decade”—the timeframe defined in the Voluntary Agreement. In response to the February 14, 2007, letter, the MVC team expanded the sequencing analysis to include two time horizons: 2015 and 2030. This analysis of both 2015 and 2030 scenarios was included in the Draft EIS (see Chapter 29, Sequencing). The addition of the 2030 time horizon addressed the commenters’ concern about the need to consider longer-term effects on land-use patterns.

Alternative Land-Use Assumptions

The Smart Mobility memo attached to the February 14, 2007, letter also expressed concern that the consultants preparing the sequencing analysis “are reluctant to alter the future land-use assumptions from the Mountain View Vision Scenario”—that is, the Growth Choices Vision for future land use that the local jurisdictions endorsed in the Voluntary Agreement. The memo suggested that the MVC sequencing analysis should consider different land uses and not be limited to “feasible preferences.” The memo cited examples from other cities to show that, over time, land-use preferences can change in a manner that supports more transit-oriented development. The memo suggested two methods for developing the alternative land-use scenario: an “expert land-use panel,” which would use a process known as the Delphi method, and a land-use model known as UrbanSim.

At the time of the February 14, 2007, letter, the sequencing analysis assumed that land use in 2030 would be consistent with the Growth Choices Vision. It did not examine alternative land-use scenarios. The Growth Choices Vision land use is the appropriate scenario to use as the basis for alternatives analysis in the EIS. The Growth Choices Vision was developed through a collaborative process that considered a range of potential development scenarios: Expansive, Trend, and Compact. The Growth Choices Vision represents a compromise between the Trend and Compact Scenarios. The Vision represents the land use that the local jurisdictions were willing to adopt (see Chapter 3, Growth Choices).

Nonetheless, in response to the February 14, 2007, letter, the MVC team decided as part of the sequencing analysis to consider an alternative future land-use scenario that involves much higher density and more transit-oriented development. This alternative land-use scenario is based on the Compact Scenario from the Growth Choices process—a scenario that the local governments considered and rejected because it departed too greatly from current



trends and the public's preferences. Even though it is unlikely that the Compact Scenario will ever be implemented, it was included in the sequencing analysis in response to the February 14, 2007, letter. The results of this analysis were included in the Draft EIS (see Chapter 29, Sequencing).

FHWA and UDOT decided not to convene an expert land-use panel or use UrbanSim to develop an alternative land-use scenario. While those tools are appropriate for use in some situations, they are not necessary here because an alternative, higher-density land-use scenario (the Compact Scenario) has already been developed as part of the Growth Choices process. In addition, the MVC team has had several discussions with the staff of the two metropolitan planning organizations in the project area (WFRC and MAG), and they agree with Smart Mobility's statement on page 5 of their memo, specifically that UrbanSim might not be ready to use for project-level land analysis.

Ability of the Travel Demand Model to Forecast Transit Trips

The Smart Mobility memo attached to the February 14, 2007, letter also states that the travel demand model used in the sequencing analysis is not capable of providing accurate forecasts of future transit ridership. The memo contends that the model tends to underestimate future transit usage.

The travel demand model for the MVC study area is maintained by the two metropolitan planning organizations for the region (WFRC and MAG). In Version 6.0 of the model, which was used for forecasts in the Final EIS, WFRC and MAG have made several adjustments to the way transit forecasts are handled in the model. One of the adjustments included using existing transit ridership information to calibrate transit ridership forecasts. The travel demand model used is accepted by the relevant federal agencies (including the Federal Transit Administration) and is considered to be state of the art. The Final EIS used WFRC and MAG's approved model as the basis for the highway traffic and transit forecasts in the sequencing analysis.

Consideration of a Transit-Only Alternative

In the Other EIS Deficiencies section, the Smart Mobility memo attached to the February 14, 2007, letter questioned the alternatives screening process and recommended that a transit-only scenario (which could include transit, transportation demand management, transit-oriented development, and arterial improvements) should be considered.

As part of the MVC screening process, a wide range of transportation alternatives and modes was considered including both highway-only and transit-only scenarios. See Section 2.1, Alternatives Development Process. Alternatives were



carried forward in the screening process only if they could meet the project's purpose. Those alternatives that could not meet the project's purpose were rejected. A transit-only scenario could not meet the project's purpose because it would not meaningfully reduce roadway congestion in the MVC study area. Therefore, the transit-only alternative was rejected. See Section 2.1.2.1, Alternatives Screening – Level 1.

The traffic forecasts used in the alternative screening process were based on the Growth Choices land-use scenario. As explained above, the Growth Choices land-use scenario reflects the most realistic assumption about future land use. Nonetheless, as part of the sequencing analysis, the sequencing included forecasts for an alternative land-use scenario (the Compact Scenario), including a scenario that involves major transit investments, no major new highway capacity, and compact land use. This analysis provided an additional test of the ability of the Compact Scenario to address roadway congestion. The results of this analysis were reported in the Draft EIS (see Chapter 29, Sequencing).

Economic Effects of Alternative Transportation Investment Strategies

The Smart Mobility memo attached to the February 14, 2007, letter also suggested that the sequencing analysis should be used to evaluate the longer-term economic effects of alternative transportation investment strategies. Specifically, the memo suggested studying the economic effects of “transit first, transit only, and toll highway first” scenarios as part of the sequencing analysis. The MVC team did not conduct a separate economic effects analysis as part of the sequencing analysis. However, the results of the sequencing analysis provided information that can be used to qualitatively assess the economic effects of transportation choices. For example, the sequencing analysis shows varying levels of congestion and varying levels of transit use among the different scenarios. This information indicates the effects of the various scenarios on commuting costs.

Decisions on issues such as density and land use development types are the responsibility of local governments. While the Growth Choices process did not result in a density “sea change” for cities along the Wasatch Front, it was a successful and worthwhile endeavor because the cities in the project area participated in a process that asked them to consider different strategies and outcomes and also considered development on a more regional level. Therefore, the land-use scenario in the Growth Choices Vision was used as the basis for alternatives analysis in the MVC EIS. An alternative land-use scenario, representing a higher degree of density, also was considered as part of the sequencing analysis.

Health Effects of Freeways

In addition to commenting on the sequencing analysis, the February 14, 2007, letter also mentioned a 2007 study by W. James Gauderman on the health effects of mobile-source air toxics (MSATs) on people living near major roads. The letter requests that the EIS include an analysis of the health effects resulting from MSAT emissions. The MVC Draft EIS acknowledged the variety of studies that describe the health effects of ambient air pollution on the public, including the Gauderman study. The Draft EIS also included an MSAT analysis consistent with FHWA guidance. This information has been retained and updated in the Final EIS (see Chapter 12, Air Quality).

- D. *Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club commented that the screening analysis rejected “transit-first” alternatives out of hand by arguing that they would result in unacceptable congestion on some roadway segments at some times of the day. This analysis was flawed for several reasons. First, as noted elsewhere and in the Smart Mobility, Inc., comments, the analysis was based on an outdated model that did not properly capture expected future demand (and the nature of and rate of growth in demand), as well as the ability of new, well-designed transit to meet that demand. Second, the analysis considered only alternatives that were not designed properly to maximize the effectiveness of a transit-first strategy.*

The sequencing analysis for the Final EIS has been revised based on Version 6.0 of the regional travel demand model. Before performing the sequencing analysis for the Draft EIS, members of the MVC team met with representatives of Utahns for Better Transportation and the Sierra Club to review the analysis methodology. Their input was used in developing the methodology and the alternatives that were analyzed (see Response C on page 35-144 of Section 35.29).

- E. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the sequencing analysis is artificially limited to the project study area. They also commented that the MVC project is a major regional investment and that how much growth comes to the study area, as well as its nature, is affected by major investments. A strong regional investment in transit, followed by a strong real estate market in transit-oriented development, could shift development into areas closer to existing transit stations. If the resulting traffic growth in the corridor is slower, road investments could be delayed longer relative to transit. If the transit is built first, then the land-use patterns for further investments could be re-evaluated after the resulting growth patterns become more apparent.*

See Response J on page 35-10 of Section 35.1.1 for a discussion about how the MVC study area was determined. The study area was applied consistently

throughout the sequencing analysis; therefore, none of the sequencing alternatives was given an advantage over the others.

This comment is recommending that, rather than seek ways to meet the transportation needs in the MVC study area, this EIS should have considered ways to change land-use patterns broadly throughout the region in a geographic area that would extend well beyond the MVC study area. As part of this process, FHWA and UDOT coordinated with local governments, developers, and others to assess future land-use patterns in the region both with and without the project. See Chapter 25, Cumulative Impacts. This analysis concluded that, while there might be some shift toward transit-oriented development as recommended in the Growth Choices process, the historic pattern of single-family home development is likely to continue in large parts of the region. Alternative land-use scenarios suggested by the commenter, involving much greater changes in land use, are speculative and therefore were not included in the sequencing analysis.

- F. *Smart Mobility (on behalf of Sierra Club and Utahns for Better Transportation) commented that the sequencing analysis does show how the study area VMT varies significantly with the different analysis, with the lowest VMT in Scenarios 2 and 5, which do not include a new freeway. It is important to consider the benefits of lower VMT, which include less out-of-pocket driving costs and lower air pollution, in the decision of which alternative best serves the region. An analysis using VMT shows that the “transit-only” alternative might outperform the roadway alternatives in some key regional measures of reducing VMT, reducing air pollution, and reducing the cost of transportation, yet the analysis in the Draft EIS is overly constrained to consider only the equivalent costs of vehicle delay but not the out-of-pocket costs of vehicle travel. There is growing interest in many communities along the MVC to plan for transit-oriented development along the proposed transit corridor on 5600 West. The Draft EIS should consider the benefits and tradeoffs of transportation investments that will foster these more-sustainable types of development. A first step is to consider the true cost of transportation, as well as the effects of VMT on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.*

See Response M on page 35-12 of Section 35.1.1 for a discussion about VMT and hours of delay reduction as related to the evaluation criteria. The effects of VMT are included in the air quality analysis.

35.30 Chapter 30 – Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination

- A. *Commenters stated that public comments are not considered in making a decision, and others commented that affected property owners should have been met with in person to discuss potential options.*

All comments provided during the EIS process are part of the project file and were considered in the development of the EIS. Comments provided on the Draft EIS are included in the Final EIS with a response to each comment. FHWA reviews the project file and the comments on the Draft and Final EISs when making a final selection of alternatives in its Record of Decision.

Numerous meetings were held throughout the EIS process (see Chapter 30, Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination). Fliers and mailers of public meetings were sent to property owners and residents along the MVC action alternatives to give the public an opportunity to discuss potential alternatives with the MVC team. At those meetings, the public had the opportunity to review the alternatives and discuss how an alternative affected their property. Given the size of the MVC project and the number of property owners affected, the public-meeting format was considered the best way to meet with the public and discuss potential project alternatives.

- B. *Hexcel Corporation commented that the public involvement process including Growth Choices did not represent mid- and small-size property owners and single-family homeowners. They also commented that the project team did not contact individual property owners.*

The public involvement process was developed to ensure that the public and all property owners had an equal opportunity to provide comments. Numerous meetings were held throughout the EIS process (see Chapter 30, Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination). Fliers and mailers of public meetings were sent to property owners and residents along the MVC action alternatives to give the public an opportunity to discuss potential alternatives with the MVC team. In addition, advertisements were placed in local papers regarding meeting locations, and there were numerous news reports about the project. At the public meetings, the public had the opportunity to review the alternatives and discuss how an alternative affected their property. Given the size of the MVC project and the number of property owners affected, the public-meeting format was considered the best way to meet with the public and discuss potential project alternatives. The Growth Choices process was conducted jointly with the NEPA scoping process and included extensive opportunities for public involvement. Six scoping meetings/Growth Choices workshops were held, which were attended by

about 300 people. In addition, Growth Choices stakeholder committee meetings were open to the public (see Section 3.2, Overview of the Growth Choices Process).

35.31 Other Comments

- A. *Commenters wanted to know where copies of the EIS could be reviewed.*

Fliers, mailers, newspaper ads, and the project website all provided the locations where copies of the EIS could be viewed.

- B. *Commenters stated that, to reduce impacts, the corridor should have been planned and built before houses and businesses were constructed.*

Currently, the local metropolitan planning organizations (WFRC for Salt Lake County and MAG for Utah County) develop long-range transportation plans that look 20 years into the future. Although the plans might identify a need for a project, funding might not be available to purchase property before it is developed. In other cases, the need for the project might not be identified until an area has already begun to develop, as is the case for the MVC project. In these cases, it would not be possible to build the project without affecting some properties.

- C. *Commenters stated a fact about roadway infrastructure, made a statement about other projects, or made a comment that was not clear.*

Thank you for the comment.

- D. *Commenters stated that new development in the area of the proposed MVC alternatives should be stopped until a decision on the project is made.*

UDOT cannot stop private land from being platted or developed without purchasing the property. Cities can try to work with developers during the platting process to preserve private land for future transportation needs.

- E. *Commenters stated that the aerial photographs used in the EIS process are old and therefore undercount the number of homes that would be affected.*

The initial aerial photographs were taken in early 2004 and were updated in October 2007. Housing impacts were based on data in January 2007.

- F. *A commenter stated that they wanted to review all comments on the MVC Draft EIS.*

Copies of comments made on the Draft EIS are available for review in Appendix 35B, Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS.

▲ ▲

G. A commenter stated that they wanted to know who the decision-makers are for the MVC project and which alternative would be implemented.

The final selection of an alternative for each county will be made by FHWA in the Record of Decision, which will be prepared after the Final EIS is completed. For the MVC project, roadway decisions will be made by FHWA in cooperation with UDOT. The transit decision will be made by UTA in cooperation with UDOT and in consultation with FTA. The decision to have a non-tolled or tolled MVC freeway will be made by the Utah Transportation Commission.

▼ ▼

35.32 References

[CEQ] Council on Environmental Quality

- 1981 NEPA's Forty Most Asked Questions. www.nepa.gov/nepa/regs/40/1-10.HTM#2. Accessed May 6, 2008.

Cervero, Robert

- 2000 NTI Training Manual. National Transit Institute.

Diaz, Roderick B.

- 1999 Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. From the APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper. www.apta.com/research/info/briefings/document/diaz.pdf. May.

[EPA] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- 2006 Provisional Assessment of Recent Studies on the Health Effects of Particulate Matter Exposure. EPA/600/R-06/063. July.

[FHWA] Federal Highway Administration

- 2008 Travel Volume Trends. April.

Hee, Edgar J.

- 1994 *City of Jacksonville Traffic-Induced Vibration Study*. Report No. MAI 1-5259. Marquess & Associates, Inc. Consulting Engineers. October 25.

[MAG] Mountainland Association of Governments

- 2007 Conformity Determination Report: Mountainland MPO [Metropolitan Planning Organization] 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Miller, Harris

- 2006 *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. Prepared for the Federal Transit Administration by Miller & Hanson, Inc. Burlington, MA. May.

Nelson, Jon P.

- 1982 Highway Noise and Property Values. *Journal of Transport, Economics and Policy* 16:2, 117–138. May.

Polzin, Steven

- 2006 The Case for Moderate Growth in Vehicles Miles of Travel: A Critical Juncture in U.S. Travel Behavior Trends. April.

[UDOT] Utah Department of Transportation

- 2008 Performance Report. performance.utah.gov/agencies/udot.shtml. Accessed June 20, 2008.

[WFRC] Wasatch Front Regional Council

- 2007 Conformity Analysis for the Updated 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

▲ ▲

This page is intentionally blank.

▼ ▼

Appendix 35A: Commenter and Response Matrix

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Anonymous			1	35.6.3A
Anonymous			2	35.6.3A
Anonymous			3	35.2.7A
Anonymous			4	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Anonymous			5	35.2.1D
Anonymous			6	35.2.13A
Anonymous			7	35.2.7C
Anonymous			8	35.2.3A, 35.2.4A
Anonymous			9	35.2.7C
Anonymous			10	35.2.1F
Anonymous			11	35.2.7C
Anonymous			12	35.2.7C
Anonymous			27	35.2.7C
Anonymous			34	35.2.7A
Anonymous			206	35.2.1B
Anonymous			207	35.31G
Anonymous			208	35.6.3A
Anonymous			209	35.31C, 35.2.4B, 35.13A
Anonymous			210	35.2.7C
Anonymous			211	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Anonymous			212	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Anonymous			213	35.2.1I, 35.2.1J
Anonymous			214	35.2.6A
Anonymous			215	35.2.7C
Anonymous			216	35.2.7C
Anonymous			217	35.2.7A
Anonymous			218	35.2.9A
Anonymous			219	35.2.7C
Anonymous			220	35.2.9A
Anonymous			221	35.2.6A
Anonymous			222	35.2.1F
Anonymous			223	35.2.7C
Anonymous			224	35.2.10A
Anonymous			225	35.2.6A
Anonymous			226	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A
Anonymous			227	35.31C
Anonymous			228	35.2.8A
Anonymous			229	35.2.5A
Anonymous			230	35.2.10D
Anonymous			231	35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Anonymous			268	35.2.4B
Anonymous			357	35.2.7A
Anonymous			381	no comment
Anonymous			382	35.2.9A
Anonymous			386	35.2.7C
Anonymous			545	35.2.7D
Anonymous			556	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Anonymous			654	35.2.7C
Anonymous			655	35.2.7C
Anonymous			680	35.2.7A
Anonymous			720	35.2.7A
Anonymous			734	35.2.9A
Anonymous			735	35.2.7A
Anonymous			736	35.2.7C
Anonymous			770	35.6.3A
Anonymous			771	35.2.7C
Anonymous			772	35.2.7A
Anonymous			773	35.31C
Anonymous			774	35.2.7A
Anonymous			775	35.2.7D
Anonymous			776	35.31C
Anonymous			777	35.2.7D
Anonymous			778	35.2.7A
Anonymous			850	35.2.7C
Anonymous			938	35.7A
Anonymous			939	35.31C
Anonymous			940	35.2.7A
Anonymous			941	35.31C
Anonymous			942	35.2.7C
Anonymous			943	35.2.7A
Anonymous			993	35.2.4A
Anonymous			1034	35.2.9A
Anonymous			1134	35.2.3A
Anonymous			1161	35.31C, 35.2.4B, 35.13A
Anonymous			1162	35.31A, 35.6.3A
Anonymous			1163	35.31G
Anonymous			1164	35.2.1B
Anonymous			1170	35.2.5A
Anonymous			1188	35.31C
Anonymous			1189	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A
Anonymous			1197	35.2.6A
Anonymous			1205	35.6.3A
Anonymous			1225	35.2.1F
Anonymous			1226	35.2.13A
Anonymous			1227	35.31C
Anonymous			1228	35.31C
Anonymous			1229	35.6.3A
Anonymous			1230	35.2.9A
Anonymous			1231	35.2.13A
Anonymous			1338	35.2.7C
Anonymous			2046	35.2.10A
Anonymous			2048	35.2.10A
Anonymous			2118	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A
Anonymous		Smart Mobility	2157	35.1.1J, 35.1.1K, 35.2.7F, 35.1.1L, 35.1.1M, 35.2.1S, 35.2.3I, 35.29E, 35.29E, 35.2.7F, 35.1.1J, 35.2.1T, 35.1.1M, 35.2.1U, 35.2.3I
Anonymous			2267	35.2.7A
Anonymous			2304	35.2.1A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Anonymous			2376	35.6.3A
Anonymous			2377	35.6.3A
Anonymous			2400	35.2.7A
Anonymous			2523	35.2.5A, 35.9A, 35.6.1A
Anonymous			2565	35.2.7A
Anonymous			2566	35.2.7C
Anonymous			2573	35.2.7A
Anonymous			2574	35.31C
Anonymous			2575	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A
Anonymous			2576	35.2.6A
Anonymous			2579	35.2.7A
	Alex		2296	35.2.1A, 35.12.1A
	Amy		115	35.2.7C
	Amy		285	35.31A
	Austin		539	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
	Barry		412	35.2.7C
	Ben		174	35.2.7C
	Chelsea		371	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
	Chip, Liz		1214	35.2.4G
	Chip, Liz		2538	35.12.1A, 35.2.11A, 35.2.3A
	Chris		1097	35.2.10A
	Chrissy		640	35.2.3A
	Cindy		290	35.6.3A
	Danny		439	35.2.7C
	Dave		1906	35.6.3A
	Doug		2275	35.31C
	Elliott		1475	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
	Heather		614	35.2.7A
	J.D.		1137	35.2.10A
	Jamie		1018	35.2.7C
	Jeff		732	35.31C
	Jenny		867	35.2.7A
	Joanie		922	35.2.7D
	Joey		588	35.2.7D
	Kathy		2047	35.2.7C
	Kevin		1116	35.2.9A
	Kristine		1037	35.2.7C
	Kristy		914	35.2.7C
	Lonni		70	35.2.7C
	Maria		516	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
	Melissa		45	35.2.7C
	Melissa		411	35.2.7A
	Michelle		581	35.2.7A
	Mindy		1545	35.2.7A, 35.2.7F, 35.2.7A
	Molly		99	35.31C
	Molly		2375	35.2.11A
	Ryan		745	35.2.7C
	Seth		291	35.6.3A
	Seth		292	35.6.3A
	Shelly		1011	35.2.7A
	Spencer		1126	35.2.1I, 35.2.1A
	Steve		863	35.2.9A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
	Tiffany		452	35.2.9A
	Tina		58	35.2.7C
	Tina		2318	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4C
	Vladimir		293	35.6.3A
	Wendy		540	35.2.7A
	Wendy		741	35.2.8C
	Whitney		1115	35.2.9A
Abiu	Fowsign		1628	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Abney	Susan		503	35.2.7C
Abney	Susan		1399	35.2.7C
Adams	C. Richard		1742	35.2.7A
Adams	Darlene		758	35.2.9A
Adams	Judy, Richard		2177	35.2.9A
Adams	Tonya		2220	35.2.7A
Aders	Aaron		2332	35.15.4A, 35.2.1H
Adkins	Laura		232	35.2.13A
Affleck	Lyle		82	35.31C, 35.1.1A, 35.2.10A
Aguilar	Jay		1190	35.31C
Aguilera	Luis		1349	35.2.7C
Ahlstrom	Jennifer		1617	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Alexander	Heather		1307	35.2.7A
Alexander	Heather, Joe		1855	35.2.7A
Alexander	Sue		1322	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Alig	James		2391	35.2.9A
Allan	H. Jerry		1340	35.2.6A
Allen	Eric		2266	35.2.7C
Allen	Kristi		54	35.2.7D
Allen	Lance		1074	35.2.1A, 35.1.1H
Allen	Lori		1550	35.2.7C
Allgrunn	Dave		1411	35.2.10A, 35.31C
Allred	Jennifer		1068	35.2.7A
Allred	Jennifer		1069	35.2.7A
Allred	Michael		59	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Allred	Shan		842	35.2.7A
Alva	Shawna		165	35.31C
Alvarado	Jose		472	35.2.7A
Ames	Tiffany		120	35.2.13A
Andelin	Doris		1727	35.2.7A
Andelin	Nathan, Jennifer, Shannon, Karalee		1410	35.2.10A
Anderson	Adam		333	35.31C
Anderson	Adam		334	No comment
Anderson	Alan		1052	35.2.4A, 35.2.10A
Anderson	Eric		2045	35.2.7C
Anderson	Jalin		511	35.2.7C
Anderson	Jalin		1400	35.2.7C
Anderson	Johnny		1169	35.2.10A
Anderson	Kristine		1017	35.2.7A
Anderson	Millie		1341	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Anderson	Rachel		2099	35.2.9C
Anderson	Richard		461	35.2.1K
Anderson	Richard R.		1487	35.2.7D, 35.2.1K
Anderson	Robert		341	35.31 C
Anderson	Ryan		57	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Anderson	Ryan C.		1576	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A
Anderson	Shawn		138	35.2.9A
Anderson	Shawn, Jackie		1862	35.2.7A
Anderson	Terry		1217	35.31C
Anderson	Victor, Shontell		703	35.2.7A
Anderson	Victor, Shontell		704	35.2.7A
Anderson	Victor, Shontell		705	35.2.7A
Anderton	Deann		1491	35.31C
Andrews	Emerson		1342	35.3A, 35.12.4A
Andrews	Emerson		2443	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.3A
Andrews	John		546	35.2.7D
Andrews	John, Fern		1764	35.2.7A
Andrus	Millard, Peggy		352	35.2.9A
Apa	John		2261	35.2.10A, 35.2.3A
Appel	Jeffrey W.	Lehi City Council, Lehi Mayor, and Lehi Residents	1919	35.1.1O, 35.1.1P, 35.1.1Q, 35.2.7F, 35.2.1H, 35.1.1R, 35.2.1P, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7F, 35.2.1W, 35.1.1S, 35.2.1H, 35.3B, 35.2.7F, 35.1.1P, 35.1.1R, 35.1.1P, 35.2.7F, 35.2.1W, 35.2.1BB, 35.2.1CC, 35.2.11C, 35.2.7F/H, 35.3E, 35.4D, 35.2.7F, 35.5B, 35.5C, 35.24K, 35.6.1E, 35.8F, 35.2.1P, 35.1.1O, 35.1.1P, 35.9F, 35.9G, 35.10A, 35.11E, 35.25G, 35.12.1I, 35.13F, 35.13G, 35.14E, 35.14F, 35.15.1B, 35.17B, 35.21A, 35.24C, 35.24D, 35.24E, 35.24F, 35.24G, 35.24H, 35.24I, 35.24J, 35.25B, 35.25C, 35.25D, 35.25E, 35.25F, 35.27A, 35.27B, 35.27C, 35.27D, 35.28D, 35.2.1P, 35.1.1O
Applegarth	Bill	Riverton City, Mayor	1878	35.2.11B
Aquino	Rosario		665	35.2.7A
Araya	Esteban		425	35.2.7A
Arbor	Jenica		870	35.2.7A
Archuletta	James		757	35.6.3A
Armbruster	Christine		2329	35.15.4A, 35.2.1H, 35.12.1A
Armstrong	Arlene		2530	35.6.3A
Arnell	Ranae		1147	35.2.9A
Arnesen	Teresa		1492	35.2.7C
Ash	Wayne		1907	35.2.10A
Ashby	Dora, Edward		1791	35.2.7A
Ashcraft	Tina		2125	35.2.9A
Ashton	Tiffany		1564	35.2.9A
Ashton	Tyler		1467	35.2.9A
Astrope	Janet		117	35.2.8A, 35.2.9C
Astwood	Henry		492	35.2.7C
Atwood	Arah		1947	35.2.9A
Atwood	Jay, Anna Mae		260	35.2.9A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Augustine	Elaine		1948	35.2.9A
Autrey	Loren		611	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Aydelotte	Nanette		1792	35.2.7A
Aydelotte	Nanette, Michael		740	35.2.7A
Ayers	Lindsay		1290	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
Ayers	Lindsay		2423	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A, 35.1.1A
Bacher	Genifer		2467	35.2.13A, 35.6.1A, 35.6.3A, 35.2.7A
Bacher	Michael		2468	35.2.7C, 35.13A, 35.9A
Bacon	Jonathan		465	35.2.9A
Bacus	Tom	Kennecott Land	2179	35.2.3A, 35.2.3F, 35.2.4O
Baer	John I.		1168	35.1.1A
Baggaley	Michael		1145	35.2.7C
Baggaley	Wendi		1144	35.2.7C
Bailey	Brian		520	35.2.7C
Bailey	Laurie		2115	35.2.7D
Bailey	Matt		507	35.2.9C
Bailey	Rob		1949	35.2.9C
Baily	Jack		584	35.2.7C
Baily	Jack		1555	35.2.7C, 35.12.1A, 35.2.9C
Baily	Jack		2063	35.2.7C, 35.2.9B, 35.31C
Bair	Linda		1061	35.2.10A
Baird	Jeff		1515	35.2.7A
Baird	Jeff		1931	35.2.9A
Baird	Michele		2197	35.2.9A
Baker	Cheri		1762	35.2.7A
Baker	Cory, Stacey		1536	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Baker	John		570	35.2.7A
Baker	Mary M.		2328	35.15.4A, 35.2.8A, 35.2.1H
Baker	Nathan		261	35.1.1E, 35.2.8A
Baker	Nathan		1856	35.2.7A
Baker	Paul		1409	35.6.1B, 35.2.4H, 35.2.10B, 35.1.1A
Baker	Sherry		25	35.2.7C
Baker	Sherry		378	35.2.7C
Baie	William		664	35.2.7C
Ballash	Kenneth		509	35.2.7C
Balzotti	Tyfani		309	35.2.7A
Barclay	Jon		2456	35.2.6A, 35.2.1H
Bardalez	Abraham		1346	35.2.7C
Baresh	Joshua		1621	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Baresh	Tina		1625	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Barker	Karleen		2221	35.2.13A
Barker	Karleen		2222	35.2.6A
Barker	Megan		1663	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Barker	Ronald		1235	35.1.1A, 35.12.4A
Barker	Sandy		1028	35.6.3A
Barnes	Amy		462	35.2.7A
Barnes	C.J., Idona		1851	35.2.7A
Barnes	Camille		361	35.2.7C
Barnes	Jeff		2027	35.2.7C
Barnes	Reldon		2477	35.12.1A, 35.2.7A
Barnham	Kemp, Amy		1857	35.2.7A

▼▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Barnum	Scott, Julie		201	35.2.7C
Barnus	Natalie		661	35.2.7C
Barrett	Ray		1244	35.2.7C, 35.2.1D, 35.2.1B
Barrus	Gary		2089	35.2.10A
Barsh	Steve		486	35.2.6A
Bartholomew	Leon		75	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Baskam	Clarissa		1026	35.2.7C
Bateman	Shane		1345	35.2.7A
Bateman	Tyler		598	35.2.7C
Batmond	Kiley		900	35.2.7A
Bates	Tanya		418	35.2.7C
Baugh	Jennifer		527	35.2.7C
Baxter	Shelley		2124	35.2.9A
Bayles	Linda		1107	35.2.7A
Beal	Dave		760	35.31C
Beamson	Karyl		1793	35.2.7A
Beck	Ben		1365	35.2.9A, 35.2.6B, 35.2.9A
Beck	Jacob		1095	35.2.7D
Beck	Paul		1557	35.2.7A
Beck	Rachele		592	35.2.7A
Beck	Rebecca		80	35.2.7A
Becker	Dan		369	35.2.7A
Becker	Dave		1672	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Beckstrom	Dianna		1951	35.2.3A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.1A
Beckstrom	Dianna		2432	35.2.3A, 35.2.1A
Beecher	Robert		1087	35.2.7D
Beeltz	Seth		1627	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Beffort	Robert		2184	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.12.1A, 35.14D, 35.2.9A
Bell	Gina		820	35.2.13A
Belliston	Peter		257	35.2.13A
Belnap	Ilene		367	35.2.7C
Beltran	Debra		2102	35.31C, 35.2.7C
Bemis	Nancy		2368	35.2.4A, 35.2.10A
Bench	Thomas, Denice		1271	35.2.7A, 35.9A, 35.2.9A
Bench	Thomas, Denice		1584	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.7B
Benich	Jamie		1490	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bennion	Suzette		167	35.2.7C
Bennion	Todd		173	35.2.7A
Bentley	Dennis		1153	35.2.4B, 35.2.1A
Bentley	Kimberly		833	35.2.7A
Bentley	Kimberly		834	35.2.7A
Bentley	Nancy, Richard		1600	35.2.7C, 35.2.6A, 35.2.9C
Bently	Richard, Nancy		733	35.2.1D
Berdanolic	Gary		548	35.2.7C
Berendson	Shelley		2269	35.2.7A
Berg	Paula		1589	35.2.9A
Bergfeld	Jeff		499	35.2.7C
Berry	Katherine		547	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1F
Bertrand	Alain		1236	35.2.4A
Best	Jennie		2408	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Best	Richard		847	35.2.7A
Best	Richard		2392	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Beutler	Gary		1495	35.2.10A
Bevenridge	Hailey		1952	35.31C
Beverly	Curtis		694	35.2.7C
Bigelow	Brooke, Blake		2300	35.2.9A
Billings	Erin		673	35.2.7C
Billings	Kolby		2002	35.2.8C
Bills	Kevin		1885	35.2.4E, 35.31C, 35.1.1A
Biney	Drey		447	35.2.7C
Bird	Jim		992	35.2.10A
Birdsall	Kathy		1092	35.2.5A, 35.2.10C, 35.2.10B
Bitter	Cherie		2305	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Bitter	Forrest R.		2126	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A
Bitton	Marta		1002	35.2.8A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Bitton	Michael		1056	35.2.8A
Black	Andrew		2138	35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.4E, 35.13A
Black	Richard		1953	35.31C
Black	Tammy		1682	35.2.7A
Blackburn	David		569	35.2.7C
Blackburn	Fred		190	35.2.7C, 35.1.1F
Blackburn	Fred		1493	35.1.1F
Blackburn	Fred		1494	35.1.1F
Blackburn	Jodie		568	35.2.7C
Blackburn	Manya		1567	35.2.7C
Blackburn	Parker		566	35.2.7C
Blackburn	Sarah		567	35.2.7C
Blackmore	Marco		1678	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Blake	Shanda		1412	35.2.7C
Blake	Tracie		1099	35.2.10C
Blakesley	Jane		14	35.2.7C
Blaser	Troy		1300	35.2.7C
Blatter	Don, Leslee		2040	35.2.7C
Bloxhen	Ray		1669	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Bluemel	Katherine		1027	35.2.7D
Bluemel	Terry A.		2417	35.2.5A
Blust	Kendal		2160	35.15.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.24A, 35.2.1H, 35.4A
Boch	Rachael, Adam		380	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bodily	Doug		1059	35.2.7C
Bodily	Reagan		2165	35.2.7C
Bodtcher	Aaron		1566	35.2.6A
Bohman	Phil, LeeAnn		2536	35.2.7C
Bohnstedt	Marvin, Daryl		235	35.2.7A
Bollard	Dick		1876	35.2.5C
Bollock	Vera		877	35.2.7D
Bolnick	Joanne		1317	35.9A
Bolnick	Joanne		1318	35.13A, 35.12.1A, 35.1.1A
Bolnick	Joanne		2370	35.13A, 35.12.1A, 35.1.1A
Bolnick	Kelly		1319	35.2.2A
Bolnick	Kelly		2371	35.2.2A
Bolnick	Larry		1940	35.12.1A, 35.9A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Bone	Linda		859	35.2.7A
Bonham	Ryan, Amy		246	35.2.9A, 35.2.7B
Bonilla	Charles		88	35.2.7B
Bonnell	Rose H.		1389	35.2.1I
Bonnell	Rose H.		1575	35.2.1I,
Bonner	Jeff		1372	35.31C, 35.31E
Bonner	Jeff		2381	35.31C, 35.31E
Bonner	Stacie		1371	35.2.4C, 35.31E, 35.6.3A
Bonner	Stacie		2380	35.2.4C, 35.31E, 35.6.3A
Borgenicht	Roger	Utahns for Better Transportation and Sierra Club	1880	35.29A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.1P, 35.12.1F, 35.2.1Q, 35.2.1R, 35.3C, 35.2.1R, 35.29C, 35.2.3A, 35.12.1G, 35.29A, 35.29D, 35.2.3A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.12.4F, 35.12.3A, 35.6.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.29A, 35.15.4C, 35.2.9A, 35.2.6C,
Borgenicht	Roger		1881	no comment
Borgenicht	Roger		1882	no comment
Bork	Eric		1785	35.2.7A
Bort	June		876	35.2.7D
Boshard	Susan, Robb		491	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C, 35.2.8C
Bosley	Jon, Rebecca		1179	35.2.1F
Boss	David		35	35.2.7A
Bott	Jason		2136	35.2.7A
Bott	Krista		2135	35.2.7A
Boucher	Kurtt		1632	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Bowen	William		2374	35.31F
Bowen	William		98	35.31F
Bower	Bruce		1101	35.2.7C
Bowers	Kristine		1619	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Bowers	Monica		1795	35.2.7A
Bowers	Vicky		1218	35.6.3A
Bowler	Elvin, Jane		1718	35.2.7A
Bowles	Holly		951	35.2.1A, 35.2.4H
Bowles	Holly		1886	35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Bowman	Robert	Jensen Land Development, LLC	2223	35.4B, 35.6.3B, 35.11A, 35.2.1A, 35.13A, 35.2.4R, 35.2.4G, 35.2.4E, 35.4C, 35.2.4R
Boyd	Debora		2013	35.2.9C
Boyd	Patrick		78	35.2.1D, 35.2.13
Boyer	Barbara		841	35.2.7A
Boyer	M. Beth		1794	35.2.7A
Bracken	Shad		1081	35.2.3A
Bradbury	Brittany		169	35.2.7C
Bradford	Jason		1192	35.2.7C
Bradley	Rick		449	35.2.7C
Bradley	Scott		496	35.31C
Bradshaw	Diane		2116	35.2.7A
Brady	Melisa		1615	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Brady	Ty		1796	35.2.7A
Braithwaite	John		1578	35.2.2A, 35.1.1A
Braithwaite	John		2081	35.12.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Braithwaite	Kent		768	35.2.9A
Braithwaite	Regina		2149	35.12.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Brandt	Dan		286	35.6.3A
Brannum	Marla		1010	35.2.7A
Breck	Pauline		329	35.2.7C
Brems	David		1614	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Brems	Louis, Ruth		1174	35.2.4A
Bresley	Theresa		1644	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Bret	Johson		2503	35.2.7A, 35.2.7E
Brewer	David		1001	35.2.7A
Briggs	Justin		2128	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Briggs	Megan		2132	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Briggs	Tyler		729	35.2.7A
Briles	Stephen		365	35.2.6A
Brimhall	Ammon		196	35.2.7C
Brimhall	Ammon		544	35.2.7C
Brimhall	Ammon		1496	35.2.7C
Brimhall	Greg		1497	35.2.10A
Brimhall	Timo		2006	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bringhurst	Rachel		2175	35.2.7C
Broadbent	Judy		1237	35.6.3A
Broderick	Nicole, Mike		1797	35.2.7A
Brook	Carol		904	35.2.7A
Brooks	Beverly		891	35.2.7A
Brooks	Derek		162	35.2.7C
Brooks	Gina		38	35.2.7C
Brooks	Peter		1182	35.2.7A
Brooks	Peter		1299	35.2.7A
Brothers	Alex		1234	35.15.4B
Brown	Annie		557	35.2.7C
Brown	Casey H.		1954	35.31C
Brown	Charles, Sylvia		2434	35.2.4B, 35.8A, 35.6.1A, 35.2.4B, 35.6.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.6.3A,
Brown	Cindy		2464	35.2.7A
Brown	David		467	35.2.7C
Brown	Dennis		672	35.2.13A
Brown	Dennis	Saratoga Springs Planning Commission Members	2219	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Brown	Jim		2463	35.2.7A
Brown	Lynn		300	35.31C
Brown	Lynn		1216	35.31C
Brown	Mark		1413	35.31C
Bruff	Alisa		1023	35.2.7A
Brunner	Jeffery K.		1082	35.2.4B, 35.2.1A
Brunner	Jeffrey K.		2268	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4B, 35.6.3A, 35.2.4B, 35.2.10A
Brunvand	Amy		1679	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Buck	Nathan, Charisma		1728	35.2.7A
Buck	Rob		1683	35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Budge	Kimberly		754	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Budge	Ryan		726	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bullock	Neldon		1039	35.2.7D
Burnham	Donna		1120	35.2.7C
Burnham	Grant		1798	35.2.7A
Burnham	Lincoln		1029	35.2.7C
Burnham	Terresa		1513	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.1H
Burningham	Josh		366	35.2.7A
Burningham	Marian		407	35.2.7C
Burningham	R.		586	35.2.7C
Burningham	Susan		585	35.2.7D
Burns	Mike		882	35.2.7C
Burr	Cecile		1408	35.2.7C
Burr	Wesley		2204	35.2.9A
Burt	Rose		181	35.2.7C
Burton	Ashlin		105	35.2.10D
Burton	Chris, Julie		1799	35.2.7A
Burton	Daniel		2472	35.2.9C, 35.2.13A
Burton	Lawrence, Janet		2178	35.2.8C, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1B
Bush	William S. Linda H.		204	35.2.7D, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bush	William S., Linda H.		2054	35.2.9A
Bushey	Jon		1007	35.2.10A
Bushman	LaRille		1800	35.2.7A
Bushman	Robin		1657	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Butler	Audrey		2239	35.2.7C
Buto	Robert		616	35.2.4A
Butterfield	Danelle		2011	35.2.7C
Bybee	Andrew		1272	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Bybee	Ryan		1273	35.2.8C
C.	Mark		1213	35.2.10A, 35.2.4A
Cable	Heather		283	35.2.4A
Cabot	Jennings		1890	35.12.4A
Calaway	Cory		2111	35.2.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Caldwell	Debra A.		2451	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
Caldwell	Stephanie		441	35.2.6A
Calkins	Gordon		318	35.2.1F
Calkins	Gordon		1306	35.2.1F
Call	Lance		625	35.2.13A, 35.2.7A
Call	Matt		40	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Callister	Chris		1915	35.2.7A, 35.2.7F, 35.2.9A
Calton	Douglas		869	35.2.9A
Calton	Kenneth, Christine		94	35.2.7C
Calton	Kenneth, Christine		95	35.2.7C
Cammack	Shane		1208	35.2.4A
Campbell	Kimberley		1846	35.2.7A
Canolt	Ryan		858	35.2.7A
Capell	Bruce		1194	35.2.6A
Capson	Saffron		1288	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7F, 35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Capson	Tyler		1955	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Caputo	Joey		1291	35.12.4A, 35.29A
Caputo	Joey		2424	35.12.4A
Carbine	Katherine		1219	35.2.8A
Carbine	Kathryn		1801	35.2.7A
Cardon	Annie		1802	35.2.7A
Carin			1156	35.2.7A
Carlile	Brian		505	35.2.7A
Carlile	Brian		974	35.2.7A
Carlile	Brian		1215	35.2.9A
Carlquist	Chris		862	35.2.7C
Carlson	Frank		325	35.2.13A
Carlson	Stephanie		952	35.2.4H, 35.2.4B, 35.1.1A
Carlson E.	Frank, Heather		17	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Carlton	Kenneth		1803	35.2.7A
Carper	Eric		1302	35.2.7C
Carrington	Brian R.	Suburban Land Reserve	2156	35.2.4A, 35.2.4Q
Carroll	Brian		994	35.2.7C
Carson	Merrill, Glenda		1830	35.2.7A
Carter	Chad		1957	35.6.3A
Carter	Kristen, Ross		1874	35.2.7A
Carter	Lynsay		1956	35.6.3A
Carter	Marianne		1211	35.2.11A, 35.2.10A
Case	Zac		1499	35.2.7C
Casper	Ken		31	35.31C
Casper	Phillip F.		814	35.2.7A
Castiblanco	Andrea		506	35.2.7A
Caussey	Lyndie		1367	35.2.7C
Cavane	Connie, Jack		1899	35.31C
Cavane	Jack, Connie		739	35.31C
Cavane	Jack, Connie		2429	35.2.4L
Cedar	Carrie		1220	35.2.4M
Chamberlain	Drew		1248	35.31C
Chamberlain	Jennifer		517	35.2.10A
Chamberlain	Jennifer		518	35.2.7C
Chamberlain	Luke, Emily		781	35.2.7A
Chamberlain	Luke, Emily		782	35.2.7A
Chapman	S.		2187	35.2.9A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Chappel	Amy		670	35.2.7C
Chatham	Lance, Terra		1684	35.2.7A
Chatwin	Dee		1603	35.6.3A
Cheadle	Michelle		2175	35.2.7C
Cheney	Scott		1666	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Cheney	Zac, Hilary		1848	35.2.7A
Cheney	Zachary A.		643	35.2.9A
Cheney	Zachary A.		2476	35.2.9A, 35.2.13A
Chidester	Ray		233	35.2.1G
Child	Allen		2510	35.31D
Child	Tiffany		150	35.2.7A
Chiurato	Doug		2545	35.2.6B
Christensen	Brian		49	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Christensen	Carrie		1590	35.2.4C, 35.2.4B, 35.2.5B
Christensen	Damon		2258	35.2.5A, 35.2.1F
Christensen	Erin		1498	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Christensen	Gary		2090	35.2.6A
Christensen	Judy		281	35.6.3A
Christensen	Karl		653	35.2.6A
Christensen	Kay		868	35.2.6A
Christensen	Rocky		913	35.2.7A
Christensen	Scott		2563	35.2.10C
Christensen	Valerie		2103	35.2.7C
Christiansen	Angie		901	35.2.9A
Christiansen	Karen		1958	35.2.7C
Christofferson	Dave		86	35.2.9A
Christofferson	Dave		1553	35.2.8C
Christofferson	Frankie		1223	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.12.4A, 35.31C
Christofferson	Gary		1036	35.2.7A
Church	Lewis, Karen		700	35.2.7C
Cieslak	Brandi		1359	35.2.7A
Clark	Evan		1608	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Clark	Holly		1157	35.2.4H
Clark	Kirsten		2325	35.15.4A
Clark	Matt		377	35.2.7C
Clark	Ward		1790	35.2.7A
Clark	Whitney		1658	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Clasball	Jerry		1155	35.2.3A
Clausen	Scott		2270	35.2.1A
Clawson	Suzanne		832	35.2.7C
Clegg	Bob		823	35.2.7C
Clegg	Travis		1510	35.13A
Clement	Cherie		603	35.2.7A
Click	Cheryl Sue		2044	35.2.9A, 35.2.3B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
Clifton	Amy		2274	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Clifton	Trevor		160	35.2.7A
Clifton	Trevor		2482	35.2.7A, 35.2.7E, 35.2.7A, 35.13A, 35.2.7A
Clover	John R.		954	35.2.9A
Cluff	Robert, Barbara		1719	35.2.7A
Cluff	Tiffini		2015	35.2.7A
Cobbley	Karlene		1207	35.6.3A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.10A
Coccimiglio	Tony		114	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Cochran	Rachael		1414	35.2.7C
Coe	Debra		837	35.2.7A
Cohen	Marrisa		2461	35.2.13A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Cohen	Paul		2462	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Coleman	Jeffery		1959	35.2.4A
Colemere	Scott	Colmere Realty Assoc., LLC	2240	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4H, 35.2.1A,
Collard	Wayne		1266	35.31C
Colledge	Marcia		982	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Colledge	Marcia		1730	35.2.7A
Collin			2104	35.2.7D
Collings	Bryan		1177	35.2.7C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Collins	Edward		2366	35.2.9A
Colquitt	Randy, Stephanie		2224	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Coltharp	Karla		1961	35.2.6A
Coltharp	Roger		1960	35.2.9C, 35.2.13A
Combe	Mitch		2065	35.2.7A
Comer	Janene		742	35.2.7A
Comer	Kyle		1962	35.25A, 35.2.9A
Comer-Miller	Janice		522	35.2.7A
Condas	Kevin		2394	35.2.5A
Conner	Barry		1804	35.2.7A
Conner	Karen		510	35.2.7
Connin	Keith		918	35.2.7C
Cook	Dave		1805	35.2.7A
Cook	J.		998	35.2.7A
Cook	Jamie		1148	35.2.7A
Cook	Michael		902	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Cook	Pam		1154	35.2.7A
Cook	Tasha		1806	35.2.7A
Cook	Tori		2141	35.2.7A
Coop	Parker	NAI Commercial Real Estate	275	35.6.3A
Cooper	Jennifer		23	35.2.7A
Cope	Aleena		2175	35.2.7C
Corbett	Michael		2471	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Corbett	Michael, Michell		642	35.2.9A
Corbridge	Debbie		296	35.6.3C
Corbridge	Debbie		1301	35.6.3A
Corbridge	Francine		2420	35.2.4B, 35.2.10A
Corbridge	Mark		1255	35.6.3A
Cordova	Anthony, Jessica		2137	35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A
Corkle	Vi		1964	35.2.3A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.2A
Corkle	William		1963	35.2.3A
Coulter	Amy		2257	35.2.7A
Coulter	David		2055	35.31C
Coulter	Mark		2241	35.2.7A
Cova	Cameron	Utah Moms for Clean Air and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment	2000	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.12.3B, 35.12.3B, 35.12.4A, 35.12.4H, 35.12.4A, 35.12.4F, 35.12.4H, 35.2.5D, 35.2.3A, 35.29A,
Cova	Cameron		2436	35.12.4A, 35.2.5A, 35.29A,
Cowie	Adam		1905	35.2.7C, 35.2.6B
Cox	Claudia S.		2014	35.2.7C
Cox	James		2017	35.2.7C
Craig	Bob		1060	35.2.7D
Craig	Julie		887	35.2.7A
Craig	Kim		1076	35.2.7A
Craig	Robert		2481	35.2.7A, 35.2.7E
Crane	Ivy		2426	35.12.4A
Crane	Lynn	Herriman City, Mayor	2079	35.2.4P, 35.2.1N, 35.2.3G, 35.2.4P

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Crane	Ray		1965	35.2.3D, 35.12.4A
Crane	Richard H.		2449	35.2.4K, 35.6.1B, 35.2.4B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1B, 35.6.3A
Craven	Brain, Heather		2185	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1L, 35.2.7F, 35.2.7H, 35.2.7K, 35.2.7A, 35.8E, 35.9D, 35.9E, 35.2.7A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.4B, 35.15.4D, 35.17B, 35.2.7F, 35.2.9A
Craven	Brenda, Mike		2018	35.2.7C
Crease	Debbie		927	35.2.7A
Creer	David M.	Utah Trucking Assoc.	1568	35.2.4A, 35.2.7C, 35.9B, 35.12.4B, 35.6.1D, 35.9C, 35.2.10E, 35.2.10A
Cresse	Richard		273	35.6.3A
Cresse	Richard		1298	35.2.5A
Cresse	Sandra		272	35.6.3A
Critchfield	Justin		589	35.2.7A
Crockett	Christy		1320	35.2.7A
Crockle	William		2441	35.2.3A
Culbreath	Anne		1808	35.2.7A
Culmone	Terri		1884	35.2.13A, 35.2.1K, 35.2.8A
Cummings	Jeremy		2549	35.6.1A, 35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.15.4A, 35.2.4A
Cummins	Shelly, Tony		136	35.2.7C
Cummins	Shelly, Tony		137	35.2.7C
Cunningham	Suzanne		147	35.2.7C
Currier	Gary		1807	35.2.7A
Curtis	Darrell		2421	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.3D, 35.12.1B, 35.2.4C
Curtis	Janene		2442	35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.9A
Curtis	Kaye		2393	35.2.7A
Curtis	ReNae		577	35.2.7C
D.	Andrea		373	35.2.7C
D.	Josh		372	35.2.7C
Daddy	Chump		2537	35.2.9A
Dale	Robin		1377	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Dale	Sharon, Trevor		2200	35.2.9A
Danforth	Ryan		988	35.2.7C
Daniels	Karen		488	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Dansie	Gary		765	35.2.7C
Dansie	Sharlene		199	35.2.7C
Darger	Jennifer		893	35.2.9A
Davidson	Cameron		1901	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A
Davis	Bonnie		830	35.2.7A
Davis	Fumi		1642	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Davis	Lynn		1221	35.6.3A
Davis	Mark		1113	35.2.7D
Davis	Missy		1149	35.2.7A
Day	Adam, Kate		1378	35.2.7C
Day	Tom		1556	35.2.7C
Dayley	Gabriel		1837	35.2.7A
Dazley	Duff		2551	35.2.10A, 35.7A
De La Cruz	Raul		1200	35.2.1A, 35.2.4H
Deal	Pearl		2041	35.2.4H
Debruin	Chris		2457	35.2.7C, 35.2.9B, 35.31C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Decker	David		727	35.2.7C
Decker	Judith		728	35.2.7C
DeDen	Daniel		1167	35.2.7C
DeDen	Daniel		2182	35.31C, 35.2.9A
Dehart	Elizabeth		267	35.2.10A, 35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
DeHaven	Darleen		1415	35.2.4A, 35.2.1F, 35.2.3D
Delahunty	Kirsty		140	35.2.7C
DeLaLoza	R.M.		619	35.2.7C
Denmark	Gwen		650	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Dennis	Mack		1043	35.2.7A
Dennison	John		2117	35.2.1A
Deon	Taylor		276	35.2.3A
Derington	Jacob		638	35.2.7C
Derrick	Mat		1720	35.2.7A
Deshler	Todd		39	35.2.13A
Deshler	Todd		1401	35.31C
Destefano	Vanessa, Chris		936	35.2.7A
Destefano	Vanessa, Chris		1014	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Devey	Glen		156	35.2.7C
Devey	Jennifer		278	35.8A, 35.2.10A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.3A, 35.1.1A
Dew	Donald		2322	35.24A
Dewey	Jerry R.	Associated Foods Stores	2521	35.2.10A, 35.2.10C, 35.1.1B, 35.2.3A, 35.2.3A, 35.31C. 35.1.1B, 35.1.1A, 35.1.1B
Diamond	Aaron		903	35.2.7A
Diamond	Barbara		865	35.2.7D
Dickamore	Bruce		2577	35.6.3A
Diepenveen	Brenda		2091	35.2.9A
Diepeveen	John		1734	35.2.7A
DiLoreto	DeAnna, Scott		1416	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Dixon	Eutona		2175	35.2.7C
Dobson	Paula		2334	35.6.3A
Dobson	Paula		2447	35.2.1A
Dobson	Scott		2450	35.2.1A, 35.2.4B
Dodge	David		809	35.2.7C
Dodge	Gwen		808	35.2.7C
Doidge	Briget		2271	35.2.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A
Doidge	William W.		2272	35.2.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A
Doidge	William W.		2273	35.2.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A
Donahue	Heather, Mark		123	35.2.7C
Dorsey	Sean		1558	35.2.6A
Douglas	David		468	35.2.4A
Douglas	David		1552	35.2.4A
Dowdle	William		1293	35.2.9A
Dowdle	William Brent		787	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Dozhier	Corey		647	35.31C
Draper	Cody, Natalie		2105	35.2.13A
Driggs	Jane		1274	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Driggs	Jeffrey D.		2186	35.2.8A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Droubay	Mark		1500	35.2.10A, 35.2.1B
Du Preez	Tony		2384	35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Dubois	Loel		1763	35.2.7A
Duckworth	Larry		2422	35.31C, 35.12.1A, 35.11A, 35.1.1A, 35.12.1A
Duclos	Eric		20	35.2.7A
Duclos	Eric		1765	35.2.7A
Ducos	Charlotte		429	35.2.7C
Dudson	George		934	35.2.7A
Duersch	Jason		358	35.2.7C
Duke	Jay		1254	35.2.3A, 35.1.1G, 35.31G
Duke	Sharlene		1253	35.2.4B, 35.12.4A
Dumas	Cole, Lindsey		353	35.2.7A
Dumas	Lindsey		1328	35.12.1A
Duran	T.		420	35.31 C
Durkin	Priscilla		30	35.2.7C
Dwyer	Tim		1659	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Dyer	Cori		928	35.2.7D
Dykhuisen	M.		44	35.31C
Eagar	Michael		1577	35.2.13A
Earley	Julie		2293	35.2.7A
Earling	Shane		658	35.2.7C
Eastin	Bud		2335	35.6.3A
Easton	Anne		1889	35.12.4G
Ebara	Raylynn		886	35.2.9A
Ebertson	Wally		1066	35.2.7D
Eccles	Brandon		762	35.2.7C
Edelman	Dustin, Beth		247	35.2.7A
Edlefsen	David		112	35.2.7C, 35.2.1D
Edvalson	Margaret		2430	35.12.4A, 35.13A, 35.6.1A
Edwards	Jannilyn		1685	35.2.7A
Edwards	Lori		669	35.2.7C
Edwards	Robert		1766	35.2.7A
Eggett	Karen		322	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Eggett	Karen		1315	35.2.13, 35.2.6A
Eggett	Shelley, Kent		1686	35.2.7A
Ehat	Jill		579	35.2.9A
Ehat	Jill		1549	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Ehat	Jill		1573	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Ehat	Taylor		1572	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Ekern	James		2336	35.13A
Ekern	James		2337	35.31C
Ekstrom	Michael K.		2119	35.2.7C
Ekstrom	Mike		818	35.2.7C
Elkins	Emily		2324	35.15.4A, 35.24A, 35.2.9A
Elliott	Mark		1480	35.2.7C
Elliott	Robert		1641	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Ellis	Gary		1624	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Ellis	Heather		1609	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Ellis	Natalie		924	35.2.8A
Emery	Scott		836	35.2.6A
Emery	Star		854	35.2.7D
Enger	Kathryn		1767	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
England	Daniel E.	England Trucking	2254	35.9C, 35.2.10A, 35.2.10A
English	Brittany		1611	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Ercanblack	Lindsay		1829	35.2.7A
Erickson	Jackie		1042	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Erickson	Jordan		1501	35.2.7C
Erikson	Wade		2101	35.2.7C
Esparza	Jose		1238	35.2.4B, 35.12.4
Esparza	Jose		2428	35.12.4A
Estes	Dale, Glenda		389	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Estes	Glenda		1330	35.2.9A
Estrada	Darlene		392	35.2.7C
Evans	Gary		1770	35.2.7A
Evans	Todd		154	35.2.7C
Evertsen	Judy		2049	35.2.10A
Ewert	Paul		2009	35.2.13A
Ewing	Janice		1674	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Fagan	Elizabeth		46	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Fairbanks	Justin		2133	35.2.7D
Fairbanks	Shannon		2131	35.2.7A
Fairbourn	Valerie		1417	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.1A
Faneus	Jamie		2427	35.2.3A
Farlow	Breann		1769	35.2.7A
Farnsworth	Scott, Andrea		1831	35.2.7A
Fawcett	David		718	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Fawn	Kimberly		1591	35.2.7A
Feldstrom	Joan		871	35.2.7D
Ferguson	Janice		1920	35.2.4A
Ferrell	Angie		2112	35.2.7C
Fewkes	Gary		1176	35.2.6A
Fiddle	Sherry		1125	35.2.4H, 35.12.1A
Fillmore	Brent		2113	35.2.4H
Finch	Scott		921	35.2.7C
Findlay	Don		1420	35.2.10A
Findlay	Suzie, Errol		2338	35.2.4J
Firmage	Carrol		1361	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Firmage	Ed, Jr.		1363	35.2.2A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Fisher	Jacob		896	35.2.7A
Fitzgerald	Sandy		838	35.2.7A
Flack	Marlane		1233	35.2.4B
Florence	Scott		2398	35.2.7A
Florence	Scott C.		906	35.2.7A
Floyd	Dan		36	35.2.10A
Floyd	Heather, Kevin		1696	35.2.7A
Fluckinger	Michael		2387	35.2.8A
Folkman	Shawn		1150	35.2.7D
Fonua	Anna		161	35.2.7C
Ford	Elaine		1432	35.2.7A
Ford	Joe, Donalyn		1768	35.2.7A
Ford	Shirley		1873	35.2.7A
Ford	Wendy		495	35.2.13A
Forman	Glen		297	35.31C

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Foutz	Markelle		2085	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Fowler	DeVere		1135	35.31C
Fowler	Melinda		671	35.2.9C
Fowler	Vance		469	35.31A
Frampton	Sherri		310	35.2.7C
Francis	Matt		186	35.27C, 35.31C
Francom	Kurtley		599	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Frandsen	Edward R., Nann		19	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Frandsen	Edward, Nann		531	35.2.9A
Frandsen	Matt		1559	35.31C
Frandsen	Nann, Edward		1756	35.2.7A
Frandsen	Peter		2205	35.2.13A, 35.2.7A
Frandsen	Shauna U.		2289	35.2.13A, 35.2.7A
Franklin	Jean		1133	35.2.7A
Franklin	Naomi		1540	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
Franklin	Nick		1030	35.2.7A
Franzen	Paul		744	35.2.7C
Frasure	Kenny		2056	35.2.7C
Freckleton	Marcie		2226	35.2.4H, 35.2.1A
Freeland	Duke		1757	35.2.7A
French	Carol		2301	35.2.9A
Freyer	John		2034	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Froehlich	Richard		1697	35.2.7A
Froerer	Karen		1638	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Fruness	Rob		746	35.2.7A
Fry	Lee, Arlene		1267	35.2.4A, 35.6.3A
Fullmer	Steve Faye		1268	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
Funicello	Joe		1579	35.2.7A
Funicello	Joe		2082	35.2.9A
Funk	Kaye Lyn		2052	35.2.1F
Funk	Travis, Rachelle		1860	35.2.7A
Furr	Krista		2209	35.2.7A
Furr	Krista Noel,		2508	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Furr	Krista Noel, Laurence		2507	35.2.7A
Furr	Krista Olsen		1295	35.2.7D, 35.12.4A
Furr	Laurence L.		2210	35.2.7A
G.	Stephen		423	35.2.6A
Gaeta	Randy		2143	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Gaeta	Suzanne		2142	35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Gage	Randy		1131	35.2.7A
Gagon	Josh		2199	35.2.9A
Gailey	Blake		1560	35.2.7C
Gardner	Bennion		2339	35.2.3A, 35.29A
Gardner	Doris		1724	35.2.7A
Gardner	Doris T.		464	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.31 C
Gardner	Eric		615	35.2.13A
Gardner	Zac		1362	35.31C, 35.2.7C
Garrett	Darin		294	35.2.6A
Garrett	Darin		1938	35.2.1F

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Garrett	M.		1311	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.6B
Garrison	Jim, Cyndy		1224	35.2.8A, 35.2.13A
Garside	Scott		565	35.2.9A
Gatten	Thomas		2388	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Gaudig	Glenda		133	35.2.3A, 35.2.10A
Gaufin	Kent		1758	35.2.7A
Gaufin	Kent B.		792	35.2.7A
Gause	Wade		816	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Gay	Jonathon, Gabrielle		1721	35.2.7A
Gazaway	Amy		596	35.2.7A
Gentry	Lisa		1992	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Gerald	Jarrah		301	35.2.7C
Gerber	David		717	35.2.13A
Gibbons	Douglas	Kern River Gas Transmission Company	2231	35.6.4C
Gibbs	Jennifer		1539	35.2.1F, 35.11A
Gibby	Ron		450	35.2.7C
Gibson	Aubrey		351	35.2.7A
Gibson	Aubrey		975	35.2.7B
Gibson	Matthew		2227	35.2.1F
Giffin	Michael R.		2005	35.2.8B
Gifford	Mary		2198	35.2.9A
Gilbert	Chris	West Jordan City, Planning and Engineering Departments	1581	35.2.4N, 35.2.4E, 35.13A, 35.2.4N, 35.13E, 35.2.4N, 35.11B, 35.15.2A, 35.11C, 35.15.3A,
Giles	Patti		621	35.2.7C
Gillespie	Rosalind		1936	35.6.3A
Gillespie	Rosalind		2525	35.6.3A
Gillette	Jenny		617	35.2.7C
Gilmore	Jerry		379	35.2.9C
Glaus	T.C.		652	35.2.7C
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		656	35.2.1D
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		21	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		248	35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		783	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		958	35.2.9A, 35.2.7D
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		959	35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		960	35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		961	35.2.9A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		962	35.2.7A
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		963	35.2.13A, 35.2.1F
Glazier	Byron, Sherry		964	35.2.7A
Gleim	Richard		1761	35.2.7A
Glover	Jena		1726	35.2.7A
Glover	Ken		1725	35.2.7A
Gneiting	Matt		1127	35.2.1K
Goates	Angela M.		2399	35.2.7A
Godfrey	Matthew P.		2215	35.2.9A
Golder	Silvia		524	35.31C

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Golding	Emma		1760	35.2.7A
Golom	Annette		1386	35.2.7C
Gomm	Lyle, Annette		947	35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1B
Gomm	Lyle, Annette		948	35.2.7A
Goodman	Jeanmarie		1966	35.2.4F
Goodman	Karrie		898	35.2.7D
Goodman	Mark		897	35.2.7D
Goodwin	Thomas		595	35.2.7D, 35.2.1H
Gordon	Grant, Donna		50	35.2.7C
Gorham	Clifford		2051	35.2.1G
Goss	Julianne		684	35.2.9A
Goss	Leonard		685	35.2.9A
Gourley	Collette		344	35.2.7C
Graf	Amanda		1139	35.2.5A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.4C
Graff	Terri		1698	35.2.7A
Graff	Terry		529	35.2.2A
Graft	Jay		2225	35.2.10A
Grange	Chris		1592	35.2.9A
Gratzinger	Michael, Nicole		1687	35.2.7A
Gray	Dustin, Jennifer		1759	35.2.7A
Gray	Pat		197	35.2.7A
Green	Robyn		1639	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Green	Will		287	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Green	William		1984	35.2.6A
Green	William		1985	35.2.9B, 35.2.7D, 35.2.6A, 35.2.6D, 35.2.1K, 35.2.1b, 35.2.1F, 35.31C
Greenberg	Paul		2064	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A
Greenhalgh	Brent		1296	35.2.7A
Greenhalgh	Brent		1297	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Greenhalgh	Brent		2212	35.2.9A
Greenhalgh	Brent, Jana		1735	35.2.7A
Greenhalgh	Jana		2213	35.2.9A
Greenhalgh	Janet		1419	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Greenwood	Karl		256	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Greenwood	Karl		1171	35.2.13A
Greenwood	Tamara		610	35.2.9A, 35.2.7D
Gregco	Thomas		1736	35.2.7A
Grerritsen	Tyler		2066	35.2.7D
Griffin	Delores		143	35.2.7A
Griffin	Dolores		1737	35.2.7A
Griffiths	Eldon		2505	35.6.3A, 35.2.12A
Grimley	Terry		1309	35.2.7C
Groene	Scott		1671	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Groll	Clare		192	35.2.7C
Grover	James		1777	35.2.7A
Grover	Jeanette		1784	35.2.7A
Grover	Jennifer		1057	35.2.7A
Gue	Stacy		175	35.2.7C
Guevara	Troy		1264	35.2.9A
Gull	Jamielynn		1738	35.2.7A
Gunderson	Ed		1667	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Gunderson	Gisela		1650	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Gunlock	Kim		1739	35.2.7A
Gunn	Randy	Layton Construction	455	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Gunn	Sarah		793	35.2.7A
Gunther	Dale		1256	35.2.6D
Gurlcok	Carol		521	35.2.7C
Gurney	Gary		1688	35.2.7A
Gurney	Kenneth		1699	35.2.7A
Gurney	Kenneth, Linda		141	35.2.7A
Guthrie	Ashton		1640	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Haaga	Jeff		2176	35.2.10A
Hackett	Karen		2092	35.2.7C
Hackford	J.		649	35.2.7A
Hackford	J.		1740	35.2.7A
Hadfield	Gloria		526	35.31C
Hadfield	Larry, Linda		528	35.2.7C
Hadlock	Nichole		1016	35.2.7A
Haidenthaller	Reinhard		1903	35.2.5A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.3E
Halbert	Teri		2557	35.2.1A
Hale	M.		387	35.31 C
Halladay	Dave, Darlene		2093	35.2.10A
Halls	Jared		1789	35.2.7A
Hamblan	Brittain		856	35.2.7A
Hamblan	Matt		864	35.2.7A
Hamblin	Laurie		331	35.2.13A
Hamblin	Laurie		790	35.2.7C
Hamblin	Matt		2389	35.2.7A
Hammer	Rebecca		2323	35.15.4A, 35.12.1A
Hammock	Sonya		1842	35.2.7A
Hammons	James		55	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Hamouri	Jolene		2035	35.2.7C
Hampton	Edward, Carma		205	35.2.9A
Hampton	Leora		1868	35.2.7A
Hancock	Joe	Rydalch Electric Inc.	2050	35.12.4A. 35.2.4B
Handy	Amy, Michael		1570	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Handy	Amy, Michael		1571	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Handy	Michael, Amy		1583	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Hanna	Matthew		1526	35.2.7C
Hannig	Russ		1461	35.2.9C
Hansen	Brian		866	35.2.7A
Hansen	Cara		1049	35.2.7A
Hansen	Derek		714	35.2.9A
Hansen	Heidi		1561	35.31A
Hansen	Helen		1836	35.2.7A
Hansen	Judy		2562	35.2.6A
Hansen	Justin		345	35.2.7C
Hansen	Kathleen		1861	35.2.7A
Hansen	L. Ross		149	35.2.7C
Hansen	L. Ross		1383	35.2.7C
Hansen	Lee		663	35.2.6A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Hansen	Linda		953	35.12.4A, 35.13C
Hansen	Lisa		2019	35.2.7C, 35.2.1D
Hansen	Ryan, Melanie		1841	35.2.7A
Hanson	Abby		1070	35.2.7A
Hanson	Julie Cawley		1202	35.2.4A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.3A
Harding	Arthur		1741	35.2.7A
Harding	JoDee		494	35.2.7C
Harding	Karla		1551	35.2.7A
Harding	Sean		274	35.31C
Hardinger	Gary		413	35.2.7C
Hardinger	Susie		414	35.2.7C
Hardman	Danielle		932	35.2.7A
Hardy	Chad		85	35.2.7C 35.2.1G
Harja	John	State of Utah, Resource Development Coordinating Committee	1883	35.12.1H, 35.6.2A, 35.28A, 35.15.2B
Harker	Jeremy	Franklin Covey	483	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Harker	Jeremy		1397	35.2.9C
Harmill	Kato, Antonio		880	35.2.7D
Harmill	Kato, Antonio		881	35.2.7A
Harper	Angela		1676	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Harper	Melissa		2020	35.2.7A
Harper	Mikki, Sage		1902	35.2.4C, 35.12.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A
Harper	Wayne		767	35.2.4A, 35.2.7C
Harris	Ann		164	35.2.7C
Harris	Cloyde		470	35.2.7D
Harris	Darren, Manu		1418	35.2.7C
Harris	Jana		453	35.2.7C
Harris	John		543	35.2.7D, 35.2.9B
Harris	Kevin		502	35.2.7C
Harris	Ryanne		1531	35.2.7D, 35.2.7A
Hart	Audrey		320	35.31C
Hart	Audrey		1313	35.31C
Hart	Eiko		2228	35.2.8A, 35.2.7A
Hart	Jon		1187	35.2.1F, 35.2.1G, 35.2.10A
Hart	Peter		2166	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Hart	Peter		2167	35.2.7A, 35.2.8A
Hart Gunn	Lesley		1637	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Harter	Lynne		1118	35.31C
Hartley	Maria		2327	35.15.4A
Hartman	Autumn		1598	35.6.3A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.3A
Hartsfield	Donda		1629	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Harvest Hills Resident			753	35.2.13A, 35.2.10A
Haslam	Tye		303	35.2.4A, 35.2.6A
Hastings	F.		1421	35.2.10A
Hathaway	Kent		1051	35.2.10A
Hatton	MaryAnn		515	35.31C
Haussleer	Joshua		1967	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Haussler	Josh		2444	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Hauver	Marc		1840	35.2.7A
Hawkins	Joseph		2435	35.2.4A
Hawkins	Kristen		1835	35.2.7A
Hayslip	Veronica		905	35.2.9A
Hayslip	Veronica		2397	35.2.7A
Healey	Rob		944	35.2.1F, 35.2.13A
Heaston	Marissa		1535	35.2.9A
Hebertson	Carol		1084	35.2.7A
Hegewald	Andrew		1968	35.2.7B, 35.2.7A, 35.2.1F, 35.2.7A
Heileson	Marc		2425	35.3B, 35.2.3I, 35.2.9A, 35.12.4A, 35.29B
Heileson	Marc		2455	35.2.6C, 35.29A, 35.2.1H
Helget	Joyce		2439	35.6.3A, 35.9A, 35.12.4A
Hellewell	Christy		2403	35.2.7A
Hellewell	Ryan		258	35.2.7A, 35.2.8A
Hellewell	Ryan		1514	35.2.7A
Hellewell	Ryan		1928	35.2.9A
Hemingway	Mark, JanaRae		2395	35.2.7C
Hendrickson	Lynn		534	35.2.7D
Hendriksen	Martin		2340	35.31C
Hendrix	McKay		2402	35.2.7D
Henley	Dan		1158	35.31C
Henrie	Warren, Mary		1865	35.2.7A
Herbert	Stephen		1562	35.2.9A
Herbst	Gage C.		2330	35.2.1H
Herget	Lon, Taleece		1347	35.2.1F
Hernandez	Rick		348	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Hernandez	Rick		1326	35.2.6A, 35.2.9A
Herron	James		719	35.2.7A
Hertell	Nicole		677	35.2.7A
Hertzler	Rob		1142	35.2.7C
Hiatt	Jeanne, Kevin		2569	35.31C
Hiatt	Kevin		1332	35.2.7C, 35.2.1B
Hiatt	Kevin		2568	35.2.7C
Hickman	Celeste		2003	35.31C
Hickman	Dan L., Sharon		1370	35.2.7A
Hickman	Nadine		597	35.2.7A
Hicks	Dennis		91	35.2.7C
Higbee	L. Marvin		1245	35.2.6A, 35.2.8A
Hiliker	George		2062	35.2.6A
Hill	Don		347	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Hill	Don		1324	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Hill	Don		1325	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Hill	Don		2372	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Hill	Farron		721	35.8D, 35.24A, 35.13D, 35.31E
Hill	Gordon		155	35.2.7A
Hill	Jason		479	35.2.7A, 35.2.13A
Hill	Jill		308	35.2.7C
Hill	Melanie		32	35.2.7C
Hill	Steve		307	35.2.7C
Hilliker	George		1523	35.2.1G, 35.2.10D
Hilton	Jake		404	35.2.7C
Hinckley	Todd		177	35.6.3A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Hintze	Nicol		580	35.2.7A
Hoch	Greg		2214	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E, 35.2.1A
Hoch	Greg		2524	35.2.4A
Hodson	Jewel		1239	35.12.4A
Hodson	Jewel		1240	35.2.4B
Hoffman	Diane		826	35.2.7A
Hoffman	Eric, Briana		701	35.2.7C
Hoffman	Glenn		2039	35.2.4F, 35.12.4A, 35.6.3A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.1A
Hoffmann	Adriana		1241	35.2.4B, 35.2.1A, 35.12.4A
Hoffmann	Glenn		1242	35.12.4A, 35.2.4B, 35.6.3A
Hokanson	Bryony		690	35.2.7A
Holbrook	Stephen	Holbrook Farms, LC	2188	35.2.9A, 35.5A, 35.2.9A, 35.12.1A, 35.13A, 35.5A, 35.2.7A
Holbrook	Stephen		2475	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.30A, 35.2.7A
Holladay	Rose		1921	35.31C, 35.2.9A
Holland	Angela		604	35.2.7A
Holley	Mark		243	35.2.7C, 35.2.6B
Holliday	Katherine		824	35.2.9A
Hollingworth	Kent		1933	35.2.7C
Holm	Mindy		33	35.2.7C
Holman	Cameron		336	35.2.7C
Holman	Joann		810	35.2.7D
Holme	Keith		674	35.2.7A
Holt	Amber		2276	35.2.7C
Holt	Gordon		1482	35.2.10A
Holyoak	Julie		2168	35.2.9A
Hone	Layne		2418	35.2.7C
Hood	Donna		693	35.2.7C
Hood	Timothy		1180	35.7A
Hood	Timothy		1181	35.2.4A
Hooper	John B.		840	35.2.7A
Horrocks	Lynn, Carolyn		1743	35.2.7A
Horsley	John		466	35.2.6A, 35.2.10D
Horst	Rick		240	35.2.10A
Houghton	Christine		848	35.2.7C
Howard	Susan		919	35.2.7D
Howe	Justin		1563	35.2.7C
Howe	Taylor		2094	35.2.7A
Howlett	Jared		618	35.2.6A
Hoyt	David		2412	35.2.7A
Hubbert	Joanna		419	35.2.7A
Hubbert	Joanna		1333	35.2.7A
Hucks	Karalynn		1722	35.2.7A
Huey	Nola		194	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Huff	Jarem		471	35.2.7C
Huff	Pat, Steven T.		950	35.2.7A, 35.31C
Huff	Steven		1879	35.2.9A
Hughes			929	35.2.7A
Hughes	Bryan, Katherine		180	35.31 C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Hughes	Don		326	35.2.6A, 35.2.9A, 35.6.3A
Hughes	Nathan		682	35.2.7A, 35.2.8A
Hulet	William		203	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Hulet	William		1744	35.2.7A
Hunsaker	Frank L.		1402	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Hunsaker	Kassie		2242	35.2.7A
Hunt	Kristen		1969	35.2.4B
Hunt	Kristi		1064	35.2.7A
Hunter	Lorraine		1046	35.2.7A
Huntington	Ryan	TalonCove Golf Club	338	35.2.7C
Hutchings	Carrie		804	35.2.7D, 35.2.6A
Hutchings	Christie		1172	35.2.9A
Hutchings	Christie		1937	35.2.9, 35.12.4A, 35.2.7A
Hutchings	Madge		1745	35.2.7A
Hutchins	Wesley, Rebecca		2494	35.2.5A
Hyde	George E.		2558	35.2.7A
Ibarra	Alexander, RayLynn		1533	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Imbler	Angenette		678	35.2.7A
Imbler	Matthew		679	35.2.7A
Infanger	Pam, Neil		178	35.2.7C
Infanger	Pam, Neil		1406	35.2.7C
Ipson	Dan		1426	35.2.10A
Ireland	Ryan		1143	35.2.13A
Isbell	Sheri		1746	35.2.7A
Iverson	Chad		709	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Iverson	Tyler J.		1344	35.2.7C
Jack	Garth		689	35.2.7A
Jacketta	Leslie		1970	35.2.9A
Jacketta	Leslie		2448	35.2.3A
Jackman	Aliesha		1425	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Jackman	Clarke		1747	35.2.7A
Jackson	Clive		1524	35.2.10A
Jackson	Emily		1040	35.2.7A
Jackson	Trent		2097	35.2.1D
Jacobsen	Amy		805	35.2.7A
Jacobsen	Amy		806	35.2.7A
Jacobson	April C.		2043	35.2.7C
Jacobson	Brandon		1387	35.2.7C
James	Chris		2501	35.2.9A
James	Clara Ann		846	35.2.7D
James	Heidi		2511	35.2.7D, 35.2.8B, 35.2.9A
James	Meri		2405	35.2.7A
Jaramillo	A.		1748	35.2.7A
Jaramillo	Cato		537	35.2.7A
Jaroch	Timothy A.		2088	35.2.7A
Jarvis	Jason, Aretta		1398	35.2.7C
Jeffries	Linda		1085	35.2.1M
Jenkins	Adrian		2030	35.2.7C
Jenkins	Julie		2404	35.2.7D

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Jensen	Alex		2120	35.1.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.4A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Jensen	Alex		2121	35.6.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Jensen	Ann		428	35.2.7C
Jensen	April		1098	35.2.7D
Jensen	Brent H.		2095	35.2.2A, 35.2.5B
Jensen	Cheryl		2122	35.12.1A, 35.1.1A
Jensen	Donald D.		668	35.2.7A
Jensen	Doug		860	35.2.7A
Jensen	Elizabeth		2312	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Jensen	Glenn		2114	35.2.10A, 35.2.1A
Jensen	Janete		1700	35.2.7A
Jensen	Jonathan		1620	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Jensen	Julie		100	35.6.3A
Jensen	Julie		2379	35.6.3A
Jensen	Leighton		563	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Jensen	Phill		2243	35.2.7C
Jensen	Robert		339	35.2.7C
Jensen	Ron		646	35.2.7A
Jensen	Shyanne		2570	35.31C, 35.2.7C
Jensen	Terry		590	35.2.7A
Jensen	William R.		1601	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
Jenson	Jeryl		1452	35.2.1I
Jenson	Rosie		1502	35.31C, 35.1.1F
Jeppson	Neal		2096	35.2.7C
Jeppson	Theron		237	35.6.3C
Jeppson	Theron		238	35.2.1A, 35.1.1A
Jessop	Lisa		1422	35.2.7C
Jex	Melanie		2540	35.2.8A, 35.2.6B
Jex	Scott		1210	35.2.8A
Jobrack	Sol		1749	35.2.7A
Johansen	Eric		478	35.31 C
John	Alex		1677	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
John	Loren		473	35.2.7C
Johns	Matt		454	35.2.7C
Johnson	Brent		125	35.2.1K
Johnson	Bryant		2147	35.1.1H, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Johnson	Collette		2277	35.2.7L, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Johnson	Dale		984	35.2.7C
Johnson	Dale		1595	35.31C
Johnson	Dana		1689	35.2.7A
Johnson	Daniel		53	35.31C
Johnson	Dave		1201	35.2.7C
Johnson	Howard H.	Lehi City, Mayor	1904	35.2.7F, 35.2.7A, 35.2.7G, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7H, 35.2.7I, 35.2.1B, 35.2.1G, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Johnson	Karen, Carl		553	35.2.7C
Johnson	Karen, Carl		2080	35.2.7C, 35.2.11A
Johnson	Melea		263	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Johnson	Michael	Zacks Investment Management, Inc.	2512	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Johnson	Nicolas		1173	35.2.13A
Johnson	Ranee		1646	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Johnson	Rebecca		1971	35.8B
Johnson	Seana		1423	35.2.7C
Johnson	Susan		1900	35.2.4E, 35.31C, 35.1.1A
Johnson	Taylor		2499	35.2.7A
Johnson	Tom		289	35.6.3A
Johnson	Trevor		1185	35.2.10A, 35.2.10C
Jolley	April		1690	35.2.7A
Jones	Eugene B.		2550	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Jones	Les		1260	35.8C
Jones	Lisa		799	35.2.7A
Jones	Lisa		1424	35.12.1A, 35.13C, 35.6.1A
Jones	Michael		1136	35.2.4B
Jones	Mike, Lisa		620	35.2.13A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.1B, 35.2.7D
Jones	Robert, Katie, Alyson		965	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Jones	Shane		554	35.2.13A, 35.2.1G
Jorgensen	Heather		872	35.2.7A
Jorgensen	Kelsey		1838	35.2.7A
Jorgensen	Stacey		800	35.2.7A
Jorgenson	Matthew		1088	35.2.7A
Jorgenson	Robert	National Guard	383	35.2.1F, 35.2.7C
Josephson	Michael		2552	35.2.10A, 35.2.10C
Juan	Israel		1849	35.2.7A
Judd	Camillia		2532	35.6.3A
Judd	Matt		1054	35.2.7A
Kaaihue	Joe		844	35.2.7A
Kalmar	Clark		43	35.2.1F, 35.2.7C, 35.2.6B
Kalmar	Tracie		107	35.2.7C
Kammerman	Ann		2546	35.2.7C
Kammerman	Gerald		1270	35.2.7C
Kammerman	Gerald		1511	35.2.7C
Kamper	Karl, Laura		949	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Kanigan	Abel		2024	35.2.7C
Kanigan	Abel		2025	35.2.7C
Kanno	Wendy		831	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A
Kartchner	Cory, Brittany		397	35.2.7C
Kauffman	Tara		1428	35.2.7A
Kearney	Scott		1031	35.31C, 35.2.10D
Keck	Tiffany		337	35.2.7C
Keele	Heather		259	35.2.7A
Keele	Heather		1932	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Keele	Heather, Kevin		972	35.2.7A
Keele	Kevin, Heather		1783	35.2.7A
Kelly	Jamie		1193	35.2.6A
Kennedy	Moreen		908	35.2.7A
Kent	Marlon		1336	35.2.7C

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Kent	Mr., Mrs. Marlon		438	35.2.7C
Kent	Sherilyn		2038	35.2.7C
Kerttula	Eevert		636	35.2.7C
Keyser	Julie A		104	35.2.10B, 35.2.10C
Killpack	Clive M.		2244	35.2.10A
Killpack	Donivan		2004	35.2.13A
Killpack	Wendy		1427	35.2.10A
Kindred	Rich		593	35.2.7A
King	D.J.		708	35.2.7C
King	Jeremy		2134	35.11A, 35.2.4A
Kinson	Robert		139	35.2.7C
Kirby	Pam		803	35.2.10D, 35.2.4A, 35.1.1A
Kirby	Steve		490	35.2.7C
Kirkham	Deborah		135	35.2.7C
Kirkham	Jarvis, Davin		1731	35.2.7A
Kirkham	Judy		711	35.2.7A
Kirkman	Jenny		651	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Kirtley	Stephanie		1612	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Kizerian	David		376	35.13A
Klawe	Noel A.		2484	35.2.2A
Klein	Dannette		591	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Klemm	Sam	WFRC	2440	35.2.11A, 35.12.1A
Klingonsmith	Jennifer		1265	35.2.7C, 35.2.9B, 35.2.10A
Klingonsmith	Quinten		1544	35.2.9C, 35.2.10C
Klock	Dave		1262	35.2.9A
Knapp	Rich	Bluffdale City	2155	35.2.8A, 35.2.8D, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7D, 35.2.4P
Knight	Russell		1178	35.2.7C
Knighting	Matthew		1146	35.2.8C, 35.2.7D
Knowles	Jennifer		146	35.2.7A
Knutsen	Daniel, Michel		839	35.2.7A
Knutsen	David		1269	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Knutsen	David, Marsha		244	35.2.9A
Knutsen	David, Marsha		722	35.2.7A
Ko	Allison		2162	35.15.4A, 35.2.1H
Kobsa	Stephen		2307	35.31C
Konold	David, Jennifer		633	35.2.7C
Koontz	L.R.		1751	35.2.7A
Koos Webb	Joshua		1636	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Kopp	Paul, Olga		1750	35.2.7A
Kotter	JaNae		2169	35.2.9A, 35.2.7H, 35.2.7A, 35.2.1H, 35.2.7A
Kramer	Alisa		2502	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Krebs	Justin		189	35.2.7A, 35.2.3A
Kretschmar	Brian		1991	35.2.3A
Krier	Adrienne Lee		912	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.12.4A
Krippner	David		332	35.2.7C, 35.2.10A
Kristine	Laura		2561	35.31C
Kuennemann	Pete		1261	35.12.4A
Kuykendall	Steve	Medron, Inc.	2526	35.2.6A
Kyle	Spencer, Mickalee		1972	35.2.7C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Lacanienta	Jennifer		1429	35.2.7C
Lai	Jennie		751	35.2.4B
LaMalfa	Kyle		262	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Lamborn	Tammy		2396	35.2.7A
Lambrechtsen	Frans J.		2163	35.12.1A, 35.15.4A, 35.2.1H
Lambson	Evan		1388	35.2.10A
Lambson	Evan		2571	35.2.1E, 35.2.1N, 35.2.10A
Lamph	L. Claude		2181	35.2.1AA
Lamph	Lunll		2229	35.2.7C
Lance	Bandley		1989	35.2.10C, 35.2.6A
Langston	Tasha		1374	35.2.7A
Langston	Tasha		2382	35.2.7A
Langston	Tyler		1375	35.2.7A
Langston	Tyler		2383	35.2.7A
Larsen	Charles		1973	35.2.7A, 35.2.1F
Larsen	Doug		127	35.2.7D
Larsen	Doug		1489	35.2.7A
Larsen	Garon		1516	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Larsen	J.		410	35.2.7A
Larsen	Patricia		1859	35.2.7A
Larson	Debbie		1196	35.2.6A
Larson	Desirae		560	35.2.7A
Larson	Doug		1278	35.2.7C
Larson	Doug		2369	35.2.7C
Larson	Eric		1195	35.2.6A
Larson	Glen		1102	35.13A, 35.2.4P
Larson	Jared		1277	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Larson	Jen		1668	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Larson	Justin		1287	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Larson	Maria		1276	35.2.9A, 35.2.6A, 35.9A, 35.12.1A
Larson	Sandra		1175	35.2.7C, 35.2.8B, 35.2.7C
Lasson	Elizabeth		1832	35.2.7A
Laughter	Chris		691	35.31C
Laughter	Chris		692	35.31C
Laursen	Thom		446	35.2.7C
Laxman	David		482	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Le	Trung		1203	35.2.4A
Leath	Chancy		2527	35.13A, 35.13B
Leatherwood	Melissa		73	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Leavitt	Katreena		1159	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A
Leavitt	Tiffani		2438	35.12.4A
LeBaron	Brent		2409	35.2.7A
LeBaron	Chad B.		1451	35.2.7C
Lee	Dallas		119	35.2.7A
Lee	Letha		1032	35.2.9A
Lee	Letha		2237	35.2.7A, 35.31C
Lee	Marisa		2245	35.2.9A
Lee	Marisa		2246	35.2.9A
Lee	Michael		851	35.2.7C
Lee Krier	Adrienne		2406	35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E, 35.12.1A
Lee Krier	Adrienne		2407	35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Leffler	Adam		2513	35.2.10A
Lehnardt	Grant		761	35.31C
Lemon	Lance		1580	35.31C
Lemon	Marnee		853	35.2.7A
LeSueur	Paula		350	35.2.7C
LeVitre	Randy		2533	35.31C
Lewis	Becky		2036	35.2.7C
Lewis	Connie		239	35.6.3A
Lewis	Connie		1166	35.6.3A
Lewis	John		1877	35.2.6A, 35.2.8B, 35.2.1B
Leyba Jr.	Gilbert		2279	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.9A
Libby	Aaron		2110	35.2.4B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.4E, 35.1.1H
Lichtenfels	Brian		755	35.1.1A, 35.2.10A
Liddle	Jeri		1675	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Lies	Karl T.		1503	35.2.10A
Lifferth	David		945	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Lima	Eileen		756	35.2.7A
Limb	Shawn		812	35.2.7A
Lindsay	Annie		873	35.2.7D
Lindsey	Tim		2012	35.2.7C
Little	Wayne		1289	35.2.13A
Lloyd	Gary, Elvira		551	35.31C
Lloyd	Michelle		2541	35.2.7A
Lloyd	Natalie		1779	35.2.7A
Lloyd	Robert		1105	35.2.10A
Lofft	Alexander		1613	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Lofgren	Anjanette Stone		2016	35.2.7C
Logan	Darlene		1869	35.2.7A
Logan	Darlene		2390	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Long	Donna		2037	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Long	Randy		1479	35.24A
Long	Randy		2358	35.2.2A
Long	Wayne, Tami		1691	35.2.7A
Lono	Marcia		989	35.2.7A
Lookadoo	Russell		374	35.2.9A
Lords	Lorin		93	35.2.7A
Lorenz	Janell		523	35.2.7A
Lott	Dean		1752	35.2.7A
Lott	Vard		327	35.2.13A, 35.2.1B
Lowe	Stetson		1993	35.2.7C
Lowery	Kathleen		2278	35.6.3A
Lowry	John, Brandi		2203	35.2.9A
Ludlow	Marianne		1602	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Ludwig	Adam		279	35.31G
Ludwig	Deneen		1974	35.2.8C
Luke	Angela		1381	35.2.7A
Lundwall	Jaime		254	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Lundwall	Jaime		255	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Lundwall	Jaime		1283	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Lundwall	Jaime		1284	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Lundwall	Jaime		1285	35.2.7A, 35.12.4A
Lundwall	Jaime		1286	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Lundwall	Jaime		1917	35.2.9A, 35.12.4A
Lundwall	Jaime		2196	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Lutze	Frederick		795	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Lybbert	Tyler, Patricia		1753	35.2.7A
Lyde	Lorien		813	35.2.7A
Lyon	Mike		2260	35.2.10A
Mabey	Clark		47	35.2.10A, 35.2.10B
MacArthur	Cameron		1094	35.31C
MacArthur	Cassidy		193	35.2.7C
Mach	Wendy		2175	35.2.7C
Mackay	Robert		67	35.2.7C
Mackelprang	Steven		1063	35.2.10A
Mackey	Marshall		538	35.2.7A
Mackintosh	William		861	35.2.7A
Madigan	Lance		362	35.2.7C
Madsen	Brook		715	35.2.7C
Madsen	Craig		1863	35.2.7A
Madsen	David, Camille		968	35.2.7A
Madsen	David, Camille		969	35.2.7A
Madsen	Erin		2123	35.2.1B
Madsen	Janice		1839	35.2.7A
Madsen	Jared, Laureen		1867	35.2.7A
Madsen	Raymond		612	35.2.7A
Magill	Shawn		634	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Maines	James		2146	35.2.1A, 35.8A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Man	Melissa		2175	35.2.7C
Mangelson	Shirley		1754	35.2.7A
Mangum	Layne		1294	35.2.9A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.7D
Manning	David		738	35.6.3A
Mapston	May		2175	35.2.7C
Marchbanks	Jill		644	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Marchbanks	Jill		2542	35.2.7A
Marinucci	John		1670	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Markus	Brad		1122	35.2.10A, 35.2.11A
Marsh	Lynn J.		1448	35.2.4A, 35.2.10A, 35.6.3
Martell	Tara		1025	35.2.7A
Martin	Brian		97	35.2.6A
Martin	David		1140	35.2.7A, 35.2.8A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7D
Martin	David		1141	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7D
Martin	Debbie		1350	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Martin	Jake		253	35.2.7D
Martin	Jamie		1891	35.2.1A, 35.2.5A
Martin	Scott		2153	35.2.4H, 35.1.1A, 35.2.1A
Martin	Tanya		249	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Martin	Tanya		784	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Martinez	Ron		2445	35.2.4F, 35.2.5A
Martinez	Ronald		1250	35.2.4F, 35.2.5A
Martinez	Twila		1249	35.1.1A
Marvin	Kris		1100	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Mason	Jared		2469	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A
Mather	Amy, Robert		883	35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Mather	Amy, Robert		986	35.2.7A
Mather	Amy, Robert		987	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Mathews	Ben		2127	35.2.7C
Mathis	April		1090	35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Mathis	April		1091	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Mathisen	Laura		1232	35.2.10A
Matt	Sadler		2491	35.2.10C
Maxwell	Amiee		1664	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Maxwell	Brent		1439	35.2.10A
Mayhew	Sarah		1626	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
McArthur	Lisa		245	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
McArthur	Lisa		1755	35.2.7A
McBride	Corey		1976	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
McBride	Kerry		271	35.2.3A
McBride	Sara		1975	35.2.7C
McCaul	Andria		131	35.2.7C
McClellan	Devin		415	35.2.7C
McClowski	Joyce		888	35.2.7A
McCloy	Lisa		1977	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
McCloy	William		1978	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
McCormick	Julie		1013	35.2.9A
McCouston	Brian		2202	35.2.9A
McDonald	Colin		151	35.2.7C
McDowell	Chuck		236	35.2.10A
McGuire	Jason		1106	35.2.10C
McGuire	Tony		2281	35.2.10A
McGuire	William		1404	35.12.4A, 35.6.1A, 35.9A, 35.1.1A
McKay	Brett, Stacy		2021	35.2.7C
McKay	Scott		1376	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
McKay	Taylor		2262	35.2.7C
McKenzie	Jeff, Karen		780	35.2.4A
McKenzie	Jeff, Karen		2492	35.2.4A
McKinnon	Ashley		1292	35.2.9A
McKinnon	Ashley		1926	35.2.9A
McKnight	Shaun		2559	35.2.13A, 35.2.7D
McLane	Mark		2170	35.2.8A
McLean	David		2359	35.31C, 35.2.10A, 35.2.4A
McLean	Marsha		1343	35.2.7A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1H
McLean	Marsha		1979	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.1H
McMaster	Betty		432	35.2.6A
McMaster	Betty		433	35.2.7C
McMillan	Tyson		2083	35.2.7A
McMurtrey	Allison		2295	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
McNeil	Chance		2548	35.2.7C
McNeil	David		321	35.31C
McNeil	David		1314	35.31C
McNeil	Lois		2493	35.31C
McNett	Meredith, Grady		605	35.2.13A
McNulty	Jim		1980	35.2.7C
McPherson	Devon		170	35.2.7C
McPherson	Josh		184	35.2.13A, 35.2.8A
McPherson	Sean		15	35.2.13A

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
McPherson	Sean		1895	35.2.8A
Meade	Loreean		855	35.2.7A
Mecham	Gaylyn		542	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Mecham	Owen		168	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Medeiros	Jason		1354	35.2.3A
Meese	John		121	35.2.13A
Mellon	Cassie		1649	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Mellor	Carl		2171	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Mellor	Carol		2470	35.2.9A
Melville	Jamie		1015	35.2.9A
Melville	Mark		955	35.2.7A
Mendez	Jorge, Denise		1778	35.2.7A
Menendez	Marcos		280	35.2.7C
Mercer	Jeff		666	35.2.7A
Mercer	Jeffrey J.		2341	35.2.1G
Meredith	John		474	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Merino	Rachael		2175	35.2.7C
Merrill	Kristi		613	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Mertz	Dennis, Marie		1434	35.2.7C
Messersmith	Bryce, Amy		2534	35.2.9A
Messersmith	Bryce, Amy		2535	35.2.9A
Messersmith	Cody		632	35.31B
Messersmith	Susan E.		630	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Mews	Joanne		1083	35.2.7A
Meyer	John, Jennifer		1774	35.2.7A
Meyers	Kara		390	35.2.9C
Meyers	Ken		1065	35.2.10A
Mierisch	George J.		2547	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A, 35.15.4A
Milam	Rebecca		2145	35.8A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Millar	M.		1504	35.2.10A
Miller	Alfred B.		536	35.2.7A
Miller	Allison		1528	35.2.7C
Miller	Bart Stanley		1366	35.2.7A
Miller	Betsy		457	35.2.7C
Miller	Ceola		1222	35.6.3A
Miller	Christine		1072	35.2.7A
Miller	Daniel		675	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Miller	Dave		1437	35.2.9A, 35.2.7C
Miller	David, Laura		956	35.2.9A
Miller	James W.		328	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Miller	Jason, Elizabeth		1605	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Miller	Lanae		2553	35.2.6A
Miller	Lorell		676	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Miller	Louise		752	35.2.7A
Miller	Mary		1024	35.2.7A
Miller	Sarah		2326	35.15.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.9A, 35.24A
Miller	Stan		1308	35.31C
Miller	Steve, Ginger		2385	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Millet	Bryan		716	35.2.9C
Mills	Gary		403	35.2.7C
Millward	Bryan		2067	35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Milne	Allison		966	35.2.7A
Milne	Allison, Daren		1782	35.2.7A
Milne	Daren		794	35.2.7A
Milne	Ryan		1680	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Milne	Shawn		574	35.31C
Miner	Branon, Marie		967	35.2.7A
Miner	Marie		1275	35.12.4A, 35.2.7D
Miskin	Jonathan		1080	35.2.9A
Misman	Reanna		878	35.2.7A
Mitchell	Sally		1117	35.2.10A
Mohacsi	Carie		623	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Mohacsi	Carie		1518	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Mondkar	Vaijayanti		835	35.2.7D
Monson	Cameron		298	35.2.9C
Monson	Tracy		1505	35.2.10A, 35.2.10C
Montague	Amanda		79	35.2.7C, 35.2.1D
Moore	Brent, Rachelle		1732	35.2.7A
Moore	Lisa		2280	35.2.7A
Moore	Robert		304	35.2.7C
Moore	Sean		72	35.2.7A
Moors	Brent		368	35.2.7A
Moors	Brent		1944	35.2.9A
Moran	Sonia		416	35.2.7C
Mordecal	Erin		594	35.2.7A
Morgan			375	35.31 C
Morgan	Jeremy		92	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Morgan	Jeremy		1983	35.2.7A
Morgan	Michelle		2410	35.2.7A, 35.2.1G, 35.2.9A
Morgan	Robert		422	35.2.6A
Morley	Rick		1103	35.2.4H, 35.2.1A
Morrell	Dustin		408	35.2.7C
Morrell	Sarah		409	35.2.7C
Morris	Luke		1596	35.2.11A
Morris	Patricia		699	35.2.7A
Morris	Tim		915	35.2.7A
Morris	Trevor		687	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Morris	Trevor		1588	35.2.9A, 35.2.1H
Morton	Chris		2489	35.6.3A, 35.9A, 35.13A
Mosier	Nichole		176	35.2.7C
Mott	Glenn		1055	35.2.9A
Mower	Gary		265	35.2.3A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.1C, 35.2.3B, 35.2.4B, 35.2.4C, 35.11A
Muhlestein	Brett		1360	35.2.7C
Muir	Douglas C., Lorraine		2247	35.2.8A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Mulford	Brittney		1481	35.6.3A
Mulford	Brittney		1542	35.6.3A, 35.31G
Mulford	Brittney		1543	35.6.3A
Mumford	Ron, Carol		1204	35.31C, 35.2.4A
Murdock	Dennis, Janet		1089	35.2.7A
Murphy	Claudia		2311	35.12.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4H

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Myers	Woneva		2100	35.2.13A
Naef	Ashton		1635	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Navarrete	Peggy		1875	35.2.7A
Neal	Paul		2478	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1D, 35.2.1G
Needles	Jason		564	35.2.7D
Neeley	Jay, Phyllis		1775	35.2.7A
Nelsen	Merrill		1243	35.2.5A
Nelson	Chris		391	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Nelson	Daniel		448	35.2.7C
Nelson	Greg		2411	35.2.7C
Nelson	Joey, Kattie		583	35.29A, 35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
Nelson	Kara		639	35.2.7A
Nelson	Kristen		1634	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Nelson	Laura		575	35.2.9A
Nelson	Lea		1356	35.2.7A
Nelson	Michael		990	35.2.7A
Nelson	Vicky		445	35.2.7C
Nestman	Lo		118	35.2.7A
Nestman	Lo B.		1987	35.2.7A
Newbold	Michelle		2331	35.15.4A
Newman	Hal		2342	35.12.4A, 35.2.4E, 35.29A, 35.2.10A
Newman	June		142	35.2.9A
Newman	Paul	PlanCo	346	35.2.7C
Newman	Paul	PlanCo	1323	35.2.7C
Newman	Paul	PlanCo	1941	35.2.7C
Newman	Wade		266	35.2.10A
Newmark	William		1351	35.2.3A
Newton	David B.		1892	35.2.10A
Newton	David B.	West Jordan City, Mayor	1893	35.2.10A
Newton	Sandy		996	35.2.10A
Nicholas	Sophia		1630	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Nicholas	Sophia		1939	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
Nichols	Chad		1012	35.1.1A, 35.2.10C
Nicoll	Alan		561	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Nielsen	Alan		111	35.2.7D
Nielsen	Chris		456	35.2.9A
Nielsen	Erica		83	35.31C
Nielsen	Karl		69	35.2.7A
Nielsen	Marilyn		1866	35.2.7A
Nielsen	Rich		2343	35.31C
Nielsen	Steve		2413	35.2.6A
Nielson	Brandon		475	35.2.7C
Nielson	Jeremy		2319	35.2.4E
Nielson	Jeremy A.	South Jordan City	2320	35.2.3J, 35.2.3K, 35.2.4O
Nielson	Karen		1771	35.2.7A
Nielson	Kellie		1995	35.2.7C
Nielson	Krista		2175	35.2.7C
Nielson	Richard, Christina		1776	35.2.7A
Noland	Doug, Tanya		1443	35.2.7C

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Norman	Bruce		602	35.2.9A
Norris	Max		1119	35.2.7C
North	David		2302	35.2.9A
Northrup	Rodney		1321	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A
Norton	Andrea		1008	35.2.7A
Norton	Brenda		894	35.2.8A
Norton	John		1565	35.2.9A
Nott	Kevin		1073	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Noyes	Carol		1541	35.2.4E
Noyes	Carol		1887	35.2.4E, 35.2.4B
Noyes	Carol		1888	35.12.1A, 35.6.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Noyes	Don		2321	35.12.1A, 35.6.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Nunley	Nick		1263	35.6.3A
Nuttall	Ronald		2419	35.2.1F
Nuttall	Ronald D.		779	35.2.1F
Nye	Misty		288	35.6.3A
Oehlschlager	Bronwen		2010	35.2.7C
Oehlschlager	Joseph		395	35.2.7C
Oland	David		1853	35.2.7A
Oldham	Diane		2344	35.2.4B, 35.12.4A
Oldroyd	D.		667	35.2.10A, 35.1.1A
Oleson	A. Garner		1184	35.2.13A
Oliver	Micki		512	35.2.9C
Olofson	Melissa		431	35.6.3A
Olsen	Danica		106	35.2.7C
Olsen	Eric		110	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Olsen	Peggy		1041	35.2.7A
Olsen	Randy		458	35.2.9A
Olsen	Romie		2098	35.2.7A
Olsen	Scott		1631	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Olsen	Steve		2522	35.31C
Olsen	Terri		1337	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Olson	Callie		1506	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Olson	Erin		1654	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Olson	Justin		1772	35.2.7A
Oprea	Claudiu		1773	35.2.7A
Ordenes	Brooke		1004	35.2.7A
Oreno	Mike		2140	35.2.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.1.1H
Osborne	KaiLynne		22	35.2.7C
Osborne	KaiLynne		251	35.2.7C
Osier	Jon		264	35.31A
Osier	Jon		2509	35.31A
Osmond	Tiffany		2282	35.2.7A
Ostler	Calvin		857	35.2.9A
Ostler	Joan		1021	35.2.7A
Oswald	Ty		1507	35.2.10A
Overall	Marie P.		2544	35.2.3A
O'Very	Brandon		122	35.2.7C
O'Very	Dave		1532	35.2.1H
Owens	Micah		1442	35.2.7C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Pace	Jeremy		442	35.2.7C, 35.2.1F
Pacheco	Dave		1616	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Pack	Darin		302	35.2.9A
Packard	Alan E.	Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District	2315	35.2.1V, 35.2.4P
Packard	John		1246	35.2.7C
Packard	Michael T.		1894	35.31C
Packer	Brian		2504	35.6.3A
Page	Doug		1508	35.2.1B
Painter	Deborah		145	35.2.7C
Paiser	S.		892	35.2.9A
Palmer	Andy		541	35.2.6A, 35.2.9C
Palmer	Betty		1509	35.2.1F
Palmer	Bradley		1597	34.2.7F, 35.2.7A, 35.31C, 35.2.7A, 35.6.3A, 35.2.7B, 35.13A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.11A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.9A
Palmer	Bradley, Rachel		723	35.2.7F, 35.2.7A, 35.31E, 35.2.7A, 35.6.3A, 35.2.7B, 35.13A, 35.2.7A
Palmer	Bradley, Rachel		724	35.2.11A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.9A
Palmer	Ione		1695	35.2.7A
Palmer	Ione E.		980	35.2.7A
Palomar	Claudia		1458	35.31C, 35.31A
Parish	Joseph		501	35.2.7C
Parish	Saerome		500	35.2.7C
Park	Dustin		885	35.2.7C
Park	Tony		2284	35.2.8A
Parker	Elizabeth		609	35.2.9A
Parker	Timothy L.	Saratoga Springs, Mayor	1896	35.2.7C, 35.2.7J, 35.2.9C
Parkin	Angie		710	35.2.9A
Parkin	Angie		725	35.2.7A
Parkin	Angie		981	35.2.7A
Parkinson	Anthony	Ivory Homes	396	35.2.7A
Parkinson	Tony	Ivory Homes	1946	35.2.9A
Parkinson	Wilma		1703	35.2.7A
Parry	Vickie		1062	35.2.4H
Patterson	Kimberly		933	35.2.7C
Paulsen	Chris, Christie		572	35.12A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Paulsen	Chris, Christie		641	35.2.7A
Paxton	Ted		144	35.2.7C
Payne	Don		786	35.2.7A
Payne	Don		2506	35.2.7A
Payne	Shawn		1440	35.2.7C
Pearce	Linsey		2164	35.15.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1H
Pearson	Adella		28	35.2.7D, 35.2.8A
Pearson	Betty		2283	35.2.1K
Pearson	Grant		769	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Pearson	Mitch		335	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Peaslee	Gary		354	35.2.7C, 35.2.10B
Peaslee	Gary		976	35.2.10A
Peaslee	Gary		977	35.2.1I

▼▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Peaslee	Gary		1943	35.6.1C
Peck	Carol		1152	35.2.7D
Peck	Clint		1384	35.2.7C
Peck	Jackie		1282	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Peck	Judd		1281	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Peck	Justin		13	35.31C
Peck	Justin		26	35.2.7C
Peck	Justin		398	35.2.7C
Peck	Justin		1331	35.2.7C
Peck	Justin		2567	35.2.7C
Peck	Ron		1390	35.2.9A, 35.2.6A
Peck	Ron		2495	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.9A
Pedersen	Elizabeth		1665	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Peeler	David E., Lily Ann		2345	35.2.13A
Pelton	Sherrin		1447	35.2.10B, 35.2.10A
Pelton	Sherrin		2053	35.2.10A
Pelton	Sherrin		2218	35.2.10A
Pendleton	Jason		1833	35.2.7A
Perez	Julie		513	35.2.1J
Perkins	Jared		1433	35.2.7A
Perkins	Joyce		1138	35.2.7A
Perkins	Tyler		355	35.9A
Perry	Dee		284	35.2.4A
Person	Arnold		1652	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Petersen	Darwin		234	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.9A
Petersen	Darwin		1165	35.12.4A, 35.2.9A, 35.6.1A, 35.2.3A
Petersen	Nichole		1463	35.2.7C
Petersen	Riley		313	35.2.7C
Peterson	Barbara		930	35.2.7A
Peterson	Brad		1206	35.2.5A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.5B
Peterson	Dan, Lin		1446	35.2.7C
Peterson	Gail		1704	35.2.7A
Peterson	Harley, Deena		1996	35.2.7C
Peterson	Jared		2346	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Peterson	Jaynalee		1380	35.2.7C
Peterson	John		2514	35.1.1G, 35.2.3A
Peterson	LeAnn		306	35.2.7C
Peterson	LeAnn		2539	35.2.7C
Peterson	Matthew		1050	35.2.9A
Peterson	Patricia		152	35.2.7A
Peterson	Patricia, Andrew		2042	35.2.7A
Peterson	Robyn, Gene		1038	35.2.7A
Peterson	Rodney		2578	35.6.3A
Peterson	Ron		1006	35.2.7D
Peterson	Ronald		1112	35.2.7A
Petilos	Theda		712	35.2.7A
Pettit	Nathan		2347	35.2.1F
Pettus	Jennifer		1990	35.2.3A
Petty	Wayne		1897	35.2.4B
Pexton	Richard		148	35.2.7C
Phelps	Richard		2348	35.2.7C

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Phillips	Rhonda		1872	35.2.7A
Phillips	Sarah		2249	35.2.3A
Pierce	Ann		695	35.2.7D
Pierce	Daniel		696	35.2.7D
Pilling	Chris, Melissa		68	35.2.7D,35.2.9A
Pilling	Chris, Melissa		1438	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Pilling	Chris, Melissa		1705	35.2.7A
Pinkham	Justin		113	35.2.8C
Pitcher	Stan		1655	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Pitchforth	Dillon		1522	35.2.9A
Plummer	Scott		2497	35.2.9A
Poduska	Bernard		627	35.2.7C
Poduska	Bud		2414	35.2.7C
Poduska	Bud, Barbara		1436	35.2.7C
Ponzio	Joyce		62	35.2.7A
Ponzio	Joyce		2217	35.2.7D
Ponzio	Thomas		1781	35.2.7A
Pope	Chad		608	35.2.7A
Pope	Lois		1809	35.2.7A
Porter	Alda Mae	Malt Investments	2191	35.6.3A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Porter	Mike		52	35.2.10A
Porter	Mike		1488	35.2.10A
Portillo	Michael		51	35.2.7C
Poslusny	Duane		1653	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Postell	Nathan		1622	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Poulsen	Kathy		61	35.2.7C
Powell	Chase		925	35.2.7D
Powell	Kaye		315	35.2.7A
Powell	Kaye		1303	35.2.7A
Powell	Mac	Lehi Block Company	2248	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Powell	Maxine, Chase		926	35.2.7A
Powell	Terry	Lehi Block Company	2192	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Powell	William		316	35.2.7A
Powell	William		1304	35.2.7A
Powers	Stacey		1474	35.31C, 35.2.9A
Preece	Brian		1357	35.2.13A
Preece	Brian		1988	35.2.13A
Preisendorf	Michele		807	35.2.7A
Prentice	Eric		1209	35.2.4A
Preston	Karen		1706	35.2.7A
Prettyman	Eric		749	35.2.7A, 35.2.8C
Prettyman	Kyler		911	35.2.9A
Price	Camille		635	35.2.10A
Price	Chris		116	35.2.7C
Price	Lindsay		750	35.2.7A
Price	Richard		1858	35.2.7A
Price	Sandra		1780	35.2.7A
Price	Tami		1707	35.2.7A
Pritchard	Michael A.		1929	35.2.9A
Pritchard	Michael A.		1930	35.2.9A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Pruhs	Joyce		587	35.2.7C
Pyles	James E., Kryst J.		979	35.2.9A
Pyper	James W., Diane H.		96	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Quigley	Tom		63	35.2.8C
Quinn	Shaina		1000	35.2.3A
Quinney	Joy		400	35.2.7C
Quintana	Andy, Tricia		1708	35.2.7A
Quintana	Tricia, Andy		2086	35.2.9A
Rackham	Benjamin		1998	35.13.1C, 35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Raehl	Ben		731	35.2.7A
Raehl	Karen		1035	35.2.7A
Rafferty	Monica		1525	35.6.3A
Rahn	Carla		1128	35.2.7D
Rainey	Vic		2148	35.2.1B
Ramirez	Rodrigo		163	35.2.7C
Randall	Denise		2236	35.12.4A, 35.12.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4H
Ransdell	Linde		2486	35.1.1A
Rashid	Brooks		648	35.2.7C
Rasmussen	Heather		899	35.2.7A
Rasmussen	Jarvis		426	35.2.7C
Rasmussen	Linda		2077	35.2.10A
Rasmussen	Lori		2256	35.2.7A
Rasmussen	Louie		2151	35.2.7A
Rasmussen	Martha, Tad		1459	35.2.1B
Rasmussen	Tad		1460	35.2.6A
Raulston	Colleen		2234	35.1.1H, 35.12.4A
Raulston	Colleen		2235	35.2.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.4E
Rawlings	Patrick		1003	35.2.7A
Ray	Greta		550	35.2.7D, 35.2.6A, 35.2.1G
Ray	Neva		578	35.2.7A
Ray	Waldo		2068	35.2.9A, 35.2.1G
Raynor	Ruth		660	35.2.11A
Reall	Branden		1403	35.2.7C, 35.31C
Reall	Brigitte		493	35.2.7C
Reay	Anne		1058	35.2.9A
Reel	Kathy		2433	35.9A, 35.12.1A, 35.13A, 35.6.3A, 35.6.1A
Rees	Stephanie		2360	35.2.5A
Reeves	Faye		514	35.2.9A, 35.2.13A
Reeves	Michele		343	35.2.7A
Reid	Nancy		2175	35.2.7C
Reid	Tiffany		1454	35.6.3A
Reinbold	Krissa		582	35.2.7A
Remund	Craig		299	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Revill	Chuck, Renita		785	35.2.7A
Revill	Johnny		2367	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Revill	Renita		2473	35.2.9A
Reynolds	Frankie		743	35.2.7A
Reynolds	Scott		1456	35.2.10A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Reynolds	Tim		460	35.2.6A
Reynolds	Vicki		1692	35.2.7A
Reynolds	Vicki		2084	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Rhodes	Ryan		2007	35.2.3A, 35.12.4A
Riboldi	Pablo		71	35.2.7C
Rich	Douglas		2250	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A, 35.2.8A
Rich	Joanna		1191	35.2.13A
Rich	Peter		2032	35.2.7C, 35.31C
Rich	Sherry		1093	35.2.7A
Richards	Jim		130	35.31C
Richards	R. Jeff	Rocky Mountain Power	2314	35.6.4B
Richards	S.		796	35.2.7D
Richardson	Bob		2285	35.2.9A
Richardson	Keara, Mark		2543	35.2.7C
Richins	Steve		2350	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Richins	Tami		2349	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Richter	Branton		802	35.2.7C
Ricks	Ben		2130	35.2.1A, 35.8A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E, 35.1.1H
Ricks	Tabitha		2129	35.2.1A, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1H
Riddle	Heather		402	35.2.7A
Rider	Earline		1693	35.2.7A
Riding	Pamela		1108	35.2.7A
Riggs	Micah		2076	35.2.8A
Riggs	Norman		1252	35.2.8A, 35.31C, 35.2.1B
Riggs	Norman		2483	35.2.8A, 35.2.1B
Riley	Diane		440	35.2.7A
Ring	Brent		1407	35.2.7C
Ring	Brent, Debi		182	35.2.7C
Ritter	Jill		558	35.2.7A
Robb	L.		801	35.2.7C
Roberts	Debbie		153	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Roberts	Jeremie		519	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Roberts	Larry, Becky		2263	35.2.7C, 35.2.13A
Roberts	Mark		920	35.2.7A
Roberts	Samuel		1468	35.2.7C
Roberts	Scott		179	35.2.7C
Roberts	Stan, Lillie		2109	35.2.6A
Roberts	Steve		1574	35.2.1B
Roberts	Steven	Deseret Transportation	270	35.2.1B
Roberts	Tamee		1472	35.2.7C
Robertson	Michael		2026	35.2.7D, 35.2.9A
Robinson	Marc B.	Sadie Properties	2107	35.2.7A
Robinson	Matthew		606	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Robinson	Ray		789	35.2.6A
Robinson	Reed		2454	35.2.4K, 35.9A
Robinson	Rob		1373	35.2.7C
Robison	Ray		1186	35.2.6A
Robison	Rhonda		2453	35.2.4K, 35.9A

▼▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Rodriguez	Daniel		1435	35.2.9A
Roethel	Bryan		2288	35.31C
Roethel	Dustin		1130	35.8A
Roethel	Taunie		2316	35.31C
Rogel	Paula		195	35.2.7A
Rogers	Marisa		628	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Rohbock	Russell		828	35.2.9A
Rohletter	Annette		825	35.2.7D
Roll	Steve, Aaron		363	35.2.7D
Rollo	Teri		2028	35.2.13A
Roman	Heather		2480	35.2.7A
Rose	Erika		2317	35.2.7A
Rose	Kendrick		1694	35.2.7A
Roseman	Kelly		2351	35.2.1B, 35.2.7C
Rosemann	Debra		481	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Rosemann	Debra		1339	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Rosemon	Stanton		2458	35.2.7C
Rosenhan	Lee		2154	35.2.9B
Rosenvall	Andrew		2233	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.4A
Rossello	Stephanie		978	35.31C
Rothenberg	Robert		434	35.2.13A
Rowe	Matt		763	35.2.1H
Rowe	Matt		764	35.2.1I
Rowe	Randy		657	35.31C
Rowland	Jeff		1183	35.1.1A, 35.2.10A
Rowley	Angie		629	35.2.9A
Rowley	Becky		1709	35.2.7A
Rowley	Donavan		330	35.2.13A
Rowley	Stewie		849	35.2.7C
Ruden	Kirsten		1834	35.2.7A
Rudy	Frank		48	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Ruff	Lynn		128	35.31C
Ruper	Steve, Mary		159	35.2.7C
Rupper	Steve H.		1986	35.2.1F
Rush	Chuck, Claudette		250	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1279	35.2.9A, 35.2.1G
Rush	Claudette		1280	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1391	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1392	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1393	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1394	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1483	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1484	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1485	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1486	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1512	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1546	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1547	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1585	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1586	35.12.4A
Rush	Claudette		1587	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1908	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Rush	Claudette		1909	35.2.9A
Rush	Claudette		1910	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		1911	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		2189	35.2.7A
Rush	Claudette		2190	35.2.9A
Russell	Mike, Karen, Josh		1710	35.2.7A
Russell	Mike, Karen, Josh		2498	35.2.9A
Russon	Dee R.		2087	35.2.7A
Russon	Dee, Jalaine		1712	35.2.7A
Russon	Glade		1711	35.2.7A
Russon	K.		895	35.2.7A
Russon	Stanford		1828	35.2.7A
Ryan	David		889	35.2.7A
Sabey	Casey		730	35.2.7A
Sabey	Dawn		1843	35.2.7A
Sabin	Jason		2193	35.2.7F, 35.2.7H, 35.2.7A, 35.2.13A
Sabin	Rachel		2207	35.2.7A
Sabin	Rachel		2208	35.2.9A
Sadler	Brian		2555	35.2.10C
Safsten	Nancy		1022	35.2.7D
Sandberg	Claigh		1716	35.2.7A
Sandberg	Karen		1713	35.2.7A
Sandberg	Megan		1714	35.2.7A
Sandberg	Robert, Stephanie		1715	35.2.7A
Sandburg	Jason		1212	35.13A, 35.9A, 35.2.1M
Sanders	Alan		2057	35.2.5A, 35.2.10A
Sanders	Scott		323	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Sanders	Scott		324	35.2.3A
Sanders	Scott		1316	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Sanderson	Brad		637	35.2.13A, 35.2.1B, 35.2.1I
Sandoval	Dan		282	35.31C
Sasaki	Lynnette		1358	35.2.4F, 35.2.4I, 35.13A, 35.1.1A
Sasser	Tamara		1470	35.2.7C
Sattler	Joan		1009	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Schaefermeyer	Scott		1123	35.2.7A
Scharman	Mary		370	35.2.7A
Scheffer	Jeanne		1648	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Schiess	Marilyn		29	35.2.7D
Schindler	Greg		631	35.2.4A, 35.2.4G
Schmalz	Ben		1379	35.2.7C
Schmutz	Tony		102	35.2.7C
Schneider	Brett R.	Hexcel Corporation	2230	35.6.3D, 35.2.1W, 35.2.1A, 35.2.1X, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.1Y, 35.1.1N, 35.2.12A, 35.1.1N, 35.3D, 35.2.3B, 35.1.1N, 35.30B, 35.1.1A, 35.1.1N, 35.1.1N
Schoolcraft	David and Family		2022	35.2.7C
Schrader	Susan C.		2286	35.6.3A
Schuck	Galen		1610	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Schulz	Gregory		1199	35.2.10A, 35.31C
Schung	Jan, Alma		1733	35.2.7A
Schusinger	Terry		1109	35.2.4H
Schwartz	Richard		827	35.2.7A
Schwinn	Carol		681	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Schwitzer	Michael		1369	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Scoresby	Mikeael A.		1918	35.2.13A
Scoresby	Richard		1247	35.2.7C
Scott	Marilynn		875	35.2.7A
Scott	Vernon		1854	35.2.7A
Searle	Travis		559	35.2.13A
Seavey	Bonnie		480	35.2.7A
Sederholm	Wilfrede		1045	35.2.7C
Sedwick	Ryan		1047	35.2.7A
Seegmiller	Robert		401	35.2.7C
Self	Stefani		77	35.2.7C
Semmens	Carol		2460	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A,
Serre	Joseph		697	35.2.6A, 35.2.9C
Shadowen	Donna		2058	35.31C
Sharp	Paul, Lynette		1364	35.2.10A
Shaw	Kirk		508	35.2.8C
Shepherd	Aaron		2152	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A
Shepherd	Cheryl		759	35.9A, 35.1.1A
Shepherd	Erin		2232	35.2.7A
Shepherd	Kim		937	35.2.7A
Shepherd	Leita		923	35.2.7D
Sherwood	Xenya		1534	35.2.3C
Shumway	Diane		1548	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Shupert	Vanessa		1623	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Shurput	Stephen		1618	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Sibiel	Amy		1643	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Sibul	Amy		2287	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Siefert	Charles		1717	35.2.7A
Sigmiller	Barbara		157	35.2.7C
Sigmiller	Robert		158	35.2.7C
Simmonds	Dean	US SYNTHETIC CORP.	2564	35.2.6A
Simons	Amber		340	35.2.7A
Simonsen	Christina		1647	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Simpson	Michael		2515	35.2.6A, 35.2.1F
Sindt	Anna		811	35.2.7A
Singer	Alicia		1455	35.2.9A
Skidmore	Jason		65	35.2.6A
Skousen	Keith		1395	35.2.9A, 35.2.8C
Skousen	Veda Joan		2474	35.2.9A
Slack	Robert		1826	35.2.7A
Smedley	Craig, Karol		1825	35.2.7A
Smith	Adam		359	35.2.7F, 35.2.13A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.3A, 35.12.4A, 35.9A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.10A
Smith	Crystal		2531	35.6.3A
Smith	Daniel		576	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A, 35.2.1F

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Smith	David B.		463	35.2.3A
Smith	Geralee		1870	35.2.7A
Smith	Heidi		997	35.2.9A
Smith	Hugh, Melody		2298	35.12.4A
Smith	Jacob		1981	35.2.7C
Smith	Jamie		600	35.31C
Smith	Jamie		601	35.2.7A
Smith	Jason		1520	35.6.3A
Smith	Jason		1521	35.6.3A
Smith	Jeff		2306	35.2.9A
Smith	Joe		1198	35.2.5A
Smith	John		314	35.2.7C
Smith	Kay, Gail		1823	35.2.7A
Smith	Kristine		1788	35.2.7A
Smith	Linda		76	35.2.7A
Smith	Lisa		1441	35.2.7C
Smith	Malcolm		1469	35.2.7C
Smith	Marc		819	35.2.7A
Smith	Marilee		1824	35.2.7A
Smith	Melinda		624	35.2.7C
Smith	Melissa		1982	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Smith	Nile		1701	35.2.7A
Smith	Pam		907	35.2.7A
Smith	Sam, Kim		2144	35.2.7A
Smith	Samuel		81	35.2.7 C
Smith	Stephen		1396	35.31C
Smith	Tim		101	35.2.7C
Sorensen	Collin		1822	35.2.7A
Sorensen	Hillary		2487	35.13A, 35.6.1A, 35.2.1A
Sorensen	Kennard		2361	35.1.1A
Sorenson	Colleen		890	35.2.7A
Soria	Alex		484	35.2.13A
Soria	Alex		1827	35.2.7A
Sor-Lokken	SnowOwl		1352	35.12.4A, 35.29A, 35.2.3B
Spaeth	Cassandra		393	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Spaeth	Chris		394	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Spalding	Derek		295	35.31C
Spencer	Clinton		24	35.2.7C
Spencer	David		1121	35.31C
Spencer	Kathy		1129	35.2.7D
Spens	Anna		437	35.2.7C
Spinti	Jennifer		1537	35.11A, 35.2.5B, 35.2.7C, 35.2.3A
Spotts	Richard		1348	35.12.4A, 35.29A, 35.2.3B
Sprague	Sarah		405	35.2.7C
Springer	Patrice		879	35.2.9A
Squire	Clifford		706	35.2.7A
Squire	Kally		686	35.2.7A, 35.2.8C
Staks	Peter	Wardley Development	2488	35.2.7C
Stanworth	Erica, Jeff		2075	35.2.7C
Stapleton	Janet		2069	35.2.7C
Stauffer	Matthew		713	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Steadman	Brittany		910	35.2.7A
Steadman	David		305	35.2.6A
Steadman	Tasha		1912	35.2.7D
Stebinger	Mike		1527	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Steele	Stanley E., Sandra M.		2560	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A
Stensaas	Suzanne S.		1464	35.2.3A, 35.2.9A
Stephen	Carla		1994	35.2.10A
Stephens	Derrick		999	35.2.10, 35.2.3D, 35.2.3H
Stephens	Jolene		2496	35.6.3A, 35.19A, 35.13A, 35.2.11A, 35.9A
Stevens	Chris		459	35.31 C
Stevens	Jocelyn		1453	35.2.7C
Stevens	Marty		2172	35.2.7D
Stevens	Peggy		2362	35.31C
Stevens	Peggy		2363	35.31C
Stevens	Spencer		2059	35.2.7C
Stevenson	Cami		2401	35.2.7A
Stewart	Chelsea		1844	35.2.7A
Stewart	Loreece		533	35.2.7D
Stewart	Sheldon		2528	35.2.10A, 35.2.10C
Stinger	Preston		2108	35.2.7A
Stirland	Quinn		60	35.2.10A
Stitley	Jim		1477	35.31C
Stitley	Jim, Tresa		2216	35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.3A
Stitley	Tresa		1476	35.12.4A
Stitley	Tresa		2364	35.2.2A
Stock	Brandon, Tresa, Gabriel, Setera, Sadie		1898	35.1.1H, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.4A, 35.2.4E
Stock	James		436	35.2.13A
Stock	James		1335	35.2.9C
Stockett	Jerry		311	35.2.7A
Stocks	Martin		659	35.2.1F, 35.2.7C
Stockwell	Trent, Alyssa		985	35.2.6A
Stockwell	Trent, Alyssa		1845	35.2.7A
Stoddard	Natalie		476	35.2.7C
Stoker	Justin		2290	35.2.4A, 35.2.10B, 35.2.4G
Stoker	Richard, June		1871	35.2.7A
Stokes	Paul		571	35.2.7A
Stone	Jay		399	35.2.7C
Stott	Jeff, Marcy		2291	35.12.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Stout	Irene B.		2294	35.2.9A
Stout	John, Lynda		1702	35.2.7A
Strasburg	Shanna		84	35.2.7C
Strassburg	Joel, Jalena		983	35.2.1K
Strassburg	Joel, Jalena		1821	35.2.7A
Stringham	Steven		2070	35.2.1K
Strong	Jim		1864	35.2.7A
Stroup	Jeremy		2313	35.2.4H, 35.12.1A, 35.8B, 35.2.1A
Stroup	Joshua		427	35.2.9A, 35.2.1B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A
Struthers	Kim		241	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Struthers	Kim		1258	35.2.9A, 35.2.8A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Struthers	M.G.		683	35.2.7A
Struve	Jim		1606	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Struve	Jim		2001	35.2.3A
Stubbs	Natalie		909	35.2.7A
Sturgeon	Shamala		406	35.2.7C
Sucher	Scott		1048	35.2.9A, 35.31C
Suggs	Steven, Cheryl		607	35.2.7C
Suitz	Brian		2365	35.2.3A
Sullivan	Mark		1927	35.2.9A
Sullivan	Mark		2465	35.2.9A
Summers	S.		1923	35.2.9A
Svoboda	Larry	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8	2158	35.1.1I, 35.14A, 35.14B, 35.14C, 35.12.1C, 35.12.4C, 35.12.4D, 35.12.1D, 35.12.1E, 35.14A
Swain	Reed		1478	35.1.1A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.10C
Swank	Gordon		1820	35.2.7A
Swanson	Steven		417	35.2.7C
Swapp	Kathleen		822	35.2.7C
Swiderski	Pete		2029	35.2.7C
Swim	Lyall		109	35.2.7C
Swindler	Joe		2173	35.2.9A
Swinford	Amy		1582	35.2.9A
Szalay	Tom		1673	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Szoke	Carol		1935	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Szoke	Jenna		1005	35.2.9A
Szoke	Siegfried		1934	35.2.7A
Szoke	Siegfried		2211	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Tadlock	Ellen		317	35.2.9C
Tadlock	Ellen		1305	35.2.9C
Taggart	Ron, Sally		349	35.2.7C
Taggart	Sally, Ron		1942	35.2.7C
Taggart	Ron, Sally		1327	35.2.7C
Talley	Sara		342	35.2.7A
Tallon	John		817	35.2.7A
Tanner	Eldon, Kay		2071	35.2.9A
Tanner	Kathryn		1819	35.2.7A
Tate	Brent		1466	35.2.7C
Taylor	Becky		2415	35.2.7A
Taylor	Bryan		1922	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Taylor	Jason		504	35.2.7A
Taylor	Jennifer		187	35.2.1F, 35.2.7C
Taylor	Jennifer		188	35.2.7C
Taylor	Josh		845	35.2.7A
Taylor	Robert C.		2516	35.31B
Taylor	Timothy		645	35.2.7C
Taylor	Willie R.	US. Dept. of the Interior (includes USFWS)	2333	35.15.1A, 35.15.2C, 35.28B, 35.28C
Tedesco	Craig		2031	35.2.7C
Tedesco	Raylene		198	35.2.7C
Teeple	Ryan	Teeple Custom	2572	35.2.7D, 35.2.6A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Templar	Morgan		2072	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Templar	Stephen		2073	35.2.7C, 35.2.9A
Tenney	Michael		1444	35.2.7C
Tew	Jill		2195	35.2.7A
Tew	Steven		2194	35.2.9A
Thacker	Jan		748	35.2.7A
Thaller	Connie		2416	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Thatcher	Erica		1645	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Thayer	Jeannette		171	35.2.7C
Thing	Adam		1044	35.2.7A
Thomas	Blaine		1723	35.2.7A
Thomas	Paul		2352	35.2.3A, 35.12.1A
Thomas	Richard		2517	35.2.4A
Thomason	Allen		1079	35.2.9A
Thompson	Benjamin		64	35.2.7C
Thompson	Chris		1818	35.2.7A
Thompson	Denise		2452	35.6.1A
Thompson	Garen		451	35.31C, 35.1.1C, 35.31C
Thompson	Joyce		183	35.2.9A
Thompson	Rod		874	35.2.7D
Thompson	Sharlene		200	35.2.7A
Thomsen	Paul, Brookell		1850	35.2.7A
Thomsen	Travis		66	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Thorn	Jeff		797	35.2.6A, 35.2.10A
Thorne	Mark		2518	35.2.10A
Thornton	Cody		1096	35.2.7A
Thornton	Deborah		1077	35.2.7A
Tidwell	Amanda		525	35.2.7C
Tiller	Kimberly		2060	35.6.3A
Tippetts	Chase		74	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A
Titus	Chris, Courtney		1445	35.31C
Titus	Jon, Jane		1462	35.31C
Tobian	Meryn		489	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Tobin	Deanna		435	35.2.7C
Tolley	Michael		1075	35.6.3A
Topham	Dan, Mari		821	35.2.7A
Torgersen	David		129	35.2.1F
Torres	Ivan		2353	35.31C
Torres	Julie		185	35.2.7A
Torres	Terry		421	35.2.9A
Torres	Terry		1334	35.2.9A
Torres	Terry		2373	35.2.9A
Townes	Amanda		384	35.2.7C, 35.31 C
Trent	Meggen		1914	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.8C
Trent	Patrick		1913	35.2.9A, 35.2.8C, 35.2.7D
Trimble	Stephen		2292	35.12.1A, 35.2.3A
Trujillo	Joel, Lisa		1132	35.2.1A
Trusty	Chris		498	35.2.7C
Trusty	Chris		1950	35.2.7C
Tucker	Tiffany		1471	35.31C
Tuckett	Valerie		1086	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Tuley	Cecil E., Judy N.		41	35.2.6A, 35.2.1B, 35.2.13A
Tuley	Cecil E., Judy N.		42	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A
Turman	Tempestt		1633	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Turner	Jill		1473	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Turner	Linda A.		252	35.2.9A
Turner	Mary Kathleen		1160	35.31C
Turner	Robert		2354	35.2.13A
Tuttle	Chris		319	35.2.7A
Tuttle	Chris		1312	35.2.7A
Tyree	Kevin, Michelle		2308	35.1.1A, 35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Udall	King S.		2255	35.2.4A
Udell	Cherise		2437	35.12.4A, 35.29A
Ulmer	Tiffany		1259	35.2.7C
Ulmer	Tiffany		2180	35.31C
Ulmer	Tiffany, Adam		242	35.2.6A
Upp	Kevin		957	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Upp	Kevin		2500	35.2.9A
Utah	Yuan		497	35.2.7A
Vale	Trisha		2078	35.2.7C, 35.2.9C
Vallejos	Georgia		388	35.9A
Vallejos	Georgia M.		1945	35.2.1A, 35.2.4H
VanBuskirk	Rory		1449	35.2.7C
Vandermeide	Ed		1251	35.31C
Vanliere	Rebecca		1604	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Vanordon	Mark		1020	35.2.7A
Varner	Sarah		532	35.2.7A
Vaughan	Adam		1916	35.2.4H, 35.2.4B
Veylupek	Dallin		707	35.2.9A
Villegas	Nelson		2466	35.2.1L, 35.2.7A
Vowles	Taylor, Emily		1817	35.2.7A
Wadman	Robert		2529	35.2.1A
Wadman	Robert, Yasmina		2252	35.2.1A
Wadman	Robert, Yasmina		2253	35.12.1A, 35.12.4A, 35.1.1H, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.4E
Wagner	Dwayne		1847	35.2.7A
Wagstaff	Howard		1019	35.2.7A
Waite	Jay		884	35.2.9A
Wakamatsu	Lincoln		2459	35.2.9A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.7A
Wakowski	Mark, Jodi		191	35.2.7C
Walker	Dan		1430	35.2.6A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.13B
Walker	David, Marla		1787	35.2.7A
Walker	Glade		1151	35.2.10A
Wallace	John		626	35.2.7C
Waller	Rod		1816	35.2.7A
Walter	Richard		1355	35.2.3A
Walton	Linda	The Walton Group Inc.	2556	35.31A
Wanders	Michelle, Chad C.		970	35.2.7A
Wanders	Michelle, Chad C.		971	35.2.7A

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Ward	Jana		1661	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Wardle	Randall		103	35.2.10A
Ware	Brent		2479	35.2.8A, 35.2.9A
Wasden	Chad		1599	35.2.2A
Wasden	Chad		2519	35.2.3A
Washburn	Jerry	Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)	2106	35.2.7C, 35.2.9A
Watkins	Brian		1662	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Watkins	Carleton		1033	35.2.9A
Watson	David, Ann		202	35.2.8C, 35.2.7C
Watson	Kris		1660	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Wayman	Ursula		2174	35.2.7C
Wayne	John		995	35.2.13A
Weaver	Steven	Alpine Vision Center	424	35.2.7C
Webb	Jennifer		1385	35.31C
Webb	Jennifer		2259	35.2.9A
Webb	Sherman		1815	35.2.7A
Webster	Kathy		852	35.2.7A, 35.2.1K
Webster	Richard		385	35.2.7A, 35.2.10A
Webster	W. Jean		1814	35.2.7A
Weintz	Lori		2554	35.2.10A
Wells	Rebecca		1114	35.2.7A
West	Irene		1681	35.2.7A
West	Shelby		1852	35.2.7A
Western	Edward		1078	35.2.4A
Western	Karen		562	35.1.1A, 35.2.3A, 35.2.1A
Westover	Laura		2161	35.2.4A, 35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Westover	Lisa		788	35.2.7A
Westwater	James		1431	35.2.9A, 35.2.6C, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1H, 35.2.3B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.9A
Westwater	James		1554	35.2.9A, 35.2.6C, 35.2.9A, 35.2.1H, 35.2.3B, 35.12.4A, 35.2.9A
Whatcott	Gary, Jeri		2033	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Whidden	Andrea		485	35.2.1I
White	Corban		312	35.2.1C, 35.2.1E, 35.2.1B, 35.8C, 35.2.1F
White	David		1067	35.11D
White	Rachel		1353	35.12.4A, 35.2.4A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.3A
Whited	John		2355	35.2.7C, 35.2.8B
Whitehead	James, Pauline		973	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Whitehead	James, Pauline		2201	35.2.9A
Whitehead	Kevin		688	35.2.7A
Whitehead	Melany		1729	35.2.7A
Whiting	Carl		430	35.2.7C
Whittington	Lauri L.		2303	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4H
Wickham	Kent		2183	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Wilcock	Dave, Marianne		1999	35.2.6A
Wilcox	Doug		166	35.2.9A
Wilcox	Robert		477	35.2.7C
Wilcox	Robert		791	35.2.7A

APPENDIX 35A: COMMENTER AND RESPONSE MATRIX

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Wilford	Julie		662	35.2.8A, 35.2.7A
Wilkerson	Lyndee		364	35.2.7C
Wilkerson	Lyndee		1329	35.2.7C
Wilkins	Brian		702	35.2.7A, 35.2.8A
Wilks	Jennifer		931	35.2.7A, 35.2.13A, 35.2.8C
Willden	Melinda		1569	35.2.9A, 35.2.1H
Willey	Charles		935	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Williams	Dana		2251	35.2.7A
Williams	Dennis R.	Utah Refractories Corp.	2264	35.6.3A, 35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Williams	Dennis R.	Utah Refractories Corp.	2265	35.6.3A, 35.2.7A
Williams	Karen		2431	35.2.4K, 35.12.4A
Williams	Lori		843	35.2.7A
Williams	Marci		2008	35.2.7C
Williams	Paul		1517	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Williams	Paul		1538	35.2.9A
Williams	Rylee		549	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Williams	Rylee		1519	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Williams	Rylee		1813	35.2.7A
Williams	Wayne		1593	35.2.7C
Williamson	Dan		487	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Wilson	Aaron		172	35.2.7C
Wilson	Aaron		1405	35.2.7C
Wilson	Bert		1812	35.2.7A
Wilson	Beverly		530	35.2.7D
Wilson	Bradly		1053	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Wilson	Chad		991	35.2.7A
Wilson	Deanna		444	35.2.7C
Wilson	James	JIM WILSON DISTRIBUTING	443	35.2.7C
Wilson	Joshua		1465	35.2.9C
Wilson	Layne		1257	35.1.1A, 35.2.10A, 35.2.3A
Wilson	Layne F.		2485	35.1.1A, 35.31C, 35.2.10A, 35.2.3D
Wilson	Natalie		37	35.2.7C
Wilson	Ned F.		2386	35.2.7A
Wimmer	Lois		2446	35.6.1B, 35.12.1A, 35.13A
Windam-Reeves	Anna		87	35.2.10A
Winder	Kent		2357	35.2.4A
Winder	Sherri		2356	35.31C
Winegar	Allie		2159	35.15.4A, 35.2.3A
Wing	Jerry, Barbara		1607	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Winger	Mike		277	35.2.10A
Winger	Ray		1530	35.2.9A
Winkler	Erick		2299	35.1.1H, 35.12.4A, 35.2.1A, 35.1.1A, 35.8A, 35.2.1A
Winn	Garrett		555	35.2.13A
Winslow	G.		2074	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Wintch	Janet		2297	35.1.1H, 35.8A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E
Wintch	Leanna		2309	35.1.1H, 35.12.1A, 35.2.1A, 35.2.4E

▼ ▼

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Wiscombe	K.		360	35.2.7A, 35.2.8C
Wiser	Justin		90	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Woffinden	Jenny		134	35.2.7A
Wolfley	Rod		2490	35.2.7C
Wood	Debbie		1124	35.2.7D
Wood	Jaclyn		917	35.2.7A
Wood	Jason, Cathy		1811	35.2.7A
Wood	Julia		1382	35.2.7C
Wood	Lawrence		815	35.2.7A, 35.2.9A
Wood	Matt		766	35.2.13A, 35.2.6A, 35.2.10A, 35.11A
Wood	Mike		2061	35.2.7C
Wood	Nita		1450	35.31C
Wood	Ron		2139	35.31C, 35.2.13A
Woodbury	Brad		2520	35.2.4A
Woodbury	Nathan		1104	35.2.7C
Woodman	Jim		535	35.2.7C
Woods	Cecil		737	35.6.3A
Woods	Rosalee, Doug		56	35.2.7C
Woodward	John		622	35.2.7C
Woolley	Dwayne J.		1457	35.2.10A
Woolley	Marci		2310	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Woolley	Matt		89	35.2.7A, 35.2.1H
Wootten	Savannah		1786	35.2.7A
Worley	Sally		108	35.2.7C
Worlton	Doug, Connie		552	35.2.7D, 35.2.9B, 35.2.6A, 35.2.1F
Worlton	Evelyn		2150	35.2.9A
Worlton	M.		124	35.2.7C
Wosnjuk	Matilde T.		2023	35.2.7C
Wosnjuk	Tony		269	35.31C
Wozniak	Kyle		1656	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Wray	Lon		573	35.2.4B, 35.2.4C
Wray	Lon		1651	35.12.4A, 35.3B, 35.2.3A
Wright	Jared		698	35.2.6A, 35.2.8C
Wright	Stephanie		1071	35.2.10A
Wright	Whitney		132	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Wursten	Curtis		747	35.2.13A, 35.2.10D
Yadron	Dave		798	35.2.7A
Yates	Brandi		2206	35.2.9A
Yeagle	Anne		1310	35.12.4A, 35.2.3A
Young	David L.		1924	35.2.7A, 35.2.8C
Young	David, Patricia		1925	35.2.9A, 35.2.7A
Young	Deborah		1110	35.2.10A, 35.1.1A, 35.2.3A
Young	Deborah		1111	35.2.1A
Young	Natalie		1997	35.2.9A, 35.12.1A, 35.2.7A
Young	Shara		829	35.2.7A
Zarrahonandia	Eloisa		1810	35.2.7A
Zelanko	Ari		356	35.2.7A, 35.2.6A
Zelanko	Becky		1368	35.2.7A
Zeller	Scott		916	35.2.7A
Zerkle	John		126	35.2.9C, 35.2.7C
Zimmerman	Julie		18	35.6.3A
Zimmerman	Julie		2378	35.6.3A

▲ ▲

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Comment Number	Response Sections in Chapter 35
Zisakis	Paul Kim		1594	35.2.7A
Zobell	Randy J.	Questar	2238	35.6.4A
Zollinger	Scott		1529	35.2.7D, 35.2.1D

▼ ▼

Appendix 35B: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS

Comment 1

Comment 2

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 11-2099
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
How do I find out if a home is impacted and what is happening on 5600 West? My friend got a packet from UDOT, so we are worried.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 11-2098
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am trying to decide whether or not to buy a home near 1900 South in Lehi. Can you tell me if the freeway will be built there, what would happen to this house?

Comment 3

Comment 4

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2519
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I'm opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it [uh] negatively impacts neighborhoods, it destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. I think that that's not the best way to go. You should go farther up where there's less [uh] human beings to move and to affect, and certainly would be a shorter distance and the 2100 North connector is absolutely not the best way to go. Thank you.

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2302
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
Uh yes, I'd like to uh voice my concerns about this 2100 North corridor. Um, I I don't like it there. Um It causes a lot of problems especially dividing Lehi city and um I think it would be much better to put it where the Lehi Council has decided. Thank you very much.

35.2.7A
35.2.9A

Comment 5

Comment 6

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2370
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I live in Eagle Mountain, and we needed wider roads yesterday, the Lehi Bridge alternative is way too far north. The 2100 North option is better. But I wonder how much good it will do for those of us who travel into Provo. The arterial road through Lehi should be at 1000 south to address this problem, and should be built ASAP.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2156
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
After viewing the proposals for the East/West artery - the 1900 South artery is the only one that satisfies the real need. For Northbound traffic the Mountain View Corridor is crucial and a great idea. However thinking that an East/West artery is for northbound traffic as well is a short-sighted and mislead idea. This artery should be thought of as mainly for Easterly and Southerly access. Thus, moving the artery as close to Lehi Main Street on the South Side as possible is the best solution. Moving it to the North side of Lehi Main Street reduces it's effectiveness and usefulness by every block it heads north. For those residents living in the Central to Southern part of Saratoga Springs and those living in Eagle Mountain it is senseless to move further North to gain an East/South artery. The back roads will simply continue to be used as they will still be more efficient (sad). Please consider heavily and approve the 1900 South artery.

Comment 7

Comment 8


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.3A
35.2.4A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2112
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I want to let you know that I am in support of the 2100 N alternative to connect to I-15. It is the best way to move traffic to and from the Saratoga Springs area. I know the city of Lehi doesn't like this alternative, but in order to avoid major gridlock for those of us out here, we need to have this connection. The point of the mountain is way to far north.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2111
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I believe it is time to invest in mass transit opportunities as well as highways. Also, the 5800 W alignment makes most sense for business access and overall usage.

Comment 9

Comment 10

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2076
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
As a Saratoga Springs resident, I am writing to express my support for the 2100 North Alternative. I believe it would impact the fewest amount of people and be the most cost effective.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2068
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am in favor of the 2100 North and Lehi Bridge proposal.

Comment 11


Comment 12

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2066
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 As a recent move-in to the Ranches in Eagle Mountain, my wife and I are anxiously awaiting a solution to the terrible traffic problem out here. After reviewing the many options that have been discussed up to this point, as well as looking at the reports of the studies, we must say that we are in full support of the 2100 North proposed route. The 2100 North option will "minimize the negative effects of large-truck commercial traffic" by removing the traffic from local streets. The 2100 North option will, in our opinion, be the only option which will actually address the issue. Other options, such as the Lehi Bridge proposal, will not provide adequate transportation for even todays traffic, let alone the traffic of the future in this area. Please consider the 2100 North route as the only viable route. Thank You



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2064
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT


Comment:
 Hi, I live in Saratoga Springs and we would like to see the 2100 North project come to pass. If you could just come and spend even a couple of hours observing Redwood Rd out here you would be excited about the 2100 N project also. We love where we live, but we hate the way the transportation is set up right now. 2100 N would ease traffic situations a lot sooner than the other alternative which is bringing it all the way back into Salt Lake County, you might as well jump onto Bangerter Hwy at that point to connect to I-15, it's not much further. Saratoga Springs resident

Comment 13

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 11-2059
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT


Comment:
I live Saratoga Springs and hate the comute out of here. I am all for the Mountain View Corridor!

Comment 14

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 1840-2308
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Blakesley, Jane
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
Yes, my name is Jane Blakesley, B-l-a-k-e-s-l-e-y. My phone number is 801-755-5102. I am in favor of the 2100 North alternative. It is the best solution and meets the needs of the people in that area the best. Thank you very much. Bye.

Comment 15

Comment 16

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 2933-2340
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: McPherson, Sean
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 REGARDING THE MVC COMMENT, UM MY NAME IS SEAN MCPHERSON. I AM A RESIDENT OF SARATOGA SPRINGS AND THE REASON I'M CALLING IS TO GIVE MY OPINION UM REGARDING THE MVC CONNECTION AT UH 2100 IN LEHI, UH THE PROPOSAL WHICH THE SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY COUNCIL AND THE MAYOR OF SARATOGA SPRINGS HAS ALSO BACKED. UM MY COMMENT IS THAT UH THE 2100 NORTH UM AREA HIGHWAY IS NOT THE BEST ALTERNATIVE. MOST OF THE POPULATION OF SARATOGA SPRINGS THAT BUILT OUT WILL BE SOUTH OF SR-73. THE MAJORITY OF THE POPULATION OF EAGLE MOUNTAIN IS SOUTH OF SR-73 AND LEHI OF COURSE IS SPLIT WITH A UH LARGE PORTION OF IT BEING NORTH OF SR-73. IT'S RIDICULOUS TO THINK THAT HAVING A HIGHWAY NORTH OF THE MAJOR POPULATIONS OF BOTH THOSE CITIES IS GOING TO ALLEVIATE THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION WHEN A RECENT STUDY WAS SHOWN THAT UM UH PRETTY MUCH 50-50 OF DEPENDING ON SARATOGA SPRINGS OR EAGLE MOUNTAIN. IT'S A LITTLE HIGHER FOR EAGLE MOUNTAIN VERSUS SARATOGA BUT THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE WHO NOT UH UH WORK IN SALT LAKE CITY ABOUT ONLY, ABOUT 10% UM AND THE REST WORK ALSO DOWN IN UTAH COUNTY. NOT EVERYONE NEEDS TO GO NORTH. THE BETTER ALTERNATIVE THAT LEHI'S PROPOSING IS THE CORRECT ONE. HAVING 5 ARTERIAL ROADS IS THE BEST WAY TO GO. TURN 2100 NORTH INTO A NICE PARKWAY, CAN BE A NICE 4 LANE PARKWAY INSTEAD OF A HIGHWAY. THEIR CONNECTION IS SHORTER UH WHERE THEY WANTED TO BUILD THEIR BRIDGE. IT STILL ALLOWS FOR THE SAME AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC. ONLY A COUPLE MORE MILES NORTH ISN'T GOING TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE AS FAR AS PEOPLE DECIDING TO TAKE THE ROAD, THEY'RE HEADING NORTH ANYWAY. WHAT SARATOGA SPRINGS AND EAGLE MOUNTAIN NEEDS IS TWO ROADS, A MINIMUM OF TWO OR THREE CONNECTING AROUND THE NORTH RIM OF THE LAKE. EAGLE MOUNTAIN ALREADY HAS A ROAD THAT CONNECTS COMES OUT OF UM SILVER LAKE OR UH WHAT OTHER SUBDIVISIONS THAT WRAPS AROUND AND AND IT GOES BY THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL AND JUNIOR HIGH BEING BUILT IN SARATOGA SPRINGS. UH THAT ROAD SHOULD BE TURNED INTO A CONNECTOR, INTO A PARKWAY, AND THEN DROPPED DOWN INTO THE NORTH RIM OF UTAH LAKE AND CONNECT OVER TO AMERICAN FORK / PLEASANT GROVE EXIT ALONG WITH A 2100 AND UM SOMETHING A LITTLE AND UH UH ALONG THE MIDDLE WLL ALLEVIATE THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION. THAT THAT'S MY MY PROPOSAL. THE CONCURRENT 2100 NORTH ALSO WILL IMPACT THE SARATOGA SHORES ELEMENTARY UH (RECORDING STOPPED-DEFAULT RECORDING BEGAN).

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 2966-2322
Date: 11/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Wolfley, Rod
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Rod Wolfley. My telephone number is 801-766-3190, again, 801-766-3190. I live in the Saratoga Springs, Saratoga Springs Subdivision on Hunter's Haven. I am for the 2100 North alternative and against the Lehi bridge proposal. Uh, so, that is my vote. I'd like to see the 2100 North alternative be put into place. Uh, I believe that the bridge proposal won't do anything to help the traffic from people in Saratoga Springs, especially those of us down here in the Saratoga Springs heading south to Provo and anyway, that's my vote: for 2100 North against the Lehi bridge proposal. Thank you.

Comment 17

Comment 18

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 4185-2577
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Carlson, E. Frank & Heather J.
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Dear Parsons, As residents of Saratoga Springs, we are vitally interested in the proposed Mountain View Corridor. The current eastbound/westbound traffic situation in this part of Utah County is abysmal! While the Mountain View Corridor may not be specifically designed to relieve the traffic congestion out our way, it could certainly help if it is done correctly. We think the east/west link to I-15 should be further south than the proposed 2100 North route. But realizing the practicalities of funding a more southerly route, we think that 2100 North is probably the best solution. It is our opinion that the Lehi bridge proposal put forth by the City of Lehi would be a terrible waste of taxpayer dollars and would not accomplish anything of real value for traffic flow. From outward appearances one might think that the City of Lehi has some strong real estate developers controlling their governing bodies and these persons are letting personal profits stand in the way of rational reasoning. Or perhaps they just love the smell of all the pollution of vehicles trapped in the terrible Lehi-Main-Street gridlock. E. Frank Carlson Heather J. Carlson

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 4630-2100
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Zimmerman, Julie
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 I heard there is a list of all businesses and residents being taken out by the road and I believe we are one of them. Where can I find the list?

Comment 19

Comment 20

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 4793-2570
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Frandsen, Edward R. & Nann
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Dear Sirs, I am opposed to the proposed 2100 North Connector Road from the Mountain View Corridor to Interstate Highway 15 for the following reasons: -29 homes would need to be relocated. -3 Businesses would be adversely affected. -Existing churches would be negatively affected. -Property values could be negatively affected. -More than 14 acres of wetlands would be lost. -Lehi City would again be divided by a freeway (e.g. I-15). The proposed connector road should be moved north to a location just south of Camp Williams (Utah National Guard Base) and connect with I-15 near State Road 92. This location would be more economically efficient. Location of the needed connector road at Enforcement Agencies/Communities as a training site. Location of the connector road should serve as many persons as possible. Location of the connector road to I-15 near State Road 92 would eliminate persons driving to Highland and/or Alpine having to backtrack from Lehi. The greatest good for the greatest number of people served by economic definition is considered the "Least Cost Alternative." Moving the connector road (see enclosed map) would be less disruptive to existing neighborhoods, eliminate relocation of existing homes and churches, and not cause adverse socio-economic impacts. Sincerely, Edward R. Frandsen

35.2.7A

35.2.1K



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 4802-2298
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Duclos, Eric
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:


Yeah, my name is Eric Duclos. My number is 801-836-1461. My comment is, is that it's really funny that the thing that impacts Utah Valley and Utah County is being held up in Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City area schools, not in Utah. I think that's a joke. I think that you are not caring about the impact that it has on the city, nor the people or residents of the city in which you are impacting. I think that is ridiculous and what a terrible waste of government funds. Why don't you worry about what the people want and what the people in the area of the, of the impacted area care about and not yourselves and your bottom dollar, and your money for you, which you think is best, or supporting a plan. I'm very disappointed in that and this letter from that I received from Saratoga Springs is just infuriating to me and this mayor is a joke, who obviously doesn't know what the crap he's talking about. Yes, I am upset. It impacts my household, my family, my property values, and I'm very disappointed in the way the state has tried to overpower with their money and their support of something that the people and residents of the city and community that it's affecting do not want. Why don't you quit caring about you what you think is best to make you look good and worry about the people who pay your salary. Good-bye.

35.2.7A

Comment 21

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 4808-1960
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Glazier, Bryon & Sherry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am very opposed to the 2100 N. Mountain View Corridor Freeway connector. It will destroy neighborhoods, the city of Lehi will be divided by another freeway, and wildlife will be destroyed. I would strongly urge you to consider the Lehi City Plan, which makes a lot more sense, costs less, moves more traffic and affects far less homes and neighborhoods. Please don't destroy the beautiful neighborhood we live in by running a huge freeway thru it. Please take the time to consider all options, including the Lehi City Plan. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 4880-2163
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Osborne, Kailynne
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of and support the 2100 North option in Lehi. I am also disappointed in the Lehi City Council and their scare tactics that they have sent out the the people of Lehi. This WILL NOT divide the City! It WILL make a smooth transition from the East to West and would eliminate any type of bottlenecking that would occur if Boulevard's were used instead. The air and noise pollution will be the same regardless of freeway or Blvd. I used to live in a Southern California City and we had a freeway connector very close by. Air and noise were not a factor because it was done well. It actually was a PLUS and convenience for those in the area. I appreciate UDOT'S attempts to keep the public informed with their open houses and ask them to continue to try and keep communication going with cities involved. (I understand this can be difficult sometimes as not all cities are open minded...) Again, I'm for the 2100 North option. The time is now, as the traffic is getting worse and development continues. It is the best solution for our area! If, in the future there is a need for more connectors, then 4800N. could be looked at.

Comment 23

Comment 24


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 4960-2252
Date: 11/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Cooper, Jennifer
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, yes my name is Jennifer Cooper. My phone number is 801-331-8253. I'm just calling to let you know that I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. Please do not ruin our neighborhood. We would very much appreciate it. Thank you.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5003-2016
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Spencer, Clinton
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I still wish the alignment was further south to alleviate more traffic on Lehi Main Street, but I think the 2100 North alternative is better over the Lehi proposal. I won't travel it very often as I commute south to work from SR73, but at least it will benefit those going north from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs.

Comment 25

Comment 26

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5627-2280
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Baker, Sherry
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Yes, my name is Sherry Baker. My phone number is 407-4276 and I live in Eagle Valley, uh excuse me, Eagle Mountain and I just wanted to say that I am in support of the 2100 North alternative. I think it's about time that we start realizing that the growth here is going to completely halt any type of traffic from out of this area. So, I don't think that the Lehi bridge proposal is going to effectively help this community and if you have any questions, please call me.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5649-2576
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Peck, Justin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern, I grew up a citizen of Lehi City in Utah County, and am currently a resident of Eagle Mountain just 8 miles west of where I grew up. I love this part of Utah and have watched closely the debate regarding transportation concerns in this rapidly growing community. The traffic through Lehi main Street is ridiculous. I have resorted to traveling north to State Street, or even worse through residential south Lehi, all in search of a better route to I-15. Although an arterial road along 1000 South would help the Main Street problem, it would not address the need for uninterrupted freeway access. Trust me when I say your efforts to address the need for improved access to I-15 are greatly appreciated! I am in - STRONG- support for the 2100 North Alternative for connecting the Mountain View Corridor in northwest Utah County to I-15. I feel this is the best of the three alternatives mentioned in the draft, and represents a much better alternative than the Lehi Bridge Proposal. I believe the 2100 North Alternative -WILL- provide the much needed uninterrupted travel to I-15 that best suits our growing transportation needs. It will also improve the quality of live for the people in Lehi (where my dear parents still live) by relieving the serious congestion on Lehi Main Street. The bridge Proposal is too far out of the way for our needs and simply - WILL NOT- have the desired impact in my estimation. I URGE YOU TO SELECT THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE WHEN THE TIME COMES TO DECIDE WHICH ALTERNATIVE IS BEST. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if I can help in anyway. Sincerely yours, Justin Peck

Comment 27

Comment 28

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7D
35.2.8A




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5649-2300
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Peck, Justin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Yes, hello my name is Justin Peck. I grew up a citizen of Lehi and I am currently a citizen of Eagle Mountain, Utah and I did want to take a minute to comment. I have followed this debate for awhile and am grateful that things are moving. Um I have looked at the proposals for the three alternatives and to me, the best one for access to I-15 both in uninterrupted access and um also to relieve the Main Street congestion in Lehi, which is ridiculous, um would be the 2100 North alternative. The one that Lehi I think is pushing and where I grew up, that bridge proposal is simply too far out of the way and would not have the needed impact especially with the growth that we're seeing uh that we could be much further south from that bridge proposal which the corridor, or sorry the 2100 North alternative would address and those cities being Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs and then of course the people up on the hill, uh I forget the name of that community but just north of a, of a 73. Anyway, please consider this in your decision making process. Again, I do believe the 2100 North alternative is the best one that I've seen. Uh, my name is Justin Peck. [Um] You can reach me on my phone uh at 801-318-8495. You could also email me at javajuster@yahoo.com. If I can be of uh any assistance or what not but thank you fro opening this line and thank you for listening to my comments. Bye-bye.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5819-1952
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pearson, Adella
Location: American Fork, UT

Comment:
 I am not in favor of the 2100 N connector in Lehi, there are arterial options that fit the community better.

Comment 29

Comment 30

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5824-1961
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Schiess, Marilyn
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
We don't think 2100 north is the best place for this connector.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5835-1984
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Durkin, priscilla
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I just wanted to vote for the 2100 North corridor.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment 31

Comment 32

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 5837-1990
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Casper, Ken
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Living in Eagle Mountain was suppose to be e great investment however due to the poor traffic and city / county planning, it has become a great nightmare for both Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs residents. Lehi is stuck in the 1920 mentality with its poor leadership. It is time Utah County and the State of Utah get it together and quite living 25 years behind in time. The traffic needs fixed to accomadate the population. If you do not want the traffic, do not issue building permits for housing. We must improve and build this road to allow the residents the ability to survive in this county.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5840-1994
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Melanie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 As a Resident of Lehi, I am more than aware of the need for a road that connects west Utah county to I-15. I live just south of Main street and am often frustrated by the amount of traffic on Main street and the time it takes me to get anywhere outside of my neighborhood. I know that the situation is only going to get worse with all the rapid growth. I STRONGLY SUPPORT THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE!!!

Comment 33

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 5841-1995
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Holm, Mindy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 First of all I would like to say that any option for the Mountain View Corridor that does not connect to I-15 does not make sense to me. Whether I'm going North to south Salt Lake City or South to Orem/Provo, what sense does it make to not be able to get onto I-15? I want what will be best for everyone and the 2100 North Freeway option seems to make the most sense. While the South freeway option would make my usual travel time the best I can see how the 2100 North Freeway meets the needs of a lot of people. The option of only having a freeway connection clear up at the point of the mountain seems odd and does not address the east/west traffic north Utah County needs and provides no help when trying to travel south to Orem/Provo.

Comment 34

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5842-1996
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am strongly opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal. It will very negatively affect my quality of life because I live so close to the area of the proposed connector. It would affect my health. I have asthma and my health would suffer from the pollution. It would also affect the peacefulness in this area of Lehi. I also don't agree with the destruction of the wetlands and habitats that would occur. I am from California, and I have seen the affects of both destroying and preserving these habitats, and destroying them to make way for a freeway and mass transit will just turn Utah into a more congested and polluted state.

Comment 35

Comment 36

Response
Section in
Chapter 35




Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5843-1997
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Boss, David
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector in Lehi. I think it will negatively impact many established neighborhoods. It will destroy a lot of wildlife habitats and damage the Jordan River Ecosystem. Lehi has proposed what I believe to be better options.



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5844-1998
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Floyd, Dan
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 Having read, studied, listened, attended, etc. there is absolutely no way that I can support a toll scenario for the Mountain View Corridor. I cannot express strongly enough how much I am opposed to tolls for this project. Tolls would leave the I-15 and I-215 freeways—that were paid for by everyone in Utah (including me)—conveniently located to others, while placing the toll road conveniently located near residents living in the west of the valley. Why should everyone get taxed for those roads, but now the onus of a toll comes to the west? Those on the east will gladly use I-15 without the west side traffic, while blithely ignoring the toll roads and the plight on the west. The west gets the dilemma of going farther for I-15 (which they've already done for decades) or paying extra. I'd bet a lot of people will refuse to use the freakish toll road. Although I commute to Orem everyday, I know that I will not use a toll road in Mountain View Corridor! Tolls work in places like Texas that have a much much larger problem. We aren't to that point here in Utah and pretending that we are is foolhardy. I've spoken to legislators about this. Those that I've spoken to assure me that tolls are not necessary to build Mountain View coridor. And don't give me that build it now with a toll or later without line! I've asked and I believe that UDOT is either uninformed or misinformed since the need for a toll purported by UDOT contradicts those that have the purse strings. Some funds earmarked for such projects were spent elsewhere. Those funds need to be replaced (legislative responsibility). It is better, IMO, to raise taxes in general (e.g. gas tax), than to implement an inherently skewed and unfair toll! All tolls, of course, are not created equal. My view is not regarding tolls in general, but against this one for Mountain View Corridor.

Comment 37

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5845-1999
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wilson, Natalie
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Please approve the 2100 N option. I believe this is the best alternative and will give us the smoothest traffic for our area. Thank you

35.2.7C

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5846-2000
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Brooks, Gina
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North alternative because this is more than just making a temporary solution like the Lehi City bridge proposal. The 2100 North alternative is a long-term solution to a continually growing problem.


35.2.7C

Comment 39

Comment 40

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5847-2001
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Deshler, Todd
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I give my support for the "Southern Freeway Alternative" in Northern Utah County. It is the only alternative that will allow an efficient commute to the north and to the south. Any other option is insufficient.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5848-2002
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Call, Matt
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I am a resident of Eagle Mountain. I commute to the Salt Lake County area 3-5 days per week. The 2100 North Alternative for the Utah County in my opinion is the best option. An alternative to Lehi Main street is needed badly for both north and south I-15 access. The proposed "point of the mountain bridge" idea is short sighted and may ultimately ruin Lehi main street and downtown.

Comment 41

Response Section in Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5849-2568
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Tuley, Cecil E. & Judy N.
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
Citizen Response regarding UDOT proposals for Mountain View Corridor through parts of Utah County 20 NOV 2007 TO: UDOT % Parsons Brinckerhoff FROM: Cecil Tuley, 3816 So. Starlight Dr. (Lake Mountain Subdivision), Saratoga Springs, UT 84045 My wife and I have been attending information meetings regarding the Mountain View Corridor for the past two years. We quite concerned about the development of this corridor, especially now that the 2100 NORTH option seems to be the one that Saratoga Springs City Council has decided to back. We recognize that the City Council wants to get behind the option that is most likely to be accepted, but that option has not been their preferred route over the past two years. They and we have seen that option or the 4800 North option as very short term and highly inadequate to serve Utah Valley commuters effectively. It seem to us that most emphasis is being placed on what serves the Salt Lake Valley best, with some small consideration for Utah Valley. We support the full Southern Freeway option because it is the only long term, do it once, option being considered. It also serves the rapidly growing areas in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain that are south of SR73. We have previously recommended that the Southern route not connect to American Fork Main Street but turn southward there and run parallel to I-15 on the west side - with short connector roads joining to I-15 all the way into Provo eventually (Geneva Road option). This option eliminates the OVERCROWDING WE ALREADY SEE ON I-15 NORTH OF OREM TO DRAPER. The 2100 North option will do nothing to alleviate the congestion on I-15 in Utah County and would require moving forward later with another highway project. SPEND THE MONEY ONCE. Those of us living south of SR73 will not be using the 2100 north road. It is too costly and causes more pollution to drive 5 or 6 miles north to catch a cross road to the freeway and then head back south to Provo or Orem where we have business affiliation and family. Even if we are headed to Salt Lake City we would use Redwood Road and Bangarter Hwy. to avoid the mess at point of the mountain. The souther Freeway option leaves numerous options open later for connections from south Eagle Mountain and Cedar Valley and for any potential development of a causeway across the lake (in somebody else's lifetime). So, Our hope and vote is for the Southern Freeway Route as the long term solution that is OVERALL LEAST COSTLY AND LEAST CONGESTIVE ON I-15 at all connector points. We would accept 2100 North as a poor second option and we soundly reject a 4800 North option. Cecil E. Tuley Judith N. Tuley

35.2.6A

35.2.1B

35.2.13A

Response Section in Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5849-2003
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Tuley, Cecil E. & Judy N.
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
My wife and I have been attending information meetings regarding the Mountain View Corridor for the past two years. We are quite concerned about the development of this corridor, especially now that the 2100 NORTH option seems to be the one that Saratoga Springs City Council has decided to back. We recognize that the City Council wants to get behind the option that is most likely to be accepted, but that option has not been their preferred route over the past two years. They and we have seen that option or the 4800 North option as very short term and highly inadequate to serve Utah Valley commuters effectively. It seem to us that most emphasis is being placed on what serves the Salt Lake Valley best, with some small consideration for Utah Valley. We support the full Southern Freeway option because it is the only long term, do it once, option being considered. It also serves the rapidly growing areas in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain that are south of SR 73. We have previously recommended that the Southern route not connect to American Fork Main Street but turn southward there and run parallel to I-15 on the west side - with short connector roads joining to I-15 all the way into Provo eventually (Geneva Road option). This option eliminates the overcrowding we already see on I-15 north of Orem to Draper. The 2100 North option will do nothing to alleviate the congestion on I-15 in Utah County and would require moving forward later with another highway project. SPEND THE MONEY ONCE. Those of us living south of SR 73 will not be using the 2100 north road. It is too costly and causes more pollution to drive 5 or 6 miles north to catch a cross road to the freeway and then head back south to Provo or Orem where we have business affiliation and family. Even if we are headed to Salt Lake City we would use Redwood Road and Bangarter Hwy. to avoid the mess at point of the mountain. The southern Freeway option leaves numerous options open later for connections from south Eagle Mountain and Cedar Valley and for any potential development of a causeway across the lake (in somebody else's lifetime). So, Our hope and vote is for the Southern Freeway Route as the long term solution that is overall least costly and least congestive on I-15 at all connector points. We would accept 2100 North as a poor second option and we soundly reject a 4800 North option. (Microsoft Word Format)

35.2.6A

35.2.13A

Comment 43


Comment 44

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.6B
35.2.1F

35.31C




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5850-2004
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Kalmar, Clark
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I feel that this is a vital project. I believe in using open land as a lost cost strategy is key. It seems to me that the freeway adjacent to the water is not an option for a couple reasons. 1. It has major environmental impacts. 2. It has less open land to utilize. 3. It does not co-inside with current planning. 21 st North Freeway is the best East West option. A north East West connector is also needed. "Porter Rockwell" Thought should also be given to staying truer to Redwood Rd - SR 68 on the South End in Utah county. The mountain bottleneck provides perfect layout to do so. Thanks for your time - I know that your team will do the right thing. Clark



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5851-2005
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Dykhuizen, M
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I moved to Saratoga Springs to get away from the city when I moved there I knew the roads would be busy but I choose to move there. Why build new homes and condos just to get rid of them. Most of the residents are young people and they WILL NOT GET MARKET VALVE FOR THERE HOMES IF A ROAD GOES THROUGH. Move the road some where else

Comment 45

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5852-2006
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Melissa
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I am writing to support the 2100N alternative for MVC. I would love to see the MVC start construction. The commute is crowded and continuing to get more crowded as time goes on. It will be great to have this alternative to help traffic and congestion.

35.2.7C

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5853-2007
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Fagan, Elizabeth
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I am strongly in favor of the 2100 North alternative as the only one that makes sense. The Lehi bridge proposal is a terrible idea. First of all, it is not Salt Lake county's problem and secondly and most important, it is a waste of money. Redwood goes to Bangerter which is already a connector to I15.

35.2.7C
35.2.9C


Comment 47

Comment 48

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.10A
35.2.10B

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 5854-2008
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Mabey, Clark
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
I am in opposition to tolling Mountain View. Tolling will not relieve congestion to other roads on the west side the same way a non-toll road will. Tolling will negatively impact business and quality of life.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5855-2009
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Rudy, Frank
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Please go with 2100 North option...please do not use the Lehi bridge proposal as it isn't adequate for our long term needs.

Comment 49

Comment 50

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5856-2010
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Christensen, Brian
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Being a resident of Lehi, I support the preferred alternative through Lehi using the 2100 North alignment. I applaud UDOT and their consultant for the difficult task of selecting an alternative that has the fewest impacts with the greatest benefit. I appreciate UDOT's efforts in minimizing the visual impact the corridor will have by making it a depressed freeway through our City. I think Lehi City's Mayor and City Council's preferred alternative does not meet the needs of the corridor. Their idea of putting trees on a "Bangert Highway"-type facility on 2100 North will not fix the problem...it's like putting lipstick on a pig. Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain traffic will continue to use Lehi Main Street and other surface streets to get to their Cities if Lehi City's option is built because the 4800 North alternative is too far out of the way. Our City officials are being very short-sighted with their plan, and I think they are bowing to pressure from developers. I say: Built it NOW!

35.2.7C

35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5857-2011
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gordon, Grant & Donna
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
We have started to widen 2100 North, it seems like we should finish it and get the traffic moving faster. I live on Main street and watch it go bumper to bumper every night. It's time something is done and also the people traveling west should help pay for the improvement. We may have been asleep at the wheel when we let people build so close to 2100 North-but we have got to do something and do it as fast as possible. Sorry I was out of town on the meeting date.

35.2.7C

Comment 51

Comment 52

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5862-2017
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Portillo, Michael
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I am in support of the mountain view corridor and would like to see the 2100 North freeway option in Utah county. I think this would better meet the needs of Lehi/Saratoga Springs/Eagle Mountain residents.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5864-2021
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Porter, Mike
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
UDOT, I would like to voice my opinion on the consideration of making the Mountainview Corridor a toll road. I STRONGLY OPPOSE IT. I have paid my taxes for years, which have gone to road projects around our great State. I don't see the logic in taxing the West Side when our tax dollars have sustained projects from Snowville to St. George, and Wendover to Vernal. Do not toll the road or I won't be using it. Some might, but my neighbors and I are very cost sensitive. Why would I spend \$\$ on a toll road when I can drive an extra 5 minutes to access the Interstate for free? Mike Porter West Jordan Resident

35.2.10A

Comment 53

Comment 54

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

35.2.7D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5865-2022
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Johnson, Daniel
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
My wife and I attended the public open house at Copper Hills High School on Nov. 17. We were impressed with the information, maps and answers to our questions about this project. I am highly in favor of having this project constructed as a full-fledged freeway along with the proposed commuter light rail lines as soon as possible. The residents of Salt Lake and Utah counties cannot afford to put this project off any longer. The growth projected for northern Utah makes the addition of these transportation options imperative. I do hope however, that these projects can be completed in a way that would negatively impact as few people as possible, such as those who would be displaced from their current homes in the areas at the northern parts of the corridor. As far as how to pay for this project, I am not sure at this time whether additional county or state-wide tax increases or a toll option would be better. If it turns out that a toll-way would be the best option, then tolls should be charged along the entire length of the corridor and not just portions of it.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5866-2027
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Allen, Kristi
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am against the 2100 North Connector. It impacts our property value as well as the quiet neighborhood we all thought we were moving into.

Comment 55

Comment 56

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

35.2.13A
35.2.6A

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5867-2028
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hammons, James
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Growth potential is highest in Eagle Mountain, Southern Saratoga Springs, and farther West in Cedar Fort and Fairfield. The main problem right now is traffic on Lehi Main Street (SR-73), composed largely of workers commuting to Lindon, Orem, and Provo for the workday. Traffic moving to Salt Lake County isn't nearly as backed up as that heading to the Provo-Orem area. The arterial solution, while offering a lower-cost alternative to freeway buildout, is temporary at best. Traffic will continue to be a problem until a permanent freeway or expressway allows residents in Northwestern Utah County to get to Provo with minimal stops at traffic lights and bottlenecks. The 2100 North arterial, whether built as a highway with traffic lights or as a freeway, would only serve residents of Northern Saratoga Springs in their commute to Provo and Orem, as this route would be longer and more cumbersome for residents of Southern Saratoga Springs and the Western cities. Traffic flowing North to Salt Lake County would continue to use the Bangarter Highway, as the 2100 North corridor would be longer and more cumbersome. This road provides virtually no solution to the problem at hand. The Southern Freeway solution, however, allows traffic from the Western cities to flow North to Salt Lake County AND South to Provo-Orem without passing through stop lights and backed up traffic on Main Street. The interchanges at Pleasant Grove and Lindon would provide easy access for workers in those areas, leaving only traffic flowing to Northern Lehi and American Fork dependent on SR-73. As buildout increases, an arterial corridor could be easily connected with the American Fork Main Street I-15 interchange, providing further relief. The Southern Freeway alternative is the most sensible and effective means of facilitating traffic flow. This alternative would also keep smog, noise and pollution out of residential and commercial areas, better protecting the health and well-being of residents. The improved access to Saratoga Springs and the Western Cities will attract new residents, increase property values, and bring in new businesses, thus vastly expanding the tax base of these cities. Commuters would save time, gas, and vehicle mileage. Adopting a less expensive alternative today only increases the potential costs of a permanent solution later, and places a higher potential burden on taxpayers and commuters. Please support the Southern Freeway alternative for Utah County for the benefit of all.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5868-2029
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Woods, Rosalee & Doug
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 My husband and I support the 2100 north alternative, we live in Eagle Mountain, the growth that will take place in the years to come will be astounding, we need to act now and build roads that can handle the growth. We believe this option will address those needs. ***The Lehi City Plan does not.*** We hope and pray Udot and others that are in charge of the final decision will look long term and not short term.

Comment 57

Comment 58

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5869-2030
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Ryan
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I drastically oppose the 2100 North connector proposal. It divides Lehi again, where more BLVD type roads would better serve those in Saratoga / Eagle Mnt. I find it commical that everyone moves out to Saratoga and Eagle Mnt. knowing they are removed from everything and when they see an opportunity they pounce on UDOT to remedy thier self inflicted problem. A connector more north along with the Lehi city plan benefits those heading North to SLC (they will not want to come all the way into Lehi to head north on I-15) and the smaller BLVD's that everyone in Lehi wants still gets traffic to the South. Please do the required research, the 2100 North option wasn't even on the table a few months ago so how could all the information be accurate without ample time to study it. The Commercial and Residential impact you will have on No Utah County and Lehi will be devastating with the 2100 connector, you will sacrifice prime land in Lehi and miles around the connector just to appease people who chose to live way out in Saratoga and Eagle Mnt. Please do what is right not just what ruffles the least amount of feathers.
Thanks Ryan Anderson

35.2.7D

35.2.9A

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5870-2031
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Tina
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am in complete support of 2100 North Alternative!

35.2.7C

Comment 59

Comment 60

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5878-2045
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Allred, Michael
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I support the current Mountain view plans for Utah County. Specifidly I support the 2100 N connection to I-15. As a resedident of Saratoga Springs I commute every day to work by having to go through Lehi Main street. Traffic has gotten so bad that I often go out of my why to the 2100 N exit in lehi and take back roads around Lehi main street. We need a faster way to get to I-15 without going through Main St. Lehi. I do not support going as far north as point of the mountain as Lehi city would like as that would force me to continue to use Lehi Main street or back roads. The point of the mountain connection proposed by Lehi city, in my opinion, will be a waste of a road because it will not searve the need to take the pressure off the current overcrowded roads. Espessialy for those how are comuting north.

35.2.7C

35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5884-2055
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Stirland, Quinn
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
I am in opposition to tolling.

35.2.10A

Comment 61

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5885-2056
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Poulsen, Kathy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I agree with the 2100 N. connector. It would help solve the traffic problem for Saratoga Springs/Eagle Mountain. If the connector was further north, it would not really help with the Lehi Main St. problem.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5886-2057
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ponzio, Joyce
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I OBJECT! I know Lehi needs an alternative, but there are 100's of deer that use that land as a temporary home between seasons. I know because I live there and I look for them every year. We steal their homelands in the mountains to build now they come to the wetlands for refuge and we going to steal that too? Do we really have to kill mother nature and everything in our path? It seems extremely selfish to me and it makes me feel very sad.

Comment 63

Comment 64

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5887-2058
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Quigley, Tom
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
There are really two issues that should be addressed by the Mountain View Corridor: 1-Create an alternative route for traffic that is generally heading north or south on I-15 to avoid the congestion of downtown SLC and 2-Ease the congestion that exists in the general flow of traffic in and around Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain. It appears most of the discussion about the placement of the connector between the MVC and I-15 surrounds the first issue (ie, connecting N/S bound traffic on I-15). Any investment of this magnitude and permanent nature should address the second issue as well. The general congestion in Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain is getting worse rapidly - in my view it is already a safety issue that should be addressed with public transportation funds - such as is being spent on the corridor and connector. The arguments concerning noise, exhaust pollution, wetland issues, and traffic concerns - pale in comparison to the safety issues related to congestion on the roads. Ingress and egress are essential for safety responses - wildland fire by itself poses a real threat that deserves attention to road placement. These issues warrant reconsideration of the connector to a location south of Lehi Main Street rather than the proposed location north of Lehi Main Street. The proposed mitigation measures you have suggested for the northern connector can be applied to the southern end with a connector just north of Utah Lake - this should impact few homes and carry small environmental tradeoffs. The connector needs to ease congestion from the northern and southern sections of Redwood Road. Anyone traveling to anyplace in Utah County (Orem, Provo, American Fork, Payson, etc) from Saratoga Springs, Lehi, or Eagle Mountain will not travel north so they can travel south again. Utah County is the principal servicing area for these cities. The congestion in and around Lehi will only get worse with the proposed north connector.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5889-2060
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Thompson, Benjamin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
The "2100 North Alternative" IS the only viable alternative for Northern Utah County traffic! If, the Lehi City Bridge Proposal comes to fruition, then all south bound traffic (for Residence and Business Owners for Eagle Mountain/Saratoga Springs and West Lehi) can expect to add 15 to 30 minutes onto their commute. And, that doesn't include the bottle necking that will occur with the North bound traffic. It already takes me 40 minutes to commute to work! I moved out to this area because it was the only affordable area closest to my employment. Added commute time only adds to the feeling that I live "way out in the boonies." But, where else can we move where there is affordable housing?.... The "2100 North Alternative" IS the only viable alternative for Northern Utah County traffic!

35.2.7C

35.2.8C

Comment 65

Comment 66

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5890-2061
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Skidmore, Jason
Location: , UT

Comment:
As a resident of Eagle Mountain, I travel to both Salt Lake and Utah Counties. I need a better route to both locations and gladly welcome the Southern Freeway option. I believe it will best meet the needs of all who live and travel through these areas. We need to act now!

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5891-2062
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Thomsen, Travis
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I really feel like the proposal presented by Lehi presents the best option overall for Utah and Utah County. The 4800 North Freeway Connector would be great for folks heading to and from SL county. Bolstering 2100 to a 4 lane highway and improving SR-73 will also help. Bot moving a full 6 - 8 lane freeway at 2100 North seems like a bad idea for many reasons. It will have a negative impact on Home Values as well as the being very bad for the environment. I really like the idea of having a southern East west corridor as well. Basically the Lehi Proposal looks like the best all around proposal for future growth, overall value of North Utah County, as well as being the best choice for the environment. I really hope you will give plenty of consideration to the folks who will be affected the most. The people who reside in North Utah County.

35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment 67


Comment 68

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7D
35.2.9A




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5892-2063
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: MacKay, Robert
Location: saratoga springs, UT

Comment:
 The 2100 north east-west corridor proposed for northern Utah county is the better solution from my perspective in contrast to the bridge over the Jordan river narrows. Simply put the bridge will be too far north to be an effect traffic mitigation solution for the traffic problems of the north shore communities.



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5894-2065
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pilling, Christopher
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 To Whom It May Concern: I am writing in response to the debate that is going on between UDOT and Lehi City. I am VERY, VERY, VERY strongly OPPOSED to the 2100 North option. I think this is a terrible idea. It is the wrong place be having a six lane freeway! I support Lehi City suggestion of the 4800 North route. This makes so much for sense. Lehi city shouldn't be the ones to suffer for poor planning from the beginning. There are too many structure in the way on the 2100 North route. 4800 North just plain out makes more sense. Thank you for you time, Chris and Melissa Pilling Lehi Residents

Comment 69

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5896-2067
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nielsen, Karl
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I feel the 2100 North option is not the best option that could be taken. The proposed alternative to the north will have a negative impact on far fewer people and is a much shorter route.

35.2.7A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 5898-2069
Date: 11/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Lonni
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I think its a fantastic route will cut out huge traffic jams on Lehi main street Great job guys! I will use it every work day. Thank you.


35.2.7C

Comment 71

Comment 72

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5899-2070
Date: 11/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: Riboldi, Pablo
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I support this project and the 2100 North alternative. This route makes the most sense and has the least environmental impact. We need this yesterday.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5900-2071
Date: 11/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: Moore, Sean
Location: LEHI, UT

Comment:
 I am currently neither opposed or not opposed to the 2100 North connector. I would prefer an alternative, but I also want what is best for the taxpayers and the community. I want UDOT to realize that Lehi is already split in half by I-15, and adding the connector at that location will only increase the divide. Plus I travel in that location daily and traffic is already tight in that area. It would however definitely relieve some of the stress on Lehi Main Street. Please UDOT just remember to use some foresight and planning. So far what I've seen out of UDOT over the past ten years that I've lived in Utah, has not been to my liking. A lot of tax payers' money has been wasted on revised roadways that have proven worthless, because UDOT or engineers screwed up and didn't add enough on/off ramps, extra lanes, extra HOV lanes, etc. All I ask is that they get this right, especially since this connector lies within my community.

35.2.7C

35.2.7A

Comment 73

Comment 74

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5946-2072
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Leatherwood, Melissa
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I strongly support the 2100 North alternative for the Mountain View Corridor. The traffic on Lehi Mainstreet keeps my husband away from myself and our kids for precious time every day, and I myself often go to Salt Lake to shop via Redwood Road just to avoid Lehi Mainstreet. We have been waiting SO long for a solution to this problem and now that a viable option is available 2100 North, it is being disputed so the needs of a handful of residents can be placed over the needs of thousands and thousands of people. Please consider the rapid growth on the west side of the valley and how important the 2100 North option is to all of us. The 4800 North option proposed by Lehi City is WAY too far north to be a viable option for any of the Eagle Mountain or Saratoga Springs residents. It would have such a smaller impact than the 2100 North option at relieving traffic on Lehi Main Street. It seems almost silly to build something clear up at the point of the mountain. How does that help anything? A bunch of smaller roads are with lights every few hundred yards is not going to help either. If I, as a resident of Eagle Mountain, wanted to go to Salt Lake, I would still take Redwood Road as a more direct route, and if going to Utah County would still be forced to take Lehi Main Street. Please HELP US! Our years and years of frustration is boiling over - vote yes on 2100 NORTH!! Thank you.

35.2.7C

35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5954-2073
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Tippetts, Chase
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
The Southern Freeway Alternative is the best option for Northern Utah County in the long-term. I am concerned about the short-sightedness of the 2100 North Freeway Alternative as it does not appropriately address the traffic concerns of those who live in Northern Utah County in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. Virtually all traffic from these two cities would have to back-track in order to get onto the Mountainview Corridor making this stretch of road virtually worthless to citizens here. Again, the Southern Freeway Alternative is the best for the residents of Northern Utah County in the short- and long-runs.

35.2.6A

35.2.13A

Comment 75

Comment 76

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 5962-2303
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Bartholomew, Leon
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Yes, I'd like to make a comment about the Mountain View Corridor project that's being processed. I attended the uh the uh viewing at the junior high school in Lehi last night. I was not impressed with the presentations or the people that were there. There were a lot of people there just wondering around doing nothing. A lot of maps that were hardly readable and I was not impressed with it at all. I'm not impressed with the 2100 North connector in Lehi uh plans and projects. I feel it's just too, too big an area. It will be too expensive to build. I don't see where it's going to do anything besides interrupt business and some homeowners. Uh I'd much rather see the Lehi proposal uh which would be the proposal up on 4800 North uh connected into the uh north and south Mountain View freeway. I would support the Lehi City Master Transportation Plan a lot higher and a lot more than the 2100 North connector. I just feel this 2100 North is going to be too expensive and as I said and, and take too long to do. Uh we've been waiting for this thing for years. I think it's time that everybody gets off dead center and gets something handled. Okay. Thank you. This is my comment. My name is Leon Bartholomew. I live at 1783 North Goldenrod Way, in Saratoga Springs, uh in the Harvest Hills development. My phone number is area 801-766-3835. Thank you. Bye.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5970-2074
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: sMITH, Linda
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the proposed Mountain View Corridor. The negative social and ecological costs would be tremendous. It would destroy neighborhoods, businesses and wetlands. Please reconsider this option. There are other options that would cause less impact and accomplish the same goals. Thanks, Linda Smith

Comment 77

Comment 78

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.1D

35.2.13

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 5982-2075
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Self, Stefani
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I support the proposed East/West Mountainview Corridor connector through 2100 North in Lehi. Lehi city has proposed an alternate freeway connector through Bluffdale. As a frequent commuter, I already take Redwood Road northbound to Bangerter and then the Freeway. Lehi City's proposal is for another freeway connector in Bluffdale? I feel that if that was done, the connector would go unused as most people would continue to use the path they already take. The path through Lehi that UDOT already prefers is the best. I feel the 2100 North Connector through Lehi is definitely the best option.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6014-2077
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Boyd, Patrick
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Please build a 1000 South "southern" connection near Utah Lake. The 2100N connection does not reduce the bulk of the traffic currently using SR73: as those travelers and commuters are going south on 15. Anyone traveling north on 15 simply goes up SR68 (soon to be improved) to Bangerter. So, building a 2100N connection only helps those traveling north. Lehi Main will remain gridlock. I know I will not go north to go south. I'd rather you spent NO tax dollars on 2100N as the effectiveness of this option is too low. Thank you,

Comment 79

Comment 80

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6015-2078
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Montague, Amanda
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
We support the 2100 North Alternative. Along with this we would like to see Redwood Road widened from Saratoga Springs north to Bangerter Highway. And the most needed East/West road would be to make a surface street running from Saratoga to American Fork. Since we don't have much retail here or in Eagle Mountain we all have to drive into American Fork for basically everything. The only option right now is Lehi main street, and that needs to change. The 2100 North freeway would be nice, but is too far north to get us into the American Fork shopping areas.

35.2.7C

35.2.1D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6016-2079
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Beck, Rebecca
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal that will run through Lehi. I am opposed because of these reasons: 1) It will once again split Lehi as did I-15 so many years ago. 2) Property values will decrease 3) You will be asking 29 families to relocate! 4) It will create an island in Lehi that will cause problems for fire safety. 5) It will be loud creating noise pollution for several beautiful sub-divisions. 6) And mostly because you should be listening to the citizens of Lehi who have to live with the road!

35.2.7A

Comment 81

Comment 82

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6017-2080
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Smith, Samuel
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I would like the new road 2100 North alternative it would make my drive faster for work

35.2.7 C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6018-2081
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Affleck, Lyle
Location: Herriman, UT

Comment:
There are always going to be people who oppose the building of the MVC. Though they have their points and they should be taken into consideration, please consider the future growth of the west bench of the Salt Lake and Utah counties. The people have already come. More move in every month. There are a great many problems that we are already facing with growth and transportation issues. The corridor will be a great asset to the state servicing those of us who live out in the western benches in terms of north/south travel. East/west travel must be addressed as well. I, and many of my associates are VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED to tolling the MVC. Many people living around the proposed corridor's path struggle every day to make it to work and back. Adding another drain to their income would break them! We all understand that taxes almost always go up...they have to. I am willing to pay more in taxes and distribute the burden of the cost of the MVC evenly to the people (even those who will not be using it on a regular basis). If it must be a toll road, please consider tolling Wasatch Blvd or Highland Drive to make all things fair across the valley.

35.31C

35.1.1A

35.2.10A

Comment 83

Comment 84


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6019-2082
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nielsen, Erica
Location: saratoga springs, UT

Comment:
 I feel the Mountain View Corridor is a wonderful idea. This area is growing so much something needs to be done quickly. Lehi Main Street is too crowded and causing more accidents. I do feel bad for the homes that will be taken and land will be lost, but there's not enough to make me say, "let's not make this road." My husband and I both feel that it is a great idea and hopes that it will be carried out.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6020-2083
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Strasburg, Shanna
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I would like to say that I think that out of the two proposals for an east west connection, 2100 North Lehi would be the better of the 2 solutions. People traveling from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs to Utah county want an alternate route, and the 4800 north proposal is just too far out of the way. Everyone will still take SR73 because it will still be the shortest route. The traffic on SR73/Main is horrible, and it is not full of people going to Salt Lake County. We need something for the people going into Utah county!

Comment 85

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6021-2084
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hardy, Chad
Location: , UT

Comment:
I would think that the 21st south access ramp would be the better alternative. It would help clear out Lehi main street congestion. As an Eagle Mountain resident commuting to Salt Lake for work I do not see how a Salt Lake bridge would benefit me at all. I personally think that the bigger problem is that there is only one way in and out of Eagle Mountain/Saratoga Springs. If there is to be any bridge built to connect I-15 put it across Utah Lake.

35.2.7C
35.2.1G

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6022-2085
Date: 11/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Christofferson, Dave
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Please do not divide the city of Lehi further. I have lived her for over30 years and believe the three separate routes make much more sense to eliminate the traffic congestion on main and other routes in Lehi. The plan the Lehi city has put together is the way to go. Thanks


35.2.9A

Comment 87

Comment 88

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6023-2086
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Windham Reeves, Anna
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

Comment:
 Please do not build a toll road. It seems very wrong to allow a private company to profit on this project when all drivers are already taxed to cover road building expenses. Utah can and should come up with the funds to cover resident's transportation needs. It is obvious that there are more cars on the road than available roadway to keep traffic flowing properly. This is a systemic problem that should be solved within the structure that already exists. Do gas taxes need to be raised a few cents? or are the funds being misspent? Please do not solve this problem by getting private companies involved. We are already paying for the ability to create and maintain 'free' roads.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7B



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6024-2087
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Bonilla, Carlos
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 As a property owner, I want my property value to go up and not down. Therefore, the 2100 North connector is not a good option. It also has other negative impacts such as increased pollution, noise and consequently increased health problems for all ages especially infants and the elderly. I OPPOSE THE 2100 NORTH CONNECTOR. It is NOT a good alternative.

Comment 89

Comment 90

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6025-2088
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Woolley, Matt
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am against the freeway connector running along 2100 North in Lehi. There are better options that would have less impact on homes and wetlands. As someone that lives close to 2100 North, I am concerned about the air quality impact, as well as the impact on my property value. Please keep the connector away from 2100 North. It saddens me that we have such air quality problems in Utah already with little emphasis on mass transit such as buses and light rail. That should be our emphasis.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6026-2089
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wiser, Justin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I don't believe UDOT's 2100 N connector will benefit the citizens of Lehi, Saratoga Springs, nor Eagle Mountain because the negative consequences far outweigh the positive motives. I agree that a connector is necessary, however, Lehi Cities alternative movement makes more sense than the 2100 N connector. As a resident of the Cranberry Farms subdivision on the North side of the proposed connector, I feel this proposal will create a boundary between North Lehi the rest of the city. In addition it will decrease home values and create more pollution around wet lands. Please except alternative solutions in the decision of the connector.

35.2.7A
35.2.1H

35.2.7A
35.2.9A

Comment 91

Comment 92

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6027-2090
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hicks, Dennis
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I live in the Harvest Hills subdivision and albeit a concern for some of our residents I must say that the 2100 North Alternative is by far the overall choice that I and many others hope will be implemented. I work for IM Flash Technologies in Lehi and so I commute across to I-15 5 days a week along with hundreds of others that live either in Saratoga, Eagle Mountain, and the surrounding area. If UDOT decides to go with the bridge alternative it will be the biggest mistake this state has ever seen and would completely hinder all growth in the western valley. Let's face it the bridge alternative is a bandaid to show that something is being done without being a huge undertaking. The 2100 alternative is the only method that will help to alleviate the traffic and provide the proper road structure for further growth in the western portion of the valley. I urge you to please choose the 2100 alternative for the sake of all of us who live in this area and the hundreds who would be here if the road structure were more favorable.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6028-2091
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Website
Name: Morgan, Jeremy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
We need to seriously the consequences of having a major highway on 2100 north in Lehi. An elementary is scheduled to be built at 2100 North and 2300 West and for parents and neighbors its not very comforting that a freeway would be so close by. I believe the 4800 North would be better option for the city of Lehi which is already divided by I-15. Please think of the many children and families that would be close to 2100 North. I live close and support going with the alternative 4800 North. Thanks.

35.2.7A
35.2.9A

Comment 93

Comment 94

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6029-2092
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Lords, Lorin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
My comment is on the 2100 North Connector in Lehi. I am in favor of this connector route. I live just 3 blocks south of where the connector will be and think it is time we had good through traffic routes across Lehi. Due to lack of planning and effort on the part of Lehi City, we have terrible East-West traffic routes in Lehi. But this connector would correct a lot of that problem. Please move forward with this plan.

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6030-2268
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Calton, Kenneth & Christine
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
[um] My name is Kenneth Calton. [um] My phone number's 801-768-8951. [um] I live in Lehi [um] on 2014 West 900 North and I'm all for the 2100 North connector. Something has to be done to relieve the traffic congestion and this looks like one of the best things I've seen. The area that has been proposed, being a life-long resident here, has very minimal impact as far as I can see. [um] Anyway, I support it.

35.2.7C

Comment 95

Comment 96


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7A
35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6030-2093
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Calton, Kenneth & Christine
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I support the 2100 North Freeway alternative. This alternative is very close to my home and is very much needed. The traffic around the area is so congested. If this alternative is not used, the congestion will not be alleviated.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6031-2094
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pyper, James W. and Diane H.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 We oppose the 2100 North connector road because of decreased property values, 29 homes have to be relocated, 60 approved dwellings lost, lost commercial property, impact on wetlands, and it divides Lehi City. Please do the right thing and locate the road further North, which we understand is much cheaper with significantly lower impacts on the above items!!!

Comment 97

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6032-2095
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Martin, Brian
Location: saratoga springs, UT

Comment:
My vote is for the 1900 South route alongside the lake there is enough wetlands to go around. we need to put an end to the traffic on main street in lehi and have an alternate way for people to get into utah county.

35.2.6A

Comment 98

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6033-2096
Date: 11/10/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Bowen, William
Location: , UT

Comment:
I would like a copy of all comments received so far so I can review them and comment on the comments. I'm sure there are some groups I'll want to respond to. I don't have an interest in commenting on the DEIS.

35.31F

Comment 99

Comment 100


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C

35.6.3A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6034-2097
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: , Molly
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

Comment:
I have a few questions about the MVC. When they will be building in the 13400 area. Also, how do I access information on all UDOT projects?

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6035-2101
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Jensen, Julie
Location: , UT

Comment:
I need some help locating the MVC in Herriman/Riverton area. My clients want to purchase a home there. The address is 14180 S. 4951 W.

Comment 101

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6036-2102
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: smith, tim
Location: eagle mountain, UT

Comment:
please use the 2100 north route as the recommended route. the point of the mountain option presented by lehi is not in the best interests of the county, saratoga or eagle mountain residents.

Comment 102

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6037-2103
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Schmutz, Troy
Location: Las Vegas, NV

Comment:
Nobody likes expansion but the 2100 North is the only way to go. All the other proposals would not relieve the traffic problems from east to west like 2100 North. Most of the traffic comes from Salt Lake.

Comment 103

Comment 104

Response Section in Chapter 35

35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6041-2104
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wardle, Randall
Location: Herriman, UT

Comment:
I am excited about having the Mountain View Corridor as it will reduce congestion on I-15, Bangarter Hwy, and other major arteries. I DO NOT think it should be a toll road. Major arteries that run through cities like this is planned to be should not be tolled. It is unfair to make the West side of the valley pay a fee to commute to work, while the East Side commutes for free. It is also frustrating to hear elected officials complain that there are no funds available to build a road like this, then, in the same breath talk about the tax surplus and how they don't know what to do with the extra money they have. This seems ridiculous to me.

Response Section in Chapter 35

35.2.10B

35.2.10C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6051-2105
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Keyser, Julie A.
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
To Whom it concerns, I am a very concerned citizen who lives just off of 11800 South in South Jordan. I would like to address the use of Tolls in this e-mail. After reading about the costs of building the Mountain View Corridor I can understand why Udot is so anxious to toll the road, BUT they need to understand that many of us will REFUSE to use the corridor because the costs to us personally will be so overwhelming. Why on earth would my husband, for instance, take the MVC to help him get to work faster in Bountiful, costing us an outrageous .14cents to .23 cents PER MILE both ways, when he can just take the I-15 or I-215 for free? Of course they aren't free because we as tax payers pay for those freeways. The East side of the Salt Lake valley has it so good it's ridiculous. Why didn't Udot decide to toll the I-215 when it was created or the I-15? Why should only the West side people pay for this corridor? This corridor should be funded by the entire state NOT just people on the West side just like all the other state freeways. Toll roads are the biggest monsters of US highways as they cause congestion and financial hardships. After visiting back East I love coming back to the West where the interstate and other freeways are all toll free and we are able to drive freely with out stopping every time there is an exit (because each exit is another toll back East). As over crowded as the roads are getting, I'd rather deal with that than have to take a free way I'm forced to pay a toll on everytime I want to go somewhere. And while I know I can get some sticker thing for my car that automatically charges me, it will still be a burden for out of towners. It's still cheaper for me to pay a few cents extra in gas sitting in traffic than the outrageous price per mile Udot will charge on a toll road which will only increase as the years go on. I'd rather see a hike in my state taxes, that is spread evenly through out the state, than pay a toll. I'm happy to help pay for needed roads the same way in other parts of the state as I feel the cost is cheaper when shared and the burden doesn't just rest on one group of people. While I have not had time to look more closely at all the possible routes, I do note that 11800 South is a cut off for a part of the MVC. 11800 South is very small and getting very busy. I'm just west of Bangarter Hwy in the Country Crossing Subdivision right below Daybreak. Our biggest concern is that the state will decide to put an offramp right at 11800 South and Bangarter to help connect to the MVC more easily. This would be HORRIBLE! Please don't burden the residents of Country Crossing, whose development is so close to 11800 South and the Riverton residents so close, with an off ramp there at Bangarter. The road is so small between developments west of Bangarter in Riverton and South Jordan to hold that amount of traffic. The only way to make that feasible would be to wipe out half the new houses to widen the road. It was stupid of the two cities to allow the developments to be so close to each other across from 11800 South in the first place, but the added burden of an offramp either at Bangarter or off of the MVC will really be the cause for some terrible traffic and much increased noise. I can't seem to stop the stupidity of city leaders in South Jordan who insist on breaking all their original city planning codes so that Daybreak can continue to consume the West side with its over crowded format, but I can make a strong statement against an offramp, at least at Bangarter and 11800 South, if Udot insists on putting one an exit at 11800 South and the MVC. The whole idea of tolling has been eating at me for 2 years but no matter what I have said in papers and to Udot, frankly I know I will be ignored. You put this nice comment section in here, but I know you will never listen and just do what you want regardless of how we feel, because you think you know what is best. Please, just petition for an across the board tax hike for the state or decide Not to build the MVC at all. We'll get along just fine and save the beautiful hills between here and Utah County at the same time. We may live in congestion, but it will be congested no matter what anyway...even if the freeway is built. I grew up in California. It's more crowded than ever and takes at least an hour longer to get anywhere and that is with all the extra freeways that have been built. I've been on their toll freeway once before...it goes fast cause few people use it. The crowded ones are still FREE.

Comment 105

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.10D



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6052-2106
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Burton, Ashlin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Lehi & Eagle Mountain growth is rapidly passing the transit capacity in the area. Residents can expect to spend up to 1/2 of their total commut just exiting the town. I for one would gladly pay a toll to get to work and home quickly.

Comment 106

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6059-2107
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Olsen, Danica
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I believe the 2100 north freeway is the best option for northern and western Utah county residents. We need an east-west freeway!

Comment 107

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6060-2108
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Kalmar, Tracie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I would like to express my hope for the future of the mountain view corridor. We currently live in Saratoga Springs. We agree that as this side of Utah County grows we desperately need not only more roads, but safer roads. After looking and reading about the different options planned for Utah county, even the one proposed by Lehi City, we believe that the 2100 North freeway would best suit this side of the valley. Please consider this opinion as you finalize your plans for this project. Thanks. Tracie Saratoga Springs

Comment 108

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6062-2109
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Worley, Sally
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
As a resident of the City Center at Eagle Mountain, I don't think Lehi should be allowed to dictate where the new MVC should go ... have they ever tried to travel up or down the one main road through Lehi to Saratoga Springs Crossroads? I think that Lehi wants the MVC to be done their way because of the new "high-rise" project they are undertaking ... this is ridiculous ... let them build their own connector to that development ... we need easier access from SR 73 to the freeway system ... I vote for the 2100 N Solution

Comment 109

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6064-2110
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Swim, Lyall
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
The 2100 North route currently proposed is far better than the Lehi city council counter proposal. Please do not accept their alternate route. I look forward to the access and benefits the 2100 North route will bring to Lehi.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.1F



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6097-2113
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Olsen, Eric
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I feel that the 2100 North Lehi alternative is the best of the I-15 connectors. Lehi's proposal is way too far away to be useful. I believe that there must also be a connector that borders the north shore of Utah lake because the need is great and growing. Those of us that are south of Lehi Main will likely still have to use that route.

Comment 111

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6099-2114
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nielsen, Alan
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 First, let me say that as alternative route to bring traffic in from the west side of northern Utah county is long overdue and should have been started ten years ago. It is appalling that Salt Lake, Weber and Davis Counties have received higher priority than Utah County. It is almost too late to deal with the mess that our roads are in now. I commute from Lehi To Spanish Fork and back every day and it is almost criminal to see the lack of support and attention to the problems of moving the traffic in an efficient and prompt manner from UDOT and the state. If you think that arbitrarily pushing through the 2100 North connector from Redwood road is going to be taken lightly by Lehi residents you are seriously mistaken. Any agency that tries to push their own agenda through without public input and concern is not only trying to circumvent the democratic process but reeks of dictatorship. I received a mailing from the mayor of Saratoga Springs supporting this idiotic connector and can't believe the gall of this man to try to convince Lehi residents of this hair-brained scheme. In all fairness, I should compliment Udot on improvements made to date but caution you that The 4800 North connector is a no-brainer. The pros outweigh the cons 10 to 1. It would have very minimal impact on property issues, traffic issues, noise issues, environmental issues and just makes more sense. You do admit that common sense should prevail don't you? Just know that as taxpayers that pay your salaries and foot the bill for all this road construction you would be advised to listen to the majority on this decision. By the way, Where is our Trax line through this county? I guess we lost out on priority again to Salt Lake, Weber and Davis Counties again. Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Comment 112

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.1D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6101-2118
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Edlefsen, David
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I totally support the 2100 North, Lehi, connector from the Mountain View Corridor to I-15!!!! A connector at any other location would be utterly useless. The arguments against this connector are completely unjustifiable. We cannot allow special interest groups in Lehi City to block the construction of this absolutely necessary passage around/through Lehi from the Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain areas to I-15. I also support the creation of an arterial road along 1000 South, Lehi, from Saratoga springs through Lehi to American Fork Main Street. This should be a multi-lane through-way also. Currently Lehi City takes advantage of all the traffic that must traverse Lehi by setting up ridiculously slow speed limits and speed traps in those areas. It's a terrible bottle-neck which only gets worse by the day. I feel these roads should be build immediately without any further delay.

Comment 113

Comment 114

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6102-2119
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pinkham, Justin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Living in Eagle mountain I find access to I-15 painful. If heading to Salt Lake Redwood road / Bangater is the best solution, to Provo however there is really only Lehi main street. the 2100 North (best solution) and the 1900 South alternatives I feel are both viable solutions however Porter Crossing is a Joke I cannot believe it was even suggested. there really isn't any traffic that would benefit from that alternative. What ever is decided I do hope that both these roads are a "limited access road" Bangater has way to many stop lights.

35.2.8C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6103-2120
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Coccimiglio, Tony
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
2100 North is the best choice for quickly moving traffic to the I-15 cooridor. The Lehi city bridge proposal is moronic and will just make the situation worse for years to come.

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

Comment 115


Comment 116

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6104-2121
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Amy
Location: , UT

Comment:
 The 2100 North option seems the best to me. As a resident of Eagle Mountain, heading east through Lehi takes forever!



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6106-2122
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Price, Chris
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I live in Lehi and was happy to hear that 2100 North Freeway from I-15 to Mountain View Corridor. This is a perfect spot. This will decrease the traffic on Main Street from Saratoga and Eagle Mountain residents. If any alternates are used there is no point. These residents will continue to use Main Street leading to the building of the 2100 north route to fix the problem anyway. Please use my tax money correctly. I don't want it wasted on a road that doesn't solve the root of the problem. This will also increase access to the west side, allowing additional business growth, which will lead to more jobs for Lehi, Saratoga, and Eagle Mountain residents.

Comment 117

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.8A
35.2.9C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6108-2125
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Astrope, Janet
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 As residents of Saratoga Springs, my husband commutes to SLC daily and I commute to SLC or Orem daily. After reviewing the proposed road alternatives out preferred choice would actually be the "arterials alternate". It makes the most sense for people on the west side of the lake. It seems that that option is not being considered very heavily so our next choice would be the "2100 North Alternative". The "Lehi Bridge Proposal" up north farther would be of no use to us as residents in Saratoga Springs. We would continue our commute to SLC via Bangerter like we do now. The "Lehi Bridge Proposal" does not solve the problems at hand and would be a waste of time and money. We are in desperate need of an east/west alternative and we should build something that is actually useful (and long-term) to all of us residents on the west side of Utah Lake. Thank you for your time.

Comment 118

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6111-2128
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nestman, Lo
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 NO to 2100 North! A freeway will negatively impact the entire city of Lehi with decreasing home values, increasing pollution and noise, and fewer travelers passing through the city thus taking away from local business.

Comment 119

Comment 120

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6115-2134
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Lee, Dallas
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
We do not want the new highway to run through 2100 N in Lehi. We all have young kids in this neighborhood and the danger of having a highway that close would be horrible. It could also effect our property value.

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6126-2150
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ames, Tiffany
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I would prefer the 1900 south option for a Utah County freeway connector. There are no good alternatives, to Lehi Main, to get to the freeway, if you are heading south. My second choice would be a 2100 north connector. The main problem with this option is that it is not a good freeway connection if you are heading south from Saratoga Springs or Eagle Mountain (where all that fabulous growth is occurring). Thank you.

35.2.13A

Comment 121


Comment 122

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6129-2154
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Meese, John
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 East / West freeway is too far North to be effective. The Mountain View corridor is a wonderful idea. Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs and Lehi Areas are predicted to grow 500% in the next couple decades. The MV corridor will be important in facilitating a Northbound access. However the proposed East/West freeway route on 2100 North is in an ineffective location. This freeway's purpose is really to facilitate an Eastbound and Southbound access. However for 50% of Saratoga Springs residents (current and future) it will still be more efficient to take surface roads (back roads starting with 400S & Redwood) in order to travel East and South. Building an East/West artery is imperative - however 2100 North only benefits the deep pockets at Thanksgiving Point and doesn't take into account a real residential, commuter need. The proposal should seek to find a solution that is more south - such as W 7750 N in Saratoga. Please consider making the East/West artery more useful for everyone.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6132-2157
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: O'Very, Brandon
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I recently received the mailers from both Lehi & SS/EM. Living in Saratoga, I'm in complete agreement with that flier - a freeway at 2100 North (or anywhere South of there) would be the best possible alternative for me. My primary concerns are: 1. Commute time to Orem. 2. Traffic Light avoidance.

Comment 123

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6137-2162
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Donahue, Heather and Mark
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 My husband and I live in Eagle Mountain near the city center. We feel, as homeowners, that this will be beneficial, not only for convenience, but also in raising our property value! My husband and I also own a drywall company, and he has to drive all over the valley, and sometimes beyond. He feels this would make his commute shorter to certain areas. We are hoping for the 2100 North Alternative, we feel that would be more beneficial. My husband said he would like to see both roads go in. We hope this happens, it will be good for us all!

Comment 124

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6139-2164
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Worlton, m
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Driving anywhere in Utah county is getting ridiculous. I have lived here all my life and the gridlock is totally unacceptalbe. We need an alternative route to move traffic in and out of Salt Lake County. I-15 is outdated for this purpose. Please consider the better solution of Redwood road and 2100 North to help get traffic moving again.

Comment 125

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.1K



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6140-2165
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Johnson, Brent
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I think that SR-92 is the perfect place to extend across the river to redwood road. It would have little impact and it has a coridor now. Impacting only the Thanks Giving Point property and club house. However it could be routed north of their propery. It is shorter. It has less residential impact.

Comment 126

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9C
35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6154-2185
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Zerkle, John
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 The 4800 north east/west option makes no sense. I would have no use for it. If going north, I would go to Bangerter and then up to I-15; if going south, I would still go through Lehi Main Street. The cost of building a bridge and an interchange at the point of the mountain, you must be kidding. Once the taxpayers see the actual plans and cost they would be outraged as I am.!!! Even though there will be problems with all suggested options, I feel the 2100 North option is the most viable and will get the most use.

Comment 127


Comment 128

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D

35.31C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6155-2187
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: Larsen, Doug
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am very much against the Mountain view corridor hooking into Lehi at 2100 north. Udot has better option then this and needs to explore those first



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6172-2201
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ruff, Lynn
Location: Highland, UT

Comment:
 This Highway needs to be built especially for the people residing in West Lehi, Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. It sill also help for the people living in West Salt lake County. If the environmental concerns and the impacts on current residents are properly addressed then the process should move forward. I hope the highway is a true limited access highway.

Comment 129

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6184-2210
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: Torgersen, David
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
 As a resident of Saratoga Springs, and as a Licensed Professional Engineer, I would like to comment on the proposed alternatives to the MVC in Utah County. I am of the opinion that a combination of the Utah County Southern Freeway Alternative, and the 2100 North Freeway Alternative need to be considered. The amount of traffic that travels to and from Northern Utah County to Salt Lake County obviously needs to be addressed. I feel the 2100 North Alternative does this. However, it does very little to address or alleviate the traffic going to/from Northern Utah County (especially areas South of Lehi Main Street which have enormous potential for growth) to the Provo/Orem area. This is one of the reasons why I feel there needs to be a combination of these two alternatives considered. I understand there are enormous costs associated with combining both alternatives, however costs are only going to continue to rise, and more and more homes/businesses will be built along the routes making it that much more difficult in the future. I understand that many people are opposed to ANY alternative, stating that they recently built their "dream home", etc. Unfortunately, it is also highly probable that those same people failed to look at the Transportation Master Plan for that area prior to selecting their "dream home" location. It is obvious that something needs to be done, and why not do it as best we can when we have the opportunity, because it only gets more difficult and costly the longer we wait.

Comment 130

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6208-2233
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: richards, jim
Location: west valley, UT

Comment:
 Just build the damn thing. We need it!!!

Comment 131

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6212-2240
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: McCaul, Andria
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I think that the main focus needs to be a way to ease traffic away from Lehi Main street. As I look over the proposed plans, the Lehi bridge alternate seems ridiculous and a solution that will not help people who are trying to come from Eagle Mountain to Provo. We need a major road. We need a highway. I like the idea of the 2100 North Alternate. It seems like the best way to get to I15. We need this out here. Driving is getting harder and harder. I hope that you will choose the road that will meet the needs of this growing population. We need roads to match the growth.

Comment 132

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9C
35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6215-2244
Date: 11/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wright, Whitney
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
The Lehi Bridge Proposal is not a solution for this problem. People traveling via SR-73 will continue to do so because traveling to Bluffdale only to turn south and double back to get into Lehi (or the rest of Utah county) is too far out of the way so no stress will be relieved from SR-73. It also will not largely benefit those following Redwood Rd. into SL County as it will be close enough to Bangerter Highway to negate the purpose of building it. The 2100 North project is the most appropriate alternative as it is more of a middle point between Bangerter and SR-73 and thus will be able to relieve congestion from both routes. We are desperate for a solution to our one-lane each way highways and hope this can be resolved appropriately so it doesn't have to be revisited too soon after completion.

Comment 133

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.3A
35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6223-2251
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gaudig, Glenda
Location: Herriman, UT


Comment:
 Strongly encourage mass transit options. Opposed to tolling.

Comment 134

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6245-2253
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Woffinden, Jenny
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, name is Jenny Woffinden and my phone number is 768-1944. I don't need a call-back though unless you guys need to call me, but I just live [um] you know just a couple blocks right near the proposed Mountain View Corridor on 2100 North, and I just have to say how strongly opposed we are [um] to it being put there. That is like practically our backyard and we would have a 75 mile-an-hour freeway going through our backyard. All of our home's value would decrease and here we so worked hard to get into this home here and then now this is happening and we do not even want to be near a road like that at all. [um] Anyway, it would just totally impact our neighborhood in a negative way. [um] We don't like it [um] what it would do right here to the Jordan River and especially for us just having that busy of a street right near our house. They're gonna put a school right there, [um] is what we were told and whether they do not, we don't want a busy road like that right there [um] that would and another thing we're really worried about is decreasing property values and this is the place that we'd wanted to raise our family and we don't want to do it right next to a busy freeway connector road. So [um] we're really frustrated about that and can't figure out why you can't go a little bit further north closer to Point of the Mountain. We agree that there's transportation issue but up there it's way less developed and wouldn't be impacting people's backyards with a 75 mile-an-hour freeway road. Thank you and I hope that you know how strongly everyone here is talking about this. That all the neighborhoods everyone is just livid about this. Thank you. Bye.

Comment 135

Comment 136

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6248-2254
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Kirkham, Deborah
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
[Um] Yes, I'm calling concerning the, the [uh] connector, the Mountain View Corridor. I am totally for it. [um] These people that are complaining apparently, they don't live on a road where the traffic is [um] causing them too much trouble right now. I live on 500 West in Lehi and the traffic is backed up from the round-about clear up over the tracks every day from three-thirty until about seven and my opinion is to go ahead with the road and quit worrying about what everybody thinks and as far as they're worrying about the ecosystem and the environment, they had absolutely no problem with ruining the biggest natural wildlife we had over here between American Fork and Lehi to put in the Meadows, a bunch of stores and stuff, so I don't know why they're worried about a little three mile road. But I say go with it. People are going to have to realize there's going to be a few roads, uh houses that are going to be taken out. I say once it's done, they'll get over it and move on with there life. Thank you. My name is Deborah Kirkham.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6251-2260
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Cummins, Shelly & Tony
Location: , UT

Comment:
Hello my name is Tony Cummins and my phone number is 766-0825 and I'm calling about the [uh] Mountain View Corridor and I just want to state that I am, I am in favor of the UDOT's proposed connection at 2100 North [uh] I think that would probably serve the area better and [uh] I just want to voice my agreement with Utah, with UDOT's proposal for the 2100 North connection. [uh] Again, my name is Tony Cummins, 801-766-0825. Thank you. Bye.

35.2.7C

Comment 137

Comment 138

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6251-2255
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Cummins, Shelly & Tony
Location: , UT

Comment:
Hi this is Shelly Cummins, C-u-m-m-i-n-s. My phone number is 766-0825 and I was calling to comment on the UDOT's proposed Mountain View connector at 2100 North in Lehi and I would like to state that I think this is a great idea [um] having a connector at 2100 North, just north of the crossroads. I think the entrance on 800 West is wonderful for the people coming from Eagle Mountain. [um] It will control the traffic in that crossroads area and I think [um] UDOT is doing a great job as doing this for the Mountain View connector. I think this is [uh] a good site for it. If you need to contact me back, you can reach me again at 801-766-0825.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6263-2261
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Anderson, Shawn
Location: , UT


Comment:
Yes, [uh] I just wanted to call in on the [um] 2100 North Lehi [uh] connector that you wanted to do and I don't [uh] think that would be a very good [um] way to go with the freeway. I kind of liked Lehi had a proposal and I liked the way they were proposing right at the Point of the Mountain to kind of keep the freeway up there and keeps things flowing up there and then you have your other stuff will go down at the [uh] south end of Lehi and then anyway it doesn't tear up [uh] the middle of Lehi. So, I'd like to see that happen and not have the 2100 [uh] North go in and have that just as the Lehi proposal as a road. So, that's my comments. My name's Shawn Anderson and you can reach me at 427-0099. Thanks. Bye.

35.2.9A

Comment 139

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6266-2262
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Kinson, Robert
Location: , UT

Comment:
Comments: Uh yes, my name is Robert Kinson. I just wanted to comment on the [uh] potential [um uh] the [uh] different the [uh] different outlets here for North Utah County. I am very much in favor of the 2100 North through Lehi I don't think the bridge [uh] just south of Bluffdale is a good idea. [um] I very much would like that road to be built at 2100 North in Lehi. I think that's the most reasonable alternative and the impact there is very small while giving greater benefit to the residents of North Utah County. [um] If you have any questions, I'm at 801-787-3438. Thank you very much for listening to my comments. Bye-bye.

Comment 140

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6267-2263
Date: 11/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Delahunty, Kirsty
Location: , UT


Comment:
Hi, name is Kirsty Delahunty. My phone number is 801-768-0401 and I just wanted to comment that I am all for it. I got some mail [um] that's against it and tried to get us to contact you to tell you not to put it in, but I definitely don't feel that way. I hope that it goes through so we have a better connection to I-15. Great. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Comment 141

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6269-2264
Date: 11/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Gurney, Kenneth & Linda
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
Yes, we're against the 2100 North connector. Our name is Gurney in Lehi and our phone number is 768-0572.

Comment 142

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6272-2266
Date: 11/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Newman, June
Location: , UT

Comment:
My name is June Newman. My telephone number 768-3212. I am calling from Lehi with a please request that you consider the 48th North entrance to the freeway rather than the 21st. I feel that it would be so much better for all of the citizens of Lehi, of which I am one. There is no need to return my call. I just wanted to register this comment. Thank you so much and goodbye.


Comment 143

Comment 144

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6283-2269
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Griffin, Delores
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am very much against the 2100 North connector for the corridor in Lehi. We have too much traffic as it is and I think it'll just enhance it and make it worse. Please take this into consideration. Thank you. Delores Griffin.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6284-2271
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Paxton, Ted
Location: Orem, UT

Comment:
 Hi, I'm calling because I own a home along the [uh] Highway 91-92, [um] east of [uh] I-15 in Lehi. I'm looking at this Mountain View Corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi and I fully approve of it. I imagine that the city, some people in the city are trying to dis, [uh] you know, trying to get it thrown out but I certainly approve of it. I don't understand when they said property values may decrease there. As far as I'm concerned, property values on Main Street in Lehi have decreased because of the high volume of traffic and you need to get the traffic off of that [uh] off of that street and I don't understand Lehi's approach to that but I'm all for this 21st North connector [uh] for the Mountain View Corridor. My name is Ted Paxton. I live in the Brookhaven development in northeast Orem and [uh] I'm fully in favor of this. I hope you haven't got too many that are totally against it because I don't think that they have thought about it. I don't know what other choices you have. Anyway, I'm for it. Thank you very much.

Comment 145

Comment 146

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6286-2273
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Painter, Deborah
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Yes, my name is Deborah Painter. I live in Eagle Mountain at 3414 Appaloosa Way 84005. My phone number is 801-789-6932 and I'm for the 2100 North um for the Mountain View Corridor. (um) And I just wanted to let you know that I think 2100 is the best choice for moving quickly the traffic the I-15 corridor. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6288-2275
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Knowles, Jennifer
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Hi, [uh] my name is Jennifer Knowles, I am a Lehi resident and I am calling to let UDOT know that I am opposed to the corridor [um] being at 2100 North. I just don't, I'm very dismayed about the loss of the wetland acres. I live near there. I am irritated that the noise levels will increase. We're already near I-15 [um] the air quality is a big issue down here for us and I feel like [um] there's just going to be too much more congestion and actually, when I take the freeway home during rush hour, the bulk of the congestion happens prior to this exit and I just feel like it would be [um] it would be better if it could be located in a different area. I just don't feel like this is the best area. [Uh] It's just a shame to lose [um] any [um] wetlands and acreage here in Lehi. [Uh] We're sort of a smallish town still. We love it. We don't want it to change. And that's my opinion. Thanks.

Comment 147

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6289-2276
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Cunningham, Suzanne
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Hello, my name is Suzanne Cunningham and my phone number is 801-842-5511. I live in Eagle Mountain and I'm leaving a comment that I am, and my family is, for the 2100 [um] North alternative. We are in favor of that route. So anyway, I just wanted to leave my voice and thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Comment 148

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6291-2278
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Pexton, Richard
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 My name is Richard Pexton, a Lehi resident, 766-9344. Uh, I favor the 2100 North connector primarily because it is a shorter distance from one road to the freeway than going south closer to the lake. [uh] Also, the card that we got in the mail doesn't really talk about alternatives and so we don't know what the extra choices or the other choices are. I'd be happy to be well, better informed. [Uh] But I have no problem with the 2100 North connector. I'd prefer it than having it closer to the lake and a longer distance to build highways and I think we'd have less environmental impact there than on the new homes that have been built on the south end of Lehi.

Comment 149

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6292-2304
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hansen, L. Ross
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hello, this is Ross Hansen, 102 E. Wagoneer Road, Saratoga Springs, Utah, phone number area code 801-766-5444. I'm calling to comment on the various options for the increase in growth in the Sara... well the Northern Utah County area, Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain, etc. and reviewing these proposals, the one that makes the most sense is the 2100 North route with the uh freeway west of Redwood Road and then extending across the valley, across the river over to I-15 uh that would handle in my opinion, and I am a professional engineer by the way, that would handle the most traffic with the least disruption to the environment and to the existing residents of Lehi and all the other communities involved. And, uh, also think should take the quickest be the shortest schedule in my opinion and more empty land out there, fewer homes to disrupt. I know there'll be a few people that would be impacted by this. Some of their homes might have noisy traffic but anyway you go you're going to have that problem. We've waited too long. This probably should have been built years ago but as I look at the other options they aren't too promising and certainly if we do nothing, we're going to have serious, serious problems far worse than even we have now. I've been there six years and I've noticed a major increase in time and congestion just in that time and the rate of growth appears to be continuing. That's my comment. Again, Ross Hansen. Thank you. Bye.

Comment 150

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6293-2279
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Child, Tiffany
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, name is Tiffany Child and I wanted to call and say that I am very opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it would be very harmful and negative on the neighborhood surrounding that area. It would be bad for the wildlife habitat. It would just be a very, very, very poor decision to do. There's other alternatives and definitely I think that the 2100 North connector proposal is not the right choice and so I wanted to call and voice my opinion, and I have several friends around that area that strongly believe the same thing; that it's not the best for our community and it isn't the best proposal. It can be put somewhere else. It doesn't need to be on 2100 North. My number is 766-0478. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Comment 151

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6294-2281
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: McDonald, Colin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Colin McDonald. I live in Eagle Mountain in the Ranches area. [Uh] I think about this Mountain View Corridor, that the best [uh] route would be the preferred route, the 2100 North alternative and also having the Mountain View Corridor connect at seventy, [uh] State Road 73. I was also wondering if it connected somewhere in South Salt Lake or Salt Lake County [uh] with I-15 near Bangerter Highway or if there was access to Bangerter Highway up north there as I travel up there all the time. Okay, I hope that is what happens and good luck with all you're doing. Bye.

Comment 152

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6295-2282
Date: 11/14/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Peterson, Patricia
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, I'm calling in behalf of the Lehi proposal. I do not agree with the UDOT [um] proposal. I think it is a terrible, terrible [um] proposal and it cuts through farmland. It cuts through businesses; I mean [uh] homes, residential areas and the air quality, as you say, that the, the [uh] the quality of life is at stake. It is absolutely at stake with the pollution, with the freeway, and I am totally against it. [Um] My number is 801-687-2529 and I live in Lehi. My zip code is 84043. My name is Patricia Peterson and you can call me back.

Comment 153

Comment 154

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6296-2284
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Roberts, Debbie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Hi my name is Debbie Roberts, D-e-b-b-i-e R-o-b-e-r-t-s. I live in Lehi. I'm calling with a comment on the corridor. [Um] I'm opposed to it. I think that we do need a connector but that's not the best place. I like the proposal by the city. I think that they've done some good homework. I think we should look at that strongly. I just think it's going to impact the neighborhoods too much. [Um] it ruins a lot of ecosystem. It's just too much for that location. It's a huge road. I think they need to look at putting that at a better place. Point of the Mountain sounds better to me. So, anyway my number is 801-766-9673. Thank you.

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6312-2295
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Evans, Todd
Location: , UT


Comment:
My name is Todd Evans at 801-768-8052 and I just believe that the 2100 North is the best place to help relieve the traffic. I don't believe you're gonna have the problems with existing homes or other things of wetlands like you will at the Point of the Mountain or other places. I think that's your best bet and I believe that's where it should be. Thank you. Bye.

35.2.7C

Comment 155

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6314-2296
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hill, Gordon
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Yes, this is Gordon Hill and I am opposed to the 2100 North corridor in Lehi. I think that's it a tragedy if you put that in because of the, from what I understand there a grade school that is supposed to be built in that area. I do not think that it's a wise thing to do. I think that you ought to be able to find another place across that northern part there without having to disturb existing homes and also by cutting Lehi in two. I'm very much opposed to this 2100 North corridor. Like I said, my name is Gordon Hill. My home phone number is 768-0634. I have been a resident of Lehi for eight years. I've also been very much involved in the [uh] you know the activities of the area and I think this is a tragedy.

Comment 156

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6315-2297
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Devey, Glen
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 I'm for the Mountain View Corridor. I'm a Lehi resident. I live on Main Street and it'll alleviate traffic. My name is Glen Devey, 450 East Main, Lehi, Utah, 768-3210 or 722-5619. Have a nice day.

Comment 157

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6316-2299
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Sigmiller, Barbara
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
Uh, I am in support of the [um] 2100 North alternative. My name is Barbara Sigmiller and I can be reached at 801-224-0724. That's 224-0724, Barbara Sigmiller. I live in Saratoga Springs at 3969 South [inaudible] Mountain Drive, Saratoga Springs 84045. Thank you.

Comment 158

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6317-2301
Date: 11/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Sigmiller, Robert
Location: , UT


Comment:
This is Robert Sigmiller. I'm calling to lend my support to the 2100 North alternative. I'm very strongly in support of it. You can reach me if you need to at 1-801-830-7657. Thank you.

Comment 159

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6318-2305
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Ruper, Steve & Mary
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Yes, this is Steve and Mary Ruper and we're calling about having the connector road put at 2100 North. We feel like this is the best road. My husband travels that road anyway from Jordan Willows subdivision. It's the best way to get out of traffic and get to the freeway quicker in the mornings. Main Street in Lehi from Jordan Willows is, he said at 6:20 in the morning, he can't cross that road there's so much traffic even. So, we would like the connector road put at 2100 because that is the road he travels every morning and he has done since we moved here three years ago. So, we are with UDOT to put the connector road at 2100. Thank you. Good-bye.

Comment 160

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6319-2306
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Clifton, Trevor
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Noise and Air pollution Concern for current residence bordering 2100 North in Lehi I am concerned for the added noise and air pollution that the proposed connector would bring to our neighborhood. As concerned citizens have expressed a desire to not have a school located directly near a freeway for the safety of the children due to poor air quality and pollution, I share this concern. The difficult thing to understand is why would a school be inappropriate near a freeway yet a neighborhood would not be considered at risk? There are more children living in my neighborhood than would attend an elementary school, and those children are located within the neighborhood for more hours out of the day than the working hours of a school. Thus, if it were to be considered inappropriate, by concerned citizens, for a school to be located near the 2100 N proposed freeway connector, then our neighborhood should not be located there either. Concern for property value of current residence along 2100 North in Lehi I am concerned that the property value my home, located along the path of the proposed connector would decrease. Who goes to buy their dream home and looks right next to the freeway as their first choice? We have enjoyed very stable real-estate growth in our neighborhood and this proposal jeopardizes our property values. Concern that the current Alpine School District property located at 2100 N and 2300 W would no longer be considered for an elementary school if the proposed connector were to be finalized, my concern would be that Alpine School District may not want to build a school so close to the new freeway at 2100 North and therefore put the current land up for sale. The land could become a commercial property for something very undesirable such as a gas station / convenience store that would attract non-residential motorists into our neighborhood area. This is a very likely scenario due to the fact that 2300 W at the 2100 N location would be an on/off ramp to the East West Connector and thus a prime location for convenience stores and fuel sales. Concern that the Proposal by Lehi City for an alternative connector at 4800 N has not been considered enough to replace the 2100 N proposal. I am concerned that UDOT has not considered Lehi City's proposal for the Northern East West Connector enough. If UDOT truly considers the proposed bridge solution that is north of the residence in the city, then UDOT would see, as we see (me, my neighborhood, Lehi City Council, and Lehi Chief Engineer) that the 4800 N proposal would alleviate the traffic congestion from the cities out west and allow them direct access to I-15 without disrupting residence and isolating neighborhoods. Lehi City would be divided North to South I am concerned that Lehi is already divided East to West by a Freeway and another Freeway will split Lehi North to South. Freeways divide up a city, depleting the sense of community. Think about the Lehi on the East side, doesn't that seem like another city in itself? Jordan River Parkway Trail I am concerned that the Parkway trail would be interrupted at 2100 n. My family and I use the trail to go up near the windmills. When I spoke to a UDOT representative at the open house last week, he stated that the trail would most likely go over the freeway. This means that we would need to travel up a circular ramp, over a huge freeway, and back down just to go to Thanksgiving Point! With the 4800 n freeway, we would not have to deal with this interruption while going to the windmills and would not have to deal with this dangerous, ugly and annoying barrier on our trail (at least until 4800n). Commerce would be affected Much of the land near I15 and 2100 n is planned for commerce. With a Freeway on 2100n, retailers would be less likely to use the land for their stores and much of their land would be eaten up with the freeway.

Comment 161

Comment 162

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6320-2307
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Fonua, Anna
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Hi, I live in Lehi. I'm a Lehi resident and I do like the freeway, the Mountain View Corridor that comes all the way down and connects to 2100 South and goes and then connects to the I-15. I like that better over Lehi's proposed bridge which would build a bridge up from (white river) Road to I-15. I think that's pretty stupid and the 2100 North is actually a better choice because, I don't know, we need some... we need a connector from Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain and it also diverts some of the Main, some of the busy traffic that comes from Main Street. Main Street is so packed and I'd love to have some of that traffic diverted to that new 2100 North freeway. That would be a great option and I fully support the 2100 North connector from Mountain View Corridor to the I-15. Uh, my name is Anna Fonua and my phone number is 801-815-2819. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6321-2309
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Brooks, Derek
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:

Hey, my name is Derek Brooks. I'm a new resident of Saratoga Springs. I'm a teacher at Mountain Ridge Junior High over in Highland and there are about three of us who live in the Saratoga Springs/Lehi area and we all carpool every day. Um, I'd never heard of this alternative route with the freeway. I thought they were going to have to widen Lehi Main Street and I must say that, though I knew something had to be done in order to increase the traffic flow, I would be devastated if that town, Lehi, was changed in any form. It's such a beautiful town. It's got the best houses. It needs to remain, it needs to keep that integrity about it and so I was absolutely thrilled when I got the map showing the alternative route. That is just fantastic. I think if we could get that done, that would be amazing. That would just redirect the entire flow. It would really allow more communities, well, it would strengthen our community because of all the local services, and stores, and the economy. I think it would just be a fantastic idea. Plus, I have a lot of family members who would love to visit and live in Saratoga Springs but that Lehi Main Street is just a problem. I just think, you know, if that alternative route would work out they'd be a lot more apt to come out and visit and even move out here. So, that's my comment and I'm totally in support of that, and so is my wife. If you have any questions, my number is 289-6619. Thank you. Bye.

Comment 163

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6322-2311
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Ramirez, Rodrigo
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, I just wanted to call to say that 2100 North is the best choice and my name is Rodrigo Ramirez. My phone number is 801-768-3871. Thank you.

Comment 164

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6323-2312
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Harris, Ann
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Hi, I'd like to comment on the corridor at 2100 South, 2100 North in Lehi. I think it's a great idea, um, to move traffic along and the congestion out toward Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain is getting unbearable. So, I think if definitely you do this, it will do a lot of great for all the businesses out west. Anyway, thank bye-bye. Oh, my phone number is 801-674-8300. My name is Ann Harris.

Comment 165

Comment 166

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6324-2315
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Alva, Shawna
Location: , UT

Comment:
(Message left on Cyndi Keller's Direct Phone Line.) Hi Cyndi, this is Shawna Alva. I just have been looking at the maps of the proposed highway that's supposed to be a west side highway and for all intents and purposes, it appears that it is just an alternative route that's set up for people who live on the east side. I see absolutely no reason why this should be going east instead of going west with egress out into Utah County. We have no roads out here and it seems that everything that's done is done with an eastside perspective. It's not done with a west side perspective and to have a west side freeway, that would be just wonderful. It's certainly something we desperately need, but there's absolutely no reason for that to curve back east and if they just want to use the west side to cut down traffic for eastside dwellers, that's really not something that's acceptable to me. Um, I would love to speak with you about this. If you'd please return my call, I would sure appreciate it. You can reach me at 967-UTAH, that number again is 967-8824. Thank you and it's Shawna Alva. Bye-bye.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6325-2313
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wilcox, Doug
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I'm not sure what mistakes have been made in the past (i.e. poor planning, red tape, etc...) to create the current problem with traffic through Lehi, but I am confident that it is not best resolved by simply implementing the easiest or quickest solution, as traffic is only going to continue to increase. I would rather see the right thing done even if it delays the process, than to simply try to make a quick fix. The main support I hear for the 2100 North proposal is because UDOT is ready to move on it. That is not reason enough for me! The 4800 North proposal by Lehi City seems to find the better balance between meeting the real needs of those who live West of Lehi, while not requiring those who live in Lehi to pay the price. I say, take the time to do it right and 4800 N. is the right choice

Comment 167

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6327-2317
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Bennion, Suzette
Location: , UT

Comment:
 (Received and relayed by Patty Brierley to Cyndi Keller's direct phone line.) [Suzette] says she's in favor of the 2100 North proposal. She does not approve the Lehi bridge proposal.

Comment 168

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6328-2316
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Mecham, Owen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I live in a neighborhood bordering the proposed site of the east west connector. I am opposed to the freeway for the following reasons: Decrease in property values Adverse affect on the Jordan River parkway and wetlands Further segmentation of Lehi City, we are already divided by I 15. The property owned by Alpine School District would not longer be in consideration for an elementary school. A better route exists with the Bluffdale/Porter Rockwell bridge Building this connection would be a great mistake. A multilane parkway would be a better option, with the addition of the connector at 4800 North.

Comment 169

Comment 170

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6329-2318
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Bradbury, Brittany
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
(Message left on Cyndi Keller's direct phone line.) Hi Cyndi, my name is Brittany Bradbury. I am calling to leave a comment on the Mountain View Corridor. The comment line's mailbox was full so they transferred me to you. Um, my phone number is 789-3196 and I've lived in out in Eagle Mountain since 1999 and I just wanted to call and support the um Saratoga Springs option of going at 2100 North instead of taking it into Salt Lake County. I commute into Provo every day and the Salt Lake option does me absolutely no good. I feel like we already have a connection going that way through the Redwood to Bangerter to I-15 connection, and we have no good alternative heading north out of here, and it would be a complete backtrack for me to do that and I wouldn't do it. I would just continue to take Main as would everyone else and it's absolutely impossible to get through Main Street, as you know. So, I just, I don't see why that's even a consideration. It's not a good alternative for us out here and it's, the growth is amazing. I've seen it since '99 and I've seen people not come out here because of the horrid commute and, and we just really need this corridor going to the south end of the valley. I am calling in support of the southern access route. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6331-2320
Date: 11/16/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: McPherson, Devon
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Hi, name is Devon McPherson, D-e-v-o-n M-c-P-h-e-r-s-o-n. I live at 7657 Willow Walk Lane, Eagle Mountain. I wanted to comment how it is necessary that we have a 2100 North alternative instead of doing the Lehi bridge proposal. It is, the 2100 North option is the one and only best choice for quickly moving the traffic to I-15 and it is necessary, and the Lehi bridge proposal, it is a drastic mistake and unfortunately, it seems selfish to move the proposal, the alternative, the 2100 North alternative to the Lehi bridge proposal. It would only be because of [uh] Lehi's government and not allowing us to build on the land which is the necessary part of growth. It is unfortunate but it is necessary, and I highly support having a 2100 North alternative. Thanks.

Comment 171

Comment 172

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6332-2321
Date: 11/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Thayer, Jeannette
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I think that the 2100 North um alternative is the best solution. I myself drive from Eagle Mountain to Salt Lake every day and find that driving through Lehi is really becoming more and more of a problem. So, that is what my opinion is. My name is Jeannette Thayer and my phone number is 801-641-5384. Thank you.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6334-2324
Date: 11/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Wilson, Aaron
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
Hi, my name is Aaron Wilson. [um] You can contact me at 801-368-2285. I live in [uh] on 12th West not far from 2100 North. [uh] I'm concerned because I recently read that the alternative down here in Utah County that received the most public comment was going to be the alternative chosen. That seemed a little ridiculous to me, if it's even true. [um] I know that there are a lot of people up in arms that are mostly the [uh] "we don't want it in our backyard" group. [uh] I think it's very clear to most people with that are looking at this logically instead of emotionally, that the best option is the 2100 North route. [um] You know I've just lived here for twenty years and I've, it's obviously the lake route would be probably be even better for commuters but [uh] it's got way too much impact and I can clearly see that. [uh] The route at 2100 North really has a minimal footprint and anything farther north than that is not going to get used. [um] It's not going to solve any problems. I would hope that this decision is being made by [uh] civil engineers who are looking at all of these factors instead of by a popularity vote because there are some really squeaky wheels out here who [uh] I would really hate to see make a dumb decision just because they're [uh] making a lot of noise. So, that's my opinion and [uh] thanks for listening. Bye.

35.2.7C

Comment 173

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6336-2325
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Bennion, Todd
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I still cannot believe that you're considering putting a freeway up through a series of residential neighborhoods. Why isolate the neighborhoods to the north? Further, there are kids here! And lots of them, they're young neighborhoods! Why increase pollution for them? Push the freeway up north a bit and you'll practically eliminate that problem, and leave Lehi largely intact while still accomplishing your goals.

Comment 174

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6338-2328
Date: 11/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Ben
Location: SARATOGA SPRINGS, UT

Comment:
 HELLO HI, UH, MY NAME IS BEN, UM. I'M A RESIDENT OF UH SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY. AN UHM I SUPPORT THIS UM 2100 NORTH UM. THE ALTERNATIVE HWY. CAUSE UM YOU KNOW PEOPLE JUST TALKING ABOUT A LOT ABOUT YOU KNOW ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS OR OR NOT IN MY BACKYARD AND YOU KNOW THIS THIS UM YOU KNOW SIDE OF UM YOU KNOW THE CITY GROWING LIKE A LOT AND I I I HAVE IT EVERY SINGLE DAY EVER BIG TRAFFIC JAM IN THE SHOWERS (?) WHEN I COMMUTE AND AND IF IF YOU KNOW THE CITY GROWING LIKE THIS SPEED THEN LATER ON WE WILL HAVE A MAJOR PROBLEMS AND IF WE DO NOT DO THIS NOW AND WE ALL TALKING ABOUT SOMETHING ELSE IT DOES NOT GONNA MAKE YOU KNOW THIS SIDE OF CITY I MEAN THIS SIDE OF STATES ITS YOU KNOW YOU KNOW GOOD PLACE TO LIVE SO I SUPPORT THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE UM INSTEAD OF UM YOU KNOW THE WHAT THE POINT OF MOUNTAIN OR OR BELOW LEHI MAIN STREET K MY NAME IS BEN GUE UM UM I LIVE IN SOUTHWESTERN CITY UM MY ADDRESS IS 543 W NATALIE WAY IN SARATOGA SPRINGS UTAH AND MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801 UH 681 AND 3322 SO IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS YOU CAN JUST CALL ME BACK OK BYE

Comment 175


Comment 176

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6339-2329
Date: 11/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Gue, Stacy
Location: SARATOGA SPRINGS, UT

Comment:
 HI HI MY NAME IS STACY GUE AND I AM A RESIDENT OF SARATOGA SPRINGS AND I SUPPORT THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE THE MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR A FOR THE REASONS OF THAT WE NEED A ALTERNATIVE OUT HERE TO GET BACK AND FORTH TO THE FREEWAY AND TO CONNECT TO THE EAST SIDE AND TO GET UP TO SALT LAKE CITY IT IS REALLY PACKED OUT HERE UM AND I DO NOT LIKE DRIVING ON ONE WAY STREETS ITS IS VERY DANGEROUS THERE ARE MANY DEER AND UM IF THERE WAS AN EMERGENCY AND THE TRAIN BLOCKED UM DOWNTOWN LEHI UM THAT COULD BE VERY DANGEROUS AND UM I AM JUST VERY CONCERNED IT NEEDS TO BE SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE QUICKLY TO MAKE THIS A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE OTHERWISE ITS JUST GOING TO BE A MESS OUT HERE WHICH IT KIND OF ALREADY IS A MESS OUT HERE AND SO WE REALLY NEED SOMETHING DONE LETS GET THIS 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE GOING AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. I SUPPORT IT UM MY NAME IS STACY GUE I LIVE AT 543 WEST NATALIE WAY SARATOGA SPRINGS UTAH 84045 AND MY CONTACT NUMBER IS 232 7028 AREA CODE 801 AND I APPRECIATE THAT THANK YOU VERY MUCH GOODBYE.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6340-2330
Date: 11/18/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Mosier, Nicole
Location: EAGLE MOUNTAIN, UT

Comment:
 HI, MY NAME IS NICOLE MOSIER AND MY PHONE NUMBER IS 789-5371. I LIVE UM 9008 MT AERIE DRIVE IN THE RANCHES AND IM CALLING TO VOTE FOR THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE UM AND MY HUSBAND IS RUNNING FOR THAT AS WELL AND IF YOU NEED TO GET AHOLD OF ME PLEASE CALL ME AT 789-5371. THANKS

Comment 177

Comment 178

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6341-2331
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hinckley, Todd
Location: , UT

Comment:
YES, MY NAME'S TODD HINCKLEY YOU CAN REACH ME BACK AT 836-2608. I JUST HAVE A QUESTION FOR YOU ABOUT THE A PROPOSED MVC CONNECTOR AT 2100 NORTH IN LEHI. I WAS HOPING TO SEE A LARGER MAP OF THIS AND THE IMPACT IT WOULD MAKE ON A HOMES EAST OF THE FREEWAY ON ABOUT 300 WEST IN LEHI. IF YOU COULD CALL ME BACK I WOULD APPRECIATE IT AT THAT PHONE NUMBER. THANK YOU. BYE

35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6342-2332
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Infanger, Pam & Neil
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I'M CALLING TO RESPOND TO THE MVC PROJECT. MY NAME IS PAM INFANGER. I LIVE IN SARATOGA SPRINGS. MY PHONE IS 766-8869. I'M CALLING IN FAVOR OF A OR LENDING MY SUPPORT TO THE 2100 NORTH FREEWAY OF THE A ALTERNATIVE FOR A TRANSPORTATION NEEDED THROUGH NORTHERN UTAH COUNTY. AGAIN, PAM ENFANGER IN SARATOGA SPRINGS CALLING TO LEND MY SUPPORT TO THE UM 2100 NORTH FREEWAY ALTERNATIVE UM AND UM I'M HOPING THAT THIS MESSAGE IS GOING TO GO THROUGH TO YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. BYE NOW

35.2.7C

Comment 179

Comment 180

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6343-2333
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Roberts, Scott
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
THIS IS SCOTT ROBERTS, A RESIDENT IN SARATOGA SPRINGS. JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW I LIKE THE 2100 NORTH CONNECTION. IT MAKES THE MOST SENSE FOR THE AREA AROUND LEHI AND SARATOGA SPRINGS. THANK YOU.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6344-2334
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hughes, Bryan & Katherine
Location: EAGLE MOUNTAIN, UT

Comment:
HI, MY NAME IS KATHERINE HUGHES AND MY ADDRESS IS 4025 CATTLE DRIVE IN EAGLE MOUNTAIN AND I JUST WANTED TO VOICE MY OPPINION UM MY OPINION IN THIS MVC IS YES, I AM IN FAVOR OF THIS. I THINK THIS WOULD BE A GREAT THING FOR TRAFFIC AND FOR ALL THE DEVELOPMENT THAT'S GOING ON HERE IN EAGLE MOUNTAIN. UM SO, IF YOU NEED TO REACH ME, UM MY NUMBER IS 789-8709 AND ONCE AGAIN, IT'S BRYAN AND KATHERINE HUGHES. WE ARE IN FAVOR. THANK YOU.

35.31C

Comment 181

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6345-2335
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Burt, Rose
Location: SARATOGA SPRINGS, UT

Comment:
THIS IS ROSE BURT. I LIVE AT 44 EAST WILDHORSE RD IN SARATOGA SPRINGS AND WE WANT
THE 2100 NORTH A ACCESS TO THE FREEWAY AND MY TELEPHONE NUMBER IS 768-8354.
THANK YOU.

35.2.7C

Comment 182

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6346-2336
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Ring, Brent & Debi
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
HI, MY NAME IS DEBI RING. I LIVE AT 927 WEST JOSHUA DR IN SARATOGA SPRINGS. MY
TELEPHONE NUMBER IS 768-6527 AND I WOULD LIKE TO UM SHOW MY SUPPORT. I I SUPPORT
THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE FOR THE MVC. THANK YOU SO MUCH.


35.2.7C

Comment 183

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6347-2338
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Thompson, Joyce
Location: , UT

Comment:
 HI, MY NAME IS JOYCE THOMPSON. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 766-5399, AREA CODE 801, AND I'M CALLING TO UM RESPOND TO THE CORRIDOR THING, I THINK THERE'S OTHER ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD WORK BETTER, UH I THINK THERE'S BEEN ONE PROPOSED BY LEHI CITY THAT WILL NOT CUT OUR CITY IN HALF AGAIN AND I UH WANT TO MAKE MY THOUGHTS KNOWN. I THINK THAT IT'S NOT THE BEST WAY TO CONNECT AND I AND I UH WANTED THIS COMMENT TO BE KNOWN TO YOU. THANK YOU. BYE

Comment 184

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A
35.2.8A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6349-2342
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: McPherson, Josh
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Hello. My name is Josh McPherson. I live in Eagle Mountain and my phone number is 789-2726. I'm calling in regards to the Mountain View Corridor. I, like my brother, also do not believe in the 2100 North alternative, at least as a highway. I think 2100 North is a perfect alternative for a, what we call back home in the east coast, a different kind of road, a parkway. The five parkways, or arterials, is a much better idea. 2100 North impacts Saratoga Shores and doesn't really take care of the population of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs or [inaudible]. Most of the populace resides south of SR-73. They need roads that can connect to I-15 closer to Lehi Main Street and American Fork. Many of the population goes [uh] works north in Salt Lake County and much works south in Utah County. Therefore, arterials along the rim of the lake connecting [uh] Pleasant Grove through Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, having a parkway there and three other parkways spread throughout, is a much preferable to just having one [uh] highway from 2100 North. If you, having lived in a planned community, Peachtree City, Georgia, also Hilton Head Island. I can tell you that the cities out here, Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, need to get their act together if they want to have growth. Growth along the west side of the lake is going to continue south. It's going to continue in Saratoga Springs south. That's the only place it can go. The people that are in the southern portion eight, nine, ten miles south of SR-73 aren't going to want to drive all the way up to 2100 North just to get across to I-15. They need a closer route. Obviously, eventually, across the lake is going to need to be done but until then, right across the north rim is, is an arterial parkway road connection would be more beneficial. Having five of those versus one highway gives access to many, many different neighborhoods and many different access points. The one highway idea is just stupid and anybody who's been to any decent planned community would know that.

Comment 185

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6350-2341
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Torres, Julie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
My children and my husband all have asthma and poorer air quality would be a disaster to any one with breathing problems. I moved to Lehi because it was such a clean and quaint city, please don't ruin it with noise and air pollution by building a freeway connector in a residential area.

35.2.7

Comment 186

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6351-2345
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Francis, Matt
Location: saratoga springs, UT


Comment:
I support the 2100 freeway alternative. It seems to be the best way to help the traffic flow problem coming out of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. Additionally, I would like to see better shoulders or bike lanes along Redwood road. Currently it is extremely dangerous to ride a bike anywhere on Redwood.

35.2.7C
35.31C

Comment 187

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6352-2369
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Taylor, Jennifer
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I previously commented in support of the 2100 North alternative, and I do support that option. I also want to voice my support for the 1900 South arterial. If that road were built, it is likely the one I would use most often to get to and from I-15.

Comment 188

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6352-2367
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Taylor, Jennifer
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am writing to voice my support for the 2100 North alternative for uninterrupted east-west travel from Saratoga Springs to I-15. I feel that getting a viable alternative to Lehi Main Street (SR-73) is extremely important to everyone who lives in Saratoga Springs. I feel that if that Mountainview Corridor is built further north (the Lehi bridge option), most residents in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain will be stuck driving to and from I-15 on the grossly over-traveled, dangerous Lehi Main Street.

Comment 189

Comment 190

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6355-2377
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Krebs, R Justin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

My family lives in a home at: 2243 West 2120 North in Lehi. We are concerned about the proposed connector at 2100 North in Lehi. We are opposed to the connector because it negatively impacts our neighborhood, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. I think that now is the time Utah should be more concerned about funding more public transit options such as Trax rather than continuing to build more freeways. My family and I will get almost no benefit out of this connector, yet it will impact us greatly. Those who will get the most of this connector are in other cities who should have considered these issues before building their cities. Overall, I am more concerned about whatever option will have the least impact to the homeowners, not the environment, even though another freeway as opposed to public transit will just continue to reduce the already poor air quality in the valley. However, if push comes to shove, please place our families and homes above the environment.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

35.1.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6370-2558
Date: 11/28/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Blackburn, Fred
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:

November 26, 2007 Gentlemen: I received your pretty card saying "We just don't think 2100 North is the best place..." Who is "we"? What IS the best place? You have criticized the plan without suggesting a better alternative. I think it is a tremendous idea. It passes across mostly undeveloped land from east to west. However, there are potential problems at the connection site at the south. I foresee incredible jams when traffic northbound on Redwood Road, eastbound from Eagle Mountain and westbound from Lehi will have problems at the current intersection at Redwood and #73. The approach and access to the proposed south terminus presents a major concern. I would like to see a viable and sensible plan for that connection. The following suggestions are for UDOT and Lehi City, as well as a response to the "open letter on transportation from the mayor of Saratoga Springs." I add this for your consideration as well. A boldly printed note at the top of Page #3 of the letter mentions a risk and quality of life factor, essentially meaning the FUTURE. Be advised, this is a PRESENT concern. The traffic problem has not been addressed in an adequate manner up to this time. Knowing the growth taking place (or WOULD take place considering building permits issued) over the last five or six years, should have alerted UDOT and all city officials having planning responsibilities to make ready. Instead, we are at the stage of making what seems to be emergency measures. This calls for action NOW. The Corridor plans as presented will take months, if not years. I propose an immediate adjustment in east/west lanes from the Lehi turnabout westward to Eagle Mountain. My plan will relieve traffic pressure in both the morning and afternoon rush hours. 1. Paint the surface, dividing Rt. #73 into three lanes. 2. Install overhead signs and flashing yellow lights indicating: a. two lanes eastward in the morning for about three hours, one westward b. two lanes westward in the afternoon, one eastward c. the center lane to be empty or used for left turns at other times I saw this plan work very well on a narrow busy street in Dallas, through a neighborhood not unlike 1300 East in Salt Lake City, north of 2100 South idea (where this should be considered)! It would work on Rt. #73, the one problem being the narrow bridge over the river. Widening the bridge would be much quicker than waiting for the Corridor to be completed, and traffic snarls would be greatly reduced. As requested, these are my STRONG opinions...with a solution. Very truly yours, Fred Blackburn cc: UDOT cc: Lehi City cc: Mayor of Saratoga Springs

Comment 191

Comment 192

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6393-2442
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Wakowski, Mark & Jodi
Location: , UT

Comment:
Hello, [um] I was just calling to give my support for the 2100 North corridor so [uh] and that's also my wife, as well, and that is Mark Wakowski and it's Jodi Wakowski and we're to be contacted at 867-5305. Thank you.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6396-2469
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Groll, Clare
Location: , UT

Comment:
My name is Clare Groll and I'm calling as a resident of Lehi City to state that we, my husband and I, agree with UDOT's plan and we prefer the 2100 South Freeway. Thanks.

35.2.7C

Comment 193

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6397-2470
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: MacArthur, Cassidy
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Cassidy MacArthur that's M-a-c-A-r-t-h-u-r. My phone number is 801-766-6736. I'm a resident of Saratoga Springs and I got a thing in the mail about the connector at 2100 North in Utah [um] and it said to voice your opinion [um]. I just want to voice my opinion that I'm for the connector at 2100 North in Lehi. [um] I think that's the best route to go at this point and [um] I just wanted to leave that, that I'm definitely for the 2100 North in Lehi, the best route. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 6398-2471
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Huey, Nola
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hi, I'm calling in comment to your Mountain View Corridor. I live at 1800 North 500 West in Lehi which puts me just across the freeway from this. Getting from my end of the community to the other end of the community, at this point, is very difficult. Very often, we take the outer routes because you can get through. By putting this 2100 North connector through, I will be blocked off basically by a big fat freeway, which makes getting anywhere in Lehi more difficult since I live on the north side of the existing freeway. I really can see good reasons to put a road out 2100, but not a huge freeway with no way to get across for miles at a time. [uh] You've got an access road on the Redwood Road, I assume that's what this little triangle means, but I can see no way to get to my friends' house who live out that direction other than to jump off the freeway and right on either side both directions, which again conflicts with my traffic. It'll also change the water existence out there. I think it will destroy a lot of open property that I think Lehi City needs because we have so little. [uh] Lehi City's [ah uh] project appears to be to me a better choice. It brings the traffic down and out way before it hits into the north part of Lehi City which would break down the city mess that we have caused by the three or four different roads owned by the State of Utah, which seems to have no effect on our getting anywhere because you won't bother to put a light where lights are needed because, and I quote the people, "we made a study and nobody drives north-south on the roads". Lehi people aren't stupid. If you can't get across the main road, you go around and move with the traffic. We would appreciate that perhaps you would come and talk to the neighbors who live by these roads. Talk to the people on 2100 North who will tell you they really don't want it there. I appreciate being able to put my input in and hope that you'll have listened to some of the things that he will have said and I do hope a lot of people have called because it's sad, it seems to be the silent minority that lose in this area instead of the strong minority. I appreciate that you are listening and hope that you can get back with us and let us know what's happening with this. [uh] Again, my name is Nola Huey, so you'll know, and I do live at the north end of Lehi and thank you very much. Have a good day.

Comment 195

Comment 196

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6400-2473
Date: 11/21/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Rogel, Paula
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Yes, I'm calling because I strongly oppose the 2100 North option for the Mountain View Corridor. This is [uh] would highly disrupt my life and six blocks from it, I already hear the noise from I-15 as it is. I don't need more noise coming off to the other side [um] and my name is Paula Rogel, R-o-g-e-l, [ah] phone number 768-2943. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6402-2520
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Brimhall, Ammon
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Hi, my name is Ammon Brimhall. My contact information is [uh] phone number 801-789-6105. I live on 1898 East South Independence Way, Eagle Mountain. I'd like to comment referencing the east-west portion of the Mountain View Corridor in support of 2100 North road as opposed to the Thanksgiving Point bridge that Lehi's suggested. Going that far north for me, from Eagle Mountain, would be useless. I might as well go through the Lehi Main Street which would not save me any time and would keep Lehi congested. That means I would spend more time, more gas, cause more pollution, as would tens of thousands of us who are trying to get to that side of the [uh] of the valley so I'm not sure why we would build the road if it doesn't save any time, any gas, or make the flow of traffic any better for a great majority of us that live [uh] quite a distance further south from Thanksgiving Point. I can see no overall benefit and that effect would be we would hurt a few thousand in Lehi but we would help tens of thousands in the rest of the valley versus by protecting those in Lehi, a couple thousand, we would hurt ten thousands in the rest, uh tens of thousands in the rest of the valley. Thank you. Bye-bye

Comment 197

Comment 198

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6435-2515
Date: 11/23/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Gray, Pat
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
[Uh] Yes, I'm calling about the [um] 21 North [uh] connector in Lehi. [uh] My name is Pat Gray and I live at 862 Whipple Drive. I am very concerned about it because the noise level will increase. The air qualish air quality will diminish. Also, the city is also divided in many ways and I think it needs to go more north out of the neighborhoods [um] because it's just going to divide more neighborhoods and we need to get away from that and I think that [uh] we need to look more into it and I am opposed to where they want to put it on 2100 North. Thank you very much.

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6436-2517
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Tedesco, Raylene
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
Hello, this is Raylene Tedesco calling. I live at 141 West Suncrest Lane in Saratoga Springs. I am calling in support of the 2100 North freeway proposal. My telephone number is 766-1775. Thank you.

35.2.7C

Comment 199

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6437-2518
Date: 11/25/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Dansie, Sharlene
Location: , UT

Comment:
 My name is Sharlene Dansie and I am for the 2100 North connector in Lehi.

Comment 200

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 6438-2521
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Thompson, Sharlene
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Sharlene Thompson. My address is 150[inaudible] August Drive, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84[inaudible]. My number is 801-949-4749, 801-9[inaudible]-4749. I am strongly against Mountain View Corridor connector at the 2100 North [inaudible] Lehi [inaudible] Lehi [inaudible] where they have four roads connecting because I don't think just one road will do it and I think that the impact is on the environment is very, very bad the way it impacts neighborhoods and destroys wildlife habitats and damages the ecosystem along the Jordan River. I'm very big on, on nature and I really don't think this is the best way to go and my number again is 801-949-4749. My name is Sharlene Thompson. I think there is a better way. Thank you.

Comment 201

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6439-2522
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Barnum, Scott & Julie
Location: Cedar Valley, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Julie Barnum. My number is 801-766-8180. I live in Cedar Valley, Utah. My comment is that I believe the 2100 2100 um North would serve us better than the 4800. My feeling is, is that my husband works at Novell in Provo, to go further north, to go further south wouldn't, wouldn't help us at all. Many of us out here feel sorry for Lehi, that it will take out houses but six years ago when the study began, they approved so many houses and without any care for the residents of Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain, Cedar Valley, Fairfield, Cedar Fort and all the rest of the communities in the ranches that are springing up. So my feeling is, is if it's taking out homes, poor Lehi. We actually needed this six years ago. Um, We have no choice but to go through Lehi to reach any other place in the valley, either Salt Lake or to go south to Provo in that area. unless we take a two-lane highway. We need a highway to I-15 and my support is for the 2100 option 2100 North option. Um, please represent all of us who are north of er um north and south of Le of Lehi who have to go through Lehi. UDOT really should consider all of us even though Lehi has very much access to I-15. Thanks. Bye.

Comment 202

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.8C

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6470-2560
Date: 11/27/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Watson, David W. & Ann
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Dear Mr. Brinkerhoff: As a 10 year resident of Eagle Mountain, my husband and I are increasingly concerned about the traffic situation along SR73. It is obvious that alternate routes must be provided, otherthan plowing east on SR73 thru Main St. in Lehi. At certain times of the day the traffic is almost at a stand still. In our opeion, there actually needs to be several east/ west roads that parallel SR73. If there was a disaster of any kind which necessitated mass evacuation, the citizens of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain would be in real trouble. As it is, at certain times of the day, even a motor vehicle accident on SR73 can cause traffic to come to a halt. Wäht a tragedy it would be for someone, in an emergency situation, to be stuck in a traffic jam like this, and die trying to get to an emergency room! Although our schedules have not permitted us to attend one of the meetings that have been scheduled for public comment, we understand that, at the present time, at least two plans are being considered for connecting the Mountain View Corridor in northwest Utah County to I-15. We have heard about two of these plans. One is the 2100 North alternative and one is a bridge proposal that would connect Redwood Rd. to I-15 much farther north. In our opinion, the 2100 North option would be the best, and help with the most pressing need. While we are sure that the bridge idea much farther north would be a good idea in the future, it certainly should not be considered ahead of the 2100 North option. The bridge option is too far north of SR73. The first priority would be a connector much closer to SR73. Our opeion is that we need a minimum of two east/west connector roads, but several would be better. Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs and Lehi are continuing to grow. The traffic situation is only going to get worse! Thanks for listening! David & Ann Watson


Comment 203

Comment 204

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6474-2565
Date: 11/26/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Hulet, William
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Gentlemen, I am strongly opposed to the proposed 2100 North connector to the Mountain View Corridor at Lehi. From my home I join a large amount of traffic coming down the Alpine highway. Most of this traffic goes North to Salt Lake and beyond. For us to make use of the new corridor and bypass the heavy traffic on the freeway, we would have to go in the opposite direction, South, to use the 2100 connector. The appropriate place for the connector is somewhere between Highway 92 and the Point of Mountain. Believe me, a lot of traffic would be affected. Sincerely yours, William Hulet


Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

35.2.7A

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 6479-2572
Date: 11/19/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Bush, William S. & Linda H.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 To Whom It May Concern: We wish to submit our concerns relative to the proposed Mountain View Corridor Connector near or through Lehi, Utah. We doubt that our concern will do much good as we have expressed them before and the UDOT decision was directly in opposition. Your decision reflected the early indications that you had already decided to construct the connector at 2100 North Lehi. Our wishes, and those of most of Lehi's residents, appear to be contrary to your "preferred roadway." We agree that the connector is needed but not at 2100 North. We request that you reconsider and hear us when we say that a decision to construct the roadway at 2100 North will have a negative impact. It will negatively impact the economic well-being of many residents of Lehi, the wildlife habitat along the Jordan River, noise and air pollution issues that are already becoming more health-threatening, and the value of property in Lehi. It will also divide Lehi City neighborhoods. It appears that this is being done in the face of reasonable and far less invasive solutions proposed by Lehi City planners. To say we don't understand your decision is probably an understatement, so we again request that you reconsider and change that decision. Thank you, William S. and Linda H. Bush 3332 N 660 E Lehi, UT 84043 801-520-3938

Comment 205

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 6480-2573
Date: 11/20/2007
Source: Letter
Name: Hampton, G. Edward & Carma
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Dear UDOT I was raised in Lehi but was living away when I-15 Freeway was built. It was a shock to me. There was no way to escape the noise and pollution and still live in Lehi. Now it is proposed to add to this intrusion. Please put the corridor north of Lehi. We have paid enough for others convenience. Thank you for your consideration Ed & Carma Hampton

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.1B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 My comment that I wanted to make, I have this mailer that you sent out about the environmental impact statement and you are showing UDOT preferred and the other two alternatives. It would be nice to know and maybe it's because I just moved here but, does this road still feed back onto I-15 because I-15 is so congested now. It would be nice to know if there are definite plans to go on the west side of the lake; what the timeframe is for those roads. I have to drive on the busy road going through Lehi and the road from American Fork to Pleasant Grove. Because I live in Utah County, the north freeway alternative isn't as important as what goes on after that. And will that be discussed at the meetings or given out to people? Thank you.


Comment 206

Comment 207

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31G



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT


Comment:
 Well, hello youngin of all youngins. I was just calling to find out whether or not Mountain West Corridor was going through 5800 W. or 7200 W. If you can call and tell me that. Thank you.

Comment 208

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Yah, you say our comments are important, well you don't care what we have to say. You're going to do what the * you want. and the way it looks, I'm going to be out of a job and possibly a home. What the * you guys thinkin' man? "Oh, it's progress." Well, you are going to push me back to the stone age. I hate UDOT. I hate Harper. I don't want 7200 W. I don't want 5800 W. and I work for KTBN radio. And you want to take the whole thing. A federal communications radio station allocated by the US Government. Also, federal communication and you are going right through our building. but you ain't gonna touch Harper, you're not going to touch the USANA amphitheater, you're not going to touch the golf course, you're not going to touch any of the gravel pits or the cement plants - but no, you're going to go right through KTBN radio that was there before any of the gravel pits, beofre the USANA amphitheater. KTBN radio has been there since 1957. And all those other gravel pits and everything came since the Olympic bid. You want my comment? Here it is..." UDOT.

Comment 209

Comment 210

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
Hi, I'm just kind of curious. I'm seeing all these maps and stuff like that the way it's going. But, 5600 dies just south of 70th. So I'm just kinda wonderin what you guys are going to do. My thing is that 7200 is better. Really the Utah DOT in West Valley, it's not feasible. The other way it goes around us and stuff like that so we won't have to hear all the noise and stuff like that. Because I just live on the east side of that. I'm up here on Copper City drive which is 60th West and I'm just kinda curious. So I guess I better go to the meetings and see what's going on. But as usual UDOT is going to get their way, but hopefully not. Anyway, just thought I'd leave a message. Thank you.

35.31C
35.2.4B
35.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
This route makes the most sense. We've been held hostage by Lehi, it's a nightmare route thru SR73 to the freeway. There are always displaced/ticked off people, but this route is "direct through mostly open spaces".


35.2.7C

Comment 211

Comment 212

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
The 2100 N alternative needs to happen and it needs to happen soon!



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
Please DO NOT give in to Lehi's lame bridge idea. That won't do anything to help Saratoga Springs/Eagle Mountain residents. What is the point of having a bridge just a short distance down from where Bangerter connects to I-15??? This makes absolutely no sense. Please give us the 2100 North Alternative. While it's unfortunate that some in Lehi will lose their homes, the reality is that 2100 North is the best for EVERYONE, not just for those in small areas of Lehi. The traffic on Main St. in Lehi is absurd and 2100 North will save EM & SS residents from having to use it.

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

Comment 213

Comment 214

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
Why not put the 2100 north section in utah county right on the boundary of the military owned land. And move the corridor farther west away from a major housing development. PLEASE consider moving it as far west away from homes as possible. A second solution putting it on the east side of Redwood road. I get it will effect homes, but not 800 homes. PLEASE CONSIDER MOVING IT AWAY FROM HOMES.

35.2.1I
35.2.1J



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I think the 2100N will be far to impacting for the small community of Lehi. I think a better alternative to 2100N would be the SOUTHERN FREEWAY ALTERNATIVE that runs behind Lehi. I would support the southern freeway alternative I would not support the 2100N lehi option as it is far to impacting to the residence

35.2.6A

Comment 215

Comment 216

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am highly in favor of the 2100 North Alternative. We need alternative roads further south, not further north like Lehi City is proposing.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I believe the 2100 North Alternative is the best alternative out of the three that have been proposed. I do not support the Lehi City's bridge proposal.


35.2.7C

Comment 217

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT


Comment:
I live under where the freeway will go, and have no faith in the ability of anyone involved in this decision to do the right thing. I am looking for a new home...

Comment 218

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
as a property owner that will be directly effected by this i request that the 2100 no. be moved farther north, esp when the consideration is still to put an additional road to saratoga via the pleasant grove exit.

Comment 219

Comment 220


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am in favor of the 2100 North connector as proposed by UDOT. I do not believe the hot air from Lehi City and am upset that they are using my tax dollars to oppose an alignment that impacts property owned by an elected official from Lehi. DO NOT LISTEN TO LEHI, DO THE RIGHT THING!!!

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am not in favor of the Lehi 2100 N connector. The impact is less severe to use Lehi city's or the arterials plan.

Comment 221

Comment 222

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I am a resident of eagle mountain the reason of me writing to you is because when i came to eagle mountain i loved the people and the houses being built. The point is that i wish that the southern freeway was built because it would give me and all the people that travel through main street in Lehi a way to get to AF, PG, Lindon, and Provo much faster and if you see the ammount of traffic traveling through main street it horrible. every day i travel to lindon to work on my way there it takes me 40 min because of traffic on main street the only way to get to that side of town, when it should be a 15 min drive. the southern freeway is my choice.

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I think the mountain view corridor would be very beneficial to our transportation. The traffic is so bad in this area and there are no alternative routes. I wish they would do another corridor South of this and just North of Utah Lake also. I think if Lehi City is upset about cutting out downtown Lehi, they should have thought about that before they made it a historical mainstreet which can not be widened.

35.2.1F

Comment 223

Comment 224


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.10A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I support the proposal to built a corridor at 2100 N in Lehi. Living in Harvest Hills I would appreciate a connecting road to I-15 that is not all the way down by the lake and also not all the way up over the point of the mountain. I know many residents in Lehi are opposed to this, but I support it and think it's a good way to get across to I-15.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
The Mountain View Corridor is needed. I don't agree with it being a toll road considering all the other freeways aren't. We've spent a lot of tax money funding the eastside freeways...they can help pay for one on the west side.

Comment 225

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.6A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I live in Eagle Mountain and am excited to see any and all solutions. We need to build the MVC to extend all the way to I-15 in Utah county, not just to SR 73. That would be the same as only building half of I-215 in Salt Lake County. The growth is here and will only continue. If we only build half the freeway we will just have to build the rest later at a greater cost. Also make sure there are east/west connector roads too.

Comment 226

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.6A
35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I support the Southern Freeway alternative. I don't like the other options, because if we're going to build a road to facilitate travel, it seems to make more sense to make it a freeway than just another arterial road. I also am definitely against making it a toll road.

Comment 227

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
The UDOT Preferred - 5800 West Freeway Alternative is "preferred" by the UDOT and has been "preferred" from the beginning. When have our opinions as residents, property owners, commuters, etc. in Utah been considered on this issue anyway?

Comment 228

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.8A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am in favor of the 7200 West option because it can take advantage of the new growth that will be happening in the Magna area.

Comment 229

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.5A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I don't like the alternative for the 5800 W freeway option. I live along 5600 w and I don't want a freeway running straight thru my neighborhood. That will cause noise and reduce air quality around my area. 5600 W is already a busy road, we don't need it to be worse. I understand you want to lessen congestion, but they've projected a lot of growth further out west with the announcement of Kennecot selling land and making a college and ski resorts. There will be a lot of growth further out west, and I think the 7200 W alternative will accomodate for that much better. Plus, it doesn't interfere with as many already existing residential areas.

Comment 230

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.10D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Mountain View users should pay for this road. This road will benefit mostly developers who created dramatic new growth without paying for transportation infrastructure. Since most citizens of Utah outside of this area will not benefit from access to the freeway, Mountain View freeway users should pay for the road. Mountain View should be a toll road.

Comment 231

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.1A
35.1.1A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 As mentioned in the study ATK has already cleared areas for the 7200 option. The further west will help reduce the congestion. Most of the new construction and increased population is west of 7200. In addition to the developmnt plan of KCC and the propopsed ski resort the further west will increase the options for future development. 201 runs along the benches on the east side run a similar route on the west. North and South freeway still does not fix the East and West problem.

Comment 232

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Adkins, Laura
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
 Although the 2100 North Freeway Alternative is a good option for those commuting to Salt Lake, it does not address the ever growing problem of those who commute south from Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and west Lehi. The 2100 North Freeway will do NOTHING to help those of us who have to drive down Lehi Main Street every morning in order to commute south of Lehi, where most of the jobs in Utah County are. The Daily Herald reported on November 16, 2007 that Utah County had the highest population growth rate in the state between July 2006 and July 2007 (5.5 percent). Provo City has also announced a new shopping center which will mean even more jobs in that city. If we do not have a Southern Freeway access road, it will be difficult to work in Utah County while living west of Utah Lake.

Comment 233

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1G



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Chidester, Ray
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 What are the comments or reasons that we could not build a road accross Utah Lake East to West? I'm sure I don't know all the details but I think it would be less impact on residential and help to make the lake cleaner because it would seperate the lake making it less filled by the wind and waves.


Comment 234

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.12.4A

35.2.3A
35.29A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Petersen, Darwin
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
 Construction of the corridor would be both a short term and temporary fix to the rapid population growth and the increasing traffic growth. The corridor would bring more traffic through West Valley City thus increasing health problems through car pollution. One health study shows that residents living within 500 yards of freeways have increased risks for cancer. I applaud and give credit to West Valley City for the city wide smoke free law. One would think that a city that concerns itself with improving the health and quality of life for its residents would be able to understand that the increased health risks that the corridor will create will be very damaging. The only alternative to the corridor that will be a permanent fix rather than a band-aid is mass transit along 5600 West. Forward thinking cities understand that mass transit costs less for tax payers because of far less costs in maintenance. Mass transit also reduces pollution for obvious reasons. With that in mind, does West Valley City want to be known as a forward thinking city that provided a solution for its traffic problems while reducing pollution and truly improving the quality of life for its residents. Or does West Valley City want to be like far too many other cities that has used only temporary fixes to traffic problems that has increased taxes and health risks for its residents.

Comment 235

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Bohnstedt, Marvin & Daryl
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 I am opposed to 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. Marvin Bohnstead (801)768-0859

Comment 236

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: McDowell, Chuck
Location: Kearns, UT

Comment:
 The Kearns Community Council's position is that tolling is clearly not in the best interest of the citizen's of Kearns. 1) It extracts an extra tax directly out of the pockets of Kearns citizens but does not do the same consistently across the state. This is a very discriminatory road tax. 2) Tolling will only further impact the 5600 West Corridor by driving commercial traffic to 5600 West as they attempt to avoid the toll. 5600 West already needs infrastructure improvements in the form of widening, paving, striping, crosswalks, sidewalk & gutter, lighting and sound barriers along much of its course. 3) Tolling will negatively impact commerce along the affected portion of the 5600 West corridor between 4500 and 7000 South. Whereas, this subject has been presented and discussed at the June 8th, 2006 meeting of the Kearns Community Council regarding the impending construction of the Mountain View Corridor along the western portions of Kearns; and Whereas, by proposing to make the Mountain View Corridor a toll road UDOT will force increased use of 5600 West; and Whereas, the conditions along 5600 West adjacent to the future Mountain View Corridor project require infrastructure improvements which have not yet been addressed; be it RESOLVED, that the Kearns Community Council opposes any tolling associated with the Mountain View Corridor because of the increased hardship such decisions have and will continue to have on the citizens of Kearns; and be it Signed: Chuck McDowell Kearns Community Council

Comment 237

Comment 238

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Jeppson, Theron
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
Looking through the list of residential and business impacts for the 5800 west route, I noticed that the are tables filled up with the same address over and over. Why? I also noticed that many of the residences that will be impacted are listed as business impacts solely based on the fact that they are owned by a LLC, government agency, utility company, or other. These are still residence dwellings, shouldn't they be listed as such, and not businesses in teh DEIS? A little deceitful don't you think.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1A

35.1.1A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Jeppson, Theron
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
I keep hearing about the massive budget shortfall or lack of funds for transportation needs in the state. Then UDOT goes and selects the 5800 West corridor as their preferred route for the MVC, which will cost a lot more than the 7200 West route, have a greater impact on local residences and local businesses. Does this make any sense? Even better why not build the MVC along U-111, UDOT already owns most of the right-of-way through that corridor and that is where the growth is going, especially with Kenncofts plans for more Day Break style communities. Put the MVC on U-111 and find a good east-west route, where the need is real, not another north-south freeway. Also UDOT needs to look more into alternative modes of transportation. The solution isn't always to build more and more freeways (just look at southern California) the solution is in providing residents with more options than just always using a motor vehicle to get from once place to another.

Comment 239

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Lewis, Connie
Location: Kearns, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Connie Lewis. I would like you to call me back. I have some concerns about the Mountain View Corridor. I think there are other ways to handle it. But my main concern is that you allowed your phone number to be printed in the newspaper to allow residents to call to see if their property is going to be impacted by the road and then there is no way to reach anyone. an you are giving me a 2-day call back? That's kind of irresponsible. If you don't have enough people to man the phones, then you need to get some more people. I would like you to call me back. I am interested to know if my property is impacted.

Comment 240

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Horst, Rick
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
 On behalf of the South Jordan City, its citizens and elected officials, we are pleased to see the progress toward finalizing the environmental impact study relating to the Mountain View Corridor. While South Jordan City is pleased with the alignment and conditions as presented in the Statement as it pertains to the corridor within our jurisdiction, we also recognize that this will require new options and methods to fund. We desire to reiterate once again that we would have significant concerns should South Valley citizens be given the burden of funding the majority of the Mountain View Corridor via a toll road, a project now estimated to cost approximately two (2) billion dollars. As the southwest end of the valley grows economically, the return on local investments, as local citizens will bare the majority burden of paying for the corridor, will be distributed throughout the state in terms of sales tax revenue sharing policies and income tax in support of statewide school systems. UDOT will be a beneficiary of this economic growth as well. If the citizen of state, county, and local governments are to be beneficiaries of our economic growth, should they not participate in the cost of infrastructure investment? We who serve directly, on a day to day basis, here in South Jordan City and in other jurisdictions who will be impacted by a tolling decision, know that our citizenry will not use the system, not pay the proposed toll, and seek alternative routes that will create significant demands on local government and create a failure in local transportation systems. We know the Transportation Commission has the authority to create a toll road, we trust that they will be conscious of the desires of our citizens and provide a fair and equitable process to fund this very important corridor.

Comment 241

Comment 242

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Struthers, Kim
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am strongly opposed to UDOT's preferred 2100 North alignment. The 2100 North alignment impacts existing neighborhoods with relocations, and noise and pollution issues for those who remain. It creates a physical barrier that could limit emergency vehicle response times to the NW quadrant of the city and also makes it more difficult to provide other services. It also creates awkward frontage roads, creates a very messy interchange at I-15, and impacts future commercial properties at I-15. I strongly support Lehi's proposed 4800 North alignment with 2100 North as an arterial road. The main advantage to moving the connection to 4800 North (with 2100 North as an arterial) is that it would provide greater east west mobility (two east west routes instead of one). With the growth taking place in northwest Utah County, the more east west road options the better. From the information provided by Lehi City the 4800 North connection is also less expensive and has less environmental impacts. It is the shortest distance between MVC and I-15. There are very little impacts to homes and it appears much of the right of way is held by different government entities, making impacts and ROW costs less. When I look at other bridges that have been built, including the new bridge in front of Deer Creek Dam I don't see why a bridge cannot be designed and built to cross the Jordan narrows at 4800 North. There is a natural peninsula of land on the west side of I-15 that would be ideal to route the MVC across to shorten the length of the bridge that would be required. For the above stated reasons, I would ask that you please consider Lehi's 4800 North option, it just makes more sense. Thank you for your consideration.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Ulmer, Tiffany & Adam
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Please give us a free way and not another Salt Lake City valley of a million stoplights to go East/West. While I would personally prefer a more Southern Route than the 2100 N, I still think this route is the best alternative for Eagle Mtn and Saratoga Springs and all of Cedar Valley.


35.2.6A

Comment 243

Comment 244

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Holley, Mark
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I believe the 2100 North option is best. The 4800 North option preferred by Lehi is too far north to be a viable option for people to the west of Lehi, and it's only going to further delay a road that is sorely needed. It's frustrating that our elected officials in Lehi are so adamant about the 4800 North alternative. Lehi decided to become one of the largest cities geographically in the state, and a consequence of this is the possibility of being divided by another freeway. This should have been thought of when the city went on annex binges over the past several years. For the record, I'm a Lehi resident, but I don't believe the city's elected officials are in agreement with most residents on this issue. The southern freeway would turn the MV corridor into the Legacy Parkway because the Sierra Club would become heavily involved. In the interest of full disclosure, I live in south Lehi, but even before I lived in this area I found the southern freeway option to be a poor choice, mainly because opposition to this option would make the Legacy Parkway battle look like a minor disagreement, and the amount of homes that would be replaced is substantially more than other options.

35.2.7C

35.2.6B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Knutsen, David & Marsha
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I would like to comment about the Mountain View Corridor. I feel that it's important that we go ahead and try to put that road in around 4800 North in Lehi as I think it would be able to handle more traffic. It would keep away many of the vehicles from the middle of the city as well as the north side of Lehi. It would create a lot less problems regarding the residents of Lehi. And would help the city not be divided any more than it already is. I think it would require fewer relocations as well and overall would just be a better way to go. So that is 4800 North. If you have any questions, you can call me. Thank you and I appreciate your concern.


35.2.9A

Comment 245

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McArthur, Lisa
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am greatly opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal. It negatively impacts neighborhoods, businesses, and wildlife in that area. I know that the Lehi City Council favors a 4800 North connector which as a concerned Lehi citizen I do also. That option would be much better for the citizens of Lehi.

Comment 246

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

35.2.7B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bonham, Ryan & Amy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am frustrated with the things that UDOT has been doing with the connector that is truly needed for those that live on the far west side of Utah County. UDOT has reported that they have spent a lot of time reviewing the solutions and going over possible answers to the growth issues but the current "preferred solution" (connector at 2100 North) has only been an option since February 2007 and was proposed as the "preferred solution" a few months after it had been conceptualized. I do not think we should delay a decision just to delay it, however, I do feel that UDOT is rushing to a decision while Lehi City's plan has not been reasonably considered. Lehi City had a plan for a connector that is much more suitable for those involved. When I attended the UDOT community meeting in Lehi last summer UDOT officials simply waved off the plan that Lehi City had and would not talk about it. From research I have seen the Lehi City Master plan is a much better plan for citizens of the community, traffic capacity, health impact and is what I support. Another major concern that I have is that UDOT is advertising the connector as a depressed freeway. I sincerely question UDOT's research. The houses that will be destroyed in order to build the freeway have had flooding issues. If these houses have flooding issues and the water table is that high, how is it feasible to have a depressed freeway? Most likely UDOT is trying to get the depressed freeway passed and will then have to change the freeway to a raised freeway, due to "unforeseen issues". If you really want the people's decision you should listen to the City Council and Mayor of Lehi, who is elected by the people and is the voice of the people. The simple fact that UDOT's direction has not changed or slowed with all that people are saying and the City is doing, is proof enough that asking for input from residents is UDOT's smoke screen of political correctness.

Comment 247


Comment 248

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

35.2.9A




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Edelman, Dustin & Beth
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 As you have most likely heard from many I am opposed to the 2100 north freeway in Lehi. We are first time home buyers and our house will be severely affected by the freeway. I am understanding that it would be cheaper to use 2100 north but sometimes I believe that you should look out for the people who you are greatly impacting. I have made many objections and I am sure that it doesn't matter, however I hope that people have a heart and will understand that they should move the interchange north to the point of the mountain and use the alteriors and not affect the home values. I cannot understand how you decide to impact residents when there are other options that will not affect the residents. To me that is what is most bothersome. Sometimes the easy way out is not the smartest. Pleast consider this! THank you, dustin edelman



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Glazier, Bryon & Sherry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I strongly urge you to reconsider your original choice. The Lehi City Proposal is cheaper, it moves more traffic, and affects fewer homes, businesses, and wetlands. It is clearly a better alternative. Do not move forward with the 2100 N. Freeway! The Lehi City Proposal is far better! Thanks for listening to the people.

Comment 249

Comment 250

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Martin, Tanya
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because of the negative impact it will have on nearby neighborhoods. This includes negative health and economic impacts that will not be compensated by the state or UDOT. I feel like the proposal for 2100 N. was thrown in at the last minute because of negative feedback further south. I am concerned that the research has been rushed because of deadlines and that all potential options have not been adequately studied. There is a lot of talk about a 4800 N. connector and my question is why that option has never been fully addressed and studied by UDOT. I think we all want an option that will meet long-term transportation needs. Since I am one of those people who will be hurt by it rather than helped I want to know why the other option proposed by Lehi City has never been on the UDOT drawing board and received a fair economic analysis comparable to the other alternatives.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Rush, Chuck & Claudette
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:


I am against the 2100 N. connector proposal because it will negatively impact people and wildlife.

35.2.7A

Comment 251

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Osborne, KaiLynne
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 My name is Kaylynn Osborne and my phone number is 801.766.1999. I'd very much like to talk to somebody about the Mountain View proposal because I am definitely for the connector at 2100 North and I do not like the dirty campaigning that the current Lehi City administration is doing. So give me a call.

Comment 252

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Turner, Linda A.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 We have already told you before that we thought the 2100 North connector in Lehi is a bad idea because on the devastating impact it will have to the Lehi Community. Once again, the more northern option proposed by Lehi city and the concerned citizens of Lehi is the option that will be the best in the end. It will allow for continued growth up north, maintain property values, still provide good transportation, and most importantly, not once again divide Lehi. We love the small town feel that we continue to enjoy despite our growth. Having a second, major freeway cutting through our community will make that almost impossible. Please, please, put the freeway further up north. Spare our community this divisive invasion.


Comment 253

Comment 254

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Martin, Jake
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 Please do not send the Mountain View Corridor through the 2100 North Pointe Meadows area! There are better alternatives for our communities.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Lundwall, Jaime
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

Comment:
 November 14, 2007 To Whom It May Concern: This letter is to inform you that the 4800 North alternative is the best option for the Mountain View Corridor. It would be a huge mistake to build the 2100 North option. It would cost less money, effect less people, and better serve the community at large to build the 4800 North alternative. There are neww communities that would be dramatically and negatively affected by the 2100 North option. Young children who live very close to that prosed area would be exposed to the carcinogenic pollutants that would come from at the congestion and traffic. There lives and their family's lives would forever be changed by the wrong decision to only look at the 2100 North alternative. Why not keep the traffic out of the peaceful community of 2100 North? The traffic that would be using the Mountain View comdor is not looking at 2100 North as their final destination. They all want to get to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. Do NOT ruin another community, just so the traffic can get to these other cities. Keep the traffic to the north and let the people get to where they need to go without hurting another community. This would be accomplished by building the freeway at 4800 North. PLEASE, consider this option carefully. It just make more sense and the City of Lehi is behind this plea! If the freeway was to be built at 2100 North, there would be dramatic increase in pollution and the drastic effect that will have on us and the health of our children if the proposed 2100 North Freeway and Mountain View Corridor are constructed. It is a proven medical fact that cancer predisposition happens before the age of 2 in a child. We are all familiar with a "Red" day in terms of air quality; the doctor mentioned that breathing the air on a red day is the equivalent to smoking a 1/2 pack of cigarettes. This is what our children would be faced with everyday. Something to think about as you consider preparing a comment to UDOT is who will benefit from the 2100 North Freeway and the Mountain West Corridor? Also to consider, who will NOT benefit. It is pretty clear that our children who live in the surrounding communities will suffer adverse effects. Not to mention, who will pay for this large project? By allowing this freeway to go forward, we are sacrificing the health and safety of our children and families. Please do not hurt the children and families who live near 2100 North. Build the freeway at 4800 North. It just makes more sense! Do not bring traffic to 2100 North where it would cost more money, hurt more children and families and not solve the traffic issues at hand! Please consider the 4800 North Alternative! Jaime Lunwall Mountain West Small Business Finance and concerned citizen

Comment 255

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Lundwall, Jaime
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment:
November 14, 2007 To Whom It May Concern: This letter is to inform you that the 4800 North alternative is the best option for the Mountain View Corridor. It would be a huge mistake to build the 2100 North option. It would cost less money, effect less people, and better serve the community at large to build the 4800 North alternative. There are neww communities that would be dramatically and negatively affected by the 2100 North option. Young children who live very close to that prosed area would be exposed to the carcinogenic pollutants that would come from at the congestion and traffic. There lives and their family's lives would forever be changed by the wrong decision to only look at the 2100 North alternative. Why not keep the traffic out of the peaceful community of 2100 North? The traffic that would be using the Mountain View comdor is not looking at 2100 North as their final destination. They all want to get to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. Do NOT ruin another community, just so the traffic can get to these other cities. Keep the traffic to the north and let the people get to where they need to go without hurting another community. This would be accomplished by building the freeway at 4800 North. PLEASE, consider this option carefully. It just make more sense and the City of Lehi is behind this plea! If the freeway was to be built at 2100 North, there would be dramatic increase in pollution and the drastic effect that will have on us and the health of our children if the proposed 2100 North Freeway and Mountain View Corridor are constructed. It is a proven medical fact that cancer predisposition happens before the age of 2 in a child. We are all familiar with a "Red" day in terms of air quality; the doctor mentioned that breathing the air on a red day is the equivalent to smoking a 1/2 pack of cigarettes. This is what our children would be faced with everyday. Something to think about as you consider preparing a comment to UDOT is who will benefit from the 2100 North Freeway and the Mountain West Corridor? Also to consider, who will NOT benefit. It is pretty clear that our children who live in the surrounding communities will suffer adverse effects. Not to mention, who will pay for this large project? By allowing this freeway to go forward, we are sacrificing the health and safety of our children and families. Please do not hurt the children and families who live near 2100 North. Build the freeway at 4800 North. It just makes more sense! Do not bring traffic to 2100 North where it would cost more money, hurt more children and families and not solve the traffic issues at hand! Please consider the 4800 North Alternative! Jaime Lunwall Mountain West Small Business Finance and concerned citizen

Comment 256

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Greenwood, Karl
Location: Provo, UT

35.2.13A
35.2.6A

Comment:
I'd strongly urge that some alternative be built at the Southern Freeway alignment. In order to allow better flow of traffic from the growing Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain, and Cedar Fort communities to Provo and other areas of central and southern Utah County, a more direct alternative should be provided (or at a minimum land obtained and later provided). I am afraid that the current preferred alternative would facilitate the travel between Salt Lake County and central Utah County without providing alleviation to the traffic within Utah County.

Comment 257


Comment 258

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A

35.2.7A
35.2.8A




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Belliston, Peter
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Regarding the Mountain Vie Corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi - As a resident of Saratoga Springs, I think the location is ridiculous and do not see it being used by anyone in the south part of Saratoga Springs nor Eagle Mountain to reach I15. For a destination north on I15 the proposed connector goes too far east and requires one to then go back toward the west on I15. U68 to Bangerter Highway would still be preferred. For those with a south destination on I15 the connector is too far to the north and out of the way, requiring one to then travel back to the south. U73 or the "farm route" would still be preferred.



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hellewell, Ryan
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I think that the 2100 North connector is not the solution to Utah counties traffic problem. True wetlands need to be considered, but so do many other factors, such as the loss of comercial property that the 2100 N freeway creates, and the fact that it does not serve Lehi, only the western cities like Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. In addition the Arterials Alternative, protects wetlands, prevents huge impacts in any one area, and serves a larger portion of Utah county. This is the better option for those of us who actually live here.

Comment 259

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Keele, Heather
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 Hi I'm calling regarding the proposed freeway connector at 2100 N. in Lehi. And I am calling to let you know that I am very, very, very opposed to such an endeavor. My family lives only a few miles away from there and I know there are so many families in this area with so many children. And it just seems completely irresponsible of UDOT to build something so close that can negatively affect so many people. I know that the Lehi City Council has proposed a different freeway connector area. That makes so much more sense it would not require the replacement of families the negative effect on other ones. The families are so young It's awful that UDOT would do something like this. You can contact me. My name is Heather Keele, I'm a mother myself and I know every body in the neighborhood would hate having it here. It would bring our property values down so much, but that's not the most important thing. The most important thing is the safety of children here, the crime that such a freeway would bring it's not a matter of it, but when. And the negative health impact it would also have. My name is Heather Keele and I live in Lehi. My number is 801.786 4196. I will be having all of my neighbors call also call you guys and tell you. I thank you for having this line and for asking for our opinion. I beg you to please reconsider this. Thank you very much. Again, thank you for having this line available.

Comment 260

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Atwood, Jay & Anna Mae
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 My preference for the connection of the MountainView Corridor to I-15 is that proposed by the city of Lehi for the reasons that they have previously submitted to UDOT.

Comment 261

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Baker, Nathan Baker
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I do not desire to be insulting to the past evaluations however logic and reason must apply in all issues. My concerns are centered around the southern connector between the West and East sides. I believe there is a simple understanding of the need to get traffic between the two. The events of the past decades have proven valuable for us today. Years of growth and traffic on I-15 have proven several things: -The Point of the Mountain is dangerous to travel in the winter -Growth and construction have caused removal of millions of tons of rock and gravel from the Point of the Mountain. -The closest distance between two points is a straight line -The least expensive construction occurs when no buildings or other structures must be removed -The shorter the road the least expensive it is to build -The least amount of disruption to wetlands is most economical I purpose the following as the very best solution which in my mind has generational value to the monies that will be spent on this project: -The disappearance of the Point of the Mountain would allow I-15 to be slightly rerouted to path just South of the Utah State Prison-through the gravel pits North of the current freeway-through the narrows by Camp Williams-passing through the gravel pits South of the Point of the Mountain-reconnecting with the current I-15 North of Cabela's-This routing would allow a short bridge to be constructed across the railroad tracks and Jordan River just East of Camp Williams at an optimum height -Connection to the Redwood corridor could be made just South of Camp Williams -Construct two boulevards East to West at 2100 North and 1000 South in Lehi which would not divide the city This reconstruction would make the corridor safer to travel, would satisfy the needs, and would cost less to maintain over the decades to come. Please give this serious consideration and forget about trying to connect the East and West down 2100 North, Lehi. You know it is not the wise thing to do. Thank You

35.1.1E

35.2.8A

Comment 262

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: LaMalfa, Kyle
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

Comment:

Do not build the new freeway. Our air is already bad enough. Utah's kids need a chance to grow up without asthma. A better option would be to expand mass-transit opportunities before expanding new roads.

35.12.1A
35.2.3A

Comment 263

Comment 264

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Johnson, Melea
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am absolutely outraged about the new freeway plan! We built a brand new home in Lehi and now we are being told there is going to be a freeway less than 100 yards away???????? We built here for the location. If we wanted to be next to a freeway, we would have built a home there!! Our community was nicely constructed and now there will be a freeway dividing it all up. Why cant there be a freeway leading east to west in an area that does not have a bunch of homes already built???

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Osier, Jon
Location: , UT

Comment:
When will hard copies of the MVC DEIS be available at: FedEx Kinko's - Salt Lake County Location 5616 S Redwood Rd, Taylorsville Spoke with someone at the Taylorsville Kinko's and they were unaware of having said document.

35.31A

Comment 265

Comment 265 (continued)

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↪



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Mower, Gary
Location: Taylorsville, UT

Comment:

General comments on all alternatives: 1) Mass Transit: Alternatives to the automobile trip need to be supported by providing alternate modes of transportation through transit. A stronger mass-transit presence throughout the corridor is needed. Build mass transit first before the freeway. Transit should be built before a roadway to allow transit-oriented land uses to become established. 2) Impact on Salt Lake County east/west routes needs to be addressed better: Another north/south route in Salt Lake will significantly impact east/west travel. Learn from the mistakes of Bangerter Highway. Bangerter Highway was supposed to ease traffic congestion, help Utah's economic growth, and all the other goals and promises that the Mountain View Corridor has. Bangerter Highway has increased traffic congestion (especially east/west) and unless this is better addressed the MVC will follow the same mistakes created with building Bangerter Highway. 3) Pedestrian and Bike routes throughout the MVC should be a high-priority: Another major roadway will make conditions worse for pedestrians and bicyclists. There is a lack of continuous pedestrian/bicycle facilities already in this area and MVC promises more discontinuous routes. Currently, there are no continuous north-south or east-west pedestrian/bicycle facilities in the study area. There is a need to improve the availability of pedestrian/bicycle facilities as an alternative to travel by automobile. A multi-use trail was included with all freeway alternatives to be consistent with the long-range transportation plans for Salt Lake and Utah Counties, however it is not continuous. The MVC has many obstacles to practical, easy, and safe pedestrian and bicycle travel, most of which are not addressed. Add bicycle and pedestrian trails throughout the corridor. 4) Use less right of way: Six-lane configurations would be acceptable for both the Salt Lake and Utah County alternatives, there is no need to purchase additional land for eight lanes. Building less lanes and building narrower lanes are one way to provide for the additional right of way needed for a multiuse trail. The less land paved over and devoted to automobiles the better. 5) Transit trips undercounted: The Travel Demand Model's ability to predict transit ridership is flawed. See TRAX undercounts as an example. Comments on why I prefer the 7200 West alternative to the 5800 West alternative: 1) Building the freeway along the 5800 West alternative will impact the surrounding community more than 7200 West. 2) 5800 West would cost \$100,000,000 more than 7200 West. With the concerns raised about funding this project, a savings of \$100,000,000 is significant. 3) The proposed 7200 West freeway alignment follows two existing edges - 7200 West and the political boundary between Magna and West Valley City. 4) 5800 West has a greater negative impact on community cohesion and quality of life: 5800 West creates a physical separation in the area that decreases cohesion. 5800 West further separates from the larger residential area residential neighborhoods east of the existing power corridor. Other community impacts will occur from the alteration of community gathering places such as Hunter Park, Hillside Elementary, and Hunter High School. 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. Page 9-49 states, "in summary, the 5800 West Freeway Alternative would not divide communities enough to change the cohesive nature of the area." I don't believe this statement. How can anything be more divisive than putting an eight lane freeway in the middle of West Valley City? Look at I-15, I-80, I-215, and Bangerter Highway as examples of how a major roadway divides communities. 5) Building the freeway on 7200 West will impact less people: It is further away from residential areas and won't split up residential areas. 6) 5800 West is too close to Bangerter Highway. Building a freeway to ease traffic congestion within two miles of a highway that was recently built to ease traffic congestion doesn't make sense. If something is not working, then don't keep doing the same thing. The freeway should be placed further west for access for people in that area as well. 7) 5800 West has greater impact on schools: Avoid building a freeway close to schools. What are the plans to ensure the safety of

35.2.3A

35.1.1A

35.11A

35.2.1C

35.2.3B

35.2.4B

35.2.4C

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↪
35.2.4B



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


en? Walking/biking to school and air quality around schools should be a concern. 8) The 5800 West Freeway takes land away from two schools and a park in West Valley City. 9) Don't sandwich residents in a closely enclosed area between a transit way on 5600 West and a freeway on 5800 West. 10) 7200 West provides sufficient capacity to meet the project's purpose. 11) Travel time is same between 5800 West and 7200 West alternatives. 12) 7200 West impacts less farmland. Farmland is a rare and shrinking commodity in Salt Lake. 13) 7200 W has less utility conflicts.

Comment 266

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Newman, Wade
Location: South Jordan, UT

Comment:
 I am strongly opposed to turning the Mountain View corridor into a toll road. I attend the Utah Taxpayers' Association's annual conference so I recognize the obstacle of limited resources - but I believe that the currently popular (for over-promising politicians) toll road trend would prove to be a regret if implemented in the Wasatch Front for a number of reasons.


Comment 267

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A

35.2.3A
35.12.4A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Dehart, Elizabeth
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 I understand the need of the corridor. I am fortunate I can travel on Bacchus to get downtown. Others in my area aren't so lucky. I would love to see tolls enforced on all Semi trucks, Diesel trucks (including those with more than one occupant), and all other vehicles with only one occupant in them. I believe that will alleviate the concern of increased pollution that comes with a new highway. The only way to make the highway work is to provide a Trax line from 1-80, near the proposed airport line) into Lehi in conjunction with the highway and to NOT allow stoplights like the flawed Bangerter Highway but rather on/off ramps. More pollutants are released into the air with stop and go traffic than with traffic that is constantly moving as evidenced by this study located on page two of this pdf file located here:
<http://www.aaaai.org/patients/advocate/2005/fall/fall05.pdf> or to quote the study "Infants living within 100 meters of "stop and go" traffic wheezed twice as often as those living within 400 meters of interstates, and more than three times as often as infants living in unexposed areas."

Comment 268

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.4B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: , UT

Comment:
I think the 7200 West freeway alternative for the Mountain View Corridor is the better option. I believe with the growth projected for areas further west in the future, this will accomodate better for that. This option also doesn't interfere with as many already developed residential areas. There is more open land to build the free way through. I personally don't agree with the 5800 W freeway alternative because I live in an residential area that lies between 5800 W and 5900 W. My concerns are that my neighborhood will eventually become less appealing to home owners and become more rental homes. This will cause the value of the neighborhood to depreciate. Right now, my neighborhood is a peaceful, nice area to live. Many of the people in my neighborhood are home owners and have families. The 5800 W alternative will actually run right through the middle of my neighborhood and I feel it will cause a split and disruption to the peacefulness it has at this time. The neighborhood is not very hold, the homes are 15 or so years old, and there are many newer homes going up further out west as we speak. Taking advantage of the more open, free land further west would be best so that it doesn't disrupt many of our already existing residential neighborhoods.

Comment 269

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Wosnjuk, Tony
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
West Utah County is in desperate need for easier access. Right now is a bedroom city but with better roads that way we could attract business as well as new residents. Please, I'm sure we can find ways were the animals and humans can live together. I'm sure we can come with projects where we can reforest Lake Mountain and other areas in the west side. Build the ROAD ... we need it.


Comment 270

Comment 271

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1B



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Roberts, Steven
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

Comment:
 I wonder if a Provo by-pass at this time would be more beneficial, ie extend the freeway south on the west side of Utah Lake rather than trying to tie into I-15 in Lehi. Has that been considered?

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McBride, Kerry
Location: Perry, UT


Comment:
 The plans for the Mountain View Corridor preferentially favor individual motor vehicles. This preference then favors increased pollution, urban sprall, and effectively subsidizes home builders to build housing farther and farther out by making it more accessible. My preference is to put in public transit FIRST, and not later as an afterthought. If public transit is convenient, and readily accessible in projected growth areas (and if highways are not as convenient), then this will have three important benefits: 1) Decrease pollution as growth continues; 2) Reduce our area's contribution to green house gases; and 3) help to reduce increased demand for oil from foreign countries in volatile regions in the world. Consideration should also be provided for greenways that provide safe routes for those who want to commute by bicycle. After and only after a good public transit network is in place should we consider increasing highways and highway size. By doing so, the use of that good public transit network will be highly encouraged. Note, I reside in Perry. But since I work for ATK, there is a high probability I may be transferred to Bacchus some day.

Comment 272

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Cresse, Sandra
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
 Enough already. After we bought our house in 1992 we were told, "Why did you buy there? Did you know they are going to build a highway?" Thankfully we ignored the comment, and have crafted a house into a home to raise our five sons, and developed such close ties with our neighbors that it hurts to think it is all going to come to an end. If it is going to come to an end, and you are going to take out my neighborhood along the 5800 W corridor, please just do it. Do you know how difficult it has been these last four years having our lives on hold? Thinking any day your house is going to be taken. Not doing the projects you want to do around the house because it would just be a waste of money when the bulldozers come. I have never seen such a slow painful process. Is it really fair to tell someone they will be uprooted and have their life out of control in the next 5-20 years? Why do we have all these comment periods of time? Do they help? The road will be built, and the needs of the many will outweigh the needs of the few. But please stop this unending torture so we can move on with our lives.

Comment 273

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Cresse, Richard
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the Mountain View Corridor because you are uprooting my life, and I will never be able to replace what I currently have. Have you seen the prices of houses? None of the houses have any property. I have five boys, and we need a big yard. Where will I be able to find a house big enough with an acre lot? Where will I find a place where my boys can build, play and grow? Where will I be able to show them a deer in their backyard, and fox from our patio door, and pheasants as next door neighbors? Any house that has all that is way out of my price range, or too far of a commute especially with the price of gas. I did not know if you knew all of this was available in West Valley City, but it is, and it would be a crying shame to lose all of this just for a highway.

Comment 274

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: HARDING, SEAN
Location: MAGNA, UT

Comment:
 THIS IS A BAD IDEA . THIS MOUNTIAN VIEW CORRIDOR AFFECTS ME TWICE . ONE IF IT GOES DOWN 7200 W IT AFFECTS MY AREA AND MY HOME. TWO IT AFFECTS MY LAND IN AMERICAN FORK WHICH HAS BEEN OWNED BY FAMILY FOR CENTURIES AND NOW IF YOU CLAIM IT S IMMENT DOMAIN WE LOOSE IT BAD BAD IDEA

Comment 275

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: Coop, Parker
Location: Salt Lake, UT


Comment:
 My company is developing property at 5600 W. and 820 S. The Parcel number is 1411200021. We need information about how the new roadway will impact 5600 W. Will the road go up over the railroad?

Comment 276

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Taylor, Deon
Location: West Jordan, UT


Comment:
 Living within 1/2 mile of the approved corridor, I would first like to see light rail go in before it is determined if we really need another freeway. I really want a TRAX option on the west side. My family would much rather use TRAX than another freeway option.

Comment 277

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Winger, Mike
Location: WVC, UT

Comment:
 Re: Toll Collection on MVC in general I am a supporter of toll roads, particularly if the road could be considered as an alternate route. However, I don't believe the MVC can realistically be considered an "alternate route". Rather, it is a long overdue supplement to our existing highway system. This plan, if approved, appears to be unfair to west side residents; Anyone living on the east side of the valley between 2100 S & 6400 S has access to a "free freeway" within approx. 15 blocks of their homes. Many of us who will have to contend with the MVC in our very backyard, will have to travel at least twice that distance to obtain access to a non-toll road. If the gas taxes paid on this side of the valley are the same as those on the east side, why should we have to pay to have reasonable access to the freeway system. Everyone, including east side residents, will benefit from the easing of traffic congestion on I-15 / I-215 if people are encouraged to use the MVC. If additional sources of revenue are needed, perhaps a surcharge on new and future home construction would be appropriate. After all, they are responsible for the overwhelming shift in traffic patterns.

Comment 278

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.8A
35.2.10A
35.12.1A
35.2.3A
35.1.1A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Devey, Jennifer
Location: Riverton, UT

Comment:
 I have concerns that in my area, Riverton, the MVC is redundant. We do not need or want the MVC and the Bangerter HWY to cross, both within 2 miles, everytime we drive somewhere. We have had enough traffic problems with the intersection at Bangerter and 13400 south and 12600 south !!! To have another intersection to cross would only add to our driving time. I think the toll idea is terrible. If the state can't find other ways to fund the MVC, they should wait on the whole project. I will NOT pay a toll to use the road. I'm not convinced that a superhighway is the best way to solve the problems. Our air quality, even in this quadrant of the valley has been worsening every year. The highway will only make it worse. How about some usable mass transit for this part of the valley? That would be far more useful. Or some express routes that go east and west? We already have 2 or 3 that go north and south, depending on how you count 215. It take forever to drive east/west and I'm tired of it. I don't need to drive downtown or to Utah county!!!!!!

Comment 279

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31G



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Ludwig, Adam
Location: West Valley, UT

Comment:
 We would just like an answer on if your going to build the freeway on 5800 West or not. We have been renovating our house room by room and we were planning on putting an extension on the house. An answer would let us know if we should start saving for a new house or keep fixing up our home.

Comment 280

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Menéndez, Marcos
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am in favor of the 2100 Freeway alternative as your studies show few impact on residential, business, historic and wetland areas. In addition with the additional study to build an arterial along 1000 south in Lehi in land that has already been set aside for it I see as unnecessary to build a freeway along 1900 south that will adversely impact wetlands which cover the area extensively. GO for the proposed 2100 freeway alternative.

35.2.7C

Comment 281

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Christensen, Judy
Location: , UT

Comment:
I would like to know exactly how the Mountain View Corridor is going to affect my daughter who has just moved to 13452 S. 5000 W. Is the corridor going to go right through her house or close? Please call me.

35.6.3A

Comment 282

Comment 283

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Sandoval, Dan
Location: , UT

Comment:
My name is Dan Sandoval. I am a resident of WJ and I was hoping to speak to someone in your group. I saw your ad in the WJ journal. I am with "the breeze" radio and want to know if you guys are planning any radio advertising.

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Cable, Heather
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
I would like the new corridor to be put at 5800 West. I think that makes the most sense. I think the people in the center, from 215 over to the mountain, need something; need a freeway entrance closer than going all the way over to 2700 West or further west. 7200 West seems like too much of a span. I live at 5200 West and having a freeway access at 5800 West would be awesome and I think there is perfect space there. So that's my opinion and that's where I would like it. Thanks.

35.2.4A

Comment 284

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Perry, Dee
Location: , UT

35.2.4A

Comment:
I am calling to let you know how I feel about the Mountain View Corridor and where I would like it. I would like it at the 5800 West freeway alternative. My name, if you need it, is Dee Perry. My number, if you need it, is 252-8474. You do not need to call me back. Again, my vote is 5800 freeway alternative. Thank you.

Comment 285

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: , Amy
Location: Salt Lake City, UT

35.31A


Comment:
Can we get a hard copy of the DEIS for the Government Documents section of the Marriott Library? We have a reading room in which we keep hard copies of all state planning documents. Thanks.

Comment 286

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: Brandt, Dan
Location: , UT


Comment:
 My client has property that is impacted by the project. It leaves a small sliver that is basically unusable. Will he be compensated for it at all?

Comment 287

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A
35.2.6A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Green, Will
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
 I am a resident of Eagle Mountain (city center) and have a substantial commute every day that includes traveling on SR-73 (aka Lehi Main Street). My wife, two sons and I commute (generally carpool) to Pleasant Grove and Lindon. If there is any kind of "vote", we are in favor of the Southern Freeway Alternative. That is the most direct route for southbound traffic. While the 2100 North Freeway Alternative would provide a freeway, it seems to me that we would have to compete with northbound traffic to get to I-15, then end up with a longer commute along I-15. This portion of freeway (between Lehi and Orem) is already prone to a great deal of congestion during the morning and afternoon commute. With the Southern Freeway Alternative, we could bypass this. The same would be true for a large population of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs, a population that is growing rapidly. We are very opposed to the Arterials Alternative as that just seems like another Bangerter Highway waiting to happen. Bangerter Highway is painful to use with all the lights. I used to use this road to commute to West Valley during I-15 construction, and it was constantly backed up. Along with the extra time the commute took, my gas mileage was severely reduced. I do find it interesting that there are so many disputes over the area that would be involved with the Southern Freeway Alternative, especially since I have heard of another project (not part of the Mountain View Corridor) to route traffic from I-15 to Redwood Road in this same area. I know there is a great deal more to this issue than just the needs of my family. I understand that there are more cities involved than just Eagle Mountain. I also understand that there are financial, environmental and political factors. I would just like to add my voice and opinion to a project that has a great impact on my family. Thank you, Will Green

Comment 288

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Nye, Misty
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
I am just a little curious. I'm trying to understand these maps and would like to talk to somebody. We are actually purchasing a home not far off of 7200 West (2530 S. 7039 W.). It is a new home. And I'd like to see how this is going to impact where we have purchased this property. Please give me a call.

Comment 289

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: Johnson, Tom
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
I need to know what's going to happen to my cul-de-sac. How do I get ROW information?

Comment 290

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: , Cindy
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
 Have they made a decision yet? My home is located in an impacted area and I really need to sell it right now or I will lose it. I am on the verge of bankruptcy.

Comment 291

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: , Seth
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
 I currently own a house where that Mountain View Corridor is going to go and I just had a couple of questions. When you get a chance, if you would just give me a call back. My number is 918-5476. I have already moved and can't sell this house which is located at 5788 W. 4300 S. Are there any other options for me?

Comment 292

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Seth
Location: West Valley City, UT


Comment:
Hello my name is ? and I own the house at 5788 W. 4300 S. I was reading an article in the newspaper saying that homeowners that want to sell now, there might be funds available. I do want to sell now. If you would, just give me a call back. My number is 918-5476.

Comment 293

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: , Vladimir
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am working on a piece of property where the Mountain View Corridor goes through Redwood Road and through our property. Is the _____property Saratoga Springs and our property is next to your proposed corridor so if you can call me. Doing a subdivision at 4 corners and wanted to develop mixed use type, but if you are doing that we will go commercial.

Comment 294

Comment 295

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Garrett, Darin
Location: Eagle Mt., UT

Comment:
I strongly support the southern freeway alternative. I think dumping a freeway in the middle of saratoga springs lacks a lot in the way of relieving east /west traffic issues for eagle mt. and saratoga springs. These areas are certain to be stong growth areas for many years to come. any wet land issues i'm sure could be addressed

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Spalding, Derek
Location: Stansbury Park, UT


Comment:
I live in Tooele. My parents live in West Jordan. An actual Freeway from I-80 down to Lehi would alleviate traffic on I-15 & I-215 as well as help those on the west side get North or South quicker than what Bangeter allows. A raised freeway like I-15 would also help with sound minimization.

35.31C

Comment 296

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Corbridge, Debbie
Location: WWC, UT

Comment:
 I have been reading through the DEIS and it seems the chart in Volume 1-6A is incomplete. You only have 4 Marsha Drive Residences listed as being impacted on the 5800 W Alternative. I know there are more according to your Appendix A map and all other maps I have seen. Of course I want to know how my property fits in on the Property Impact list. Where is the rest of this information?

Comment 297

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Forman, Glen
Location: Sandy, Utah, UT

Comment:
 I am glad that things are in motion to plan for future growth. I have one comment that pertains to now. The new light at the intersestion of Hwy 111 and the New Bingham Hwy is good and adds to the safety but I am not sure why it can't be regulated according to traffic. Each morning and evening when I am going north and south I have to wait for 2 and sometimes 3 cycles while hardly any traffic is going east/west. Can't the North/South traffic be given a longer turn? By the way- I commute this way because going East and West is so cumbersom in this county.

Comment 298

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Monson, Cameron
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Please do not consider the Northern Bridge Route as proposed by the City of Lehi to be a viable alternative. This route is too far North from the City Centers of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain to provide much use and relief from the current congestion problems. Also it doesn't help those who need to commute and travel to the East and Southern areas of Utah County from the West Side of Utah Lake. Even with the 2100 N Alternative there is still a need for a East/West route South of SR-73 to I-15. I do not believe that the Northern Bridge would not do enough to relieve the congestion currently on SR-73 and the alternate side roads that are already over utilized.

Comment 299

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.6A
35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Remund, Craig
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am strongly in favor of the south freeway alternative for the mountainview corridor in utah county. I have studied this issue for some time now. The option for a freeway to handle the growing transportation needs from east to west was an important part of our decision to move to Saratoga Springs. I am concerned now that we are considering options that are not good permanent solutions for the transportation needs in an area that may grow to 200,000+ people. Lehi proposes a North freeway option that provides absolutely no benefit to Utah county. This alternative makes no sense for real transportation needs and appears to be motivated by a city government not interested in the good of the whole community. I strongly oppose this alternative. The 2100 N. freeway alternative is better, but still falls short of meeting long term needs of those traveling to southern Utah county from NW Utah county. The Arterials alternative is about the same. The best long term solution is the south freeway alternative. This alternative allows for efficient travel north to SL county and south to the rest of Utah county. I recognize the environmental impact on the north end of Utah lake, but I believe a freeway can be built w/out creating a major impact on the wetlands there. I also think this transportation need outweighs the impact to this part of the environment. I encourage the MVC committee to consider long term solutions and not settle for a lesser solution, as has been done too often in the past. Please choose the south freeway alternative.

Comment 300

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Telephone
Name: Brown, Lynn
Location: Bluffdale, UT

Comment:
Where is it going to go? In my area does it parallel Redwood Road? Explain Porter Rockwell? I thought it was at 150th, but this map says it is at 160th. I will follow the information, but I don't have any other comments at this time.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gerald, Jarrah
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I think this is the BEST plan available!!!! It is exactly what makes the most sense economically as well as developmentally. I stand behind your decision to build at 2100 North in Lehi. I believe you have researched and reasoned appropriately and have come up with the best route.

Comment 302

Comment 303


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A

35.2.4A
35.2.6A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Pack, Darin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I prefer Lehi's plan.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Haslam, Tye
Location: WEst Valley City, UT


Comment:
The 5800 west is the best option. It has been discussed as a transportation comidoor ever since I can remember. Impact is minimal. However, transit needs need to be satisfied before a freeway is even considered. We MUST stop driving!!!

Comment 304

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Moore, Robert
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
 The corridor path through 2100 North in Lehi I completely support. It will be a cheaper cost and I think it is greatly needed. I even live on 1500 North close to this new road. You have my full support to build the road on that path.

Comment 305

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Steadman, David
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I strongly oppose the 2100 North Freeway in Lehi. I feel that Lehi was blindsided by UDOT in an effort to appease environmentalists. I had been to several previous open houses and at none of them was 2100 North ever mentioned as a freeway. I supported the PREVIOUS SOUTHERN FREEWAY with an alignment near 1900 SOUTH. I still feel that this is the best option. However it appears that UDOT has decided to void this option due to pressure from environmentalists (possibly not wanting a repeat of the Legacy Highway court battles). TO THE POINT: I still feel a 1900 South freeway is the best option. My second preference to this would be Lehi's proposal of a freeway at 4400 North or Porter Rockwell (the previous Northern Freeway alignment) with connector roads at 2100 North, 1000 South and 1900 South. We need a freeway that serves Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain - connector roads alone will not be adequate. That freeway needs to be on the south border of Lehi (best option) or the north border of Lehi - but not run right through the middle of the city.

Comment 306


Comment 307

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Peterson, LeAnn
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Concerning the 2100 North connector in Lehi... this road doesn't affect me directly. I live in Saratoga Springs, so I'm in favor of any connector road to come west to my town besides Lehi Main Street. It just needs to be done sooner than later. My friends won't move out here because of the lack of transportation alternatives. It has to happen some where, and from what I've read, it's the least damaging place to put it.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Steve
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am for the 2100 North Connector proposal because all traffic from Saratoga Springs uses 73 and makes my hometown of Lehi a congested, dangerous quagmire. I'd be happier and my kids safer if all that traffic moved to a 8 lane highway.

Comment 308

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Jill
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of the 2100 North connector proposal. I feel that additional byways are necessary to support the amount of traffic that the new developments have caused. I also feel that if we wait to improve the roads to alleviate the congestion there will be more several losses at hand. Currently 2100 north geographically, looks to be the best suited area to make such improvements. Without this new connector the safety of our families is at stake. Thanks!

Comment 309

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Balzotti, Tyfani
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it will negatively impact several neighborhoods, negatively impact the Jordan River ecosystem and beauty of the Jordan River trail. I am also concerned about the noise and air quality of my area. Why split Lehi in half? There has to be another solution. What about the Proposed plan of Lehi City?

Comment 310

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Frampton, Sherrie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I agree with the 2100 North connector. I feel that it will help defer traffic from Lehi Main Street. I lived in Lehi for nearly 50 years and in that general area. When I heard of this project I agreed with it and looked forward to its completion. I now live in Saratoga Springs and agree even more now than when it was first proposed. I hate to travel through Lehi any more because of the traffic. I hope this project is built soon. Thank you.

Comment 311

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Stockett, Jerry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. Please use the plan submitted by the City of Lehi.

Comment 312

Comment 313

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1C
35.2.1E
35.2.1B
35.8C

35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: White, Corban
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
After having read and looked over the maps, diagrams, and other information regarding the MVC, I have several opinions. First, I believe that in some areas of the proposed freeway it is underbuilt. It seems that the trend here in Utah is to build roads to satisfy the need that exists now rather than the need that will exist in 10, 15 or 20 years from now. Make it wide, with lots of lanes and don't neck it down towards the south end of the valley. Second, and I may be reading the map incorrectly, but it appears that there are 12 diamond interchanges and 2 single point interchanges. I believe this is far too many. I think 8-10 total interchanges would be adequate. I believe in the need to access the freeway but too many interchanges will cause extra congestion. Third, With regards to the Utah County connection, I believe that the ideal connection would be somewhere between University Parkway and Provo Center Street but I realize that the large lake in the way would pose a good size problem. That being the case, I believe that the ideal solution would be the Southern Freeway Alternative AND the 2100 North Alternative. The 2100 North Connector would provide access to the booming Northern Lehi area, Highland, Alpine, Cedar Hills, American Fork and the northern part of Pleasant Grove. Those wishing to continue farther south could stay on the MVC, exit in Lehi (access to Lehi, Saratoga Springs or Eagle Mountain), or continue on to I-15 to access Pleasant Grove, Lindon, Orem, Provo and points beyond. To do only one of these two options would simply not be enough. If the 2100 North was built alone, it would dump all the Utah County traffic in the north end of Lehi, causing major delays. Any traffic staying on the MVC would be dumped onto the already over-crowded Lehi Main Street. If the South Freeway is built alone than all the traffic destined for Northern Utah County would either exit on the west side of Lehi and work their way through town on surface streets or follow the MVC down to Pleasant Grove and then take I-15 back north. Neither of these are good options and would cause those heading to/from Northern Utah County to avoid the MVC. For a useful Utah County I-15 connector both alternatives need to be used. As a side note, I live 3 blocks away from the 2100 North alternative and think it is the ideal location for the connection. Many in Lehi are vocal that it is a bad location and would have extreme negative impacts. Having driven, biked, and walked the proposed location and as a nearby homeowner, I believe this to be the ideal location for said connector. I just think the other points mentioned above also need consideration-most importantly, OVERBUILD!!! The cars will come weather we like it or not, weather or not the road is big enough for them to flow nicely is up to us.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Petersen, Riley
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
After looking at the alternatives I agree that the 2100 North Connector would help traffic the most while having the least impact to existing structures and wildlife. Thanks!

Comment 314

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Smith, John
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Proceed with UDOT's plans the way the UDOT engineers designed the roads to go. Lehi had their chance to build it better with a master plan over the last 20 years and didn't.

Comment 315

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Powell, Kaye
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am very much against using 2100 as a connector road. This puts the residents in that area between two major, busily traveled roads and will cause them even more pollution and will very likely drop their property values significantly.


Comment 316

Comment 317

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Powell, William
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am against UDOT using 2100 North as a connector road. Putting the residents in that area between two majorly traveled roads puts their health at risk as well as dropping their property values.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Tadlock, Ellen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Re: Proposed Mountain View Corridor. I absolutely support what you are planning in creating a freeway from I-5 to Saratoga Springs. I think it is far sighted and will take care of the growing population for a long time to come. On the other hand, I am against the Lehi proposed alternatives which will only band-aid the situation. Yes, this will be a painful change for many whose property will be affected but by prolonging it I feel that many more will be affected in the future when the situation becomes unbearable once again. I am also frustrated by and concerned about the amount of money Lehi City has spent in publicizing their opposition. I have received multiple mailings of what appears to be expensively made mailings about this. Is there not some sort of restriction on what cities can use their funds for? You go, UDOT. And nice job.

Comment 318


Comment 319

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.1F

35.2.7A




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Calkins, Gordon
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am a resident of Lehi, but am not going to be affected by any of the corridor proposals. Building roads is one the most important jobs the government has. Although many people claim that they are pro development, the are of the NIMBY type. The truth is, economies change and adapt to change. The 2100 North corridor in Lehi should be built. Additionally, the South corridor that the Lehi City Council supports should be built too. I don't believe that there is a question of which corridor to build, but which one to build first. In order for West Utah County to continue to grow (and thereby providing new areas for our economy to grow) we must provide roads to support them. In fact, I think that UDOT has been remiss to wait this long to be asking these questions. The state should have new roads built into the open growth areas long before the areas begin to grow. Please stop wasting time and get building!



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Tuttle, Chris
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River!

Comment 320

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hart, Audrey
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

35.31C

Comment:
I love it! Living out in Saratoga Springs, I need good transportation to get to the places I need. Especially our family, being 7 miles from the 73/68 intersection. Lehi is remaining ignorant about the growing cities behind them that need good roads to get home. Lehi is becoming a commuting throughfare city, yet they try to stomp on any good roads, forcing us to drive on their neighborhood and back roads. If they put in decent transportation, I won't be forced to drive through quiet neighborhoods just to get to I-15. PLEASE PUT THIS ROAD IN!

Comment 321

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McNeil, David
Location: Lehi, UT

35.31C

Comment:
Get it built! Our city leaders are failing us by trying to fight this sight, please just get us a new road, which is desperately needed.

Comment 322

Comment 323

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Eggett, Karen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

While the 2100 N connector road may help some residents, it doesn't address the bulk of the traffic issues. The biggest traffic problem in the area is in central/south Lehi. All the residents of Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and central/south Lehi that want to go to American Fork or further south will only be helped by the Southern Freeway Alternative. Until a few months ago, I drove from southern Saratoga Springs to Orem several times a week. After 3 years of dealing with traffic on Lehi Main St and weaving through back roads, we gave up and moved. Now we live just off 1900 S in Lehi. As a resident of one of the neighborhoods that would be affected by the Southern Freeway Alternative I want to voice my support of that road. It would greatly benefit all residents on the west side of the county that are trying to get to the Orem/Provo area. I do not agree with the idea that a road would 'seperate Lehi'. On the contrary. It would connect Lehi to the rest of the valley. As for the displacement of homes, business & farms - an adequate East/West coridor should have been planned before all the building was done anyway. This area is going to continue to grow and the traffic will just get worse if this road is not put in. The longer everyone argues about and studies the options, the fewer options will be available because building is still going on. Make a plan and do it already! Rip off the bandaid, deal with the pain, and soon everything will be running smoothly. By the way, I'm looking forward to the improvements on the AF Main St on/off ramp. Everyone wondered why it wasn't done that way when the light was put in a few years ago. It should have been. Traffic was terrible getting over that overpass. I'm glad it will soon be over and cars going west won't have to wait for cars entering the southbound freeway.

35.2.13A

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: sanders, scott
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Dear Madam or Sir, I am strongly apposed to the connector at 2100 north in Lehi. This is not the best option. The connector at 4800 north is a better option. The connector at 2100 north has too many negative impacts on Lehi, loss of business property. connector at 4800 north would cost less and be shorter. This would have less impact on homes and businesses that exist.


35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment 324

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: sanders, scott
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
 We should build mass transit from provo north to salt lake city center and then look at freeways. Mass transit has far fewer impact on the environment

Comment 325

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Carlson, Frank
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
 Subject: Mountain View Corridor connector at 2100 North There is presently a LOT of traffic going through Lehi that either goes south on I-15 or else is commuting between the east and west sides of the valley. The 2100 North alternative will provide only marginal relief for this congestion. Lehi's proposal to push this connector even further north does not address this rapidly growing need and should not be taken seriously. I would like to see the connector moved further south than the 2100 North option that is currently being considered since it would be much more appropriate to handling the bulk of the east-west traffic that regularly results in gridlock through downtown Lehi.

Comment 326

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.6A
35.2.9A
35.6.3A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hughes, Don
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
The proposed 2100 North connector was never discussed when our children were buying homes at Cranberry Farms. That space next to their development was to be a school and some commercial services. It will bring the highway too close to properties there. It is unfair to the residents there and the city of Lehi to be responsible for the traffic issues of Saratoga and Eagle Mountain. Why not build the Lakeview Highway along the north shore of Utah Lake? Or the other proposal of connecting at 4800 north? Will UDOT buy back the homes of the people who have invested in a community that will be ruined by this connector? There is plenty of open space along the north shore that would have a lot less impact on our citizens and our city. While there is definately a need for some sort of connector to accomodate the people of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs, it should have as little negative impact to Lehi residents as possible.

Comment 327

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.13A
35.2.1B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Lott, Vard
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
UDOT's (and/or the State of Utah's) management of northwest Utah County has been a disgrace. We have lived in Saratoga Springs 7 years and there is no relief in sight - just endless bogus "environmental studies." No one cares anymore about commuters - those forced to pay taxes and yet excluded from consideration whenever it comes to transportation "improvements". It's the ROADS, STUPID! Every time a little money is finally put to roads, it's shunted to bogus politically correct MASS TRANSIT - or when a freeway is widened, the new lanes are HELD HOSTAGE by unproven HOV lanes. No one has really added a new road (except residential developers, of course) since the 1950's. All the politicians nowadays are beholden to the SIERRA CLUB. Will we ever get a Legacy Highway (even in its neutered form)? I'm not holding my breath any more for the Mountain View Corridor. FIX THE ROADS! ENOUGH ALREADY WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL HOGWASH! WHAT ABOUT THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT??? Did anyone stop to think how much pollution is generated by a bunch of poor commuter beasts of burden sitting idling in traffic? 2100 North Lehi is a great place for an arterial (please ignore the Lehi City rabble rousers, they are complete nincompoops), but it is NOT ENOUGH. What about the huge burden Saratoga Springs, Lake Mountain and Eagle Mountain residents heading south? Absolutely no relief if there is only a 2100 North East-West connector. The Mountain View coridor (if it is ever built - like I said - I'm not holding my breath). Needs to shunt I-80 down to Santaquin - or at least down to Provo (yes, back when men were men they built causeways across waterways - now we're a bunch of EFFEMINATE ENVIRONMENTALISTS - I'm not holding my breath for a much-needed causeway, either) But don't worry about my family (I knew you were worried about us :) - I am so out of this Keystone Cops state - Oh, was that Utah's strategy? "Fix" the roads by driving people OUTTA STATE so there are fewer automobiles on the creaking, old 1950's infrastructure? Have a nice day and say Hi to the Sierra Club for me. :(

Comment 328

Comment 329

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Miller, James W.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to your proposal for the 2100 North connector through Lehi City. It has a negative impact on neighborhoods and splits the city into yet another section, making it more difficult for emergency response, and extremely difficult for citizens living in the cut off area to enter or exit their neighborhood. The Lehi City proposal is a much better proposal and will better serve the needs of the citizens and commuters. Please reconsider what you are planning to do, and change to the Lehi proposal, which will be much better in the long term for all involved. Thank you.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Breck, Pauline
Location: copperas Cove, TX

Comment:
I lived in Saratoga Springs from Dec. 2002 through Oct. 2006. I have seen how the growth of Eagle Mountain, Lehi, and Saratoga Springs have put a major impact on Redwood Road, and Lehi's Main Street. I believe that the 2100 route would be the best route to reduce the congestion for all who live in those cities.

35.2.7C

Comment 330

Comment 331

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A

35.2.13A




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Rowley, Donovan
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
 I think with the extream congestion on Main street and other roads in Lehi and the fact it will only get worse the impact on the environment is less to build the road than to allow vehicles to slowley drive down mainstreet poluting the people that live, walk, and do buisness on this road. The impact on homes in this areas will be less than if we continue to waste time and money on determining other solutions. noise polution can be solved via walls and we should not let the few determine whats best for the many, just because they are richer. Thank you



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hamblin, Laurie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am so glad that something is being done to help the flow of traffic. I wish that more could be done. What are the considerations for helping traffic in South Saratoga Springs? Thank you, Laurie Hamblin

Comment 332

Comment 333

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Krippner, David
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I believe that the Mountain View Corridor should be built as described in the preferred plan by UDOT. This project needs to begin immediately as traffic on the west side is past horrible. Also, the 2100 North connector is a great idea. Go for it! Get it going now! As far as the public comment (read special interest winnings) please do not allow this to become bogged down like the Legacy Highway project. The bottom line is that expanding road systems is inevitable given the population growth. On another note, how dare you propose that the MVC be a toll road! We all paid for the road systems in the rest of the valley and now UDOT is considering making the MVC a toll road to pay for it? How about you add a surcharge on the state taxes paid by every citizen who lives east of the Bangert Highway so as to reimburse those of us that contributed to "their" road system? That makes almost as much sense as making the MVC a toll road. Ridiculous!

35.2.7C

35.2.10A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Adam
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
Any and all proposed highways, or freeways should of been approved before all this growth in Lehi. To delay any of this projects will only increase cost and create more problems and lead to the destuction of more homes. As we all wait in our cars for up to 30 minutes to cross the city of Lehi, I wonder how there wasn't anything done about this 10 years ago.

35.31C

Comment 334

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Adam
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:

Comment 335

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D
35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Pearson, Mitch
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I am not in favor of the 2100 N connector in Lehi. I understand the need for it (I Live in Lehi, and work in American Fork) but I am not convinced that it is the best option. I prefer Lehi city's proposal or the arterial proposal.

Comment 336

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7 C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Holman, Cameron
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I am in favor of the proposed connector at 2100 North. I understand this location has been planned for some time. Let it be done before more development is done that then has to be removed.

Comment 337

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Keck, Tiffany
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am all for the IDOT preferred 2100 North alternative. Lehi city is launching a pretty strong campaign for citizens to comment in favor of the arterials alternative, which is why I felt strongly that I needed to give my input in favor of 2100 North. Can't wait for the mountain view freeway!

Comment 338

Comment 339

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Huntington, Ryan
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am supportive of the 2100 North connector proposal. The growth of the Saratoga Springs/Eagle Mtn. areas have greatly overwhelmed the local roads and created traffic nightmares. Better access to these communities and businesses is crucial for their continued growth and success. I am also very much opposed to and offended by the negative campaign against this project and any other legitimate options by the city of Lehi.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Jensen, Robert
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
Please put this road at 2100 N. in Lehi rather than the proposed change at the point of the mountain. The 2100 N. option is the most reasonable and will meet the needs of residents in N. Utah county much, much better. Thank you, Robert Jensen

35.2.7C

Comment 340

Comment 341

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Simons, Amber
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
As a Lehi resident living very near to the proposed 2100 North connector I would like to state my opinion on the matter. My biggest concern besides the fact that our property value will go down, the crime rate will go up, is the air pollution this may cause. I have a son with severe asthma. It is very difficult for him to get through the winter months as it is because of the inversion we already have to deal with. Now because of this proposal it will definitely impact my son and his quality of life. I cannot support anything that may endanger my child's health and happiness. If my opinion matters at all I ask you to please think about the small people.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Robert
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I think some sort of fast transit is needed as an alternate route from Utah county to Salt Lake county. The MVC couldn't come fast enough. The longer this gets put off, the worse the problem will get. There is no pleasing everyone, considering the loss of a few homes, or damaging some wetlands, but overall, we almost all drive automobiles and hate waiting for stop and go traffic.

Comment 342

Comment 343

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Talley, Sara
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 As a business owner, home owner and city resident I strongly disagree with the proposed Mountain View Corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi! This corridor is unacceptable for many reasons! This corridor would NEGATIVELY affect each and every Lehi Resident. Such a HUGE corridor right through the center of an area that could be so perfectly developed with inviting businesses and family friendly attractions would destroy the serenity and privilege of living in Lehi. I want Lehi to be a place I want to live forever. With this plan in place I would definately change my plans and reconsider my businesses location.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: reeves, michele
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 we are against the 2100 north connector proposal because it is a negative impact on our neighborhoods. We do not want it in our neighborhood.

35.2.7A

35.2.7A

Comment 344

Comment 345

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gourley, Collette
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Definitely in favor of 2100 North connector. Traffic on Lehi's Main Street is unbelievable, and almost impossible at certain times of the day. In total favor of the road at 2100 North!!

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hansen, Justin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
As a resident of Lehi, I see first hand every morning and afternoon the traffic problems that have been created by building so many homes in Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain, and western Lehi without having proper roads to accommodate the increase in traffic. Lehi Main Street was a fine road for east/west travel until about eight years ago. Now it is a joke – traffic is always slow and backed up for miles every morning and afternoon as commuters try to travel from their homes to the freeway and back. The 2100 North alternative in Lehi makes the most sense, since the majority of commuters I see are trying to travel to the Salt Lake valley for their jobs. The 2100 North alternative would allow commuters in the growing communities of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs a quick and easy access point to I-15. Such a road would drastically reduce congestion on Lehi Main Street and Redwood Road, since commuters would have a faster and more convenient route to get to work. I am in full support of the 2100 North alternative.

Comment 346

Comment 347

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Newman, Paul
Location: , UT

Comment:
I received a flyer in the mail from Lehi City on November 12, 2007 asking me to voice my opinion. My opinion will surprise Lehi and maybe UDOT. I feel that Lehi officials are not representing the citizens that they represent, and certainly are not presenting each option fairly with my tax dollars. I completely support UDOT's proposed 2100 North Mountain View Corridor Connector. I think the alternate plans do not accommodate the east-west traveling traffic, which seems to be the majority, nor do they seem to be create sustainable structures.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Don
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I believe the 2100 North Connector represents the most sensible and quickest solution for residents of Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain and Lehi as well as American Fork and cities south to reach the New Mountain View freeway and just as important to quickly reach I-15 from the West going North or South. It utilizes an existing exit from I-15 and makes a direct line through what is now mostly open and blighted areas. The city of Lehi has complained about splitting the city but Lehi is already split by I-15 which hasn't stopped development on the Northeast side. The silly turnabout the Lehi has placed on State Road 73 (Mainstreet) is the biggest hurdle traffic has to face trying to get to Salt Lake or even American Fork and points South. Lehi City has made it very difficult for the majority of citizens living in the area to get anywhere very quickly by not offering alternative routes through the area. It is time for UDOT to make sense of traffic needs and over ride Lehi City on behalf of all the citizens who must travel throughout the area. Bangerter highway is already available for an additional northern connector. What is now needed are additional West/East arterials through Lehi or Saratoga Springs to go South.

35.2.7C

35.2.1F

Comment 348

Comment 349

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hernandez, Rick
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 3 years ago we moved from the south side of Main St in Lehi to the North side because we got tired of trying to get on to Main street today we have easy access to the 12th west entrance in Lehi. My main concern is the plans udot has for the crossover at 2100 north in Lehi. It seems like overkill with huge environmental impact to this area. From the meetings I've been to there are better alternative routes that would not disrupt the lives of some many home owners and the peaceful lifestyle we live now. This seems like the big bully (udot) wanting to do what they want to do no matter who it affects. I believe the best and least intrusive route is a cutover up by the gravel pit near the point of the mountain right before you descend into Utah county. It would affect 0 homeowners and would cut the length of your project considerably. If the 2100 project is chosen you can bet money on it I will move from the area because it will turn my subdivision from one of the most desirable into one of the least desirable in areas in Lehi. Plz reconsider your plans for 2100 N. bypass. If it makes no sense to the people of Lehi why must udot insist on pushing it on us especially when there are much better alternatives

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Taggart, Ron & Sally
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 you are probably receiving a lot of negative comments about the 2100 no. Lehi project. You need to know those are NOT from the silent majority. The majority supports the proposal and wants to proceed with the development and completion as soon as possible. 2100 No is the best of all undesirable solutions and should be pursued to it's conclusion. The opposition seems well funded and has published a couple of highly offensive and misleading flyers trying to gain support for their view. Some of the city leaders have been misled and bought into the negative view. At your public hearings you need to address the misleading "facts" they are quoting and set the record straight.

Comment 350

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: LeSueur, Paula
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Get the Mountain View Corridor done now. We need the help with commuter traffic. Give more consideration to homes rather than Wetlands. the 2100 North Connector in Lehi would greatly help traffic congestion.

Comment 351

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gibson, Aubrey
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Please please do not put in the 2100 N Lehi connector. This is literally in my back yard. The neighborhood is full of young families and children that would be negatively impacted financially and in the security of their homes and families. I bought my lot here because I could see the mountains. If the connector is put in all I will see and hear is freeway. I realize that there are families in other areas that need transportation solutions, but not at the cost of our well being.

Comment 352

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Andrus, Millard and Peggy
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
We are not in favor of the connector road being built at 2100 North in Lehi. We think it should be at the 4800 North proposed site. By using the 4800 North site there will be less congestion and not cut into the city of Lehi.

Comment 353

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Dumas, Cole & Lindsey
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
We are opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it will bring danger to our young family with the increased traffic and air pollution. Our children will not be able to play outside as much as we had planned. Our children deserve a nice, clean and, most importantly, safe neighborhood to play in without a freeway running right next to it.

Comment 354

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.10B



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Peaslee, Gary
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of the 2100 N option. Utah valley needs an East / West corridor that promotes rapid transit. The arterials provide more of the same slow roads with cross traffic that will lead to accidents. This option would tie in close to the "Highland Highway" providing a good corridor. I would be against a toll road. This would push people back on to the surface streets thereby defeating the purpose of building this freeway. That would again lead to busy residential streets and more accidents. This option puts the freeway within a quarter mile of my home. I am certain that it will only increase my property value as it will provide quicker access.

Comment 355

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Perkins, Tyler
Location: West Jordan, UT


Comment:
 There is definitely a need for the MVC. The commute is horrible no matter which road you take out of the West Jordan area, especially 6200 S. Hopefully the MVC would lessen the congestion, and most importantly make us more prepared for future growth on the west side. My only concern is the decline in property value and increase in crime that seems to occur close to freeways. But if it's needed, it's needed.

Comment 356

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.6A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Zelanko, Ari
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I oppose the the 2100 N Freeway alternative for the MVC project. It will have a terrible effect on the surrounding neighborhoods. I think the the Southern Freeway alternative is a better plan.

Comment 357

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: , UT

Comment:
The mountain view corridor connector at 2100 N in Lehi is a bad idea. I think there are much better alternatives. The other locations would be far less damaging to the community. It doesn't make sense to destroy a brand new development, that adds so much to the city of Lehi. There has to be a better location for the corridor.

Comment 358

Comment 359

Response Section in Chapter 35

Response Section in Chapter 35



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Duersch, Jason
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:

I was looking over some of the consequences for the 2100 North Connector. The two that concern me the most are the socioeconomic impacts of residential homes, and loss of Commercial property. With the loss of residential property and having a freeway so close, it would seem ideal to have this area become commercial industry. With that being said, I'm in favor of having the 2100 North connector...traffic is terrible going through Lehi. Has anyone thought of the socioeconomic impacts of this current condition? The longer the project waits, the more cost and problems will arise when other development gets started. The need to have a solid thoughtful planning to access the west Eagle Mountain area is great. Ideally north and south freeway access would be best.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Smith, Adam
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I have several comments I would like responded to: 1. The preferred route was near Utah Lake. This was the preferred route for much of the time. It seems the change to 2100 North as a main connector was hasty and not well thought out. Is UDOT scared of an environmental fight like the legacy highway? Was the route moved so quickly just to meet internal / federal deadlines? It seems time sensitive pressures made an alternate route the preferred route just because it was easier. 2. The 2100 North option does not serve the public interest. It does not serve Harvest Hills, Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain and other west growth. The routing is too far to the north to help these communities. The main traffic will go through Lehi Main Street as currently done. If you think people will go north to use the 2100 North freeway they will not. 3. The corridor on I-15 from point of the mountain to Orem is already very congested. Dumping 135,000 cars right in the middle of this congested area of I-15 does not make sense. By bringing the routing south it seems you would get rid of Lehi, Alpine, Highland, Eagle Mtn, Etc traffic off I-15 and reduce congestion. 4. The 2100 north freeway divides the city of Lehi, goes contrary to Lehi's master plan, and takes away prime commercial / residential property. The impact on the community will be great. If we look at community impact the 4800 North routing makes sense - it has less impact on communities, people and businesses. 5. The 2100 north freeway will significantly increase pollution to businesses and communities nearest the freeway. If we can put it in an area less populated by residences why are we not doing that? 6. The 2100 North routing is much longer than a northern routing. Won't this cost much more? I understand the studies done (even with the cost of a bridge north) that the 2100 North routing is more expensive. Please send the cost estimates (with detail for review). 7. I don't see any plans for environmental friendly items for the freeway. What about TRAX, green space, bus options, etc. Putting a full scale freeway seems behind the times. 8. What about commuter rail / TRAX that shares the freeway right of way? This freeway seems to address current problems what about planning for the future? 9. The poor air quality around the freeway is significant. My understanding is anything 1/3 a mile away from a freeway causes major health hazards. If this is the case then address it and buy out all the property within a 1/3 a mile of the freeway, create a green space and eliminate extended contact people have with the extra pollution. My home will be 2 blocks from the freeway. It is estimated my children (as well as myself and my wife) will have increased chance for asthma, cancer as well as a decreased life span. What about the routing so close to alpine district schools? You have chosen to avoid the south routing because of environmental problems with wetlands why is a wetland more important than my children? 10. What about decreased property values? I understand purchasing property and use of E. domain but my property values have already dropped (in addition to the general market conditions) just because of the draft EIS. How will I be compensated for this decreased property value if I am close to the freeway but not purchased out. I should be compensated for the decrease of my property value as a direct project cost of the freeway. 11. How will I-15 take all the increased traffic from the Mountain View corr.? 12. I have heard talk of tolling the road. Why is I-15 build on public funds and this possibly built on private money (tolls). This corridor if built would serve the whole valley if it cannot be funded with public money (not tolls) it should not be built. Based on the unanswered questions above I am currently strongly opposed to the routing on 2100 north. This freeway is short sighted and does not meet the future needs of the valley. It literally divides Lehi while not serving the communities of Lehi and surrounding communities. It does not help congestion because it dumps traffic into an already over congested I-15 section of road. It does not address environmentally friendly ways of transportation. I appreciate what UDOT is doing to address the problems we have on transportation but this current plan is just too short sided and old school. I love what you are doing expanding TRAX, increasing park and rides, and the new train up north. We need more solutions like this in Utah County. We may need a freeway but not this way. Please consider what this

35.2.7F

35.2.13A

35.2.7A

35.2.3A

35.12.4A


35.9A

35.2.7A

35.2.10A

Comment 359 (continued)

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ay will do the the communities, air quality for residents, etc. Thank you for your time. Please send written response to these comments. I would like each item addressed.

Comment 360

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.8C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Wiscombe, K
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To whom it may concern: I am opposed to the 2100 North Connector- I think its a waste of homes, land and churches because I don't think it will relieve the taffic through Lehi. All those that live south/west (Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain) will continue to use main street Lehi to get home. What there needs to be is 5 or 6 good size roads (back and forth traffic with a turn lane seperating them) that lead out West. That area is just going to grow and I don't think one big freeway is going to relieve traffic through the town of Lehi. Sincerly, A Conserved Lehi Resident

Comment 361

Comment 362

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Barnes, Camile
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I'd like to add my name to the list of Lehi citizens who SUPPORT the UDOT Mountain View Corridor proposal. The 2100 North connector, in my opinion, is the best resolution for the major traffic problems northern Utah county is currently experiencing. I strongly wish that the Mayor and City Council would stop the "war", thereby allowing UDOT to press forward with all haste to begin this project. Lehi already has I-15 running through the north-south center of town and we've been able to handle this for many many years. The 2100 North connector will be located at the less populated northern end of town and should work out nicely. Hurray for UDOT and I wish you well!

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Madigan, Lance
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
Moving the Mountain View Corridor north doesn't make any sense. It doesn't ease traffic concerns from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga. And the argument from Lehi City Officials who argue "it splits our city" just doesn't make sense. With the 10th South EW Connector, 2100 North just makes sense (besides the numbers you guys present with cost, property displacements, and loss of wet lands). BUILD THIS SOONER RATHER THAN LATER!!!

Comment 363

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Roll, Steve & Aaron
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
Lived in Lehi over 11 years, served on the Planning Commission for almost 9 years, the 2100 n. freeway is unacceptable, there are alternatives that must be considered and built.

Comment 364

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Wilkerson, Lyndee
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I strongly urge those in power to select the 2100 North Freeway Alternative for northern Utah County. This is the best choice for quickly moving traffic to the I-15 corridor.

Comment 365

Comment 366

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Briles, Stephen
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
For the Utah county side I prefer the Southern Freeway alternative as 90% of my travel is into Utah County (Provo, Orem). The bottom line is that we need a way to bypass Lehi since Lehi seems to want to bottleneck everything.

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Burningham, Josh
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not agree with the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. It will negatively affect the property value of homes in this area and will ruin some of the "rural" aspects of this area. It also will have negative environmental impacts and will create additional congestion in that area. This is not the best solution!

35.2.7A

Comment 367

Comment 368

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Belnap, Ilene
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I am really embarrassed by the reaction of Lehi government and citizens to the 2100 North Connector plan. It is very selfish of them to think only of themselves and not of the families that would be helped by cutting down commuting times to and from work and shopping. I don't believe that property values on most homes would be effected. Infact some like living closer to freeway access. I have heard it said that it will split Lehi in half. Have you ever tried to cross Main Street during most of the day! It is already divided in half and buisness on Main Street is suffering. They also say it will decrease air quality in the area. The stop and go traffic on Main Street causes much more pollution then steady traffic would, not to mention that lives will be extended by decreasing the stress of sitting in traffic and road rage. I feel badly for the families that will have to be moved but if a plan had been in place years ago when building started in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain there wouldn't be so many homes impacted now. They also say that if you build it more traffic will come. Well it is already here and due to home costs many people who want to live in Utah County have no chose but to move to areas they can afford. Our population is going to increase in the future. The only thing we can do about it is plan for it. I feel that in the next 10 to 20 years we are going to need all the East/West corridors that are being considered now. Lets act now to solve the traffic problems before more homes will be built to later be torn down.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Moors, Brent
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Please do not make the 2100 North Connector a reality. While we do need East/West route, the 2100 N. proposal will have terrible effects on the area's wildlife. The Jordan River ecosystem is already being impinged upon by housing. Let's not make it worse, or start up a costly legal battle such as is going on with the Legacy highway.

Comment 369

Comment 370

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Becker, Dan
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Help me to understand why the 2100 North freeway can not be placed about 50 yards further south. This could eliminate the need of demolishing some of the homes in Pointe Meadow? Thanks!

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Scharman, Mary
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North Corridor, because it will impact too many neighborhoods and plans already being made for homes. It will also impact the city of Lehi by splitting the homes south of Thanksgiving point. It is a poor location and could be placed farther north without disrupting homes already in existence. There is more space farther north of Thanksgiving Point. Please do not disrupt our community.

35.2.7A

Comment 371

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A
35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Chelsea
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not agree at all where udot plans to put a major highway on 2100 N in lehi. I live very close to where that would go and I do not want a freeway in my backyard!! I agree we need a better route to get out to saratoga and eagle mountain but to disrupt so many peoples lives? I heard there is a much better solution to put it a little futher north by the point of the mounitian that would not really disrupt anyone. Why not there????

Comment 372

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: D. josh
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
i believe the 2100n. route would be best .

Comment 373

Comment 374

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: D., Andrea
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
the 2100n route would be the best alternative at this point in time and the sooner it gets done the better

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Lookadoo, Russell
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am strongly, and irresolutely OPPOSED to the 2100 North Corridor. How can you even consider the destruction of a peaceful neighbor hood when there is vast undeveloped land just to the north of Thanksgiving Point. Surely a connector 2 miles further north that would take a quarry is a better option than the taking of 5 dozen homes and the disruption of hundreds of others. THINK...destroy homes??? Cross a quarry....thers is not logic to the former.


35.2.9A

Comment 375

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Morgan,
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I am all for any new roads that help everyone move around better. There is nothing like needing to get home, and it takes about 30 to 40 minutes once you get off the freeway to get to your door. I hate to leave my home to run simple errands that normally used to take about an hour, and now I need to plan for at least 2 hours sometimes more depending on the time of day. I have lived in Saratoga Springs for 8 years now and I am tired of planning my day around the traffic. It is very simple, we need more roads!

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.13A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Kizerian, David
Location: Riverton, UT

Comment:
 As a resident that is very close to the proposed Mountain view corridor, I have a few concerns. In the EIS draft there is lengthy discussion of noise problems and solutions, but my house will be one of the ones possible left with excessive sound, no solution, and decreased property values. Please see below -----
 - 5800 West Freeway Alternative – Segment 9 (13400 South to Utah County) Land uses south of 13400 South to the Utah County line consist of residential development on the west side of the alignment with undeveloped open space on the east side of the alignment (see Figure 13-9, Noise Analysis – 5800 West – 13400 South to Utah County). Noise levels in Segment 9 would increase by 2 dBA to 16 dBA at residences nearest the alignment. The residential NAC would be approached or exceeded at 24 residential receptor locations representing about 58 residences in Segment 9. ----- And here is Review of possible noise abatement solutions for the approximately 58 homes affected... -----
 ----- 5800 West Freeway Alternative – Segment 9 (13400 South to Utah County) One noise barrier was evaluated in Segment 9 (see Figure 13-9, Noise Analysis – 5800 West – 13400 South to Utah County). Barrier 14 (about 2,500 feet long) was located on the west side of the alignment south of 13400 South. Noise barriers between 15 feet and 19 feet high were modeled but would not provide the minimum required 5 dBA of noise reduction to the majority of first-row residences because of differences in terrain between the alignment and the residential development. As a result, Barrier 14 would not be feasible according to UDOT's noise-abatement criteria. During the final design phase of the project, noise barriers will be re-evaluated at this location to determine if conditions have changed enough (for example, additional residential development, roadway design changes, and so on) that a noise barrier would be reasonable and feasible. ----- So as a resident I'm being told that yes, approximately 58 homes, at least two local parks, a church, and possible an elementary school would have noise levels rise near or above The FHWA Noise-Abatement Criteria (NAC), and because of the terrain of the area commonly accepted noise abatement methods will be ineffective. I can find no mention of road construction materials, but based on the last few major UDOT projects Concrete roadways are probably the direction they will go again. I would like to request a very in depth study into doing asphalt roadways for this project, as the difference in noise created by the two different roadway materials is SUBSTANTIAL. Thank You Dave Kizerian Riverton Resident

Comment 377

Comment 378

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Clark, Matt
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I feel that UDOT has done their homework on this mountainview corridor and the most sensible place and least costly to taxpayers is to place it along 2100 north. The few that seem to be complaining are those along that road. I can't believe the slanted consequences of negative impacts whomever in the city of Lehi initiated the postcard sent to residences. It seems the same old farmer mentality to slow growth and progress isn't quite over in Lehi politics. Get the damn road built now and stop the madness on mainstreet in Lehi. If there were any progressive thinkers in that city council they should have had this road built long before now. The ridiculous thought that this road will cause 100 acres of commercial growth to be lost will be only be because city council will vote it out. They are the residences worst enemies and don't even know it. Get on with it NOW!!!

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Baker, Sherry
Location: Eagle Moutain, UT

Comment:
I am for the 2100 North Alternative. We need to realize the growth we have in this area and the needs we have and are going to increasingly have for travel. The Lehi Bridge Proposal will not eliminate any of the congestion for those of us that live in the area. We need to look ahead and effectively plan for the future instead of a band-aid like the Lehi Bridge Proposal.

35.2.7C

Comment 379

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gilmore, Jerry
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
The Lehi city's bridge proposal if adopted, will have terrible consequences for everyone in north Utah county. Please DO NOT use that altgemative I am retired and live in Eagle Mountain

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Boch, Rachael
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Please do not build a freeway connector at 2100 North in Lehi. We do not want the noise, the polution, or the negative impact to the land. Lehi is proposing a much better plan to build on 4800 North that we hope you will consider more seriously. Thank you for your attention to pubic opinion. Best, Adam and Rachael Boch

Comment 381

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↪
No
comment

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: , UT


Comment:

Comment 382

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↪

35.2.9A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: , UT

Comment:
I am very much opposed to UDOT's proposal of where the connector should go. Lehi's own proposal makes much more sense with less negative impact on existing homes, business, and future plans that Lehi already has for the city. Cost should not be the only consideration because some things do not come with a price tag!!!! Please listen to those of us that live here.

Comment 383

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Jorgenson, Robert
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I am for the 2100 north Alternative, but would still like to see the widening of Redwood Road and SR73 and another street on the south end of Lehi

Comment 384

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Townes, Amanda
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I would like to let you know how I feel about the traffic situation from Eagle Mountain to Orem. It is very frustrating for me to have to use secondary farm access roads to get to the freeway in a normal time without huge amounts of traffic. This causes many issues that I have seen on these roads on a daily basis. An example of this is commuters driving extremely fast putting other drivers and residence at risk. I feel that if the Lehi Bridge proposal is put into place this will not fix the issue. Because many people going south bound on I-15 will be unwilling to drive to Bluffdale to use this infrastructure. I see the 2100 North Proposal as the best alternative to this situation. Another issue I would like to express is the fact that a car pool/toll lane was put in to resolve traffic issues on the freeway. I do not see an improvement in the traffic backup from Lehi main street to Orem 8th north. I feel that social engineering is not going to fix this issue. I feel the cost of the toll is too much if the price was more reasonable you would see more people using the lane. Which inturn would aleaviate traffic congestion. Another major issue that I see on my daily commute is the American Fork main street exit. This has turned into more of a parking lot than a road. Which I feel will force more cars down secondary roads that do not have the capacity to maintain this amount of traffic with out putting the general public safety in question. I hope that you will take this in to consideration when making your future decisions.

Comment 385

Comment 386


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.10A

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Webster, Richard
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not care for the idea that a new 2100 North connector so close to our neighborhood will make our property values decrease. We have worked hard to pay for and have a nice home. To have its value go down would be terrible. When and where the connector will go in is a growing problem.. I believe the funds should come from the whole state and tolls should not be considered. Please use all caution in this corridor decision. There is alot of negative consequences to the 2100 North connector proposal. Regards
Richard Webster Lehi

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: ,
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I agree with UDOT, build the 2100 north collector in Lehi. It will only cost more to build the longer we wait. 3 businesses and 29 homes relocated is a small price to pay for some adequate diversion roads.

Comment 387

Comment 388

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hale, M
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
I won't be affected by either location of the new freeway, but as a taxpayer I'm concerned about a very conspicuous error on this map: http://www.udot.utah.gov/mountainview/maps_2.php The map shows the town of Copperton as being located almost due west of Airport #2, when it is actually quite a bit south of there, just west of Highway 111 where the New and Old Bingham Highways merge. It does make one wonder about the accuracy of the other maps showing the proposed route in the southern end of Salt Lake Valley. Have a nice day. :-)

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.9 A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Vallejos, Georgia
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
WHAT!! You're running a train right in front of my house!! Gee, thanks a lot...a train right out my back door and a highway out the front. I hate you guys. You just ruined my life. You made my house unsealable. I am a 54 year old widow that put all of my husband's life insurance into my house, which by the way is only 3 years old, and now because of YOU, it's worth nothing! This house is all I had to leave to my children. It was worth \$380,000, so you just destroyed my children's inheritance. I bought this house because it was out of the way in a quiet neighborhood, where I could grow old in peace. Now I get to listen to trains right out my bedroom window until I'm 90, and highway noise, too! You owe me big time..I hope you rot in hell!!!!!!

Comment 389

Comment 390

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Estes, Dale & Glenda
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I strongly oppose the connector placement at 2100 North due mostly to air pollution in this populated area. It will also impact our property value because of the health hazard, noise and traffic congestion. Instead of these unnecessary consequences of a 2100 North connector, I favor the Lehi City proposed placement at 4800 North.

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Meyers, Kara
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Leh's proposal of a bridge to connect with I-15 at point of the mountain will not serve the purpose of lessen the traffic flow on I-15 nor SR 68. During the winter months Point of the mountain becomes slippery, combine with driving habits of Utahans accidents are a guarantee therefore backup of traffic and the alternate is SR 68. With the udot proposal where the communiters for the western communities travel the mountain corridor, it is that much less cars on I-15.

35.2.9C

Comment 391

Comment 392

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Nelson, Chris
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To whom it may concern, I am opposed to the Lehi, 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods and our community. I know Lehi city proposed an alternate connector farther north which was dismissed because it would require a larger bridge. The price of a larger bridge in an unpopulated portion of Utah valley if far outweighed by the detrimental affects such a large connector would have running right through Lehi. Please consider my comments and the comments of others and reconsider alternate connector routs. Sincerely, Chris Nelson

35.2.7A
35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: estrada, darlene
Location: saratoga springs, UT

Comment:
I now live in Eagle mountain and am moving to Saratoga Springs. I would prefer the 2100 North Alternative vs. the Lehi bridge proposal. We need to solve the problems with the congested Lehi Main street and the bridge would not do that.


35.2.7C

Comment 393

Comment 394

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Spaeth, Cassandra
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I support the Lehi City Master Plan for the north connector to I-15. I realize that Saratoga Springs is in support of the 2100 N option; however, it is not going through their city!!! I know we desperately need the mountainview corridor and support and even applaud UDOTS efforts in making it happen, however, I agree with our Mayor and City Council in Lehi that a connector up closer to the point of the mountain would have less negative impact on the city of Lehi while still offering an alternative route to I-15. The UDOT proposal at 2100 N would disrupt our residential communities that are near there and have a negative impact on small business growth. In addition, an eight lane road in Lehi will ruin our small town feel. You might be thinking "small town?" but while we are growing at incredible rates our community has done a fabulous job of maintaining a "small town feel!" Please don't ruin that for us!!! That is why I love LEHI!!!

35.2.9A

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Spaeth, Chris
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern, I would like to voice my opinion in favor of the Lehi Master Plan's transportation solutions to our traffic problems. I realize that a connector road at 2100 N may be a little more convenient for some commuters coming from Saratoga Springs or Eagle Mountain and even those of us on the west side of Lehi. However, the 2 minutes it might save on our commute does not out weigh the detrimental impact it would have on our city! The 2100 N connector would not run through my neighborhood (I live south of Main) but it would still be an 8 lane highway running through MY town! When you read people's comments I hope you will take into consideration those comments coming from Lehi with a little more thought than those coming west of us. Why would Saratoga Springs or Eagle Mountain care if Lehi turns into something less than desirable? The negative impacts of the 2100 N connector will only affect Lehi. This is our town and a town in which most of us residents that tremendous pride! Please seriously consider the option of a connector closer to the point of the mountain that will have far less impact on our housing, farming, and businesses!!!

35.2.7A


35.2.9A

Comment 395

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Oehlschlager, Joseph
Location: , UT


Comment:
I want the Mountainview 2100 North connector!

Comment 396

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Parkinson, Anthony
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I strongly oppose UDOT's proposal for 2100 N. in Lehi. What is wrong with Lehi City's proposal for arterials as indicated by the master plan?? My wife and I were thrilled by the location and price range of our new home at Cranberry Farms. The last thing we want is 135,000 cars passing by our peaceful home each day and with the price of real estate today, how can we possibly re-locate our family when this massive freeway has destroyed what we love about our neighborhood????!! Have a heart!

Comment 397

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Kartchner, Cory & Brittany
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 As residents of Saratoga Springs for 5 years we would like to voice our support for UDOT's Mountain View Corridor project and the 2100 North corridor in Lehi to connect I-15 and the MVC. We feel it's a great way to help minimize congestion on the local roads and get traffic moving. We feel the Lehi Bridge Proposal will not help decrease traffic congestion as it is so close to Bangeter Highway. We need an alternate route 'closer to the problem', one which will draw traffic away from the local streets and onto the 'big' streets or highways. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Cory & Brittany Kartchner

Comment 398

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Peck, Justin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I grew up a citizen of Lehi City in Utah County, and am currently a resident of Eagle Mountain just 8 miles west of where I grew up. I love this part of Utah and have watched closely the debate regarding transportation concerns in this rapidly growing community. I believe the 2100 North Alternative -will- provide the much needed uninterrupted travel to I-15 that best suits our growing transportation needs. It will also improve the quality of live for people in Lehi (where my dear parents still live) by relieving the serious congestion on Lehi Main Street. The Bridge Proposal is too far out of the way for our needs and simply -will not- have the desired impact in my estimation. I urge you to select the 2100 North Alternative when the time comes to decide which alternative is best. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if I can help in anyway.

Comment 399

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Stone, Jay
Location: saratoga springs, UT

Comment:
I prefer the 2100 north alternative in Lehi.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Quinney, Joy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
The 2100 North solution is the best proposal. The other alternative is only a band-aid and won't do much good in the long run. Sometimes we have to sacrifice for the greater good and unfortunately the residents along 2100 North are going to need to do just that.

Comment 401

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Seegmiller, Robert
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 The 2100 N. Lehi alternative is the only feasible one that helps northern Utah County Residents living west of Utah Lake connect with I-15. Lehi is being shortsighted, for nearby property that will be devalued upfront, can be developed into industrial, commercial and other profitable and taxable businesses, revenue of which can be put to good use by Lehi and others as this whole region of Utah grows exponentially.

Comment 402

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Riddle, Heather
Location: , UT


Comment:
 I am against the MVC going through at 2100 North. My support would be for the alternative of the bridge going in just past Bluffdale. I am a part of the community that lives close to the 2100 alternative. Having the freeway go right through our neighborhood would cause so many problems for our children's health and safety. This is my main concern. Moving the connection North a bit will affect less homes and residential property. Please consider the smarter, safer and less costly alternative. Thank you!

Comment 403

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Mills, Gary
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
I am for the 2100 North connection and also access to SR73. I'm against the Lehi Bridge proposal because it is much further North. The 2100 North would work better for access to go South into Utah county and also North into Salt Lake county.

Comment 404

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hilton, Jake
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
Living in Saratoga Springs I am completely for the 2100 North Alternative through Lehi... it provides great access to the freeway go to north or south and is in my opion the best solution to an ever increasing problem.

Comment 405

Comment 406

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Sprague, Sarah
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am strongly in support of the 2100 N. Freeway. I am a citizen of Saratoga Springs I know that my family would not use the Bridge Proposal because it is very inconvenient. We would still use Lehi Main street for our east/west travel. I don't believe the Lehi Proposal would help the traffic situation in this area. However, the 2100 N location is convenient enough that we would use it.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Sturgeon, Shamala
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I have been experiencing quite a bit of concern over the growing transportation issue in North West Utah County. Until now, I was not able to stand by any one of the options placed before us to rectify the problem, until now. The 2100 North Alternative seems to be the best choice out there. It would solve or greatly diminish the East/West traffic, as well as the "RUSH HOUR" Redwood Road traffic. Traveling to Salt Lake is much faster from Eagle Mountain than traveling to Orem for any reason, so building a main road towards Salt Lake County makes much more sense. Thank you for FINALLY coming up with a WINWIN alternative!

35.2.7C

Comment 407

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Burningham, Marian
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
We are in support of the 2100 North Alternative. We live in Eagle Mountain and have lived here for nearly 10 years. It is our opinion that this alternative will provide the GREATEST LONG- AND SHORT-TERM RELIEF to the horrible traffic congestion between our home and the I-15 corridor with the least amount of negative impact upon property owners, etc.

Comment 408

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Morrell, Dustin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I am in strong support of the 2100 North alternative. The Lehi Bridge Proposal will not be sufficient. The traffic through Lehi and Redwood road has been horrible and the situation will only get worse as Eagle Mountain and Saratogo expand. The 2100 North alternative is the only alternative! Thanks, Dustin Morrell

Comment 409

Comment 410

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Morrell, Sarah
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
With the rapid growth in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs, I am in strong support of the 2100 North Alt. Being a commuter into Salt Lake and Lehi the Lehi Bridge proposal is not enough.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Larsen, J
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
i am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because the city would be divided by another freeway & would negatively impact neighborhoods.

35.2.7A


Comment 411

Comment 412

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Melissa
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Please reconsider plans to build the 2100 North connector in Lehi. We made plans to live here and not have to relocate. What an awful thing to have to relocate due to your proposed connector. The road is now 25mph, (which is strictly enforced) and you are planning to build a huge freeway on this road. What does that say? Please consider the people and their homes when choosing a connector. I do not believe that 2100 North is the best option because it will cause safety issues with so many young children nearby and also more safety issues with a possible elementary school right next to the connector. Please choose an alternative that will not affect so many families and their homes.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Barry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Like most people I would prefer to enjoy the benefits of growth and improvements to the area I live without having to suffer with the negative impact that so often comes with them. I realize however that they do come hand in hand and it is not possible to have one without the other. After looking at the alternatives for expanding the transportation capacity for Utah County I feel strongly that the 2100 North Freeway would be the best, and only, long term option. The Lehi Bridge alternative would not even raise the capacity to current levels and certainly would not address continued growth. I feel we need a solid solution that will solve todays problems and avoid future problems as the growth continues, not just a quick band-aid. The right decision typically isn't the easiest but it is still the right decision.

Comment 413

Comment 414

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hardinger, Gary
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I like the 2100 North alternative, I think it is a great idea. I say lets do it

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hardinger, Susie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I like the idea of the 2100 North alternative

35.2.7C

Comment 415

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McClellan, Devin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
2100 North is the only feasible alternative route. If we go further north it is a waste. I commute to Orem everyday and the mainstreet is a joke, but it will still have very heavy traffic if we go with the Lehi preferred route. We need to use common sense in our decision. It needs to go with the original spot right from Saratoga Springs. 1--Choice is the original route from the SS 2--2100 north

35.2.7C

Comment 416

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Moran, Sonia
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
2100 North is best for us. Traffic is terrible thru Lehi.

35.2.7C

Comment 417

Comment 418

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Swanson, Steven
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
Go with the recommended route, 2100 North in Lehi. Although not ideal it is the best option available.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bates, Tanya
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
I believe the 2100 North Freeway is the only reasonable option to the rapid growth that is currently and will (in the future) impact Utah County's transportation problems. Please build the 2100 North Freeway for the MVC project.

35.2.7C

Comment 419

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hubbert, Joanna
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 N. connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods (as well as property value), it will increase NOISE POLLUTION and AIR POLLUTION, destroys wildlife habitat, and will have a negative effect to the already fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. I OPPOSE the proposed UDOT's corridor connector at 2100N. at Lehi Thank You, Joanna Hubbert 1048W. 2650N. Lehi, UT 84043

Comment 420

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Duran, T
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 I really don't think that you really care what us residents say or feel about the corridor. You are real good at putting on a dog and pony show about it, but in my opinion you don't listen to what we have to say. I moved to West Jordan almost 7 years ago to get away from the booming city life only to find myself being surrounded by it. Cities and counties only care about one thing, How to get as much of our money as possible. If they want something they just find a way to tax us. Tax and spend tax and spend, I am amazed at the cost of living in my home state and the disgustingly low wages. I almost can't afford to live here anymore. It really doesn't matter what I say to you about this corridor because I'm not rich and don't have any financial or political influence, you will build wherever is more appealing to you financially, too bad. Oh yeah, make it a toll road because after all most west siders are wealthy "NOT". That's just what we need, a road that caters to people who can afford it and not those that are in need of it but cannot afford it.

Comment 421

Comment 422

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Torres, Terry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not agree with comments sent by Mayor Parker, It benefits "one" his area "typical" politician: Why not make the best choice that was offered as fair choice for everyone: build a bridge to redwood road area. This is thought out! with out trying to benefit "one" it still allows the residents of Lehi to give but not only for "one"!

35.2.9A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Morgan, Robert
Location: , UT

Comment:
I'd love to see the MVC run along Red Wood Road, and border the lake into the Pleasant Grove/Lindon I-15 access. I do not feel that the habitat would suffer from this move.

35.2.6A

Comment 423

Comment 424

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: G. Stephen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I think the Southern Freeway is the best choice to help eliminate the traffic on Main Street. I know people who commute north from Eagle mountain, Saratoga springs and Lehi they don't have any problems getting onto the freeway using 2100 N. Main St exits for Lehi and American Fork are always busy going South. The problem is South bound traffic. That is why the Southern Freeway is the best option. Northbound commuters could use 2100 N and Main St and southbound commuters can use the Southern Freeway.

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Weaver, Steven
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
As a Saratoga Springs resident and business owner, I feel the 2100 North Alternate is the best solution for future transportation needs for northern Utah County

35.2.7C

Comment 425

Comment 426

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Araya, Esteban
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern: I'm writing to let you know that I'm strongly opposed to the 2100 North connector. I'm opposed to it because of the following reasons: 1. It will negatively impact what is now a rural neighborhood. 2. It will damage the beautiful Jordan river and its surrounding areas. 3. Lehi needs an east west connector, but it needs it further south; along Main Street or even closer to the lake. Thank you for considering my concerns. Sincerely, Esteban Araya

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Rasmussen, Jarvis
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am commenting on the 2100 North Connector. I think that out of the options it is by far the best. Lehi Main street needs relief! This will give it a lot and it will connect to I-15 in an ideal spot for north or south bounders. The negative impacts will be comparable anywhere you put a road.

35.2.7C

Comment 427


Comment 428

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9A
35.2.1B
35.12.4A
35.2.1A

35.2.7C




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Stroup, Joshua
Location: Riverton, UT

Comment:
 Instead of sinking the state in funding of a 16.5 billion dollar project. Why not target the actual problems that we face at the bottlenecks. The real issue is the bottleneck at Point of the Mountain. I really think the suggestion the Lehi Mayor has should be considered. Make a larger freeway that expands off 140 in Bluffdale merge to Camp William Road and then you can enlarge that road to handle traffic. Bring that road down and reconnect back to I-15 in Nephi. The cost would be considerable less. Also the impact on the environment would be lessened, your "Super Highway" wouldn't give all the schools on the west side cancer. Having all those schools within 1500 meters and not considering that as an issue is very immoral in my opinion. My second question is that why can't we use the U-111 as the freeway? I think a road that connects east to west side all the way to U-111 would be more efficient given that ALOT of congestions happens East and West as well.



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Jensen, Ann
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I have carefully studied the ideas given and I support, and ask that you support, the plan to make 2100 North in Lehi the corridor leading to I-15.


Comment 429

Comment 430

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Ducos, Charlotte
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I wanted to voice support for the 2100 N. alternative in Utah County. I am an Eagle Mountain resident. I see the 2100 N. option the only viable option being presented for those of us to the west of Lehi. While I understand the City of Lehi's concerns with the option, the option they are proposing is not one that will positively impact those who will use it most frequently. If I wanted to access 1-15 as far north as they are suggesting, I could just take Redwood to Bangerter! Those of us to the west need alternatives that allow us to access locations within Utah County without driving through Lehi. We need secondary access options that don't take us so far north and south that we are forced to use the same roads that are already in existence and overcrowded today! I am also very supportive of the 1000 South option that is being moved through the pipeline and urge all possible speed in completing that road as well. Thank you for all you do, Charlotte Ducos

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Whiting, Carl
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 We need the Mountain View Corridor built as quickly as possible. The current process is much too slow. Cities and counties should not be allowed to continue to grant building permits when there the transportation situation is so bad. The 2100 North alternative is clearly the best. Please start on this ASAP. Don't let Lehi city pressure you into changing to a different route. Why is it taking so long to widen Redwood Rd between Bangerter and Saratoga Springs. You guys really need to move faster on these roads.

Comment 431

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.6.3A

 **STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD**

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Olofson, Melissa
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
I would just like to know how this freeway will impact my residence? I live in the Balmoral Towne Homes just west of 5600W and 2700S. in West Valley. Will I still have a home, and if so, how will the corridor impact the neighborhood? And how soon will these changes occur?

Comment 432

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.6A

 **STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD**

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McMaster, Betty
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
WAIT! I just looked at the other alternatives. And if they're still available, the southern freeway and Utah County trails alternatives would be perfect!! Either of them would relieve so much congestion going through Lehi. What great ideas! I hope you pick one. Thank You

Comment 433

Comment 434

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: McMaster, Betty
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I live in Saratoga Springs and strongly support the 2100 North freeway alternative for the smoothest flow of traffic in this area. Of course, ideally, I'd also like a freeway that would follow the power lines from Saratoga Springs straight over to Orem. But this 2100 North alternative is a great start to relieving the traffic congestion. Thank you

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Rothenberg, Robert
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
I believe that we need a fast and direct high-speed route from the Eagle Mountain / Saratoga Springs areas over to I-15, by as direct a route as possible. Going all the way north to Point of the Mountain is not a good option. Arterial streets with multiple stop lights are not a good option in view of the current and rapidly growing population.

35.2.13A

Comment 435

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Tobin, Deanna
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I drive to Salt Lake every day to go to work. I have watched Redwood get more and more congested. After reviewing all of the available information, I am in favor of the 2100 North Alternative as a solution to the traffic problems from the Eagle Mountain & Saratoga area. I do not believe that a bridge would take any traffic off of Redwood or Lehi mainstreet.

Comment 436

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Stock, James
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 As I see it one of the great transportation issues of Utah county is access to the southern portions of Utah county. Currently there is ample access into Salt Lake county. It is busy along redwood road but the mountain view corridor will address that problem either way. The biggest problem, as I see it, is getting from the saratoga springs/Eagle Mountain area down to the Provo/Orem area. The further north you go with the East/West connection the less productive you will be. If you put the connection at the point of the mountain it is just another connection next to the bangater highway that already exists. It is redundant to put a East/West Coridor so colse to the Bangater Highway. I understand the idea of not wanting a freeway in your back yard. I have a brother who is right next to the proposed site. No matter where you put it you will have people disatisfied. But the purpose of doing this is for the greater good. Lets not defeat the purpose of this East/West connection, real access to the I-15 coridor both North AND South. Truth be told I think you would accomplish the objective better by going just north of Utah Lake.

Comment 437

Comment 438

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Spens, Anna
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
The west to east traffic through Saratoga Spring into Lehi is becoming unmanageable. Also the traffic going north on Redwood road into Salt Lake County is a joke. It's a dangerous narrow road that must be widened and alleviated of the congestion. The Mountain View corridor through 2100 S to I-15 makes the most sense. This corridor is the least expensive and has the least impact to people and the environment.

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Kent, Mr. & Mrs. Marion
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
We would respectfully request that all other options be discarded and the freeway go through running south along the west side of Redwood Road to the north end of Saratoga Springs where it will then go east across the valley and connect with I-15 at 2100 North in Lehi. Thank you very much.

35.2.7C

Comment 439

Comment 440

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Danny
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I agree that 2100 North would be the best decision to get to and from I-15 and needs to get started as soon as possible.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Riley, Diane
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
I am extremely opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal. It is unbelievable to me that I try to better my life by purchasing a home in a nice neighborhood, and now that is all in jeopardy. My home will either be destroyed or I will have to stay and not be able to sell my home for what it is worth. It also bothers me that all that natural land that supports different animals will be destroyed. Can't this happen somewhere else?


Comment 441

Comment 442

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Caldwell, Stephanie
Location: Provo, UT

Comment:
 The Lehi option doesn't work for everyone. It only works for those going North to Salt Lake. What about all of us who are going to Provo everyday? We'll be stuck on that way-too-skinny road into Lehi Main Street and then still fighting our way through Lehi to get to the freeway. I'm buying a house in Eagle Mountain and I think that the Southern Freeway option helps ALL OF US get to the freeway, not just those going to Salt Lake. I'm sorry that some people will be forced to sell their houses, but it's not like they're "losing" them and being left with nothing. They will be given a fair price for their property so that they can buy something comperable. Yes, it isn't the best situation to be in, but it helps more people that it will unsettle. I understand the frustrations, I had some friends who went through this same situation in Scottsdale, AZ but they were given a MORE than fair price for their property and actually ended up in a nicer, newer home. I understand the frustrations of those in Lehi, but the poorly planned road out to Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs is just too congested, and then you have to deal with the busy Lehi Main Street once you're through, it's just too much to deal with TWO TIMES A DAY. I suggest those who oppose the Southern Freeway plan, go out and drive the stretch from the freeway, out to Eagle Mountain DURING the RUSH HOURS every day for a week, and then see if they still oppose the plan.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C
35.2.1F



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Pace, Jeremy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 The idea for 2100 N. to become a corridor is a great idea to help alleviate the problems that Lehi Main Street has encountered. It would be great for those heading North bound to commute or whatever. The South bound commuters also need a solution however and along the north shoreline of the Utah Lake would be a great area for that. I would not mind paying higher taxes to alleviate the Lehi Main St Problem

Comment 443

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: WILSON, JAMES
Location: EAGLE MT., UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North alternative.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Wilson, Deanna
Location: Eagle Mt., UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North alternative


Comment 445

Comment 446

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: nelson, vicky
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 In my opinion the Mountain View Corridor should be the 2100 North Alternative. The Lehi Bridge proposal, proposed by the city of Lehi is unreasonable for a few reasons. First is the cost of building an expansion bridge over the gorge from Redwood road to I-15, I am sure would be more costly than a direct route on solid ground. Second is that if there were an accident on that bridge it would shut down the bridge making a huge mess in the traffic and forcing the travelers to revert to the existing routes, solving nothing. Third is that the commuters traveling From the Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain area, South to Orem and Provo area would have to travel quite a distance North, before hitting the I-15 connector south. Therefore those traveling South would continue to route themselves through Lehi to the I-15, again solving nothing for the commute south of Lehi. Also the Lehi Bridge Proposal does not provide a route for those working on the west side of the valley. The commuters would still be traveling Redwood Road through Bluffdale. I do not see them taking the Lehi Bridge, East, traveling North on I-15 and then have to travel back . West across the valley to their place of employment. The 2100 North Alternative would provide a route North for the commuters working on the West side of the valley and a connector for those working on the East side of the valley and a more rapid connection for those going south to Orem and Provo.This would also alleviate traffic from the I-15 North. It would also leave open the opportunity to expand the 2100 further North to the I-80 in the future when the I-15 gets to congested as the population continues to grow. Unfortunately progress does lead to re-location for a few to make way for the convenience of many. Growing pains are inevitable for this valley with limited space. Thank You for listening to my comments. Vicky Nelson 2085 Mountain View Dr Eagle Mountain, Ut 84005 801-471-1488

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Laursen, Thom
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of the UDOT alternative consisting of a freeway running south along the west side of redwood road to the north end of Saratoga. At this location go east across the valley and connect with 1-15 at 2100 North in Lehi. The reason is the Lehi alternative will not meet the needs of the people in Saratoga and Eagle Mountain. In fact I believe they have been blatant at ignoring our needs and proposing an action that will hurt Eagle Mountain and Saratoga's growth. Also If UDOT was to follow the Lehi recommendation, I would be required to follow the already taxed rout or drive farther to get to my destination in Utah County. I am right now looking for best alternatives to reduce driving because of the cost of fuel. Lehi's plan would not be the best alternative. It would be the worst.

Comment 447

Comment 448

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Biney, Drey
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
The Lehi Bridge proposal is simply a ridiculous idea. I live in Saratoga Springs, and commute to the Orem/Provo area every day. No one in their right mind is going to travel north to Bluffdale just to go south. I fail to see how this would alleviate the traffic on SR73. The 2100 North alternative, on the other hand, seems to be a more "central" route, and makes far more sense.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Nelson, Daniel
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
In my opinion the Mountain View Corridor should be the 2100 North Alternative. The Lehi Bridge proposal, proposed by the city of Lehi is unreasonable for a few reasons. The Lehi bridge is placed to far north to help out the Orem, Provo commuters. The bridge would have no escape route in case of an accident. The bridge would not help the employees that work on the West side of the Valley and it would not allow for expansion, wherein the 2100 corridor could be expanded Northwards in the future to give two North South Freeways for the Valley. The 2100 corridor would allow for the Southern Commuters to have an almost straight access to the I-15 from Saratoga Springs and Eagle mountain. It would take traffic from the I-15 North and allow for an easier commute, if the persons who work on the West side of the valley were allowed a straight route North in the future. Thank You Daniel Nelson 2085 Mountain View Dr Eagle Mountain, UT 84005 801-471-1602

Comment 449

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bradley, Rick
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I support the 2100 North alternative in Norther Utah County. Lehi's proposal to have a connector in Bluffdale at the point of the mountain is a bad idea because it does nothing to help alleviate congestion through Saratoga Springs and Lehi.

Comment 450

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gibby, Ron
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I agree with UDOT's preferred alternative of 2100 North in Lehi as the East-West corridor between I-15 and the proposed Mountain View corridor. A corridor between I-15 and the Mountain View corridor at the point-of-the-mountain, as proposed by Lehi, does nothing to solve the current major problem of congested traffic on SR 73 through Lehi. It would be a waste of money. Lehi's argument that a corridor through Lehi at 2100 North will section their city is a pathetic argument. Like other Utah county cities they have allowed developers to build anywhere and everywhere resulting in a city that knows no bounds. Salt Lake County has numerous large east-west traffic streets that section the Cities located there.

Comment 451

Comment 452

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Thompson, Garen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
In regards to the Mayor from Saratoga Springs, Mr Timothy Parker's comments about the "THE NOT IN MY BACKYARD MENTALITY." It is easy for him to say because it's not in his backyard. But it is in my backyard. And it's in the backyard or living room or bedroom or toy room of friends and neighbors that many of us have. Many of the proposed routes are unacceptable because they displace a family. The government needs to come up with a route that does not displace a single home. I will stand against any proposed road if it moves a family out of their home. It's not right, moral or any other way you want to look at it. So Mr Parker, are you telling us that you would be willing to move your family out of what might be a first time, custom, dream, or dream retirement home, if you lived here and were the Mayor of Lehi instead of Saratoga Springs? That is what you are asking many people across the route to do. I don't think you would be so willing to drop that "not in my backyard mentality."

35.31C

35.1.1C

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Tiffany
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I think the 2100 N. freeway access back and forth from Saratoga Springs and Lehi should not be negotiable. It just shouldn't happen. Why would you let the city and developers zone areas for resident housing and then go and destroy them? The best way for allowing people to travel to the west of I-15 needs to be a bridge at the point of the mountain. (Besides, it will be less road to produce, meaning less money out of tax payers pockets, city pockets, and state pockets.) Good news for everyone! Plus, you know Saratoga Springs supports this MVC plan because they are worried about their location. Isn't a good rule of thumb for those who like convenience: "Location, location, location."???

35.2.9A

Comment 453


Comment 454

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Harris, Jana
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I would like to see 2100 North used as the option for east/west traffic to move to the I-15 corridor.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Johns, Matt
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am in full support of the 2100 North Alternative for freeway access to I-15 as well as freeway to the North. These oneway roads (Lehi Main St., and Redwood Road) get busier by the day. I use Redwood Rd everyday as I work in the West Jordan area and it is congested going North and South, no matter what time of day. With the growth in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain the 2100 North Alternative for freeway access has to be a priority. The Lehi bridge proposal alone just will not help.

Comment 455

Comment 456

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Gunn, Randy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Please listen to the people and city of Lehi on this issue. I feel the Lehi Bridge Proposal should be accepted and the 2100 North Freeway connection not built. Both of these options accomplish the same purpose, but the 2100 North option effects so many people in an adverse way. In my case, my neighborhood will be a stones through away. I am concerned for the safety of the children. Property values will fall and land for businesses will be lost. The 2100 North freeway is not the best option. Please do what is best for everybody involved and don't build that road.

35.2.9 A
35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Nielsen, Chris
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector being proposed for Lehi. The impact to homes, business and wetlands seems to be greater at this location than if the connector were placed at 4800 N. Increase of traffic noise would also impact an already populated area. Since the length of the connector at 4800 N. would be a shorter distance than if it were placed at 2100 N., the cost would be less as well as less impact to the existing homes, businesses and wetlands. As this area is less populated, the traffic noise would be less of an impact as well. Please reconsider the current proposal for the 2100 N. location and STRONGLY look at placing the connector to the Mountain View Corridor at 4800 N. location in Lehi. Thank you!

35.2.9 A

Comment 457

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C


ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Miller, Betsy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I think the 2100 North alternative is the best proposal and I feel that it will benefit everyone as the years go by and the population along with the traffic keeps on growing.

This space is intentionally blank.

Comment 458

Comment 459

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Olsen, Randy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal. The Lehi City proposal is a much better option for the residents of Lehi.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: stevens, chris
Location: lehi, UT


Comment:
I think the mountain view corridor is a great idea, and the best plan for the problem. thumbs up.. hope it goes through and gets done in a hurry!

Comment 460

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Reynolds, Tim
Location: Pleasant Grove, UT


Comment:
 I favor the Southern Freeway Alternative. I commute daily from Pleasant Grove to the USPS Remote Encoding Center near the Salt Lake Airport and the freeway from where I get on I-15 at Pleasant Grove interchange is usually congested during the time I leave and return from work. The southern Freeway Alternative is the best option to relieve this freeway congestion. The other proposed routes would not address the problems already being experienced along the I-15 corridor. There are times when there has been trouble on I-15 that I have used the Redwood Rd route to avoid I-15. This Southern Freeway Alternative would make that choice safer because as you know, Redwood Rd route is currently a two lane traffic road and the Southern Freeway Alternative would improve that route.

Comment 461

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1K



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Anderson, Richard R.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Subject: MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR
 Sirs; I TOTALLY OPPOSE the 2100 North Corridor for the following reasons, The existing interchange with I-15 at U-92 is the ideal point for the connector because: 1: Expansion of the interchange would be simpler and less costly than multiple hubs. 2: The distance would be shortened by at least a third 3: Homes relocated or impacted and dwellings lost would be significantly less, or minimal 4: Will not divide Lehi City as critically 5: Less commercial property effected 6: Existing property values almost totally uneffected, except farmland 7: 60 MPH more than sufficient for such a short stretch 8: Crossover exit to and from corridor would be less congestive than hubs (See Cheyenne exit and interchange) 9: Merge lanes onto corridor and I-15 will add to smooth transition, making congestion minimal 10: Wetland impact would be much less where river is in channel farther downstream. A bridge would be much less invasive.


Comment 462

Comment 463

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Barnes, Amy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Nov. 13th, 2007 Lehi, Utah UDOT: Thank you for allowing and listening to comments concerning the Mountain View Corridor connector at 2100 No. in Lehi. I just wanted to make my voice heard. We know a connector is badly needed, I just don't think that 2100 No. is the best or only option. I am opposed to it because I live in Lehi and work and drive here daily. I feel the proposed connector would have a negative impact on neighborhoods and divide Lehi further. Wildlife habitat and the ecosystem along the Jordan River could be destroyed. I think more than one arterial is needed to relieve the congestion. Everyone is frustrated with traffic and there is no quick fix solution. People need to be patient. But please consider other ideas that may be better, less expensive, and will be inevitably better in the long run. Thank you for all your hard work. Amy Barnes 552 W. 1220 N. Lehi, Ut. 84043

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.3A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Smith, David B.
Location: SLC, UT

Comment:
 Howdy I need to use public transit these days because I have MS. I find large road projects take away from public transit. My grandmother lives in Magna. The building of mountain view freeway will create a unnatural divide which will be I making public decisions. I refer to the east west side battle in Salt Lake Valley by I-15. We as tax payers do not need this repeated. I want these concern reviewed in proposed road. Thanks David Smith David B. Smith #7 East 400 South SLC, Utah 84111

Comment 464

Comment 465

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Letter
Name: Gardner, Doris T.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Dear Sir: I am concerned about the connector that is going to be built through our city to connect The Mountain View Corridor to I-15. I know you think the 2100 north location is the best for you but it is NOT the best for Lehi. It would divide our city and cause a lot of grief to people in that area. There will be a school built there in the near future and a Freeway is not the best neighbor to a school and all the traffic that involves. I respectfully ask you to carefully listen to our city leaders with an open mind and put the connector road in a better place for all concerned. I would think the 4800 north site would be much better and it would connect through Thanksgiving Point on a road that is already started. While I am writing to you, I would ask you to put two more traffic lights in Lehi. We desperately need one at State Road and 500 West. 500 West is a state highway and is very heavily used and it is a very dangerous intersection. We need a wider road there, with sidewalks all the way along it. I walk in this area very often and it is dangerous. Lots of children use the road and adjoining roads to get to school, etc. We also need a traffic light at Main street and 300 East. It is so difficult to get into and out of the post office, that most people take a longer circuitous route to the post office to avoid the intersection. It is also difficult to access the businesses on the south side of the street. Getting in and out is a problem. We DO NEED a traffic light there. Your surveys may not accurately assess the traffic there, most people do like I do and use the back roads, which takes longer and more gas and that is an issue right now. I hope you will consider these traffic lights and install them soon in both locations. Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns. I have lived in Lehi for 49 years and I love it here. But our main street is impossible during most of the hours of the day, especially in commuter hours. We hope it is soon alleviated. Sincerely, Doris T. Gardner

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

35.31C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Bacon, Jonathon
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

My name is Jonathon Bacon my cell phone number is 801.660.7820. I'm a Lehi resident. I live at 4022 Bounty Cove in Lehi, 84043. I'm calling about the corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi. I actually live in the northern most part of Lehi Close to the gravel pit at the point of the mountain. Actually feel that the connector that Lehi city has proposed is more effective. And will disrupt less of the community than the one that the Mountain View Corridor project has submitted. Please feel free to call me for further comment or questions.

35.2.9A

Comment 466

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Horsley, John
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I feel the southern freeway alternative just north of Utah Lake would be a better route. The 2100 North route is less accessible to those in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. It also puts traffic back onto I-15 earlier than the southern freeway alternative. I would prefer the southern freeway enter I-15 at Lindon so more traffic is diverted off of I-15 between point of the mountain and American Fork. I would support a toll highway to help conserve the cost.

35.2.6A

35.2.10D

Comment 467

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Brown, David
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Yes! We want the 2100 North alternative!!!!!! It would ease our commuting time greatly!!!!


35.2.7C

Comment 468

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.4A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Douglas, David
Location: Riverton, UT


Comment:
 Hi this is David Douglas. I'm at 801.446.1305. We live on the edge of Riverton and Herriman. I want to give my opinion. Actually my wife and I, we prefer the UDOT preferred 5800 West freeway alternative. Also, if there was a lot of litigation with that we would prefer to just get whatever can be completed more quickly than have it tied up in litigation we find that would be a more important route rather than determining whether it should go to 5800 West or not. And one other thing was the transit alignment, it would be nice if it went out towards 13400 south instead of stopping at Daybreak. But otherwise I applaud the effort that has gone into getting this done and hopefully it can get done as soon as possible.

Comment 469

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Fowler, Vance
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Vance Fowler. I live in Saratoga Springs, Utah in the Harvest Hills subdivision and I cannot make heads or tails of where we are in reference to the proposed Mountain View corridor connector route at 2100 North in Lehi. I would certainly like to comment on it. I've only lived here about a year, I moved here from Oregon and thought that this was the peaceful place I was going to live for the rest of my life. My number is 801.331.6772. I'd appreciate knowing where I can find a map to find out where exactly I fall on this thing. I've looked at mapquest.com and I've looked at a little map that came with this and I can't figure out where I am. I did graduate from kindergarten so I think I ought to figure this out. If you do have a larger map I would appreciate finding it somewhere on the internet. Again my number is, my name is Mr. Fowler. Thank you very much for doing a very difficult job. Returned Call: explained how to access GIS on website and suggested he attend public hearing.

Comment 470

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7D



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Harris, Cloyde
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Hello my name is Cloyde Harris. I live in Lehi at 2151 N. 600 West Lehi, Utah. It appears to me that the UDOT proposal is just a way to get people out of Salt Lake. The quicker they can get 'em out of Salt Lake And dump them in Utah County the better they like it. And that's their proposal only as far as I can see, studying it over. Looking at both of them and I do not like it. My name is Cloyde Harris. My phone number is 801.768.8748. I thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Comment 471

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Huff, Jarem
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name is Jarem Huff my phone number is 801.653.2094. I recently received a card from the City of Lehi opposing the 2100 North option and I want to strongly disagree with the City of Lehi. I think the 2100 North option is the best option. I live in Saratoga Springs and Lehi has stonewalled on any progress for connections from Saratoga Springs to I-15 and they need to get out of the way and allow these roads to be built So I strongly support the road and I think in its current state, the 2100 North is much better as an alternative than the other options even the southern freeway and the other thoroughfares. I forget the exact name of it. It needs to be a freeway and it needs to go down 2100 North and it needs to get done sooner rather than later. Thank you.

Comment 472

Comment 473

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: alvarado, jose
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
As much as I would like to see the traffic congestion go down along main street, I totally opposed to this freeway deal around the area where I live. The noise is going to be unbearable (we already have to deal with the train honking 30 times day and night!) the traffic around that area is going to be a living hell. Are you looking forward to see us move out of there or what! Take other options

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: John, Loren
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
My name is Loren John and I am a resident of Lehi and Lehi City has been out asking us to comment on the 21st North connector proposal. I'm not going to make Lehi City very happy, but I am in favor of the 2100 N. connector proposal. It is possible that 4800 North could be better, however, The way I see it that would prolong the process require new studies. There are probably people that wouldn't like that proposal and I think the time for studying and looking for alternatives is coming to an end. Frankly my preferred would be in Southern Lehi. My preference above all would be to start laying some concrete so that this will get finished and I know if you decide tomorrow you are looking at a year or two before construction starts. Traffic needs to be mitigated as soon as possible and I think 2100 North is a very good, very viable alternative that is north of the cities main residential core and addresses the needs of getting people from Saratoga Springs eagle mountain area over further to the east in a sensible fashion. \And that's all I have to say. Thank you very much

35.2.7C

Comment 474

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Meredith, John
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

My name is John Meredith 2309 N. 2080 West Lehi. I am not, again not supporting the 2100 North connector. I think it is a waste of a lot of money it's gonna just make a lot of traffic where there are children. I don't like it and I don't know why they have to do this. Who's making the money? They say follow the money and you find out why it happens. And I think it's lousy. That's why I chose where I moved because the traffic was not that heavy and I like it that it says go 25 MPH down the road and I grumble. I don't like the 2100 N connector the UDOT suggested. I think the suggestion of the city of Lehi is much more preferable. And if you want to educate me or ask me something or tell me why I'm mistaken, my name again is John Meredith. 801.808.9100 And I just, I don't like it. I am so sick of this. Who came up with this idea Hillary Clinton? It stinks. It looks pretty on the map but it's lousy for the people who live here and it's going to cost a lot of money. Why should 29 people be relocated, other homes impacted – significant number, approved dwellings lost, commercial property lost, 3 businesses relocated. I don't like it. And you tell me what I can do...if I had a lot of money I'd spend it advertising against this crazy thing. Anyway, you asked for my opinion and I do not think it's in the best interest of the people of the County of Utah or the city of Lehi. Or the people who live along this route. Nobody should be moved. You certainly wouldn't support your house being moved. If you've something to say to me I'd be willing to hear it.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment 475

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Nielson, Brandon
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

My name is Brandon Nielson and I'm a resident of Lehi. My phone number is 801.494.9300. I completely am for this north connector on 2100 north. I think it is a fantastic idea. It's going to positively impact the congestion, there's so much congestion in Lehi it's going to actually help congestion with Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. And not only that it's very, very futuristic. It's great planning; way to go. Go forward with it, the sooner the better.

35.2.7C

Comment 476


Comment 477

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Stoddard, Natalie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Hi my name is Natalie Stoddard my number is 766.2011 and I live at 358 West Cinnamon circle in Saratoga Springs. And I am very much think that this connector at 2100 north is perfect and would just be the best thing. We look forward to this coming in and hopefully you can speed up the process. I think that of all the places to put it in Lehi this on is the best to go through and Hope that is comes to pass. Thank you very much.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Wilcox, Robert
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 This is Robert Wilcox. I live here in Lehi. I would like to speak to someone about the Mountain View Corridor the connector and my number is 766.1191. Once again this is Robert Wilcox in reference to the Mountain View Corridor. Thank you very much. Returned call: What a wonderful job you guys are doing. Fabulous idea the way you have it. Sorry you have to put up with Lehi politics. Just want to thank everyone involved. Tell them they got a call saying something positive instead of all the negative.

Comment 478


Comment 479

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C

35.2.7A
35.2.13A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Johansen, Eric
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am tired of hearing who has the better plan for traffic. The more we debate about who has the better plan, the more the traffic problem persist. It is just time to take action. At this point any of the submitted plans would be better, than just having committee's complain every month. While a meeting is held to debate, the citizens sit in traffic. Every month we wait for a city to have a meeting is another month that goes on without construction beginnig to solve the problem. Right now I think it is a matter of cities or organizations egos being right on their plan, than doing what is necessary.



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Jason
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 As a resident of Lehi, I am against the 2100 north freeway. Why impact so many citizens when Lehi City has proposed an option that will impact fewer people. Also, on the map it appears that the 2100 north freeway will be more beneficial to south bound commuters, while the Lehi City proposal will provide a shorter commute for north bound commuters. Are the majority of commuters headed south into Utah County, or north into Salt Lake County? The answer to that question is important to deciding which option is best for most commuters. And while the citizens of many Utah County cities are concerned with what will shorten their commutes, please don't marginalize the opinion of the citizens of Lehi, whose lives and homes will be affected most by this decision. It is not worth taking away someone's home to save a minute or two of commute time for citizens of Saratoga Springs or Eagle Mountain who are south bound commuters.

Comment 480

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Seavey, Bonnie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am against the 2100 North corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi. It decreases property values and adds noise and air pollution to an area already seriously affected by these annoyances. Also the destruction of acres of fragile wetlands is just wrong. I am desperately against the addition of this proposed highway. The negative consequences far outweigh the convenience of being able to shave a few minutes off driving time.

Comment 481

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.1K



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Rosemann, Debra
Location: Draper, UT

Comment:
 We are opposed to the 2100 N connector as it will displace families, eliminate 60 dwellings that have already been approved, have a negative impact on businesses and divide Lehi, decreasing property values. It will also have a negative impact on the wetlands there and the natural habitat. We participated in a transportation study group a couple of years ago held at Draper City Hall. We know that something has to be done. Why not put the connection at the Thanksgiving Point freeway entrance where there would be minimal impact on the residents and wildlife. There is going to be a lot more commercial going in there and east of the there, and that could be a big plus there.

Comment 482

Comment 483

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Laxman, David
Location: Eagle Moutain, UT

Comment:
As a resident of Eagle Mtn, the decision of where to place the East/West Coridor will greatly effect my commute time and quality of life. The proposed Lehi bridge alternative does not seem to be a logical choice. There are few residence that live close to Camp Williams. This Lehi proposed alternative will not benefit the majority of residence in North West Utah County. I support the 2100 North proposal. This route will provide a much safer and efficient way to I-15, than traveling through the congested and dangerous Lehi Main Street. The Lehi Bridge Proposal will only benefit a few in our community. We need to make the decision that will benefit the greatest number of residences -- Support the 2100 North Alternative!

35.2.9C
35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Harker, Jeremy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
The 2100 North alternative is the only acceptable bridge proposal for me and members of my community. We have been suffering horribly because of inadequate transportation for several years, our home values are adversely affected by a lack of good transportation in Northern Utah County. Please reject Lehi's proposal which ignores the needs of its own residents in West Lehi. The Bluffdale bridge plan will not serve the needs of residents in my community who number almost 200,000.

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

Comment 484

Comment 485

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Soria, Alex
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I would rather see the corridor formed further down south. I think by putting at 2100 North is a bad idea because it is an eyesore, and it will also divide the city. I think that by having it further south it will also assist more people that will need to use it, rather than just people that are going to SLC. I think people that commute to Utah County will not use it because it is out of the way.

35.2.13A
35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Whidden, Andrea
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I would like to strongly oppose the current location of the Mountainview Corridor. It is too close to a major housing development. The noise and mainly the pollution that will be generated is going to be very unhealthy for the majority of the residents in Harvest Hills. PLEASE consider moving it farther west, even a mile more would keep the pollution away from our backyards. PLEASE consider moving it farther away from homes!!!

35.2.11

Comment 486

Comment 487

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Barsh, Steve
Location: Orem, UT

Comment:
On a purely commuter basis from Provo/Orem, the Southern Freeway option along the North Shore of the Lake seems to make the most sense for access to Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain and future developments West of Utah Lake. Perhaps the view of the Lake could be preserved for future generations as people travel on a freeway close to the shore.

35.2.6A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Williamson, Dan
Location: Eagle mountain, UT

Comment:
Putting the east west road up at the point of the mountain really defeats the purpose of relieving traffic congestion in NW Utah county, and that is where the problem is. Putting it at 2100 will be a much better option for a larger population of people. C'mon Lehi, lets consider the option that is going to be better for the majority of people!

35.2.9C
35.2.7C

Comment 488

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Daniels, Karen
Location: LEHI, UT

Comment:
I want to let you know I do not think it's appropriate to put the Mountain View Corridor on 2100 N. It will divide our community. My entire family firmly feels that this connector MUST be placed closer to the point of the mountain. Preferably at 4800 N.

35.2.7D
35.2.9A

Comment 489

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Tobian, Meryn
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North Freeway. I think it is the only reasonable way to alleviate traffic coming out of Saratoga Springs & Eagle Mountain. We almost bought a house out there this past February, but we decided against it because the traffic is so bad on main street. The Lehi Bridge Proposal will not help traffic going to the Orem/Provo area, plus it looks like it will cost more to do. As long as anyone who loses their home to the 2100 North Freeway, receives a fair price for their home, I think it is the best option.

35.2.7C
35.2.9C

Comment 490

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Kirby, Steve
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Of the options presented, I like the option of having the freeway go through Lehi as opposed to north of it. This will at least help keep down some of the congestion on Redwood Road and help the commute between Eagle Mountain/Saratoga Springs and Salt Lake County.

35.2.7C

Comment 491

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Boshard, Susan & Robb W.
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
A connector road at Point of the Mountain is not in the best interest of the residents/businesses of Utah County. The northbound merging traffic would be moving uphill, forcing a horrible slow-down. Picture the 57/10/210 interchange in So. California. Somebody's worst nightmare came to fruition with the completion of this mess. Do the commuters of Utah really want a huge ongoing mess like that? I think not. Also, it would have to be a very high bridge, located in the worst possible area of high wind conditions. Have you ever crossed the 60 Fwy transition to the NB I-15 during Santa Ana wind conditions? Probably not, as the freeway is almost always CLOSED during this high-wind period of time. It is probably the scariest drive one can imagine ever in your life. It is also one of the most dangerous for commuters. Now, compound that condition with let's say, blizzards/sleet/freezing rain conditions and what have you got? Death, and the most horrible traffic nightmares imaginable. Although Lehi residents favor this transition, I think the proposed route at 2100 North is a much more rational approach to the transition road situation. I would also like to add, the Southern Route proposed should NOT be a freeway, but an arterial route servicing local citizens. I definitely feel there is an urgent need for both corridors. It would have less of a negative environmental/residential impact for all concerned.

35.2.9C

35.2.7C

35.2.8C

Comment 492

Comment 493

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

35.2.7C




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Astwood, Henry
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I feel that the 2100 North Alternative is a great option that will give main street a break and it will provide an faster alternative to getting to I-15. This option will give residents and workers alike a faster route to get to and from I-15.



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Reall, Brigitte
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
 I would like to request my vote for making the Mountain View Corridor on 2100 North vs. any other option! As a resident of Eagle Mountain, I'm so tired of having a two-way road, bumper to bumper for 15 minutes through Lehi's main street to get to southern Utah county! The 2100 North route is such a common sense solution for our congestions problems. Not building a bridge and making us go into Salt Lake County to get on I-15. This is ludicrous. Thanks for your time. Brigitte Reall

Comment 494

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Harding, JoDee
Location: Lehi, UT


Comment:
I totally support the proposed plan for the 2100 connector in Lehi. The whole North end of Utah County will benefit from this roadway.

Comment 495

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Ford, Wendy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I like the 2100N option much better than the Southern Freeway. I am a stay at home mom, so I don't commute, but I drive to or through Lehi many times each week for sports for my kids and shopping. The Southern Freeway wouldn't help me at all because it would take me too far south - I would still have to use Lehi Main Street. Good luck in your decision, and thanks for trying to give us a safer and quicker route.

Comment 496

Comment 497


Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.31C

35.2.7A

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Scott, Bradley
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Build it now. Don't worry about the special interest groups who only worry about the bad and never think of the good that comes from using our tax dollars for a wise purpose. If anybody is worried about or complaining about the pollution that comes from more roads then they shouldn't be allowed to drive on them. Getting all the complainers off the roads will eliminate half of the traffic.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Yuan, Utah
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 We are opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal ! It will negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat and damage the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan river. U&J 11-18-07

Comment 498

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Trusty, Chris
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I would strongly support the 2100 North alternate for the Mountain View Corridor. As a resident of Saratoga Springs, our traffic patterns support trips into both Provo and Salt Lake. Frankly, my preferred alternate would be the southern route, but unlike Lehi City, the spirit of compromise recognizes that the 2100 North alternative is the choice that gives west county residents the best alternatives while impacting Lehi the least. Than you.

35.2.7C

Comment 499

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bergfeld, Jeff
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I live in Eagle Mountain and deal with the long traffic congested commute to Salt Lake nearly every day. I am in support of the 2100 North alternative. Please do whats best for the greater number of people and not special interest groups who are unlikely to be as affected by your decisions.

35.2.7C

Comment 500

Comment 501

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Parish, Saerome
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I support for the 2100 North Freeway as the "ONLY REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE" to meet the future transportaion needs of Northern Utah County. Thank you. =)



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Parish, Joseph
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I wish to voice my support for the 2100 North freeway connecting the Mountain View Corridor to I-15. Although I believe it will only temporarily relieve the traffic Problems of west Utah and Salt Lake Counties, it is the best alternative currently under consideration.

35.2.7C

35.2.7C

Comment 502

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Harris, Kevin
Location: , UT

35.2.7C

Comment:
The 2100 North Freeway option is the only one that makes sense. A bridge at the point of the mountain will not solve the problems. I love living in Eagle Mountain and look forward to having a reasonable commute.

Comment 503

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Abney, Susan
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

35.2.7C

Comment:
Lighten up Lehi! The MVC will not only lighten the traffic on Main Street, but it will decrease the number of traffic accidents on that terribly congested road. Saratoga Springs needs an alternative method to get to I15. The 2100 North route makes sense!

Comment 504

Comment 505

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Taylor, Jason
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
My family and I are apposed to the 2100 North Alternative in Lehi. We feel it will have a negative impact upon our neighborhood by creating an insane exit at 2100 N. Increasing traffic & noise, destroying our quality of life. We believe there are better proposals that have less effect on peoples homes & lives. Rest assured, we are committed to apposing this proposal.

35.2.7A



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Carlile, Brian
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not believe that building a connector at 2100 north is the best solution. It will severely impact the homes and neighborhoods along this road in a negative way. The north Lehi connector is a better option.

35.2.7A

Comment 506

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Castiblanco, Andrea
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern: I'm writing to let you know that I strongly oppose the 2100 North Connector in Lehi. I'm opposed to the coridor because it will negatively impact neighborhoods that have lots of young children. The children will be affected by air/noise pollution and will see a decrease in safety from the proposed highway. Thank you in advance for listening to my concerns. Sincerely, Andrea Castiblanco

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.9C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bailey, Matt
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
I love the idea for the new road and I hope it gets built!!!

Comment 508

Comment 509

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.8C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT


STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Shaw, Kirk
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 We have to have an east-west route from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs to Lehi and other Utah County cities. Not everyone who lives in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs works in SLC, and the Lehi Main Street problem is getting out of control. It would be irresponsible of the Transportation Department to build the east-west route in Salt Lake County. This would not address the backup I experience every day on Lehi Main Street as I make my way to American Fork.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Ballash, Kenneth
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I am for building the Mountain View Corridor with the 2100 North connection to I-15 through Lehi. I live in Eagle Mountain and commute to SLC and Provo.

Comment 510

Comment 511

Response
Section in
Chapter 35




Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.7C




ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Conner, Karen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Udot, I am a new resident to the state of Utah and have purchased a home in the 2100 North area of Utah county. I have received information on the proposed 2100 North corridor for the Mountain View Connector and am opposed to this location. I believe that the proposed location at 2100 North would negatively impact my neighborhood by increasing traffic and would constitute a direct route for traffic to access this corridor therefore increasing pollution and noise in this area. There are also many children in this area that use 2100 North to walk to the nearby elementary school, increased traffic on this road would put their safety at risk. Karen Conner 2159 No. Banbury Ct Lehi, Ut 84043



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Jalin
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT


Comment:
 Please finish as soon as possible and have the Lehi section going through 2100 North as originally planned!!

Comment 512

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Oliver, Micki
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT


Comment:
 i just thought as a resident that will be greatly affected by either decision that is made about the mountainveiw corridor that i should let my feelings be known. my family has been in eagle mountain for just under a year and in that short time we've seen the added stress while driving do to the lack of roads and the amount of vehicles and big trucks that no one can pass that are doing much under the speed limit. i can't belive that someone thinks that if the new road is in bluffdale that it will help cut down the amount of traffic in lehi. those that go into salt lake county already have redwood(which is a joke also) so it wouldn't alleviate anymore traffic. this decision must be made with US in mind and it is best that the new road be in OUR county. the bluffdale road would be so far out of our way that we might as well sit through the traffic in lehi. we need this new road and we need it now. there are so many new families moving to our part of the county and you feel the added cars every single day. i hope that you will take my feelings into consideration when making your final decision, as the decision will affect me and my neighbors. thank you for your time, Micki Oliver

Comment 513

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1J



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Perez, Julie
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I'll be grateful for a quicker east-west corridor through Lehi. Why isn't widening Redwood Road all the way to SR 73 considered however? I live in Harvest Hills and with the preferred alternative Mountain View Corridor there will be two busy streets one on the east of Harvest Hills and one on the west. I don't necessarily want that.

Comment 514

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Reeves, Faye
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
From looking at the map, the Lehi Bridge Proposal is the shortest route for people coming or going from the north. The 2100 freeway is much longer, but shorter for people coming and going to the south. Which direction, north or south, do most people go when they get to I-15? Personally, I would prefer the Bridge Proposal, as I most often go north.

35.2.9A
35.2.13A

Comment 515

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: HATTON, MaryAnn
Location: MAGNA, UT


Comment:
I am wondering why you would put a rail line on 3500 south instead of along highway 201 with more park and ride lots. It seems to me it would disrupt fewer homes and businesses therefore would be less costly.

35.31C

Comment 516

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C
35.2.9C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD


Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: , Maria
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I am all for the Mountain Veiv Corridor. The proposed bridge idea seems very small minded, if you are still wanting to go into Utah county you would still have to fight traffic. I think that it is ridiculous that something wasn't done ahead of time before Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs got to the point they are at now.

Comment 517

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.10A



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Chamberlain, Jennifer
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Please don't toll the mountainview corridor. I personally will never use the road if it is tolled and there are many families who just can't add more money to their commuting costs. It will not reduce the traffic on the main roads if it is tolled. Thanks, Jennifer Chamberlain

Comment 518

Comment 519

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Chamberlain, Jennifer
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am for the 2100 N. Freeway Alternative. It really makes the most sense and would more likely reduce the traffic on Lehi's Main St. than the bridge proposal, which would be too far north and not as functional. Those commuting to provo wouldn't ever use the bridge proposal. If we are putting money into anything, lets plan for the future, not just for the now. A freeway will last a long time and be wide enough to carry the traffic that surely will come. 2100 N. would also be helpful to the businesses that will be coming to Saratoga in the near future and even to some areas of Lehi. I am sorry that Lehi is not thrilled about this plan, but the whole purpose in putting in Mountainview is to have a functional way to commute and reduce the traffic. 2100 seems to be the best route. Thanks, Jennifer Chamberlain

35.2.7C



STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Roberts, Jeremie
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Any proposed solution that does not provide access to I-15 from south of US 73 will not decrease congestion through Lehi on Main Street. No one is going to be willing to drive to five to ten miles out of their way north so that they can travel south on I-15 as this would add time to their commute, not decrease it. Nearly everyone traveling through Lehi from Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain is going south on I-15. Those who travel into Salt Lake use Redwood Road instead of going through Lehi because it is currently much faster. The proposed access between Redwood Road and I-15 at 4800 North in Lehi would ease congestion on Redwood Road through Bluffdale, and it is a reasonably good idea, but if it was a choice between one access point or another, the access south of US 73 would be far more useful. People in Saratoga Springs would easily benefit without having to travel out of their way to use it, and Eagle Mountain residents may be more willing to travel the two and a half miles south to avoid traveling through Bluffdale.

35.2.13A

35.2.6A

Comment 520

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C



ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT RECORD

Comment #: 0-0
Date: 12:00:00 AM
Source: Website
Name: Bailey, Brian
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I believe the 2100 N alternative is a good and solid idea. I am also hoping for a more southern connection as another alternative to go a long with the 2100 N project. The Lehi Bridge Proposal is idiotic and wouldn't do any good. It just goes to show that the council of Lehi is just as stupid now as when it was decided originally to have Main St be only two lanes instead of four.

This space is intentionally blank.

Comment 521

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6646-2793
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Gurlock Carol
Location: Eagle Mtn,UT

Comment:
HELLO, THIS IS CAROL GURLOCK A I LIVE IN THE RANCHES AT EAGLE MTN. MY CONTACT INFORMATION IS A PHONE NUMBER 789-6296. I WOULD LIKE TO STATE A VERY STRONGLY MY PREFERENCE FOR THE MVC AND I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THE 2100 N CORRIDOR AS BEING THE MOST VIABLE OPTION FOR ITS CITIZENS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH UM

Comment 522

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6644-2789
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Comer-Miller,Janice
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
YES, MY NAME IS JANICE COMER-MILLER. MY CONTACT INFORMATION 801-768-3012. I LIVE AT 1988 N HIDDEN CREEK DR LEHI UT. I WANTED TO SAY THAT I AM APPOSED TO THE 2100 N CONNECTOR PROPOSAL. I BELIEVE IT HAS TOO MANY NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR MY TOWN IN LEHI. WE REALIZE THAT THERE IS A CONNECTOR ROAD THAT IS NEEDED. BUT I DONT BELIEVE THAT 2100 N IS THE PLACE TO PUT IT. I BELIEVE THAT THERE IS UM MORE VIABLE OPTIONS TO PLACE THAT CONNECTOR ROAD THAN TO PUT IT DOWN 2100 N. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE 2100 N PROPOSAL DESTROYS SOME IMPORTANT WILDLIFE HABITAT YET DAMAGES THE FRAGILE ECO SYSTEM THAT RE IS AROUND THE JORDAN RIVER. AND I THINK THAT IT NEGATIVELY IMPACTS TOO MANY NEI NEIGHBORHOODS IN IN MY COMMUNITY. SO, I AM APPOSED TO IT AND I HOPE THAT UDOT LISTENS TO US AS A COMMUNITY AND RELOCATES THIS CONNECTOR ROAD. THANK YOU.

Comment 523

Comment 524

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6643-2788
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Lorenz,Janell
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 HI MY NAME IS JANELL LORENZ AND MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-0556. MY MAILING ADDRESS IS 2225 SUNSET DR IN LEHI. ZIP CODE 84043. AND UM WANTED TO LEAVE A COMMENT ABOUT THE UM THE 2100 N CONNECTOR. UM I HAVE A DAUGHTER THAT IS 5 YEARS OLD AND SHE HAS CISTIC FIBROSIS AND UM WHICH IS SEVERE LUNG UM DISEASE AND UM THIS WOULD GREATLY CONTRIBUTE TO THAT TO HER HEALTH IN A NEGATIVE WAY IF THIS GOES IN BECAUSE OF SUCH HIGH TRAFFIC AND ALL THE POLLUTION AND SO WE DEFINITELY DO NOT WANT THE CONNECTOR GOING IN WE WOULD RATHER GO WITH UM WITH LEHIS UM PROPOSITION OF TO THE OTHER DIFFERENT ROADS GOING THROUGH LEHI. UM SO JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW. AND HOPE YOU TAKE THIS INTO CONSIDERATION. THANK YOU SO MUCH. BYE BYE

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6641-2786
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Golder,Silvia
Location: ,UT

Comment:
 UM THIS IS SILVIA GOLDER CALLING AND MY PHONE NUMBER IS AREA CODE 801-254-6150 AND I'M LOOKING AT UM THE MVC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT WITH LITTLE MAPS ON THE BACK THAT I RECEIVED. UM I'M ASSUMING THAT HIGHWAY 154 IS THE BANGERTER HWY UM CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THAT LITTLE DOTTED THING IS ALONG THE EAST SIDE OF THAT THAT GOES FROM THE AIRPORT ALL THE WAY TO WHERE THE THE THING ENDS? THANK YOU

Comment 525

Comment 526

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6626-2766
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Tidwell, Amanda
Location: ,UT

Comment:
 HI, MY NAME IS AMANDA TIDWELL A UM MY CONTACT INFORMATION A WAS MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-8992. I JUST WANTED TO LEAVE A COMMENT ON THE UM THE WELL I GUESS THE NOR THE WELL THIS THE TRAFFIC THING HERE. THE MVC EAST WEST ALTERNATIVE. UM BASICALLY UM ABOUT THE I NOTICED LEHI IS PROPOSING THAT YOU COME IN CLOSE TO CAMP WILLIAMS AND I AM BUILDING A BRIDGE AND UM I LIVE IN SARATOGA SPRINGS AND UM THE I REALLY THINK THE 2100 N UM ALTERNATIVE WOULD ACTUALLY BE THE BEST FOR EAGLE MTN AND AND SARATOGA SPRINGS. UM I DRIVE ON REDWOOD RD ALL THE TIME AND I CAN'T TELL YOU YOU KNOW THERE'S NOT A DAY THAT GOES BY WITHOUT THAT I DON'T GET ROAD RAGE FROM OTHER PEOPLE AND UM EVEN ON LEHI MAIN STREET UM THIS IS JUST AN INSANE SITUATION. A YEAR AGO A I ALMOST GOT HIT BY A CAR. WHERE I AND MY KIDS WERE IN THE CAR AND BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE DRIVING CAUSE THEIR SO ANGRY THAT IT TAKES SO LONG TO GET TO EAGLE MTN. THAT THEY'RE DRIVING 60, OR 70 OR 80 MILES AN HOUR ON REDWOOD RD. ANYWAYS UM I THINK THAT THE BEST SOLUTION WOULD BE THE 2100 N. UM IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS GO AHEAD AND CALL ME BACK MY NU UM AND I LEFT MY NUMBER SO THANK YOU BYE

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6625-2765
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hadfield, Gloria
Location: ,UT

Comment:
 HI, MY NAME IS GLORIA HADFIELD I THINK THE MVC LOOKS LIKE A GOOD PROPOSAL. A I'M IN FAVOR OF IT. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 1-801-785-6634. THANK YOU.

Comment 527

Comment 528

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6624-2764
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Baugh, Jennifer
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 HI MY NAME IS JENNIFER BAUGH. I LIVE IN LEHI AT 3344 NORTH 560 WEST LEHI 84043. I HAVE A HUSBAND THAT COMMUTES INTO RIVERTON UT EVERY DAY AND IT WOULD BE NICE THAT THERE WOULD BE ANOTHER ROAD ANOTHER ROUTE THAT HE COULD TAKE TO COME HOME TO. I AM IN SUPPORT OF UDOT'S PLAN AT THE 2100 SITE. I THINK IT'S THE ONLY WAY AND THE BEST WAY TO MOVE THE TRAFFIC IN AND OUT OF UT COUNTY AND IN AND OUT OF WHERE ALL OF THE NEW GROWTH IS. I AM IN COMPLETE SUPPORT. I KNOW THAT MANY RESIDENTS IN LEHI OPPOSE THIS BUT I AM IN COMPLETE SUPPORT. I THINK IT'S A GREAT IDEA. THANK YOU.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 3782-2763
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hadfield, Larry & Linda
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 MY NAME IS LARRY HADFIELD AND I LIVE IN SARATOGA SPRINGS AND I WISH TO COMMENT ON THE MVC. I'M ALL IN FAVOR OF THE CONNECTOR BEING TO 2100 N A IF THE PEOPLE OF LEHI ARE UNHAPPY ABOUT THAT I THINK THEY SHOULD HAVE MADE SOME PLANS A LONG TIME AGO TO ALIEVE THE CONGESTION THAT GOES THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF THEIR TOWN. AS NEAR AS I CAN SEE THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN LEHI HAS CHOSEN TO DO ABSOLUTELY NOTHING AND MAKE NO PRES PREPARATION WHAT SO EVER FOR THE HEAVY TRAFFIC. AND NOW THAT UDOT WANTS TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT NOW THEY'RE WHINING AND COMPLAINING LIKE A SPOILED CHILD. A PUT THE THING THROUGH 2100. 4600 IS SIMPLY OR 4800 IS SIMPLY TOO FAR NORTH FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO WANT NEED TO GO FROM EAGLE MTN AND SARATOGA SPRINGS TO GET ON THE FREEWAY IT'S PARTICULARLY IF YOU'RE GOING SOUTH TO PROVO IT'S SIMPLY TOO FAR NORTH. THAT'S MY COMMENT. I'M LARRY HADFIELD SARATOGA SPRINGS UTAH. UM MY PHONE NUMBER THAT YOU CAN REACH ME AT IS AREA CODE 801-836-8038. THANK YOU

Comment 529

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.2A

Comment #: 6623-2762
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Graff, Terry
Location: ,UT

Comment:
THIS IS TERRY GRAFF. I AM REALLY UNHAPPY WITH THE MVC. I WOULD PREFER THAT IT BE PUT SOMEPLACE ELSE AWAY FROM THE RESIDENCES. AWAY FROM RES, YEAH, AWAY FROM A RESIDENTIAL AREA. UM I'M JUST I THINK IT I KNOW IT I KNOW THAT UM THE CORRIDOR, SOMETHING IS NEEDED BUT I JUST DON'T THINK THIS IS THE BEST OPTION. SO I WOULD PREFER THAT IT NOT HAPPEN. THANK YOU. BYE BYE

Comment 530

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6622-2761
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Wilson, Beverly
Location: ,UT

Comment:
A YES, I WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE A MESSAGE. MY NAME IS BEVERLY WILSON. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-8844. AND I WOULD LIKE TO REGISTER A NEGATIVE ON THE DEIS UM THEY'RE A BETTER ALTERNATIVE THAN THIS 2100 N CONNECTOR AND I AM ASKING THAT UDOT PLEASE TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AND FIND A BETTER ALTERNATIVE THAT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL FOR ALL PARTIES CONCERNED. SO, THANK YOU FOR LISTENING. BYE BYE

Comment 531

Comment 532

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 4793-2759
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Frandsen,Edward R. & Nann
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 YES, MY NAME IS EDWARD FRANCIN, I'M CALLING ON BEHALF OF MY SPOUSE, NAN, AND MYSELF EDWARD FRANCIN, 617 NORTH 100 EAST LEHI UT. THE 4800 N OPTION PROPOSED BY LEHI CITY IS THE BEST LOCATION. IT WOULD BE LESS DISRUPTIVE, ONLY 4-5 HOMES WOULD BE IMPACTED AND MORE PARTICULARLY WOULD USE UTILIZED LAND OWNED BY THE STATE OF UTAH THAT IS BETWEEN I-15 AND THE CURRENT REDWOOD ROAD. 4800 NORTH. WOULD COME IN JUST NORTH OF THE A CEMETERY, VETERANS CEMETERY. NORTH OF CAMP WILLIAMS. IT WOULD BE CLOSER AND PARTICULARLY, LESS DISRUPTIVE THAN THE 2100 NORTH PROPOSAL. THANK YOU. GOODBYE

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6620-2758
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Varner,Sarah
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 THIS IS SARAH VARNER V AS IN VICTORY ARNER. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 768-0754. I LIVE AT 1043 EAST 2180 NORTH LEHI. I DON'T WANT THE CORRIDOR CONNECTOR AT 2100 NORTH IN LEHI. UM I AM VERY AGAINST PUTTING FREEWAYS IN ALREADY EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREAS. IT IS TOO MUCH OF A NEGATIVE IMPACT FOR THE PEOPLE THAT ARE THERE. A NOT TO MENTION HOME LOSS, INCREASE IN POLLUTION, INCREASE IN NOISE POLLUTION. DANGER TO CHILDREN IN THE AREA BECAUSE CARS WILL BE SPEEDING. PROPERTY VALUES GO DOWN. THERE'S OTHER OPTIONS OUT THERE THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO DISRUPT THESE MANY THIS MANY PEOPLES LIVES. WHEN THEY BOUGHT THEIR HOMES IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD THEY WERE BUYING IT WITH THE BELIEF THAT IT WAS GOING TO BE A NEIGHBORHOOD, NOT A FREEWAY. THANK YOU

Comment 533

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6619-2757
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Stewart,Loreece
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
THIS IS LOREECE STEWART 50 WEST 500 S LEHI. I AM VERY MUCH APPOSED TO THE 2100 N
COR CONNECTOR. I FEEL LIKE THERE IS BETTER OPTIONS. IT IT NEEDS TO BE STUDIED
FURTHER. AND UH MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-3464. THANK YOU

Comment 534

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6618-2756
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hendrickson,Lynn
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
A THIS IS LYNN HENDRICKSON. I'M A RESIDENT OF LEHI UTAH. AND I I'M APPOSING A THE A
CONNECTOR BETWEEN YOUR MVC AND A INTERSTATE I-15 A AT 2100 NORTH IN LEHI. I
APOSE THAT, AND UM MY ADDRESS, A MY NAME IS LYNN HENDRICKSON MY ADDRESS IS
2618 N TURNBERRY LANE A TURNBERRY COURT THAT IS AND THAT'S IN LEHI UT 84043. AND A
MY PHONE NUMBER IS AREA CODE 801-331-8435. LYNN HENDRICKSON IS MY NAME. THANK
YOU VERY MUCH. BYE

Comment 535

Comment 536

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6617-2755
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Woodman,Jim
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 THIS IS JIM WOODMAN. I'M AT 8680 EAST 760 NORTH IN LEHI 84043. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 766-3355, AND I JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I'M IN FAVOR OF HAVING THE 21 NORTH 2100 NORTH CONNECTOR APPROVED AND HELP. THANK YOU.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 5114-2754
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Miller,Alfred B.
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 YES, MY NAME IS ALFRED MILLER I LIVE AT 650 WEST 2100 N LEHI UT. I'M AGAINST THIS NEW CORRIDOR BEING BUILT ON THE 2100 N EXIT OF LEHI'S FREEWAY. I OWN A SMALL FARM IN THAT AREA AND IT'LL JUST BRING MORE POLLUTION MORE NOISE AND MORE HEARTACHES TO ME AS A FARMER PLUS AND I'M AGAINST THE WETLANDS YOU PEOPLE PLAN ON BRINGING THIS ROAD ACROSSED. AND YOU'RE NOT HELPING US A BIT WHEN YOU CAN MOVE THE HIGHWAY CORRIDOR A 4 OR 5 MILES TO THE NORTH TOWARDS YOUR BIG CITY AND SAVE A WHOLE BUNCH OF HEARTACHES FOR US FOLKS DOWN HERE IN UTAH COUNTY. MY ADDRESS IS 650 WEST 2100 N LEHI UT. MY NAME IS ALFRED BUD MILLER. I'M AGAINST THIS CORRIDOR. THANK YOU.

Comment 537

Comment 538

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6616-2753
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Jaramillo, Cato
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 YES, UM MY NAME IS CATO JARAMILLO AND MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-9894. I RECEIVED A YELLOW CARD IN THE MAIL ABOUT UM OH IT SAYS DEAR UDOT I DO NOT WANT YOU TO BUILD THE CONNECTOR AT 2100 N IN LEHI FOR THESE REASONS. I HAVE CHECKED OFF THAT THERE ARE BETTER OPTIONS AND THAT THE PROPERTY VALUES THEY WILL DECREASE IF YOU HAVE A FREEWAY RUNNING THROUGH THERE. AND THEN THE HOMES THEY WILL BE RELOCATED THEN PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO LIVE THAT CLOSE TO THE FREEWAY AND WE'VE LIVED HERE FOR 15 YEARS AND WE'D LIKE IT IF YOU GUYS JUST LEAVE EVERYTHING ALONE. THE TRAFFIC IS CRAZY AS IT IS ALREADY. A ALSO THE APPROVED DWELLINGS THEY WILL BE LOST AND HEALTH RISK WILL THREATEN OUR FAMILIES. UM UM IT SAYS HERE I'VE CHECKED OFF 14.7 ACRES OF WETLAND WILL BE IMPACTED AND OF COURSE THEY WILL SPEED THROUGH LEHI LIKE CRAZY IF YOU ARE UM CONNECTING IT. COULD BE WE'VE GOT ENOUGH ACCIDENTS ALREADY A ALSO I'VE CHECKED OFF 100 ACRES OF COMMERCIAL LAND WILL BE LOST THIS IS THIS IS TRUE AND AND I DON'T KNOW. I MEAN THE AIR QUALITY WILL DIMINISH AND NOISE WILL DRAMATICALLY INCREASE WE'VE HAD IT SO FAR VERY PEACEFUL HERE IN THIS AREA IN LEHI AND WE DON'T YOU TO CHANGE ANYTHING TO MAKE IT A LOT WORSE. THE TRAFFIC IS DRIVING US NIUTS AS IT IS ALREADY. SO UM MY NUMBER AGAIN IF YOU SHOULD NEED ME IS 768-9894 AREA CODE 801 AND MY NAME IS CATO A C A T O JARAMILLO J A R A M I L L O THANK YOU BYE.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6615-2752
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Mackey, Marshall
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 MY NAME IS MARSHALL MACKEY. I LIVE IN LEHI. 17 E 820 S. 84043 UM AND I DO NOT WANT THAT TO BE ADDED A THE CORRIDOR OR THE ENTRANCE UM THE CONNECTOR AT 2100 N IN LEHI. UM FOR MANY REASONS UM OTHER OPTIONS PROPERTY VALUES DECREASING THE HOMES THAT ARE RELOCATED. UM THE SPEED THERE'S ALREADY A PROBLEM WITH PEOPLE SPEEDING THROUGH. SO I JUST WANTED TO LEAVE THAT INFORMATION. MY CONTACT PHONE IS 801-766-2124. THANKS.

Comment 539

Comment 540

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6614-2751
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: ,Austin
Location: ,UT

Comment:
YEAH THIS AUSTIN. JUST CALLIN ABOUT THE MVC ON THE 2100 N IN LEHI AND I APOOSE THAT PLAN. THERE'S A LOT BETTER OPTIONS THAT YOU CAN DO THAT WOULDN'T IMPACT UM HOMES IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD UM ALSO YOU'D BE DESTROYING ABOUT 15 ACRES OF WETLANDS THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE AND THE AIR QUALITY AND A LOT OF OTHER THINGS THAT WOULD BE REALLY BAD CUTTING THROUGH THE COMMUNITY AND DESTROYING HOMES AND OTHER COMMERCIAL LAND. UM SO I AM AGAINST IT. IF YOU COULD LISTEN TO THE OTHER PROPOSALS THAT ARE OUT THERE ABOUT BUILDING THIS A FREEWAY NORTH OF THE THANKSGIVING POINT AND CLOSER TO THE POINT OF THE MTN WHERE THERE IS NO HOMES AND UM OTHER HIGH VALUED WETLANDS THAT WOULD BE DESTROYED WOULD BE A LOT BETTER OPTION AND FOR JUST THE SAME PURPOSE. SO THANKS

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6606-2739
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: ,Wendy
Location: ,UT

Comment:
10:40 AM SATURDAY HI MY NAME IS WENDY. UM I MY PHONE NUMBER IS 427-7984 AND I AM EXTREMELY APOSED TO THE 2100 N CON CONNECTOR FOR THE MVC. I A THINK THAT THERE ARE SO MANY BETTER WAYS TO GO ABOUT IT WITHOUT RUNNING THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. UM ALSO I AM JUST NOT EXCITED ABOUT THE AIR QUALITY PROBLEMS THAT THIS IMPLIES. AND THE SPEED FROM IT THAT WILL CAUSE GOING THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOOD AND UM THERE ARE JUST SO MANY OTHER PLACES THAT YOU COULD PUT THIS WITHOUT HAVING IT RIGHT IN OUR BACK YARD. SO, UM I AM ASKING THAT YOU DO NOT PUT THE CONNECTOR THERE. THANK YOU BYE BYE

35.2.7A

Comment 541

Comment 542

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6581-2709
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Palmer, Andy
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

35.2.6A

35.2.9C

Comment:
 HI MY NAME IS ANDY PALMER I LIVE IN SARATOGA SPRINGS UT UM I WAS JUST WANTING TO COMMENT ON THE MTN VIEW CORRIDOR UM JUST WANTING TO STATE MY SUPPORT FOR THE 19TH N OPTION UM MAINLY BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT IT ACTUALLY IMPROVES THE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS IN NORTHERN UTAH COUNTY WHERE I DONT VIEW THE 4800 SOUTH OPTION IS AFFECTING THE TRAFFIC IN THIS PART OF THE COUNTY IN THE WAY THAT IT NEEDS TO BE UM AND I ALSO WOULD WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE PROJECT MOVED FORWARD AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE SO I WOULD STAND BEHIND THE SUGGESTED SUGGESTED OPTIONS OF ROAD THANK YOU FOR LETTING ME PLACE MY COMMENT. BYE

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6580-2708
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Mecham, Gaylyn
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

35.2.7C

35.2.9C

Comment:
 Hi this is Gaylin Mecham, I live on 7152 n Mohican Dr. IN EAGLE MTN UT 84005. MY PHONE # IS 789-2372. I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT THAT I'M HIGHLY IN FAVOR OF THE 2100 N. ALTERNATIVE. UM I AM AGAINST THE 4800 N PROPOSAL THAT LEHI HAS PROPOSED UM I THINK THAT THAT'S WAY TOO FAR NORTH. THE MAIN REASON FOR PEOPLE TO WANT TO GO TO THE EAST/WEST DIRECTION IS TO GET TO I-15 MOSTLY TO GO SOUTH UM IF WE WANTED TO GO NORTH ON I-15 WE WOULD GO TO THE BANGERTER HIGHWAY THEN GO NORTH THAT WAY I'M VERY MUCH IN FAVOR OF 2100 N ALTERNATIVE UM IT HAS LESS IMPACT ON THE WETLANDS AND LESS HOMES AND BUSINESSES THAT WOULD NEED TO BE RELOCATED. AND THE LEAST AMOUNT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES IMPACTED ONCE AGAIN MY NAME IS GAYLIN MECHAN. MY PHONE # IS 789-2372. AND I AM A RESIDENT OF EAGLE MTN ON 7152 N MOHICAN DR. THANK YOU

Comment 543

Comment 544

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D
35.2.9B

Comment #: 4805-2707
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Harris,John
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
YEA THIS IS JOHN HARRIS MY NUMBER IS 801-870-4875 AND I'M APPOSED TO THE FREEWAY AT 2100 N I THINK THAT THERE ARE OTHER OPTIONS THAT ARE BETTER A SPECIFICALLY RIGHT AT THE POINT OF THE MTN. A THANK YOU BYE.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6402-2706
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Brimhall,Ammon
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
HI A MY NAME IS AMMON BRIMHALL. I JUST GOT THIS THING FROM LEHI THAT A IS TELLING ME TO TELL YOU NO ON 2100 N CONNECTOR. I'M REALLY REALLY DISAPPOINTED IN LEHI THEY PUT A LOT OF INFORMATION HERE SAYING OH ROUGHLY THAT 90 HOMES WILL BE AFFECTED AND ALL THESE THINGS THAT WILL AFFECT LEHI. AND A I WANT TO SAY THAT I DO CARE ABOUT THE PEOPLE IN LEHI BUT I THINK THAT THE IMPACT TO LEHI IS SO MUCH LESS COMPARED WITH THE ENTIRE IMPACT OF THE THE COUNTY OF UTAH AND THE CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS AND EAGLE MTN. I THINK YOU'RE AFFECTING SO MANY MORE HOMES BY MOVING IT FURTHER NORTH. I DEFINITELY SUP SUPPORT ROAD AS FAR SOUTH AS YOU CAN GO. A 2100 N SEEMS TO BE A GOOD COMPROMISE BETWEEN GOING ALL THE WAY SOUTH AND HURTING EVEN MORE HOMES A BUT A YOU KNOW I'M REALLY UPSET AT LEHI THAT THAT THEY'RE SO SELFISH AS TO PUT YOU KNOW THOUSANDS UPON THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE WITH LONGER DRIVES A MORE POLLUTION A JUST BECAUSE OF THE LONGER DRIVE AND NOT REALLY SAVING US ANY TIME. SO, IF IT GOES ALL THE WAY UP NORTH A TO THE POINT OF THE MOUNTAIN I'LL JUST KEEP GOING THROUGH MAIN STREET BECAUSE I DON'T SEE WHERE IT WOULD SAVE ME ANY TIME WHEN I'M HEADED TO UTAH COUNTY FOR WORK. SO, YOU KNOW IF YOU REALLY WANTA REDUCE CONGESTION THEN I'M YOU KNOW THEN I REALLY FEEL SAD THAT 90 HOMES EXISTING WILL BE RELOCATED AND 60 APPROVED LOANS WILL BE LOST IN LEHI. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT I'M SORRY THE A THE IMPLICATIONS ARE HUGE AMOUNTS OF TIME IN ECONOMIC LOSS TO TWO ENTIRE OTHER CITIES NOT JUST ONE PORTION OF LEHI. THANK YOU BYE BYE

Comment 545

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 11-2705
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Anonymous
Location: ,UT

Comment:
YES, I'M A CASTING A NO VOTE FOR THE AUDOT THAT THEY WANT TO PUT THAT A 2100 NORTH CONNECTOR AND I'M VOTING AGAINST IT. THANK YOU

Comment 546

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6579-2704
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Andrews,John & Fern
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
A THIS IS JOHN ANDREWS AT 2138 N 650 WEST IN LEHI UT. MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-9585. I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY DESIRE THAT THEY NOT BUILD THAT CORR CONNECTOR, CORRIDOR AT A 2100 N IN LEHI FOR MANY REASONS UM WE'VE SAVED A LIFETIME TO A BUILD A HOUSE HERE THAT'S EQUIPPED FOR MY HANDICAPPED WIFE WHO IS ALSO BLIND AND IN A NICE QUIET NEIGHBORHOOD AND WE'D LIKE TO KEEP IT THAT WAY. PLEASE DON'T RUIN THAT FOR US. THANK YOU.

Comment 547

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D
35.2.9A

35.2.1F

Comment #: 6578-2703
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Berry, Katherine
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
THIS IS KATHERINE BERRY AT 766-1239 I AM APPosed TO THE 2100 N FREEWAY CONNECTOR IN LEHI. I FEEL IT WILL SPIT UP SPLIT UP THE CITY OF LEHI AGAIN WHICH I-15 ALREADY DOES. I THINK THE 4800 N PROPOSAL UM WILL GET TRAFFIC COMING FROM THE NORTH ON TO THE MVC SOONER AND IT IS A SHORTER CONNECTOR THAN THE 2100 N. IT APPEARS TO ME FROM LOOKING AT THE PLANS THAT THE 4800 N PROPOSAL WILL AFFECT FEWER PEOPLE AND ESTABLISH NEIGHBORHOODS. AND WHY HAVE A LONGER FREEWAY WHEN YOU CAN MAKE A SHORTER ONE. THE MAIN PROBLEM WITH LEHI TRAFFIC IS GETTING PEOPLE FROM I-15 EITHER NORTH OR SOUTHBOUND OVER INTO SARARTOGA SPRINGS ALL OVER THERE AND THE 2100 N FREEWAY CONNECTOR WON'T GET PEOPLE COMING FROM THE SOUTH OUT INTO THAT AREA ANY QUICKER THEY'LL STILL TRAVEL RIGHT THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF LEHI BECAUSE THEY'LL HAVE TO GO UP ONTO THE FREEWAY CONNECTOR THEN TURN ONTO THE MVC THEN GET ON UM STATE ROUTE 73 SO THEIR, THEIR STILL GOING TO HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF LEHI. I THINK YOU NEED A 1900 SOUTH OPTIONAL AREA ARTERIAL ROAD TO ACCOMPLISH GETTING NORTHBOUND TRAFFIC OFF THE FREEWAY AND INTO THAT AREA. A I FEEL THAT THAT WOULD BE A BETTER OPTION COUPLED WITH YOU KNOW OTHER ARTERIAL ROADS AND IT'LL LEAVE THE LEHI COMMUNITY MORE IN TACT. I THINK YOU NEED TO KEEP THE CONGESTION OUT OF THE INTERIOR OF LEHI SINCE WE'VE ALREADY EXPERIENCED ENOUGH OF THAT. AGAIN MY NAME IS KATHERINE BERRY AT 766-1238 THANK YOU

Comment 548

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6577-2702
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Berdanolie, Gary
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
HELLO THIS IS GARY BERDANOLIE IN EAGLE MTN UT. I'D LIKE TO COMMENT ON THE MVC. UM THE ROAD GOING FROM THE WEST SIDE HERE OVER TO I-15 I WOULD PREFER THE A 2100 N ROAD OPTION A THE 2100 N ALTERNATIVE OPTION A THAT WOULD BE MY PREFERENCE FOR THESE FOR THIS ROAD. AND A THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO OFFER TODAY. THANK YOU BYE.

Comment 549

Comment 550

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6517-2631
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Williams,Rylee
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:

My name is Riley Williams. I live at 2250 North and I am strongly opposed to the 2100 North um freeway alternative, the Mountain View Corridor. I think that that is ridiculous um and extremely unfair to the homeowners who've purchased homes in that neighborhood. Um I think it will decrease the values of homes it will decrease the value of the area [um] (inaudible). animals, birds, trees, all of that. It will be ridiculous and smoggy. I think there are definitely um more appropriate locations such as [um] just a little bit north towards the Point of the Mountain where there are no houses. Um I know that that had been discussed or proposed and I think that would be a far better alternative rather than moving churches and homes. [Um] My, again, my name is Riley Williams and I am a Lehi resident.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6516-2630
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Ray,Greta
Location: ,UT

Comment:

Hi, this is Greta Ray. I wanted to respond to the Mountain View Corridor, I believe that's what it's called, and I oppose the freeway alternative going on 2100 North but I do would like to voice my [um] approval of the southern freeway alternative that goes through Saratoga Springs and I also like the [um] road that you have proposed that goes across Utah Lake. It's called Foothill Road. Thank you very much. Bye.

35.2.7D

35.2.6A

35.2.1G

Comment 551

Comment 552

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 2447-2629
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Lloyd,Gary & Elvira
Location: West Valley City,UT

Comment:
 I would appreciate it if you'd call Gary Lloyd at 9 – 966-3277. Thank you. Good-bye.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

35.2.9B

35.2.6A

35.2.1F

Comment #: 6515-2628
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Worlton,Doug & Connie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 My name is Connie Worlton. [Uh] My husband, Doug, and I wanted to comment about the plan for the Mountain View Corridor and [um] it is our opinion that that we go along with Lehi City and think that the 2100 North plan is not good because it impacts too many citizens and their homes and we feel like it should go on 4800 North where Lehi City suggested it should go from the Mountain View Corridor over to I-15. And we also believe that there needs to be a freeway that goes on the north side of the lake and [um] joins into the Pleasant Grove exit and the Pleasant Grove entrance of I-15. Whether that's a freeway or whether that's just [uh] two lanes in each direction, there needs to be something done to alleviate the traffic that's on Center Street in Lehi and help those people be able to get to the Provo Orem-Provo area that are [um]. We feel like that [um] that that is the plan that impacts people and their homes and their quality of life and their family the least amount is to have [um] the freeway go from the Mountain View Corridor over to I-15 on 4800 North, the same plan that Lehi has, and then have [um] a road that has [um] that goes across the top of the lake and joins into the Pleasant Grove [uh] freeway entrance to I-15. If you want to contact us back, our telephone is 768-4141.

Comment 553

Comment 554

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6676-2826
Date: 12/14/2007
Source: Website
Name: Johnson,Karen & Carl
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
 As a resident of western Utah County (Eagle Mountain), the need for a high-speed east/west connector to I-15 is urgent. There is no present route that provides legitimate access to the South, to the North or even to the East. I am definitely in favor of the preferred UDOT alternative of the 2100 North Connector between the Corridor (Redwood Road area) and I-15. I ask that every consideration be given to approve this alternative and to begin construction at the earliest possible alternative, preferably during the year 2008. What can justify a delay?

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.1G

Comment #: 6649-2795
Date: 12/14/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jones,Shane
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
 The 2100 North Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of a freeway. The only traffic movement it satisfies is North Saratoga to North Lehi & visa versa and East Utah County to West Salt Lake County. 2100 North is too much out of direction travel on traditionally bad weather roads (around the point of the mountain) for traffic from West Utah County to East Salt Lake County & visa versa to use. Bangerter Highway is much more convenient. Moreover, it doesn't satisfy in any way traffic between East and West Utah County. Without the Souther Freeway Alternative, a freeway cooridor across Utah Lake is imperative- which combined with 2100 North would be satisfactory. Unfortunately it seems the EIS process prevents us from considering the big picture. In any case, thanks to the team for all their hard and diligent work!

Comment 555

Comment 556

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

Comment #: 6647-2792
Date: 12/14/2007
Source: Website
Name: Winn Garrett
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
 I have lived in Eagle Mountain for 7 years now, and I enjoy it. The worst thing about it is the commute from I-15 to my home because of the lack of options and high traffic volumes. So, I am particularly happy that something is being done about it. However, I worry that we are choosing an option based solely on cost and ease of getting it done. While these are important factors, I would think that traffic patterns would be at the top of the list. The main option right now really only benefits those traveling to SLC. For those going to Utah county, the current Main street drive would seem to make more sense. And this is exactly the same traffic that is currently driving Main street as most SLC traffic takes Redwood road. A northern-located corridor would, I believe, not be nearly as effective as something farther south, even if it does affect more homes and environment than a far north route since commuters to other parts of Utah county would find that it was far out of their way, and the slight decrease in traffic volume along main street would be more acceptable than driving 10 miles farther with even less traffic. So, while I am all for saving taxpayer money and with getting this project underway and completed as fast as possible, I see little value in a corridor that lies north of the current Main street route.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 11-2784
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Anonymous
Location: ,UT

Comment:
 I do not want the connector built at 2100 North in Lehi, first of all there are too many homes, churches, and some buisness that will be impacted. as I have studied Lehi's proposal, it seems to be a much better alternative, with much less impact to our city. I work in that area, and the traffic is already unsafe. It seems like your mind is already made up, and this is just a matter of letting us speak our minds. I Hope that this is not the case. I am totally against this proposal. Please listen to our opinions, and remember that it is our tax money also that is involved.

Comment 557

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6638-2783
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Brown, Annie
Location: Eagle Mtn, UT

Comment:
I am in support of the 2100 NORTH FREEWAY ALTERNATIVE in Lehi; I believe it ridiculous to have so many people with inadequate access to the freeway; please let me know what else I can do. Annie

Comment 558

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6629-2769
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ritter, Jill
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS WE LIVE VERY CLOSE TO WHERE YOU ARE PLANNING AND IT WOULD BE HORRIBLE TO HAVE IT IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. THERE ARE OTHER BETTER OPTIONS AND LOCATIONS.

Comment 559

Comment 560

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

Comment #: 6628-2768
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Searle, Travis
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Please do the southern freeway alternative. I believe Utah County needs an efficient way to move people to Provo or as close to Provo as you can. By taking the southern freeway alternative it will help move people through Utah County. The other alternatives move people to I-15 and not through Utah County. I-15 will become a parking lot. The second

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6627-2767
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Larson, Desirae
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 We moved to this location to avoid the Freeway noise, pollution, and negative effect on our property value that our old home in Lehi was affected by! This area is filled with decent homes and lots of small children, the thought of a Freeway running through this peaceful corner of Lehi is outrageous. I understand that growth has made need for a new freeway, but it seems the the 4800 route that Lehi City is proposing would make so much more sense overall. We urge you to look and that alternative to avoid destroying this beautiful neighborhood.

Comment 561

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D
35.2.9A

Comment #: 6621-2760
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nicoll, Alan
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not believe 2100 North in Lehi is the best place for a connector. Please consider alternate locations that will not divide the city of Lehi with another major freeway. I feel that multiple arterial roads or a freeway farther north of the city would have less impact.

Comment 562

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.1.1A
35.2.3A
35.2.1A

Comment #: 6613-2750
Date: 12/13/2007
Source: Website
Name: WEstern, Karen
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
As a property owner and resident slated to have the MVC in my back yard, I am strongly opposed to this project. As a commuter in Salt Lake County, I see a greater need for east-west corridors and more routes involving TRAX, which should also include a Utah County route going north/south. As a parent and citizen; i strongly oppose the current plans for MVC because of the homes which would be removed; the schools which would be impacted--specifically, Copper Hills High School which is directly in the path. As a reasonably intelligent person living in this area I wonder why the MVC is not utilizing Bacchus highway which is already a north south corridor and not too far to the west of the proposed route. The proposed routes are not the best routes and while we need to improve the traffic situation whatever decision is made will affect literally thousands of people for a very long time. Let's rethink this proposal and get the right solution.

Comment 563

Comment 564

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6612-2749
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jensen,Leighton
Location: Lehi,UT

35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment:
 Your proposal is not the most beneficial. I understand the need for another freeway due to the amount of growth out west but destroying prime property of 1 city who does not want the freeway hardly seems like the correct path to take. I would like to see a combination of the Lehi proposal and UDOT's. Traffic is terrible between Lehi main street and North Orem, UDOT's proposal will do nothing to solve this - the Lehi proposal atleast connects roads into the new PG exit & AF exit which would greatly help. I suppose the biggest thing that bothers me is when UDOT would rather destroy people's houses and property rather than go through wetlands and undevelopable land (north Utah lake) - that truly is sad. These stupid environmentalists have too much power and influence on you. The environment is important but when the decision between saving the beetle or spotted frog or whatever they are trying to save becomes more important than saving peoples houses, property and way of life then that is a good indication that something is wrong with the government (atleast in that decision). It seems like UDOT's proposal is taking the easy way out because they are afraid of a couple noisy environmentalists who seem to have more power than the government does in the future roadways of our country (just look at the Legacy project as a prime example). I'd like to thing that the deep pockets of the environmentalists are not persuading some of the officials making the final decision.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6611-2748
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Needles,Jason
Location: Lehi,UT

35.2.7D

Comment:
 Look at the option Lehi City has presented, I am admantly opposed to the connector being at 2100 north.

Comment 565

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6607-2740
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Garside, Scott
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Don't build the 2100 N connector. I've been looking at the alternative that Lehi City is proposing and feel that solution is better for the area. Please implement the solution that Lehi city wants. thank you, Scott Garside

Comment 566

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6602-2734
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Blackburn, Parker
Location: eagle Mtn, UT

Comment:
I support the 1200 north project through Lehi

Comment 567

Comment 568

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6601-2733
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Blackburn, Sarah
Location: eagle Mtn, UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 north project in Lehi

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6600-2732
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Blackburn, Jodie
Location: eagle mtn, UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North expansion option through Lehi

Comment 569

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6599-2731
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Blackburn,David
Location: Eagle Mtn,UT

Comment:
I support the 2100 North project from SR68 (redwood) to I-15, and the expansion of Redwood from SR-73 into SL County. I additionally pass on thanks for the inclusion of bike friendly roads too!

Comment 570

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6598-2729
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Website
Name: Baker,John
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I DO NOT want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for these reasons: 1. There are much better options. 2. Property values will decrease. 3. 29 Homes will be relocated. 4. 60 approved dwellings will be lost. 5. 14.75 acres of wetlands will be impacted. 6. 100+ acres of commercial land will be lost. 7. The socioeconomic impacts will be severe. 8. The cumulative impacts will be extreme. 9. Interchange congestion will be stifling. 10. Air quality will diminish. 11. Noise will dramatically increase.

Comment 571

Comment 572

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6597-2728
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Stokes,Paul
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I am against the 2100 North Connector. Here are the list of reasons I do not support the building of the connector at 2100 North: -Property values will go down -Homes will have to be relocated -Health risks will threaten our families from the additional traffic -14.7 acres of wetlands will be impacted. -Cars will speed through Lehi at 75 MPH -Noise walls will ruin the views -There are better options -Air quality will diminish Please listen to the people of Lehi and choose another route for your connector. I understand there are alternatives that will not be as damaging to our city. Thanks, Paul Stokes

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.12A

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 4720-2727
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Paulsen,Chris & Christie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the 2100 north freeway in Lehi. As a mother of three children I am very worried about the negative health effects, especially how it will effect my two year old son. He already has a very fragile immune system and cannot fight disease like most children. Having this freeway built and the poulutants that come from all of the cars will definatly make it so he will not be able to even play in the back yard. And with the housing market the way it is there is hardly any option to sell our home. But also I shouldn't have to sell my home because I was here first! The other concerns I have include the increasingly amount of people (strangers) driving through my neighborhood trying to find shortcuts to and from the freeway. I enjoy letting my children play outside and I dont want to worry about who might be speeding through my neighborhood, trying to get to work or school on time. I want to let my children walk to the bus stop or to the park (that is if you leave it alone and not build a freeway right next to it) without having to worry. I am definatly for the idea of putting it the freeway a 4800 north. I know we need a solution and I truly feel that putting the freeway there will ease congestion as well as keep my family and the other families safe in this neighborhood. There would also be alot less negative impacts in every way.

Comment 573

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.4B

35.2.4C

Comment #: 3710-2726
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wray,Lon
Location: West Valley City,UT

Comment:

This is one of many comments I have submitted. I have also voiced my opinion and objections via the Salt Lake Tribune, and was seemingly credible enough to become published on several occasions. Here are the simplest of issues as I, and numerous of my neighbors see them; First, 5600 West has just completed a long-needed expansion to 4 lanes. Voila! After some 20 years of gridlock, no more rush hour congestion at any hour. Does it still make sense now to build a superhighway just 4 blocks west? Furthermore, let's seriously discuss the term 'superhighway'. If the Mountain View Corridor will have a stop light every mile or so (As Bangarter Highway does), well, then it really isn't a superhighway is it? And it certainly can't impose its presense without these exits to take the place of the numerous residential streets it devistates. As this community continues to grow, it will do so on a westward basis. We have pretty much exploited this area as far as usable space. Would it not make more sense to utilize the westernmost option (7800 West) as opposed to 6000 West- just 18 blocks from the already-existing Bangarter Highway, and a mere stone's throw from Bacchus Highway- presently being widened? Having grown up in Southern California, I feel I am eminently qualified to recognize the long-familiar pattern of instant obsolescence. If we are in fact growing west, then west seems to be the most sensible place to build the Mountain View Corridor, does it not? At the present "UDOT preferred" location of 6000 West, we are accomplishing little, save for the realization that 10 years down the road we'll need yet ANOTHER "corridor" at about 7800 West due to unforeseen and underestimated growth. How about that. Furthermore, the 6000 West location will cut through schools, golf courses, businesses, residential areas, and the Usana Amphitheater in its senseless swath. A brief perusal of others' comments on this very site clearly demonstrates I am not alone in my convictions. Finally, the fact that in almost all cases, in almost every foun, the residents of the two areas in question vehemently demand it be built at "the other one". If any of this makes sense, I would strongly request and recommend a re-evaluation of the westernmost route. Either that, or start saving pop bottles, for in 15 years you're going to end up building another one there anyway. We as a community feel betrayed, and are heartsick, disappointed, and very dismayed that clear heads cannot prevail on this most basic and simple premise. We are awaiting someone with the foresight to see this issue as it is, rather than just "One more UDOT project". Your serious consideration will be sincerely appreciated. Lon S. Wray

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6594-2725
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Milne,Shawn
Location: Tooele,UT

Comment:

Do it already! If the original pioneers had any forethought as to planning major access points to various places of importance within the general area including and surrounding Salt Lake Valley, previous elected officials have seemingly squandered and/or been absent of any such abilities of the same. The time for prudence in aquring and developing another, western major-corridor for commuting to/from the Valley's western communities has long passed. We are now facing more expensive costs for land/leaseament purchases and construction. We are now in a mode of "catch-up". Environmentalism included, this commuting corridor is needed to facilitate less rush-hour induced clogging of our major vehicular arteries! Homes will be developed in increasing haste and quantity on the western side of the Valley, whether opponents to such like it, or not. Stalled vehicles don't pollute any less when sitting idle behind accident scenes or busy/congested roadways. Likewise, commerce is likely to be affected when commuters wary from a longer-than-need-be drive to their destinations will opt for more online shopping rather than visit their local vendors through another gruelling fight on the poorly-designed, -maintained, or beleaguered roads. All of this doesn't bode well for citizens or their elected representative. Nor does it look good for UDOT - another agency void of much trust from their "customers". Please get to work already! And be thinking ahead of what's to come in the near and far future in terms of "paving the way" for our infrastructure needs. Thanks for your time and consideration.

Comment 574

Comment 575

Comment 576

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6593-2724
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: NELSON, LAURA
Location: PROVO, UT

Comment:
 I like the Lehi City option. Wetlands and meadows are a great concern to me because I am opposed to leapfrog highway building through west Provo. What happens here can means alot to my community. The path of least resistance is not always the best solution even though it may be the easiest. Think about future generations.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.6A

35.2.1F

Comment #: 6585-2714
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Smith, Daniel
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I have no strong opinion over the Salt Lake county portion of the project. However I would like to voice my objections to UDOT's 2100 North Freeway preferred option in Utah County. I agree that the North end of Utah County needs an East/West Freeway, but 2100 North is not the place for it. Division of Lehi A freeway at 2100 North, would result in the division, separation, and isolation of the North-West part of the city from the rest of Lehi. This section already has artificial (I-15 and the railroad tracks) and natural (Point of the Mountain and Jordan River) barriers on three sides. A Freeway at 2100 North would create one on the south as well, completely boxing it in. Other than the existing Alpine/Highland interchange, I see no real options to keep this portion connected and accessible to the rest of the Lehi. Lack of connections to the rest of Lehi would reduce the ability of emergency response promptly when needed or require special stations to service this area. Customers would find it difficult to visit. This will cause the devaluation of valuable property. To prevent this, access would need to be provided to the South and State Street. Creates an Overly-Complex Interchange The 2100 North Freeway would make for an overly complex interchange with I-15, State Street, 1200 West, and with this newly isolated North-West section of town. Bad Location Compromise 2100 North appears to be a bad compromise between a North and a South route. And it's not in the best interest of Lehi, or any of the surrounding communities. It's too far North to be an attractive route to those in the communities West and South-West of Lehi traveling East and South-East. Only those going North into Salt Lake county would find this attractive. The main Freeway that is currently part of this project going into Salt Lake county already fulfills this need. Best of the Three There needs to be an East/West Freeway through the North end of Utah county. The Southern Freeway alternative is the best option and provides direct connection to the communities West of Lehi to those to the East and South of American Fork. Arterials such as 10th South and Lehi Cities preferred option for 2100 North can handle the local traffic in between. I realize there are environmental issues (wet-lands) and houses that would be displaced across the North end of Utah Lake. These shouldn't be shield away from, but dealt with up front and quickly. This right-of-way needs to be secured. Additional Option In addition to the Southern Freeway alternative, a connector between I-15 and the new Mountain View Corridor Freeway should be created, such as the 4800 North or Traverse Mountain Freeways. This will allow North/East-South/West and North/West-South/East traffic between the two valleys.

Comment 577

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6584-2712
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Curtis, ReNae
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I really like the 1900 So. idea, but if the 2100 No will work and can be accessed faster, then I vote for that one. I live next to Lehi main street and would like to see an improvment as soon as possible. Please don't put anything on hold for another 5-10 years! We need help now.

Comment 578

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6576-2701
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ray, Neva
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am concerned about the option of the connector at 2100 North in Lehi. There are better options Property values will decrease. Increased speed through my neighborhood is a large concern. Increased health risk. The noise walls will ruin views. Air quality will diminish and noise will dramatically increase. Please consider another option for this connector.

Comment 579

Comment 580

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 5056-2700
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Ehat, Jill
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

As a Lehi resident that will be directly impacted by the 2100 N. Freeway, I am adamantly oppose this option. I realize there needs to be a solution for East-West Traffic, so I support the alternatives presented by Lehi City. I don't believe that Lehi homes and therefore families should be negatively impacted by this freeway when they won't benefit from it and better alternatives still exist. Plus, with the new development at the Point of the Mountain next year, it will need it's own exit anyway. The East to West Freeway should just be built and connect here at the point of the mountain, where it won't affect homes and is only a couple miles north of the proposed 2100 N. option.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6574-2697
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hintze, Nicol
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I feel like there are better places to locate the connector freeway for the mountain view corridor than 2100 North in Lehi. There are some beautiful areas that will be destroyed in the name of "progress" if you proceed with the current plan.

Comment 581

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6573-2696
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Michelle
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
The 2100 N. Connector is to much road for a residential area. The better option is to move the connector North to point of the mountain. My children go to school in the area proposed by UDOT and cars will be going through these areas at 75 MPH! The traffic problem on Lehi Main street is from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs residents. Have them take Redwood further North to connect to I-15 and save my neighborhood!

Comment 582

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6572-2695
Date: 12/11/2007
Source: Website
Name: Reinbold,Krissa
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
2100 North is not the answer. I recognize that a connector is needed, but doing so at 2100 North is not the best place for this connector. There are too many negative consequences and the city of Lehi as come up with better alternatives for this no matter where you live. By putting the corridor at 2100 N you will decrease the property value of homes in the area, you will destroy 29 New Homes, and pose many health threats to the families in these local areas. Not only will homes be lost but acres of wetlands and commercial property for the city of Lehi will be destroyed. You need to rethink your plan, because 2100 is not the best solution.

Comment 583

Comment 584

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.29A

35.2.3A

35.12.4A

Comment #: 6560-2681
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nelson,Joey
Location: Herriman,UT

Comment:

Thank you for the comment period. After reviewing the "EIS", we strongly oppose the MVC going forward unless mass transit, i.e. Trax, Trolley, Rapid bus etc., is built AT THE SAME TIME to coincide with the freeway. A highway is what it will be, even if tolled, not a small two lane country road. Because of the massive growth in this valley, we believe very strongly that asthma and other health concerns should be at the forefront of the planning process. That is why I feel mass transit should be built concurrently with the freeway, and I oppose the freeway in every form unless the mass transit receives equal attention, and expediency/funding. I also think it is absurd to jeopardize the health of so many young people by placing the route of the new freeway so close to 3 public schools. There are many studies showing the link of asthma in children with living/attending school in close proximity to a freeway. If the freeway is built too close to the school's in Herriman where our children will attend, then we will surely move to an area that values the health of its citizen's over the growth and convenience of the metropolis. Please carefully consider ALL the implications of building another freeway in this already crowded valley, especially those pertaining to air quality for ourselves and our children. Los Angeles is a perfect experiment showing the pitfalls of building too many freeways. Mass Transit must be a major solution to the viability of our future. Thank You. Joey and Katie Nelson Herriman residents

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6559-2680
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Baily,Jack
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:

Build the 2100 N. corridor and forget the other two. I would like your fax number so that I can send you my compete memo.

Comment 585

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6558-2679
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Birmingham,Susan
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I think there are other more appropriate and less invasive options to the lehi residents.

Comment 586

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6557-2678
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Birmingham,R
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I have been a resident of Lehi for years, and am currently building OUTSIDE of Lehi because I cannot stand the Lehi City government. I cannot conceive of a body that could possibly make a greater number of bad decisions in such short periods of time. Their stance against the 2100 North Connector MUST be ignored. It seems that Lehi has absolutely no vision of the needs of its citizens; take their developments around 1200 West for an example. A road that goes from narrow to wide and narrow to wide? A 1-lane road that busses need to go down to get to their school (which, to add, is now going to be a neighbor to a transient "Extended Stay" motel!?) Lehi is wrong in just about every decision they make and they MUST be ignored!

Comment 587

Comment 588

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6556-2677
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pruhs, Joyce
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 The 2100 North Alternative seems to be the best choice for traffic to flow quickly to and from I-15.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6555-2676
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Joe
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I do not agree with the proposed connector in Lehi. This solution creates as many problems as it solves. I agree with increasing road capacities and providing access but we often feel that a 5-lane freeway is the only answer, when in fact there are better solutions.

Comment 589

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6554-2675
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Critchfield, Justin
Location: lehi, UT

Comment:
I think that the 2100 n. corridor in lehi is not the best alternative as the connector. there are too many negative consequences. Like 29 homes will be relocated and noise will increase. and wet lands will be impacted. I think having it north of Thanksgiving point would be best.

Comment 590

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6553-2674
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jensen, Terry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Putting the connector at 2100 North in Lehi is a bad idea. It will ruin the quality of life for many families not to mention the impact to the wetlands. There are better options and I strongly recommend you to select one of those.

Comment 591

Comment 592

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A
35.2.7A

Comment #: 6552-2673
Date: 12/10/2007
Source: Website
Name: Klein,Dannette
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I would request that you take Lehi City's proposal for the freeway connector into full consideration as an alternative to your current 2100 North proposal. I believe this proposal has been well thought out and would truly have the least impact on our community as a whole and especially on those who have chosen to make their home in that area. The impact on their property values and their health and safety is tremendous. Again, please use the Lehi City plan North of Thanksgiving Point. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6551-2672
Date: 12/9/2007
Source: Website
Name: Beck,Rachele
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I am writing to you to let you know that I do not want the connector on 2100 north in Lehi. I have looked at the alternative options and the Lehi proposed option is a better solution. If this were to happen, the home property values will decrease, many homes will be lost and relocated, the wetlands will be impacted, noise and pollution, and the speed of cars are some of the reasons I would not put in the road on 2100 north. Please reevaluate this connector. Thank you, Rachele Beck

Comment 593

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6550-2671
Date: 12/9/2007
Source: Website
Name: Kindred,Rich
Location: ,UT

Comment:
I am against the 2100 North Lehi connector for the MVC. Sure a connector is needed, but the connection that Lehi City is better. Why would you impact so many people, neighborhoods, businesses, etc. when a connection just a few miles further north would meet the need and have so much less negative impact on so many people.

Comment 594

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6549-2670
Date: 12/9/2007
Source: Website
Name: Mordecai,Erin
Location: ,UT

Comment:
Dear UDOT: I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for these reasons: There are better options Property values will decrease 29 Homes will be relocted Health risks will threaten our families 14.75 acres of wetlands will be impacted Cars will speed through Lehi at 75 MPH Noise will dramatically increase

Comment 595

Comment 596

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D
35.2.1H

Comment #: 6548-2669
Date: 12/9/2007
Source: Website
Name: Goodwin,Thomas
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
We oppose the UDOT connector at 2100 North in Lehi. Please compromise with Lehi City. There are much better options. While we agree a connector is needed this is NOT the right place for one. Think about future growth and invest into mass transit, such as Trax into Utah county. UTA owns the rail from the Trax station in Sandy through Provo. This area is growing way too fast. A connector will only be a short term fix. Instead of adding the amount of vehicles find a solution to decrease traffic.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6547-2668
Date: 12/9/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gazaway, Amy
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
Please do not cut our city in half again. Lehi is my home town and the best palce to put a connector is not 2100 N. This will do way more impact on our community that the one propossed by Lehi. Please try to leave as much small, home town feeling as possible and do not put cars driving at high speeds and diminish our air quality. It's our town let us have the say where this goes.

Comment 597

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6546-2667
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hickman,Nadine
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I would prefer to see the freeway connected north on the Porter Rockwell trail. I feel it would impact less homes and eliminate alot of congestion choosing that route.

Comment 598

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6545-2666
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Bateman,Tyler
Location: ,UT

Comment:
I Think the freeway through lehi is a great idea. cause it would make traffic so much better.

Comment 599

Comment 600

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A
35.2.9A

Comment #: 6544-2665
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Francorn,Kurtley
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
I live very close to where the 2100 North Freeway Connector is being proposed. My property value will be devastated if this connector is approved. Noise levels will raise greatly, Traffic congestion will be terrible. CO2 emmissions will be at unhealthy levels. There are much better options that will keep the connector north or south of the populated areas of Lehi. Why divert traffic thru the center of a city when you can divert it North or South of he community and alleviate the problem.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6542-2664
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Smith,Jamie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
My last comment was in regards to the proposed freeway at 2100 north in Lehi.

Comment 601

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6542-2663
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Smith, Jamie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I moved to Lehi to get away from it all. Lowering property value and increasing traffic, noise, pollution is unreasonable when there are other options.

Comment 602

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6541-2662
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Norman, Bruce
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I sincerely object to the current plan for the Lehi freeway interchange. The impact to the community would not be in our best interests. Lehi city planners have a much preferred and less costly plan. Please listen to what they have to offer

Comment 603

Comment 604

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6540-2661
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Clement,Cherie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I do'nt want you to build the connector at 2100 north in Lehi, there are better options. 29 people will lose their homes and a part of their life style. A major connector should be placed not in a subdivision where little children will be playing.The noise from the connector increase disrupting families lifes.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6539-2660
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: Holland,Angela
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 There are better alternatives to where you propose to place this connector. I do commute to Eagle Mountain from State Street and I do NOT want this close to my home. It will displace too many brnad new homes and my LDS Stake Center Building. It will run along my chapel and neighborhood park that my children attend and play in. I do not want a twelve lane highway that close to a quiet safe place that I feel secure with. There are cheaper and less intrusive ways to make this project. I urge UDOT to place the people first in this matter.

Comment 605

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

Comment #: 4715-2659
Date: 12/8/2007
Source: Website
Name: McNett, Meredith & Grady
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not think that the 2100 N alternative suits the need of the commuters. For my job I frequently travel both North to Salt Lake and South to the Orem Provo Area. While the alternative may help the North commute, it does not help the southern commute as it is so far north. I think that the Lehi proposal would satisfy the North exchange and a connection to the south would resolve the need for a southern exchange. The 2100 N proposal just seems to be a patch rather than a real long term solution.

Comment 606

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 6537-2658
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Robison, Matthew
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Please select another option for the Mountain View Corridor between I-15 and Redwood Road. The current proposal will ruin our neighborhood, and force some of our close friends to lose their homes and have to relocate. Our children have friends in the houses that would be destroyed. There are other options available that would NOT result in families being displaced, and where residential neighborhoods would not be affected. Please choose one of those options, preferably one that puts the corridor closer to the point of the mountain, north of Thanksgiving Point, where the connector can be shorter and affect less property and fewer lives. Consider the affect of your own neighborhood being torn down for a freeway before you select the 2100 North option through Lehi.

Comment 607

Comment 608

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 4420-2657
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Suggs, Steven & Cheryl
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I think the connector is a great idea as opposed to the other ideas expressed. There was a time when Lehi was pushing a freeway on 19th south. This would have affected a lot more people than the 2100 north. The people that are being affected this time are the Lehi city council. They have shown they do not care about the majority of their citizens nor the surrounding communities such as Saratoga Springs. Only themselves. By not putting the 2100 connector through a lot more people will be negatively impacted. So far Lehi has been sloppy in its planning and they continue to run that course. Please understand that I and my neighbors that live off of 19th south and are residents of Lehi are in favor of the 2100 north connector. We need this to relieve congestion. Traffic in our town is awful and is getting worse. This connector would help a lot.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6535-2656
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pope, Chad
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 There are Better Options, Decreased Property Values, Noise Walls Ruin Views, Air Quality, Congestions, There is a better way - this will divide the city and cause far greater problems than traffic.

Comment 609

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6531-2650
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Parker, Elizabeth
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

Sirs, Your proposed 2100N connector is ill-advised. The alternate 4800N connector proposed by the city of Lehi would impact far fewer citizens and cost less than your "preferred roadway". One would think that the government would be sensitive to these two issues. Lehi has plans for a boulevard connector in the area of your "preferred roadway" which would allow access to any future commercial or residential development. Lehi also has a vested interest in building this roadway in the near future. So far you haven't given any reasons why the Lehi proposal is not being considered. I wonder why? Respectfully,
Elizabeth Parker

Comment 610

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

35.2.7D

Comment #: 6529-2645
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Greenwood, Tamara
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

There are much better alternatives to the 2100 North Lehi Connector. The Lehi City Proposal will have much less negative impact on the city. It simply doesn't make sense to put the connector in an area with so many significant residential and commercial issues. Please take into consideration the quality of life of existing residents and recognize the flaws with the current proposal. A connector is needed, just not at that location.

Comment 611

Comment 612

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6528-2644
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Autrey, Loren
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because of the air pollution that will result. With this connector (freeway interchange) in the midst of so many family neighborhoods, I am afraid that many children (including my three children) will have health problems caused by the resulting air pollution. I have seen the cost analysis, but I have yet to see an attempt to calculate the health costs that will result from building this freeway interchange in this location. Lehi's proposed 4800 North proposal makes much more sense. First it is built further from neighborhoods. Also, there is much more wind at the 4800N location. So, even if air pollution results, it will much more likely be blown away. I hope you will reconsider for the sake of the children of Lehi.

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6524-2638
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Madsen, Raymond
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I am a resident of Lehi and have lived here for 30 years. I generally take the UTA express bus from the Lehi Park N Ride. There has been an explosion of growth in Lehi and west in Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain. The traffic problem has to be resolved. 2100 North is NOT the answer. All ready the traffic congestion at 2100 North is very bad. The off ramp from the Freeway. Traffic from all directions to get to the park n ride and just to get home makes this a very busy inter-section. Not far west from this intersection are new homes. Increased traffic here would be unacceptable for safety and liveability. The value of homes will drop from the noise problem and high speed traffic. Please consider one of the other options. Sincerley, Raymond W. Madsen

35.2.7A

Comment 613

Comment 614

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment #: 6520-2634
Date: 12/7/2007
Source: Website
Name: Merrill, Kristi
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I just wanted to voice my opinion on how upset I am of the possibility of a freeway in my backyard. I feel that there are other options that have not been investigated thoroughly enough such as Lehi city's suggested alternative. Here are reasons I am opposed to the current selection of 2100 N... I am concerned that the property value my home, located along the path of the proposed connector would decrease. Who goes to buy their dream home and looks right next to the freeway as their first choice? We have enjoyed very stable real-estate growth in our neighborhood and this proposal jeopardizes our property values. I am concerned for the added noise and air pollution that the proposed connector would bring to our neighborhood. As concerned citizens have expressed a desire to not have a school located directly near a freeway for the safety of the children due to poor air quality and pollution, I share this concern. The difficult thing to understand is why would a school be inappropriate near a freeway yet a neighborhood would not be considered at risk? There are more children living in my neighborhood than would attend an elementary school, and those children are located within the neighborhood for more hours out of the day than the working hours of a school. Thus, if it were to be considered inappropriate, by concerned citizens, for a school to be located near the 2100 N proposed freeway connector, then our neighborhood should not be located there either. I am concerned that UDOT has not considered Lehi City's proposal for the Northern East West Connector enough. If UDOT truly considers the proposed bridge solution that is north of the residence in the city, then UDOT would see, as we see (me, my neighborhood, Lehi City Council, and Lehi Chief Engineer) that the 4800 N proposal would alleviate the traffic congestion from the cities out west and allow them direct access to I-15 without disrupting residence and isolating neighborhoods. If the proposed connector were to be finalized, my concern would be that Alpine School District may not want to build a school so close to the new freeway at 2100 North and therefore put the current land up for sale. The land could become a commercial property for something very undesirable such as a gas station / convenience store that would attract non-residential motorists into our neighborhood area. This is a very likely scenario due to the fact that 2300 W at the 2100 N location would be an on/off ramp to the East West Connector and thus a prime location for convenience stores and fuel sales. Lehi City would be divided North to South I am concerned that Lehi is already divided East to West by a Freeway and another Freeway will split Lehi North to South. Freeways divide up a city, depleting the sense of community. Think about the Lehi on the East side, doesn't that seem like another city in itself? I am concerned that the Parkway trail would be interrupted at 2100 n. My family and I use the trail to go up near the windmills. When I spoke to a UDOT representative at the open house last week, he stated that the trail would most likely go over the freeway. This means that we would need to travel up a circular ramp, over a huge freeway, and back down just to go to Thanksgiving Point! With the 4800 n freeway, we would not have to deal with this interruption while going to the windmills and would not have to deal with this dangerous, ugly and annoying barrier on our trail (at least until 4800n). Much of the land near 115 and 2100 n is planned for commerce. With a Freeway on 2100n, retailers would be less likely to use the land for their stores and much of their land would be eaten up with the freeway. Many neighbors have already placed their homes for sale for fear of the freeway in our backyard. I would not have built my home here if I knew this was the plan. However, it wasn't the plan four years ago when I purchased my lot. I have come to love my neighborhood and the city of Lehi. Please consider other alternatives than destroying my neighborhood. Thank you taking time to consider our pleas. Kristi Merrill

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6519-2633
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: Heather
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I know that many favor the 2100 N alternative in Lehi because of wet lands and homes. The problem that I see is this: the 2100 N alternative does little to ease the problems related with those traveling to Orem and Provo from the west side of Utah County. Not many people will be willing to drive north that far just to drive south that far again on I-15. Eventually, there will have to be a major road further south to ease the commute and traffic. We don't want to go through this whole process again in another 5 years.

Comment 615

Comment 616

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.13A

35.2.4A

Comment #: 6518-2632
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gardner, Eric
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
My experience as I commute in and out from Eagle Mountain is that over 1/2 of the traffic from the Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs area is going into Utah County. A traffic solution too far north, like the Lehi proposal, will not be used by those going to Utah County. It seems the better routes are more southern. While the 2100 N route may be adequate, the southern route appears the most beneficial and the most used, best alleviating the Lehi Main Street congestion.

Comment #: 6514-2627
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: Buto, Robert
Location: Herriman, UT

Comment:
Please build the freeway in its current configuration as quickly as possible. Traffic will continue to get worse unless this freeway is in place to move people on the west side of the valley. Concerns about air pollution are mis-guided as having grid lock on Bangeter and the U111 will only make matters worse. If tolling is needed to make this happen quickly, then that is what we must do.

Comment 617

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6513-2626
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gillette, Jenny
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
I would just like to add my support for the 2100 North I-15 Corridor. Traffic from Lehi to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain is tremendous. After reviewing the various alternatives, this seems the most reasonable. Not only will this road ease up congestion in Lehi City Center, it will ease up congestion in The Meadows Lehi. Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain both need to be able to grow commercially and residentially, and this is the only way this can happen. We need multiple roads to ease the congestion this area is facing. Please, please, please let these roads be built!

Comment 618

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A

Comment #: 6512-2624
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: Howlett, Jared
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
I don't see the dire need for the 2100 N EW connector. I work in SLC and always travel to southern UT. County, but the most priority needed road for the majority would be the southern 1900 S connector.

Comment 619

Comment 620

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6511-2623
Date: 12/6/2007
Source: Website
Name: DeLaLoza, R.M.
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of 2100 North Alternate. We need relief from the traffic flow into Lehi. We also need to look into transportation into the Orem/Provo area, as many people work in those areas.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.7A

35.2.1B

35.2.7D

Comment #: 5246-2619
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jones, Mike & Lisa
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 The 2100 North freeway through Lehi is wrong. Looking at the maps of the different alternatives, the 2100 North Freeway doesn't even make sense when the bulk of the commuters causing the traffic problem are coming from Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. Why bring them all the way to north Lehi to connect to I-15 when more than half of them have to go to the Provo/Orem area? Where is the sense in that? We've lived out here for over eight years and can tell you that the traffic was nothing back then because very few people lived west of Redwood Road. The traffic problems started when those two area were opened up for development. Why punish Lehi residents for people who feel the urge to have long commutes to begin with? No amount of road systems will alleviate their long commute being that far west. If you make the 2100 North freeway a reality you will cause more damage than good for the residents that will be directly affected by it. Our property values will plummet which in return will bring crime our quiet neighborhood. The pollution from the freeway will be intolerable. There are children in these neighborhoods who will never be able to play outside because of the huge drop in air quality because of the car pollution. Alpine School District will not be able to use the land that has been set aside for a school. Our neighborhood schools are already beyond capacity, some of them double capacity and you want to take away land that is reserved for a school? The Jorday River Parkway trails and the beauty they provide will be affected drastically because of the so called "bridge" you say you will build for it. The trails have been an area to get away from the chaos and noise of the city. Building the 2100 North Freeway will take away from that. There are businesses, churches and homes that will be torn down. Some of those homeowners have been there for years. Others have moved in within the last year. None of us were told about the possibility of having a freeway "in our backyards." If we had we would have never moved to Lehi. Lehi is already split in half by I-15, why split it again? The route around the lake is the best alternative because it's right in the middle of the commuting problem. As stated before, the bulk of the problem is Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. 2100 N is not near them. Having to go north to 2100 N and then turn back south to Provo doesn't make any sense whatsoever. For some that will add another 45 minutes to their commute. The alternative around Utah Lake makes it so the bulk can basically come off Redwood and Lehi Main Street (State Road from Eagle Mountain) and not have to backtrack to go either way. The best alternative is a bridge across the lake, but apparently that isn't an option since we've had so called "leaders" laugh in our faces with that suggestion. Don't put our quality of life and children in jepodary by putting in the 2100 North Freeway. We've already had to deal with increased traffic on 2300 West that caused us to contact Speed Zapper to help deal with that. Please don't add to it. It just doesn't make sense to punish Lehi for Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain's growth. 2100 North Freeway is not the answer. There are too many things that will be affected including school buildings that we so desperately need. The Saratoga Springs Mayor is correct. We do have a "not in our backyard" mentality. That's because there is so much at stake with this transportation plan. I'd like to see his attitude if it was his backyard being affected by this.

Comment 621

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6501-2607
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Website
Name: Giles,Patti
Location: Saratoga Springs,UT

Comment:
2100 NORTH! 2100 NORTH! 2100 NORTH!for various reasons. Most of all for relieving traffic at the U.S. 68 and U.S. 73 intersection. I have lived in south Saratoga Springs for 7 years and it's getting more horrific every year. Allot of people need to go through that intersection to get to thier destinations. Lets spread out the traffic not congest it more.

Comment 622

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6493-2597
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Website
Name: Woodward,John
Location: Saratoga Springs,UT

Comment:
As a resident of Saratoga Springs the only reasonable alternative is the 2100 N. It is crazy to have to go almost to Point of the Mountain to get on the freeway to Provo as would be the case if your approve the Lehi Bridge proposal. I actually go to Provo more frequently than to Salt Lake City.

Comment 623

Comment 624

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment #: 6492-2596
Date: 12/5/2007
Source: Website
Name: Mohacsi,Carie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:

I am concerned that the property value my home, located along the path of the proposed connector would decrease. Who goes to buy their dream home and looks right next to the freeway as their first choice? We have enjoyed very stable real-estate growth in our neighborhood and this proposal jeopardizes our property values. I am concerned that UDOT has not considered Lehi City's proposal for the Northern East West Connector enough. If UDOT truly considers the proposed bridge solution that is north of the residence in the city, then UDOT would see, as we see (me, my neighborhood, Lehi City Council, and Lehi Chief Engineer) that the 4800 N proposal would alleviate the traffic congestion from the cities out west and allow them direct access to I-15 without disrupting residence and isolating neighborhoods. I am concerned for the added noise and air pollution that the proposed connector would bring to our neighborhood. As concerned citizens have expressed a desire to not have a school located directly near a freeway for the safety of the children due to poor air quality and pollution, I share this concern. The difficult thing to understand is why would a school be inappropriate near a freeway yet a neighborhood would not be considered at risk? There are more children living in my neighborhood than would attend an elementary school, and those children are located within the neighborhood for more hours out of the day than the working hours of a school. Thus, if it were to be considered inappropriate, by concerned citizens, for a school to be located near the 2100 N proposed freeway connector, then our neighborhood should not be located there either. I am concerned that Lehi is already divided East to West by a Freeway and another Freeway will split Lehi North to South. Freeways divide up a city, depleting the sense of community. Think about the Lehi on the East side, doesn't that seem like another city in itself?

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6482-2575
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: Smith,Melinda
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:

I agree with the argument that the "Not in my backyard" attitude has created problems that can't be fixed at this point. North Utah county is going to grow and roads need to be built, let's do it now while we have some options and before safety/pollution/time issues on Lehi Main street get any worse! 2100 N. seems like the very most logical location for a connector for Salt Lake commuters. Please keep landscaping and pedestrian access as a priority.

Comment 625

Comment 626

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.7A

Comment #: 6451-2535
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: Call,Lance
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North corridor because it is not the most effective solution to the transportation needs of Northern Utah County. Its selection was politically motivated. The residents of Eagle Mt. and Saratoga Springs need an east/west corridor north of the lake to access Orem & Provo. They do not need freeway access to Cabalas. The 2100 North area is currently open space with deer and waterfowl and will be blighted if a freeway is built through the wetlands. The 1800 South corridor in Lehi should be the Mountainview corridor instead since its already going to be a Bangerter like expressway. Please do the right thing.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6448-2531
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: WALLACE,JOHN
Location: EAGLE MOUNTAIN,UT

Comment:
 With only one major corridor in and out of Eagle Mountain it appears that any additional access to and from this area is seriously needed. As both a resident and business in this area, it is concerning to me that the commute thru Lehi is long and arduous for both the commuter and the residents of Lehi. Please move forward with the proposed route as soon as possible.

Comment 627

Comment 628

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6446-2530
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: Poduska, Bernard
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I am for the selection of the 2100 North freeway alternative for the following reasons: 1. It will provide a "life-saving" emergency evacuation route for the residence of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs; currently RS-68 and 73 would be instantly overwhelmed. 2. It will provide East-west freeway access to I-15 for the current population of 35,000 living in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. 3. This freeway will accommodate the projected population growth in these areas (est. 200,000+). 4. This freeway will encourage and facilitate business, commercial, and industrial development in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs; without this freeway, there would be little incentive for such development. 5. This freeway will provide the residents of Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs direct access to Lehi's retail and business centers that are to be built at Traverse Mountain and Thanksgiving Point.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C
35.2.9C

Comment #: 6441-2524
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: Rogers, Marisa
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 In regards to the Mountain View Corridor, I support the 2100 North Freeway as the best alternative. In fact, I would prefer something being done further south as my husband and I commute to the Provo/Orem area for work and not to Salt Lake. I also do almost all my shopping in northern Utah County and hardly ever drive to Salt Lake county. I am very opposed to the Lehi City proposal for the Point of the Mountain alternative as this will still force us to use SR73 and Lehi Mainstreet to commute to work and for shopping.

Comment 629

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6433-2514
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Website
Name: Rowley,Angie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I am a resident of Lehi. While i know that it is obvious that we need to do something about the traffic i don't feel like only building 1 freeway is the answer at all. All that is going to do is make 2300 W. extremely busy with all the traffic trying to get to the freeway. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see that the Lehi city proposal is better. It is obviously better to build 4 different roads to spread out the traffic than to direct it into one direction. All Udot is going to do is take all the traffic from going down main street and make it just as busy going down 2300 W. Lehi City proposal is the obvious best choice, 4 is always better than 1 anyway you look at it.

Comment 630

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 5113-2513
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Messersmith,Susan E.
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 FW: Do you want a freeway in our backyards? From: bryce.d.messersmith@L-3com.com Sent: Mon 12/03/07 1:13 PM To: Sue Messersmith (suemessersmith@hotmail.com); cody messersmith (cody_messersmith@yahoo.com) Hi Mom, Here is some info regarding the proposed 2100 North freeway. Lehi city is proposing it go at 4800 North which, in my opinion, is a much better proposal. Could you read below and comment to UDOT if you agree on Lehi's 4800 North plan? -----Original Message----- From: Trevor Clifton [mailto:Trevor@RockinghorseRancher.com] Sent: Friday, November 30, 2007 2:14 PM To: trevor@cliftonworld.com Subject: Do you want a freeway in our backyards? Dear Neighbor, Do you want a freeway in our backyards? You may already know, UDOT has proposed a freeway through our backyards by creating an East West Connector between I-15 and the future Mountain View Corridor (near Redwood Road). As concerned neighbors we would like to join together to share our comments with UDOT as they have invited us to submit our opinions concerning this matter. We invite you to read some of the points listed below and, if you share in these and other concerns, will you click on the link below, copy and past some points that you consider important for UDOT to understand, and submit them to be heard? The deadline for submission is 24 Dec 2007 so please take the time to do it now. Please Click HERE and Submit Some Comments (Feel Free to copy and paste some or all of the "points to have UDOT consider" listed below into the submit form if you feel you agree with the points.) Comment Web Site: http://pcms.company39.com/mvc/ Comment Email Address: mountainview@utah.gov Noise and Air pollution Concern for current residence bordering 2100 North in Lehi I am concerned for the added noise and air pollution that the proposed connector would bring to our neighborhood. As concerned citizens have expressed a desire to not have a school located directly near a freeway for the safety of the children due to poor air quality and pollution, I share this concern. The difficult thing to understand is why would a school be inappropriate near a freeway yet a neighborhood would not be considered at risk? There are more children living in my neighborhood than would attend an elementary school, and those children are located within the neighborhood for more hours out of the day than the working hours of a school. Thus, if it were to be considered inappropriate, by concerned citizens, for a school to be located near the 2100 N proposed freeway connector, then our neighborhood should not be located there either. Concern for property value of current residence along 2100 North in Lehi I am concerned that the property value my home, located along the path of the proposed connector would decrease. Who goes to buy their dream home and looks right next to the freeway as their first choice? We have enjoyed very stable real-estate growth in our neighborhood and this proposal jeopardizes our property values. Concern that the current Alpine School District property located at 2100 N and 2300 W would no longer be considered for an elementary school If the proposed connector were to be finalized, my concern would be that Alpine School District may not want to build a school so close to the new freeway at 2100 North and therefore put the current land up for sale. The land could become a commercial property for something very undesirable such as a gas station / convenience store that would attract non-residential motorists into our neighborhood area. This is a very likely scenario due to the fact that 2300 W at the 2100 N location would be an on/off ramp to the East West Connector and thus a prime location for convenience stores and fuel sales. Concern that the Proposal by Lehi City for an alternative connector at 4800 N has not been considered enough to replace the 2100 N proposal. I am concerned that UDOT has not considered Lehi City's proposal for the Northern East West Connector enough. If UDOT truly considers the proposed bridge solution that is north of the residence in the city, then UDOT would see, as we see (me, my neighborhood, Lehi City Council, and Lehi Chief Engineer) that the 4800 N proposal would alleviate the traffic congestion from the cities out west and allow them direct access to I-15 without disrupting residence and isolating neighborhoods. Lehi City would be divided North to South I am concerned that Lehi is already divided East to West by a Freeway and another Freeway will split Lehi North to South. Freeways divide up a city, depleting the sense of community. Think about the Lehi on the East side, doesn't that seem like another city in itself? Jordan River Parkway Trail I am concerned that the Parkway trail would be interrupted at 2100 n. My family and I use the trail to go up near the windmills. When I spoke to a UDOT representative at the open house last week, he stated that the trail would most likely go

Comment 630 (continued)

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

↪
35.2.7A

over the freeway. This means that we would need to travel up a circular ramp, over a huge freeway, and back down just to go to Thanksgiving Point! With the 4800 n freeway, we would not have to deal with this interruption while going to the windmills and would not have to deal with this dangerous, ugly and annoying barrier on our trail (at least until 4800n). Commerce would be affected Much of the land near 115 and 2100 n is planned for commerce. With a Freeway on 2100n, retailers would be less likely to use the land for their stores and much of their land would be eaten up with the freeway. I am strongly against putting this freeway anywhere, except at the 4100 North location. It makes the most sense to put it there.

Comment 631

Response
Section in
Chapter 35

↪
35.2.4A
35.2.4G

Comment #: 6430-2511
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Schindler, Greg
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 I prefer the 5800 West alignment. I would also like to make it clear that an interchange at 9000 S. is acceptable but not at New Bingham Highway. Truck traffic to and from the freeway should use 9000 S. only, especially since 9000 S. will intersect with both Mountainview and I-15.

Comment 632

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31B

Comment #: 6416-2492
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: messersmith,cody
Location: ,UT

Comment:
you should have planned this a long time ago when there was no house's,and now you waited till there's house's bult and now you want to rip then down house's. that's pathetic

Comment 633

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6414-2489
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Konold David & Jennifer
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:
We are in favor of the 2100 North Alternative in the northern part of Utah County. Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs are desperate to have roads that will aid in the horrible traffic congestion we experience every day.

Comment 634

Comment 635

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.6A

Comment #: 6411-2486
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Magill, Shawn
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 What percentage of Saratoga Springs, The Ranches and Eagle Mountain need routine access to the rest of Utah County and not just Salt Lake City? I, for one, will not drive all the way to 2100 North Lehi just to access the freeway, because it's too far north to double back and travel south toward Provo. We're in this fine mess because neither Saratoga Springs nor Lehi can properly plan and zone homes in their cities. Now that there are homes in every conceivable path for an east/west corridor, we see city leadership scramble for the path of least political resistance. I read in a newsletter earlier last month that our mayor endorses the 2100 North proposal. This is probably because the Southern Freeway alternative runs right through the north shore homes bordering our town. These homes provide a valuable tax base to Saratoga Springs, but in light of the recent environmental history of the Lehi floodplain, never should have been built in the first place. The Southern Freeway proposal has an added benefit of providing a partial levee against rising floodwaters when they come again, which protects the residents and farms of south Lehi. Count me as a Saratoga Springs resident in favor of the Southern Freeway alternative. The Southern Freeway is the only proposal that gives residents on the west side of the lake real expressway access to Utah county and not just to Salt Lake City commuters.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A

Comment #: 6399-2472
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Price, Camille
Location: Kaysville, UT

Comment:
 We didn't have a lot of money growing up (still don't) and one of my best memories are the day trips we took during the summer as a family to explore various parts of our beautiful state. The idea of starting down the slippery slope that makes it so only well off residents have the freedom to explore our beautiful state is heartwrenching to me. It also creates a restriction on job and housing opportunities for low income residents who would require the use of this main thoroughfare to meet these goals, but could not afford a daily toll.

Comment 636

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6395-2468
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: KERTTULA,EEVERT
Location: EAGLE MOUNTAIN,UT

Comment:
I WANT TO SAY THAT THE BEST ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE THE 2100 NORTH ALTERNATIVE.

Comment 637

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.1I

35.2.1B

Comment #: 6394-2467
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Sanderson,Brad
Location: Eagle Mt,UT

Comment:
The perfered alternative is in the in the following order; 1- southern freeway alternative 2- arterial alternative 3- 2100 north alternative Also, has there been any discussion about the possibility of making a connection from SL County through Herriman into Cedar Valley and then southward back into I-15 around payson/santiquin/nephi? It is my understanding that the federal Gov. owns most of this land however, there has been some talk about relocating the current Camp Williams facility further to the west. I unerstand that there are always going to be issues regarding funding, environmental, topography and so on, however, on the positive side, there are only a few property owners due to the valley being predominatly grazing and farming. Also, consider the savings through the lower fuel consumption and emmissions produced by the trucking industry alone. This would bring accessibility and connectivity to a geographical are larger than eastern utah county, for development as well as circulation for the state as a whole. This could also aid with the housing economy and many of the growth issues this state is facing. anyway, I was just curious if there has been any discussion.

Comment 638

Comment 639

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6392-2441
Date: 12/3/2007
Source: Website
Name: Derington, Jacob
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 After looking at the three alternative Mtn View routes I agree with the study recommendations. The 2100 north route is the most efficient and least impacting. I would go so far as to recommend that both the southern and the 2100 north route would be beneficial. The route definitely need to be freeway connection to I-15 not just highways. I have lived in saratoga springs for almost 6 years and the traffic gets worse every month on the current road system. The sooner the Mtn View Corridor gets built the better. I applaud those who worked on the study for taking a detailed look at the growing problem and coming to a good solutions. It is now upto those in charge to make this happen as soon as possible.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6380-2440
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Nelson, Kara
Location: ehi, UT

Comment:
 I am strongly opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal. It doesn't make any sense to me to destroy hundreds of homes, a church, a library, etc. when there are other alternatives available.

Comment 640

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.3A

Comment #: 6379-2439
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: ,Chrissy
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 I think that in lieu of having an east/west connector Freeway in Lehi, we should consider having another Trax line put in from the Mountain View Corridor that would connect with the proposed Daybreak line. It would be quieter, cheeper, and better for the environment.

Comment 641

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 4720-2438
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Paulsen,Chris & Christie
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:
 To whom it may concern: I am very concerned about making 2100 North in Lehi into a freeway/highway. I live in the Pointe Meadows subdivision. The subdivision is made up of primarily young families with young children. An LDS Stake Center, a park, and a city library all sit on the corner of 2100 N and Pointe Meadow Drive. I feel that a freeway/highway at this location would be very dangerous for the children in the area because of the speed of the cars as well as the noise it would bring. I also greatly fear that such a freeway/highway would bring more potential predators to this area. The 2100 N connector would bring many health risks to our neighborhood. The polution would greatly affect individuals with asthma such as my wife Children who live near freeways have significant impairments in the development of their lungs that can lead to respiratory problems for the rest of their lives and even eventually to cancer. I understand the need for additional roads allowing east/west travel, but there are many other alternatives than a freeway/highway at such a family friendly location. Please do not create a connector at this location. Thank You, Chris Paulsen Concerned Citizen and Parent of 3

Comment 642

Comment 643

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 5238-2437
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Corbett, Michael & Michelle
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am disappointed that information about the Lehi City alternative is still not available on this web site. From what I know, it would impact less people, cost less and most importantly would not be another freeway splitting Lehi into segments like I-15 already does. Please include information about the Lehi alternative on this web site as soon as possible. I am worried that less informed people might think that those listed here are the only alternatives. Thank you, Michael

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 5937-2436
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Cheney, Zachary A.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Please consider the option to build a connecting bridge at the point of the mountain. It seems that this option, at least of the south end of the project, will have the least amount of impact on both wetlands and people. Although a large bridge may be costly, you can not underestimate the cost of uprooting families, increasing accessibility for crime in residential areas, and destroying quality property for business, agricultural, and residential development. We all have seen the visual impact these gravel companies have had on the point of the mountain. Although necessary for development, a bridge over this geographical area seems to have minimal impact on their ability to resume business. It would be a fair compromise to the surrounding communities who live with the deteriorating views of the point of the mountain, and whose homes are threatened by this new freeway.

Comment 644

Comment 645

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 5529-2435
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Marchbanks, Jill
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:

I am concerned for the added noise and air pollution that the proposed connector would bring to our neighborhood. As concerned citizens have expressed a desire to not have a school located directly near a freeway for the safety of the children due to poor air quality and pollution, I share this concern. The difficult thing to understand is why would a school be inappropriate near a freeway yet a neighborhood would not be considered at risk? There are more children living in my neighborhood than would attend an elementary school, and those children are located within the neighborhood for more hours out of the day than the working hours of a school. Thus, if it were to be considered inappropriate, by concerned citizens, for a school to be located near the 2100 N proposed freeway connector, then our neighborhood should not be located there either. I am concerned that the property value my home, located along the path of the proposed connector would decrease. Who goes to buy their dream home and looks right next to the freeway as their first choice? We have enjoyed very stable real-estate growth in our neighborhood and this proposal jeopardizes our property values. I am concerned that UDOT has not considered Lehi City's proposal for the Northern East West Connector enough. If UDOT truly considers the proposed bridge solution that is north of the residence in the city, then UDOT would see, as we see (me, my neighborhood, Lehi City Council, and Lehi Chief Engineer) that the 4800 N proposal would alleviate the traffic congestion from the cities out west and allow them direct access to I-15 without disrupting residence and isolating neighborhoods.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6364-2422
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Taylor, Timothy
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:

I support the 2100 North Freeway Alternative in Utah County. Although many of the residents in SS would benefit from the Southern Freeway Alternative, I believe the residents of EM, SS and West Lehi would benefit most from the 2100 N. (Don't be fooled by the 'squawkin' from the Lehi CC. They've been complaining about us ever since we incorporated.)

Comment 646

Comment 647

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6363-2421
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jensen,Ron
Location: Lehi,UT

Comment:

I am writing to comment on the proposed 2100 north Mountain View Corridor. UDOT's plan of connecting this new corridor into I-15 at the 2100 north causes me and my family a lot of concern. This new interchange will bring the addition of thousands of added vehicle trips into a highly residential area of Lehi. Some of my concerns are:

- Increased diesel and vehicle exhaust fumes. These fumes are known to cause cancer in children and a new freeway interchange should be designed to keep highly used traffic routes out of residential areas.
- Increased traffic noise into the residential areas of Lehi. The noise from I-15 is bad already so let's not double the amount of noise by building a new freeway in the middle of Lehi.
- Segmenting Lehi: Lehi is already split into two separate cities by I-15. Now UDOT is considering splitting the city again by designing a new freeway heading west at 2100 north. Why does the residential quality of life in Lehi need to be destroyed to provide the cities out west with several seconds of reduced travel time to reach I-15? The proposed 4800 north or Pleasant Grove interchanges would provide access to I-15 without the disruption of existing neighborhoods or the health affecting consequences of building this interchange in the middle of Lehi.
- The 2100 north interchange proposal is the third proposed by UDOT. It is very apparent that the large numbers of Lehi citizens apposing this interchange have less political clout than the few affluent groups and individuals that have stopped the construction of this interchange at more realistic locations.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6362-2420
Date: 12/2/2007
Source: Website
Name: Dozhier,Corey
Location: Eagle Mountain,UT

Comment:

First of all I would just like to say that I am not an animal rights activist, I am not a bleeding heart environmentalist, but I am concerned. I am concerned about the widening of Redwood Road from Bangerter to Saratoga Springs. The reason I am concerned is that I have already seen far to many deer be hit and killed trying to cross this road. Redwood Road cuts right through an area that is a major wintering ground for deer and elk. They come down out of the mountains around Herriman, Bluffdale, and Camp Williams to feed and get water. The Jordan River is there main source of water year round. Imagine someone setting up a mine field between your living room and kitchen, then you have to try and negotiate through that mine field everytime you need a glass of water or a bite to eat. "BOOM, whoops there goes grandma, run everyone just run for it." This doesn't make any sense. If we are going to widen Redwood we need to be proactive in the effort to protect the wildlife that we all admire. Animal overpasses or safe crossings have been used successfully in Wyoming as well as Sardine Canyon. These safe crossings serve both the animals and the people who will be commuting Redwood Road in that there will be less accidents, less insurance claims, less dead deer on the side of the road, and fewer people like me who already feel guilty everytime they see a dead carcass knowing that it could have been prevented. Thank you.

Comment 648

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6361-2419
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Rashid Brooks
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am in total favor of the Mountain View Corridor. This would be a HUGE help to those of us who live in Saratoga Springs and have no other options. I realize that this has impact on others that is viewed as negative but for the overall good of the cause I think this would be the best move. Let's make it fair for those who it impacts in a bad way and enable to change for the rest of us.

Comment 649

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6360-2418
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hackford, J
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern: Though I believe that the Mountain View Corridor is essential, I think that the proposed freeway at 2100 North in Lehi is not the best option, and it would have a detrimental impact on the lives of residents like myself in that area. Since my spouse and I moved to Lehi, we have enjoyed our quiet neighborhood and the nearby parks. Next year, we expect our first child, and the prospect of losing what makes our home so wonderful has me very concerned. I fear the noise and pollution that a freeway a block or two from my house would certainly bring, I foresee losing access to both Olympic Park and the park at Pointe Meadows, and my heart goes out to my neighbors—residents, ranchers and farmers—who would be forced to give up their property and homes. For me, the crux of the issue is not property values, but quality of life. Please do not let the clamor created by this issue drown out the voices of residents like me who would be directly and negatively affected by a 2100 North freeway. Choose Lehi's plan for a freeway connection to the north with arterial roads through the city! Sincerely, J. Hackford

Comment 650

Comment 651

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6359-2417
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Denmark, Gwen
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

35.2.7C

35.2.9C

Comment:
 The 2100 North alternative is the ONLY logical solution to the congestion and weight placed on the cities of Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain. The increase in population and the continued increase, demands a solution. Placing a bridge all the way down by Bluffdale, does not accomplish anything for the crowded roads in and out of Lehi. Please do not take away the only possible way at this point in time to make travel time and distance a little more bearable. Lets DEMAND 2100 NORTH as our ONLY ALTERNATIVE!!! THANKS!

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6358-2416
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Kirkman, Jenny
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment:
 If there is another option other than squeezing a freeway in between residential neighborhoods why is UDOT not seriously considering it? This is my neighborhood and I'm very concerned about pollution. My husband has asthma so we moved here where there is better air quality. I've heard so many people against this freeway to the point that they will move. What will happen to house values if several people move because a freeway is coming in? Is UDOT seriously considering depressing the freeway into the ground? Is that not extra money? Is the Lehi proposed bridge against UDOT's plan's about money?

Comment 652

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6357-2415
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Glaus,Tc
Location: Heber City,UT

Comment:
This project in the North End of Utah County-Lehi area is long over due . Anyone who drives on Lehi Main Street knows how bad traffic congestion is, especially during the morning and afternoon rush times. And, with further growth west of Lehi the traffic on Main Street will only increase. I'm amazed that Lehi residents in the area of Main Street aren't complaining more loudly about the traffic congestion. I also believe the project on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley is essential given the growth currently going on out there.

Comment 653

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A

Comment #: 6356-2414
Date: 12/1/2007
Source: Website
Name: Christensen,Karl
Location: ,UT

Comment:
I am a Lehi resident living close to Micron. An east-west route is imperative but I strongly support the southern end of Lehi verses the northern location. The development going in by Thanksgiving Point at Traverse Mountain will only add to congestion in the north. Furthermore, the southern location has less impact to residential dwellings and those living in Saratoga Springs / Eagle Mountain will be able to get to the locations in UT county much easier. (It has been my experience that Eagle Mountain/Saratoga Springs residents generally work in UT county and need to commute south.) Thanks,

Comment 654

Comment 655

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 11-2906
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 2100 North in Lehi, the only way to go for residents west of Lehi.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 11-2905
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 The 2100 North Lehi freeway access is the only reasonable alternative to meet the needs for transportation for residents in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. The other alternatives will not solve the problem of Lehi Main street. A lot of time and resources will be spent in vain. Please consider the 2100 North option.

Comment 656

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1D

Comment #: 4808-2878
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: Glazier, Bryon & Sherry
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 To Whom It May Concern: This past week I attended an open house for the East-West Connector in Lehi, UT. It is going to connect Redwood Road with I-15. I am writing to strongly encourage UDOT to consider changing their preferred option on the Mountain View Corridor to just use the East-West Connector. It will save a lot of money instead of building two connecting freeways that split through the middle of Lehi, there will just be one adequately sized freeway connector. It will divert more traffic off of I-15, where it is already congested. And connecting the Mountain View Corridor south to the East-West Connector will also reduce the number of homes, businesses, and wetlands impacted. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment 657

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6677-2827
Date: 12/15/2007
Source: Website
Name: Rowe, Randy
Location: Cedar Valley, UT

Comment:
 It seems that the growth of the areas west of Utah Lake is going to continue. If there is not a travel corridor created that is sufficient to support the commerce and commute for the residents of that area there will be an increasing danger to the human population of that area from traffic accidents and the possibility of natural or man-made disasters. Currently there is a SEVERE bottleneck in the Lehi area on SR-73 that is caused by the high traffic load and the low speed single lane access of that road. I am in favor of the freeway alternate for the above reasons. I think that there should be a way of having minimal impact to the residents of the area (both human and natural). The homes that are built in the area are already affecting the natural wetlands habitat and there is a fairly large right-of-way now so there should be a way to make this work out for everyone. Thanks for providing this type of a forum for our thoughts.

Comment 658

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6678-2828
Date: 12/16/2007
Source: Website
Name: Earling, Shane
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I support the 2100 North proposal that would help to alleviate traffic problems in North Utah County. I would have preferred a route farther to the south, but I understand the environmental concerns a highway near Utah Lake would pose—meaning infinite delay. The bridge proposal submitted by Lehi is completely ridiculous. I would never, ever have a need to use that route for these reasons: 1. I would not travel several miles to Salt Lake County in order to go back south towards Provo. 2. I would not travel several miles to Salt Lake County in order to go back south to my work in American Fork. 3. When going to Salt Lake, I might as well continue north on Redwood Road and take Bangerter Hwy to I-15. Redwood road will be much nicer in a couple of years when it is widened. 4. I-15 at the Point of the Mountain is windy and can be treacherous in the wintertime. Having an interchange at Point of the Mountain is not a good location. I would opt to take the I-15-Bangerter interchange for safety reasons. 5. This bridge is simply out of reach for commuters going to work in Utah County and simply a diversion for those going to work in Salt Lake County. With the widening of Redwood Road, it is not needed. Lehi City is simply attempting to completely shove the freeway out of their city, and thus completely out of Utah County. I find it ironic that they would complain since I-15 interchanges through Lehi contribute greatly to its commercial tax base. It doesn't divide the city in half since it is at the north end of the city and very little of it goes through incorporated Lehi anyway. Please do the right thing and bring the MVC into Utah County to help alleviate traffic. I'm afraid future generations will never forgive us if we don't seize this opportunity now while the area is largely undeveloped. Thank you, S.R. Earling

Comment 659

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1F
3
5.2.7C

Comment #: 6679-2829
Date: 12/16/2007
Source: Website
Name: Stocks, Martin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I really like the idea of building alternate routes to alleviate the congestion on highway 73 through Lehi. I believe that any of the proposed roadways will be good, if not all of them. If I had to pick the one that would be the best to build first, the 2100 N option looks best for most people even though I would like to see the southern connector built, as I go to the Provo area often. My only complaint is that you cannot build it fast enough. Why not start right away and quit delaying what needs to be done. It's just going to cost more to do the longer we wait.

Comment 660

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.11A

Comment #: 6680-2830
Date: 12/16/2007
Source: Website
Name: Raynor, Ruth
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
So when will a decision be made and the actual work start? So far we've heard a lot of words in the last few YEARS, but nothing ever happens. You guys are typical government s-l-o-w. Do you realize that starting work now will actually cost less than waiting another three years.

Comment 661

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7C

Comment #: 6681-2831
Date: 12/15/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Barrus, Natalie
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
THIS IS NATALIE BARRUS, MY PHONE NUMBER IS 801-789-4963. MY ADDRESS IS 2007 EAST BLOSSUM ST. IN EAGLE MTN. 84005. I'M CALLING TO SAY THAT I SUPPORT THE 2100 N ALTERNATIVE FOR THE MVC. THANK YOU BYE.

Comment 662

Comment 663

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.8A
35.2.7A

Comment #: 6682-2832
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wilford, Julie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I favor the arterials alternative. I believe that it would be better to have several smaller options than one large road. I oppose the 2100 North connector proposal because it will require the relocation of so many new residents and one or more new church building.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A

Comment #: 6689-2840
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hansen, Lee
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 We really need the 1900 S bypass through Lehi as soon as possible. This would take a lot of pressure off of downtown Lehi since all southbound traffic from Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs currently has to go through or near downtown Lehi. Why not consider connecting to the interchange in Pleasant Grove instead of the Main Street American Fork interchange? I commute into Provo on a daily basis is why I am interested in this. My wife commutes north to downtown SLC 2 to 3 times per week and currently uses Redwood to Bangerter to I-15. The northern arterial through Lehi will make little difference to her.

Comment 664

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6704-2863
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Website
Name: Bailie, William
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
The 2100 north alternative is the most effective use of time and money. It will be done eventually, do it now and get it done as soon as possible. The Lehi bridge will be a waste of time and money, it seems to be offered by a small group of people serving their own interests.

Comment 665

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6705-2864
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Website
Name: Aquino, Rosario
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom it may concern, I am a property owner in Lehi, Utah and I don't want to see a freeway ruining many things for my and many other property owners in the area. I am completely against for the safety and comfort of my family and many other families in Utah. I am also against it because you can be ruining the wildlife of the animals living in the wetlands. Thank you, Rosario Aquino

Comment 666

Comment 667

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6706-2865
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Website
Name: Mercer, Jeff
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am very opposed to the 2100 North Connector. This will cut out city in half. All new growth will be on the other side. Residential and Commercial property will be wasted, people will need to be relocated, wetlands will be lost, and property values will drop (among so many other things.) Please strongly consider other alternatives. Jeff Mercer

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.10A
35.1.1A

Comment #: 6715-2879
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: Oldroyd, D.
Location: Riverton, UT

Comment:
 Add my voice to two themes: 1- Anyone who has spent time back east with all their toll roads know what a nightmare and pain they are. A free MVC would benefit all in the valley by relieving the pressure off of other roads, many would avoid a toll road. In addition, there needs to be East-West connections to I-215 and I-15 to stop the daily bottleneck on surface roads.

Comment 668

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6716-2880
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jensen, Donald D.
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for the following reasons: I feel the connector should be built in the south part of Lehi, next to the lake. I'm concerned about the noise. We get enough noise from the freeway as it is now. I live on 500 West which is a mess. People drive up and down the street way too fast and I never see anyone getting a ticket. I can just imagine the speeds on the 2100 North connector.

Comment 669

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6722-2885
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Website
Name: Edwards, Lori
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
I am writing to express my support for the 2100 North Freeway. This is by far the best option that has been proposed. The 2100 North Freeway is the only option that will decrease the traffic problems that Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain residents currently face. The option that Lehi city has proposed will not benefit the residents of Utah county like the 2100 North Freeway. Please select the 2100 North Freeway to help those of us that have to deal with the traffic on a daily basis. Thank you!

Comment 670

Comment 671

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6739-2907
Date: 12/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Chappell, Amy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I would like to express my support of the 2100 North Alternative. The need for better east/west travel is already critical and neglecting to put in place a much needed artery connecting the west side of Utah county with I-15 would be disastrous to the quality of life and potential growth in these west-side communities.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9C

Comment #: 6741-2910
Date: 12/19/2007
Source: Website
Name: Fowler, Melinda
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 My concern is safety. I do not feel safe when I travel from Eagle Mountain on either Redwood Road or Lehi Main Street. There are too many cars, and at night the road is very dark. I am against the Lehi bridge proposal because it does not solve the problems we face as commuters. I love the community here in Eagle Mountain and I do not want to worry about every time I have to travel to another city.

Comment 672

Comment 673

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

Comment #: 6742-2911
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Brown, Dennis
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I have lived in Saratoga Springs for over 6 years, and I have seen traffic get dramatically worse over that time. I have subsequently been following the Mountain View Corridor project over the years to see how it may remede some of these problems. For years I worked in Orem and when I first moved here I could commute to work in 25 minutes that time has increased to 45 min to an hour depending on traffic at the time. The best sollution to this problem would be the southern freeway alternative. I know that there are some concerns of wetlands and increased cost, but this would be the best methode by far to mitigate the traffic problems and would generate substantial improvement to Uah's economy because of the decreased travel times of employees and improved movement of goods and services. I believe that we should do everything we can to make sure this is the choosen alternative. If all else fails to build the Southern Freeway the second best alternative would be the 2100 north freeway alernative. Although this would not facilitate the movement of commuters and goods and services as well from Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain and the cedar fort area it would do so better than the aterials alternative or Lehi's 4900 North alternative. In my current employment I travel throughout Utah and therefore I will travel both north on Redwood Rd. to Bangeler and through Lehi into Utah County and further South. I typically do not have a problem on Redwood in the mornings. However in the evenings it can be very congested, however with the proposed widening of that road this should facilitate the movement North to SL County very well. Therefore the great need is not connecting Saratoga Springs, Eagle Mountain and the cedar fort area to SL County, but to Utah County. And the best proposals for doing that are by far the Southern Freeway by a long ways and secondarily the 2100 North Freeway. As far as I am concerned I would not even have the other plans listed as an option because they would not make substantial improvements to the problem and would therefore be a very expensive waste of our precious road resources. Thank you, Dennis Brown

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6743-2912
Date: 12/17/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Billings, Erin
Location: LEHI, UT

Comment:
 HI MY NAME IS ERIN BILLINGS AND MY HUSBAND AND I WOULD LIKE TO UM TELL YOU WE SUPPORT THE 2100 N CORRIDOR, I THINK. UM OUR PHONE NUMBER IS 801-768-2176. OUR ADDRESS IS 492 N WOODS DR AND THAT'S IN LEHI, 84043. I THINK THAT'S PRETTY MUCH ALL WE HAVE TO SAY, THANKS.

Comment 674

Comment 675

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6745-2913
Date: 12/18/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Holme, Keith
Location: , UT

Comment:
 HI THIS IS KEITH HOLME I'M A RESIDENT OF LEHI AND I'M A AGAINST THE A FREEWAY MAJOR A A NEW PROJECTS THA THAT'S BEEN PROPOSED TO COME THROUGH LEHI. I'M DEAD AGAINST IT. I'M A PRO PROFESSIONAL FIREFIGHTER FOR PROVO CITY. AND I KNOW WHAT ALL THAT NEW TRAFFIC DOE DOES TO THE CITIES. MY HOME PHONE IS A 768-0405. AGAIN I'M AGAIN DEAD SENT DEAD AGAINST THE A NEW PROPOSAL BY UDOT ON THE FREEWAY SYSTEM IN LEHI. THANK YOU.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 6747-2915
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Miller, Daniel
Location: , UT

Comment:
 MY NAME IS DANIEL MILLER MY PHONE # IS 801-362-7865. I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE MVC FOR A NUM NUMEROUS REASONS, UM I'LL GO AHEAD AND START LISTING THEM #1 A CHILDREN'S HEALTH ESPECIALLY WITH THE A SCHOOL GOING IN THERE BY TO THE A PROPOSED FREEWAY ON 2100 N. UM ALSO THE CITY #2 BEING SPLIT IN HALF YET AGAIN BY A FREEWAY NOT ACCEPTABLE. UM, ALSO I'D LIKE TO HEAR THE REASONS WHY, THIS IS 3, UM WHY YOUR PLAN IS BETTER BECAUSE I THINK THE A (HONEST?) SHOULD BE ON YOU AND NOT ME. A IT'S OBVIOUS THAT LEHI'S PLAN IS MUCH BETTER THAN YOURS UM INCLUDING A PROPERTY VALUE AND NET NET AFFECT OF PROPERTY VALUE. AND ALSO THE A THE EFFECT ON TAX PAYERS AND THE MONEY THEY'D HAVE TO PAY TO ACTUALLY GET THIS FREEWAY TO WORK. UM IT SEEMS LIKE LEHI PLAN IS MUCH BETTER. UM SO PLEASE CALL ME AT MY NUMBER 801-362-7865 AND EXPLAIN TO ME WHY THE 2100 N MVC AS PROPOSED IS A BETTER PLAN. THANKS

Comment 676

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A
35.2.9A

Comment #: 6749-2917
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Miller, Lorell
Location: LEHI, UT

Comment:
HI MY NAME IS LORELL MILLER. I'M A LIFETIME RESIDENT OF LEHI AND I'M OPPOSED TO THE 2100 N. CORRIDOR ON THE MTN VIEW OPTION. I BELIEVE WE SHOULD PUT THAT FREEWAY NORTH AS THE 4800 N UM OPTION, IS EXPLAINED BY LEHI TO AVOID THE DESTRUCTION TO THE WILDLIFE OUT THROUGH THE JORDAN RIVER REEDS AND THE WATER AREAS THERE BY THE 2100 N AREA. I THINK THE OPTION IS FOR LESS EXPENSIVE IS MORE IMPORTANT TO US. I THINK THE OPTION TO DO LESS DAMAGE TO OUR NATURAL HABITATS, THE WILD LIFE AND THE AREAS THERE WHERE WE HAVE THAT WATER SHED FOR THE DUCKS AND THE VARIOUS WILD LIFE THAT USE THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US. WE NEED TO CONSIDER THESE OTHER CREATURES ON GOD'S GREEN EARTH AND NOT JUST THOSE THAT DRIVE CARS. PLEASE DO WHAT YOU CAN TO MITIGATE THE THE IMPACT TO OUR NATURAL RESOURCES. THE OTHER CREATURES THAT SHARE THIS EARTH AND DRIVE THE TRAFFIC TO A PLACE WHERE LESSER IMPACT IS MADE TO OUR ENVIRONMENT. THANK YOU.

Comment 677

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

35.2.7A

Comment #: 6751-2919
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hertell, Nicole
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
MY NAME IS NICOLE HERTELL, MY PHONE NUMBER IS 17, ER MY ADDRESS IS 1700 N. 2340 W LEHI 84043. MY PHONE # IS 801-471-3945. I DO NOT WANT YOU TO BUILD A CONNECTOR AT 2100 N IN LEHI FOR THESE REASONS. THERE ARE BETTER OPTIONS, PROPERTY VALUES WILL DECREASE, 29 HOMES WILL BE RELOCATED. 60 APPROVED DWELLINGS WILL BE LOST, HEALTH RISKS WILL THREATEN OUR FAMILIES. 14.75 ACRES OF WETLANDS WILL BE IMPACTED. CARS WILL SPREE SPEED THROUGH LEHI AT 75 MILES PER HOUR. 100 PLUS ACRES OF COMMERCIAL LAND WILL BE LOST. NOISE WALLS WILL BE ADDED RUINING VIEWS. ASSOCI-ECONOMIC IMPACTS WILL BE SEVERE. ACCUMULATIVE IMPACTS WILL BE EXTREME. INTERCHANGE CONGESTION WILL BE STIFFLING. AIR QUALITY WILL DEMINISH AND NOISE WILL DRAMATICALLY INCREASE. I DO NOT WANT YOU TO BUILD THE CONNECTOR AT 2100 N AND THERE ARE BETTER OPTIONS. THANK YOU.

Comment 678

Comment 679

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6768-2940
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Imbler, Angenette
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Dear UDOT: I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi. I live in this area, and I strongly feel that there are better options. My property values will decrease, my family's health is at risk, noise will increase, and air quality will diminish. My neighborhood will be cut off from the rest of Lehi by 2 freeways and the railroad tracks. This will increase response time of emergency services. I strongly support the Lehi City arterial plan. I feel it better meets the needs of Lehi, the drivers of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, and my neighborhood.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6769-2941
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: Imbler, Matthew
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am against the current UDOT plan for a connector freeway at 2100 N in Lehi for the following reasons: There are better options that serve everyone involved, both residents and commuters. Property values will decrease Health risks will rise I have four children and plan to have more. I want them to be safe. I do not believe a freeway will be a very safe alternative. Thank you for allowing us to comment in this process.

Comment 680

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6770-2942
Date: 12/20/2007
Source: Website
Name: .
Location: , UT

Comment:
 We just bought our first home last year in Lehi and it took us a few years to finally get into a house. 2100 North in Lehi is right behind our backyard. We found out about this 2100 North corridor a few months after we moved into our brand new house. To think of leaving our new house that we planned on living in for awhile devastates us or to have a major road running right behind us. We don't understand why Udot would plan this with new houses going up around the area. They shouldn't have stopped the builders or the builders should have been stopped. To have so many new houses wiped out with as much as living costs its ridiculous and our house might be one of them!!! We think it would cost more to buy us all out of our new houses that Udot takes and build the corridor, than finding somewhere else that doesn't have a brand new development!!! Not that we think anyone elses houses should be taken out new or old, but this all could have been planned better!!! In conclusion Udot may want to think about this being where they live and would they want there new home gone or a major road in there backyard??? Just think about it! Thanks

Comment 681

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 6772-2944
Date: 12/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Schwinn, Carol
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I bought a house with 1.5 acres in Lehi @ about 1500 N last year. I bought it because of the wetlands, Jordan River trail, wildlife. I bought because there is a park across the street, a golf course past that. I expected growth, buildings, etc. But this freeway cutting through the area was not expected. I am opposed to the 2100 N connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. It will decrease my property value dramtically. Iwill destroy 14.7 acres of wetlands. It will be noisy and it will increase congestion. I recommend you cut across further north, past Thanksgiving Point so you are not cutting Lehi in half but going around the city.

Comment 682

Comment 683

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Comment #: 6773-2945
Date: 12/21/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Hughes, Nathan
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

35.2.8A

Comment:
HELLO, MY NAME IS NATHAN HUGHES, I LIVE AT 1682 N 800 E IN LEHI. I'M COMMENTING ABOUT THE MVC PROPOSED FREEWAY PROJECT. I THINK THAT THE PROPOSED ONE FROM UDOT IS NOT A PLAN THAT WILL WORK AND WILL HAVE MANY NEGATIVE EFFECTS. UM I THINK THAT A AN EXAMPLE OF THAT IS THE REBUILT I-15 SYSTEM. I THINK IT'S A NICE HWY HOWEVER WHENEVER THERE SEEMS TO BE ANY SORT OF ACCIDENTS IT REALLY SEEMS TO GET CLOGGED UP VERY QUICKLY AND VERY EASILY CAUSING ALL SORTS OF DELAYS. I THINK THAT WILL CONTINUE TO BE THE CASE WITH IF THE SAME PROPOSED FREEWAY IS BUILT. UM THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT A OBJECTIVES OR OBJECTIONS UM I'VE READ IN THE LEHI CITY LEDGER I LOOKED WHICH COMES WITH YOUR UTILITY BILL. AND I AGREE WITH ALL OF THOSE BUT THE BIGGEST THING, I CAN THINK IS I DON'T THINK IT WILL BE A GOOD, UM A A GOOD SOLUTION LIKE I SAID. NOT HAVING MANY ARTERIES UM WITH THE PROPOSED LEHI PLAN WHICH HAS SMALLER ROADS AND MANY DIFFERENT ALTERNATIVES WHICH WHICH WILL SERVE MANY DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE NORTHERN UTAH VALLEY. I THINK THAT IS THE PROPER WAY TO GO ON THE ACCOUNT THAT UM WHEN THERES WRECKS AND BLOCKAGES AND SO FORTH A TRAFFIC WILL BE ABLE TO RUN MUCH SMOOTHER. AS WE BELIEVE THAT SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE UM CASE IN POINT IF ANYBODY GOES ON MAIN ST DURING THE MORNING OR AFTERNOON COMMUTING HOURS, IT'S IT'S JUST JAMMED UP REALLY BAD. SO I'M DEFINITELY FOR SOMETHING TO BE DONE BUT I DEFINITELY THINK THAT MANY ARTERIES OF TRANSPORTATION IS THE BETTER WAY TO GO. MY TELEPHONE # IS AREA CODE 801-766-1309 OR YOU CAN A EMAIL ME AT NATECATHIE@YAHOO.COM. THANKS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR MY OPINION AND THE OPINION OF OTHERS. I CAN'T SAY THAT I KNOW OF ANYONE WHO IS IN FAVOR OF THE UDOT PROPOSED AREA A PROPOSED PLAN. SO THAT WOULD BE THE BEST THAT OUR TAXPAYER DOLLARS ARE SPENT ON THIS SITUATION A WISELY AND TO THE PUBLICS OPINION AS WELL. THANK YOU.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Comment #: 6774-2946
Date: 12/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Struthers, MG
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. MG Struthers

Comment 684

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6779-2953
Date: 12/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Goss, Julianne
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
It seems like it would be more cost effective to build the corridor further north. The road is shorter there. Less road, less cost. There would also be less environmental and social impact further north seeing as there are fewer residents and businesses involved further north.

Comment 685

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6780-2954
Date: 12/21/2007
Source: Website
Name: Goss, Leonard
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I think the mountain view corridor should be built further north than 2100 N. The distance spanned by the road is shorter there and will cost less to build. Also there will be fewer existing structures affected further north.

Comment 686

Comment 687

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.7A
35.2.8C

Comment #: 4905-2975
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Squire, Kally
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. Instead of forcing all traffic through one giant corridor, it makes sense to create smaller pockets of traffic and move them more efficiently within their own spheres of travel. This will give the people on the outskirts better routes without destroying the lifestyles of the residents along the way to major destinations.

Response Section in Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 4971-2966
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Morris, Trevor
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
To Whom It May Concern: I am strongly opposed to the Mountain View corridor being built through 2100 North in Lehi. I live in this area and am deeply upset and shocked at the idea of having a freeway less than 2 blocks from my home. The reasons I could state are numerous but to keep this simple so that you may read it all I will keep it short. I moved to Lehi 18 months ago to find a peaceful neighborhood to raise my family and that is what I found and HOPE to keep. Here are my reasons to object to your "preferred alternative" in no particular order. 1. If the freeway is built through the peaceful neighborhoods and pastures of Lehi near 2100 N. the effect on the area and city would be devastating. Many homes, farms, animals, people and even churches would be displaced. 2. Doctors have warned parents living near high traffic areas that they must have their children tested for carbon monoxide levels once a year. 3. The noise pollution in the area from traffic on the freeway and to the interchange that could be built at 2300 w. and other intersections would be horrible. My house borders 1500 N. and already the large trucks on this road shake my house to its foundation. I anticipate that with the freeway the traffic would only increase and make living in my home unbearable. 4. Barrier walls around the freeway would not solve the noise problem of arterial streets that feed the freeway. They would also obstruct beautiful views from our homes to the valley and mountains. 5. Property values would decrease at alarming rates as the freeway is built. Just take a look at what I-215 did to areas of West Jordan, Taylorsville and West Valley. There would be a mass exodus of home owners and neighbors from this area resulting in a near ghetto atmosphere. More home owners would be displaced as a result of this. 6. The air pollution would increase to unbearable levels; I have asthma and couldn't tolerate it. 7. The freeway will be passing near or through a deer migration area. This is near the 2100 N. area leading out to Redwood road (USR 68). I see many deer in this area everyday. In fact this morning I saw a herd of at least 20 in a farmer's field. The freeway would plow right through this wildlife. Are you considering that? Every week I see more dead deer on Redwood road than I care to see. It could only get worse with a freeway. 8. Traffic in the Lehi area arterial streets leading to the freeway would be even worse, the Lehi city alternative seems to me to be a much better idea for all involved and not just because I resent that you are planning on running 10 lanes of concrete through my front yard. 9. Other options need to be considered for mass transportation etc. We cannot as a society continue to saturate the countryside with concrete and automobiles until there is nothing left- just like many large metropolises where no matter how many freeways they build they cannot keep up with the traffic. (So. Cal. for example) So to summarize, PLEASE DON'T BUILD A FREEWAY AT 2100 N. THROUGH LEHI! Very truly yours, Trevor Morris 1526 N. 2260 W. Lehi, Utah 84043

Comment 688

Comment 689

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6781-2955
Date: 12/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: Whitehead, Kevin
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am against the 2100 North Connector. I am concerned about the long term development of the city and feel that the impact will be very negative. Not only does the connector have ramification for colleagues and extended family but in the long run it impacts neighborhoods. I am for the development and beautification of the city. Where I live we are already somewhat close to the freeway and feel the impact of the noise and the pollution. This connector will hem us in with major road ways which has negative socioeconomic consequences for adjacent neighborhoods to our own. Generally speaking, this type of retrogression in domestic environment is accompanied by increases in crime. That ultimately impacts our safety and environment. We want to see an improvement in the surrounding neighborhoods this connector will not aid that type of progress.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6782-2956
Date: 12/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: Jack, Garth
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I believe there must be a better solution to connecting Saratoga Springs to the I-15. There is plenty of room in Lehi besides that of carving up the subdivisions. We, as residents, property owners, and parents, should be consulted. I am excited about Lehi's growth and have bought here as an investment. Placing a major thoroughfare in my backyard poses a liability to my investment.

Comment 690

Comment 691

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6783-2957
Date: 12/22/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hokanson, Bryony
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 It's obvious something must be done to improve the commuting conditions between Saratoga Springs and Lehi, etc. I believe there are better alternate routes for an I-15 connector than to use 2100 north; it negatively impacts too many things. As a homeowner and a parent, I am concerned that my children's playground will be turned into a truck stop.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6784-2959
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Laughter, Chris
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Having reviewed more information regarding Mountain View Corridor, I would like to ammend my earlier submitted comment to add: Of the two alternatives, I would choose the depressed option as opposed to elevated one for the 2100 N and southerly portion connecting to HWY 73.

Comment 692

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6784-2958
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Laughter, Chris
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
As a resident in the Harvest Hills subdivision, which is west of Redwood Rd in Saratoga Springs, I would like to voice my opposition to the Mountain View Corridor as it is planned to run just west of my new residence. I will not go into the details of the discouragement this design brings to my wife and me, but suffice it to say we object to being subjected to a road of this magnitude constructed so close to our new home. Thank you for your consideration. Chris Laughter

Comment 693

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6786-2960
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hood, Donna
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Northern Utah County needs traffic relief immediately. Placing the east-west travel to the I-15 corridor at "Lehi's Bridge Proposal does not appear would like it would provide the necessary relief Lehi, Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain needs. 2100 North is the best choice.

Comment 694

Comment 695

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6787-2961
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Beverly, Curtis
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I believe the east-west corridor would be better at 2100 North rather than the 4800 North proposed by Lehi City is proposing. The 4800 North is to far North to relieve the majority of the heavy traffic flow Lehi, Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain are now experiencing.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6788-2962
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pierce, Ann
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am against the 2100 North connector that UDOT is pushing. Lehi city has better ideas.

Comment 696

Comment 697

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7D

Comment #: 6789-2963
Date: 12/23/2007
Source: Website
Name: Pierce, Daniel
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Count me against the 2100 North connector that UDOT is proposing.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.6A

35.2.9C

Comment #: 6790-2964
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Serre, Joseph
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 After reviewing many options that UDOT has presented I believe the best option for Northern Utah County is the Southern Freeway Alignment. I understand that it will impact more wetlands. But when are we going to listen to the voice of the people instead of special interest groups. It is very frustrating as a citizen to see how much power few individuals have compared to the majority. There is always wetland relocations. Since I know that the Southern Freeway Alignment is not a possibility my alternative choice is the 2100 North Alignment. I am concerned if you do the Lehi proposed route at the Point of the Mountain that it will not serve Lehi residents at all. In my opinion if Lehi City's bridge proposal is adopted it will have terrible and permanent consequences for the residents of Northern Utah County. I am a Lehi resident and have found no transportation planning from Lehi City. They have allowed Lehi City to be built out with no concern about traffic. Lehi City is reactive and not proactive city. UDOT will be bailing Lehi City out from they're horrible planning over the years by placing a freeway at the 2100 North alignment. It will alleviate most of the large truck traffic that travels main street, it will help move commuters that live in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs off of main street, and it will help those that live on the west side of Lehi. I think that this quote from a flyer I received sums it up, "Eliminating an east-west freeway in this region will repeat the mistakes that have been made over and over again as growing communities all along the Wasatch Front have fallen victim to a 'not-in-my-backyard' mentality. (Witness the daily commute on University Parkway and 800 North in Orem or 90th South and 33rd South in Salk County.)"

Comment 698

Comment 699

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6791-2965
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wright, Jared
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I would really like to see the South freeway built next to Utah Lake. I personally don't feel that environmentalists will ever let it happen though. Basically, the things I want to see happen is this, I would like to see a route to I-15 some where to the North of SR73. 2100 North seems the best option. A bridge would be nice in bluffdale but only in addition to 2100 North. I would also like to see at least one or two ways to I-15 Southbound from Eagle mountain or Southern Saratoga Springs. We need a route to I-15 toward Salt Lake and a route to I-15 toward Provo. It needs to start soon or we're in trouble based on current traffic.

35.2.6A

35.2.8C

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6793-2967
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Morris, Patricia
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Dear UDOT: I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for these reasons: The freeway will plow through a deer migration area, There are other better options, Property values will decrease, 29 homes will be relocated, 60 approved dwellings will be lost, Health risks will threaten our families, 14.75 acres of wetlands will be impacted, Cars will speed through Lehi at 75 MPH, 100+ acres of commercial land will be lost, Noise walls will be added ruining views, The socioeconomic impacts will be severe, The cumulative impacts will be extreme, Interchange congestion will be stifling, Air quality will diminish, And ... Noise will dramatically increase

35.2.7A

Comment 700

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6796-2971
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Church, Lewis & Karen
Location: Saratoga Springs,, UT

Comment:
The plan to connect with I-15 via 2100 N. is the best of all options. It appears that Lehi City has dug in its heels and thwarted all alternatives, such as widening their Main St. or providing for a route immediately north of Utah Lake. The 2100 N. route is really the only viable option. For pity sakes, let UDOT do their job! Thousands need a new road! Thanks for listening!

Comment 701

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6797-2972
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hoffman, Eric and Briana
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain residents desperately need the Mountain View Corridor to extend down to SR-73 and intersect with I-15 at 2100 North. This is the most important decision facing our residents right now, and the main thing inhibiting our growth. It is ridiculous that it often takes us 20-30 minutes to go 7 miles. It is rush hour for us at 2 in the afternoon. This would also significantly increase safety in the schools zones we have to pass through. I feel we are waiting for something awful to happen before we change anything. If we ever needed to evacuate as things stand it would be impossible. Other options are only bandaids, and represent a "not in my backyard" mentality that has left most of Lehi the traffic mess that it is. The few residents that are proposing tying the corridor in at point of the mountain are thinking only of their own interest. The SR-73/2100 North alternative is in the interest of 10s of 1,000s of citizens. If it is a financial issue then we have no problem helping pay our part of this construction. This is the main issue we vote on, and will be until it is fixed.

Comment 702

Comment 703

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6798-2973
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Wilkins, Brian
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

35.2.8A

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because I don't want a freeway dividing Lehi. As a resident of Lehi and a long-time resident of northern Utah County I have a vested interest in what happens in this area. Dividing Lehi in two with a freeway will hurt more than wetlands or homes. It will hurt a community. The Arterials Alternative is better suited to move people across this area and join the two freeways. It provides for northern access to and from Salt Lake. It provides southern access to and from Provo/Orem. And it provides central access to convenience locations such as Thanksgiving Point, The Meadows, and the developments at Traverse Ridge. By dividing up the traffic into three destination routes each individual route will be less congested and more useful over the long-term. Arterials also provide for economic growth and stability whereas a single freeway will only provide a short-term solution that bypasses, divides, and depreciates the community.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6799-2988
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Anderson, Victor & Shontell
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
 Hi, this is Shontell Anderson. I'm opposed to the 2100 north connector. I think you could um do something more positive by moving it north. And just a it would have less of an impact. And my number is 801-768-1864. Thanks.

Comment 704

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6799-2987
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Anderson, Victor & Shontell
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Hi, this is Shontell Anderson and I am opposed to the 2100 north connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat and damages the free fragile eco, the ecosystem there, along the Jordan River. Um my number is 801-768-1864.

Comment 705

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6799-2974
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Anderson, Victor & Shontell
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River. If you moved the connector North, the impact would be less. Highland is proposing a main artery East. Many residents would be impacted by this on top of the corridor connector. It is definately not the best route.

Comment 706

Comment 707

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6801-2976
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Squire, Clifford
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6802-2977
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Veylupek, Dallin
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 I am in favor of the Lehi City's bridge and not in favor of the 2100 North Alternative. The reasons are very clear. The Bridge takes less land and is a direct connection for those of us traveling north and south. The 2100 North takes more land and would make commuters travel further and have to back track if going north on the 15 or coming back south from the 15.

Comment 708

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6803-2978
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: King, DJ
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
Mountain View Corridor I vote for the 2100 N section rather than the alternative Lehi City has proposed. The 2100 N option will provide greater access to Lehi and American for for Saratoga and Eagle Mountain. Residents will use the 2100 N option to access Lehi and AF for shopping. The bridge idea would not benefit the residents of the west side to access the other cities. People will use the 2100 N access to shop in Lehi and AF. However, nobody will use the bridge to access these cities. The bridge would provide little benefit. Lets make sure we get this right and approve the 2100 N proposal.

Comment 709

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 6804-2979
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Iverson, Chad
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I strongly oppose the mountain view corridor connector at 2100 North in Lehi. I do realize that all of the connector options have pros and cons but I feel the 2100 North option makes the least sense and will create massive delays during construction that could be minimized by using another option. I feel that lehi city gave a more promising option when they proposed a new connector further north towards the point of the mountain.

Comment 710

Comment 711

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6805-2980
Date: 12/24/2007
Source: Website
Name: Parkin, Angie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I believe most traffic studies say that multiple smaller arterial roads will carry more traffic capacity than one big one in the long term. Please think long term. The ironic thing that many traffic experts say is no matter how many lanes something is, it will always eventually reach capacity... no matter how big it is. So, I believe I'd rather have multiple reasonable options, rather than one big huge freeway connector. Please deeply consider the Lehi proposal, and vote against the UDOT 2100 North Freeway Connector.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6809-2985
Date: 12/22/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Kirkham, Judy
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Yes, this is Judy Kirkham. My contact information is 270 E. 100 N. Lehi UT. My phone number is 801-768-4503 and I would like to comment on the MVC that um, I do not want the 2100 north corridor placed in Lehi. This will divide our town into another section. Again, we already have a freeway running through the middle of our city. Um, it will impact a number of families and it will effect the um environment. Um I would like to know how many um endangered species will be affected by this a corridor and I do not think it is right. Um a number of years ago Lehi put a Moratorium on building because we did not have the water or the electricity to accommodate any more building and Eagle Mtn. and Saratoga came in and built their own cities. And now they are requesting that we give up um property and our environment to make their lives easier and that is not right. If they do not like it here, they are welcome to leave. But, that they have destroyed the community that we have had for many years and this is not the solution to the problem. Thank you very much.

Comment 712

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6813-2991
Date: 12/26/2007
Source: Website
Name: Petilos, Theda
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am agianst building the connector at 2100 N in Lehi for many reasons: there are other options, property values will decrease, 29 homes will be relocated, almost 15 acres of wetlands will be lost, the danger from fast moving vehicles will increase, noise will dramatically increase and the quality of life will decrease.

Comment 713

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.9A

Comment #: 6824-3005
Date: 12/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Stauffer, Matthew
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the connector at 2100 N. in Lehi for a number of reasons. I am in favor of the Lehi city proposal to add the connector at Thanksgiving point. At 1853 North I live just a few blocks away from the proposed 2100 North connector. Adding the connector route will not only decrease our property value, but there will be increased noise and air pollution in what is otherwise a very quiet and peaceful residential area. Additionally the 4800 N. connector would affect fewer homes, as much of the property is already government owned, and it would be a shorter, more direct road from Redwood to I-15. For northbound commuters it wouldn't matter whether the connector is at 4800 vs. 2100. Most southbound commuters would use an alternate southern route rather than drive up to 2100 N. just to connect to I-15, and then back south. As the Lehi proposal for 4800 N. is the shortest route between established roads, and affects far fewer homeowners I believe that it is a far superior alternative to the 2100 connector.

Comment 714

Comment 715

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6825-3006
Date: 12/27/2007
Source: Website
Name: Hansen, Derek
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North Connector in Lehi City. I much prefer the alternative proposed by Lehi city. I am worried about the impact of this highway going in at 2100 N.. I think there are better options that have less impact on homes and residents. I agree that a connector of this sort needs to be created. I just don't think that is the correct placement of it.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6826-3007
Date: 12/27/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Madsen, Brook
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Yeah, I'm a resident of Lehi City. And I'm actually calling to in support of the 2100 N connector. I think that that would be a excellent opportunity through Lehi. I'm just expressing my opinion on that. My name is brook Madsen. And once again, I live in Lehi.

Comment 716

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9C

Comment #: 6831-3012
Date: 12/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Millet, Bryan
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I don't like the "Lehi" alternative of placing the EastWest connector at the point of the mountain. This doesn't solve our transportation needs in the least, nor does it save gas as the Lehi Mayor has suggested. Inconveniencing or relocating a few families to make the route useful and as unobtrusive as possible for the majority, is in my mind the best possible option. 2100 North appears to be the best route for everyone in the area.

Comment 717

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

Comment #: 6832-3013
Date: 12/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Gerber, David
Location: , UT

Comment:
While the 2100 North option would probably be less expensive to build. It seems that a better option would be to build the new connector as far south as possible. I travel across Lehi Mainstreet at 800 east daily. Most of the traffic is to and from southbound I-15 the collector at 2100 north will not have a great impact on main street traffic.

Comment 718

Comment 719

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6833-3014
Date: 12/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Fawcett, David
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
I moved here to Lehi in 2001. I would be affected in a big way if a 2100 North Freeway were to be built. I live less than a quarter mile from the proposed freeway on 1775 North. I believe that many things are not being addressed on this issue. First there would be a huge impact on wildlife in the area. This is a wintering area for deer, geese and a number of other species. Many other birds would be affected. Redtail Hawks and many song birds are residents of this area. All would likely be pushed out. I also don't agree that only a small area of wetlands would be affected, but would be likely high. I also don't believe anyone has pointed out that many of the fields in this area are a part of the migratory bird flyway. Many geese use these fields to rest and feed. I am also convinced that air and noise pollution as well as light pollution would greatly increase. UDOT claims that making the freeway below grade would be a good solution. Bad idea, as I mentioned I live out here. When we were building our home we were told the ground water level was only a few feet down. Any basements in our subdivision are required to have subpumps or basement drains. The developer had to install a land drain in order to build the subdivision. All this adds up to a continually flooded freeway and extensive cost in building a land drain. Another thing, while there is only one crossing of the Jordan River and thus on one flood plain traverse, a freeway below grade would act as a conduit for flood water. This would make sense since it is being built to reduce traffic congestion. In the event of flooding the freeway would likely be closed. It is also stupid to build a freeway in an area where an elementary school is going to be built. The school locate at 1800 North is needed for the neighborhood. The school would be located on 2300 West. Of course no one points out that 2300 West would be a major on ramp to the 2100 North Freeway. This is an open invitation to trouble. Our kids need to be safe and this would not be safe. UDOT has pointed out that other elementary schools are next to I-15, but they don't point out that non are next to a major on ramp. Cutting a 300 foot plus swath through is area would impact more homes and businesses than is indicated. No one thinks of what the area will be like in 10 to 15 years down the road. More homes will be built and more businesses. Unless of course they are all scared off and nothing gets built. Bad of Lehi tax coffers, but maybe good for me until the freeway is actually built. UDOT is bowing to pressure from residents in south Lehi by stating they prefer 2100 North. Less impact the they say and less cost. Well then why not just keep going north to 4800 North and build a freeway connector there. If they want to impact less people and keep costs down. This is the best alternative. The distance would be one third the distance as 2100 North and would still only cross the Jordan River once. UDOT says that the bridge needed would be too long and the soil too unstable. Isn't that what we have engineers for. They can do it and at less cost than 2100 North. A boulevard style of road should be built a 2100 North. This can be done a less cost and less impact to the environment than a proposed freeway. The noise would be less and the speed of vehicles would be less. This would increase the safety of our children and the quality of our lives. I am opposition to the proposed freeway as are all of the residents of this area. We should have the say on what goes in, not UDOT. We know what is best for our neighborhood, not some shirt sitting in an office 20 miles away. Don't build a freeway. We will fight you all the way and thus costs will go even higher just like the Legacy Highway ended up costing the State millions of dollars more than it should have. Fix it before it becomes a problem and think things through better. David and Jane Fawcett Lehi

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6834-3015
Date: 12/28/2007
Source: Website
Name: Herron, James
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
As I am a new resident of Lehi and hearing about the proposed road to handle the traffic from I-15 to the west side of the valley seems like a very good idea. However trading one main road for another right through the residential areas of Lehi and uprooting families, destroying homes and churches and in some cases livelihoods on the farms, and not giving the residents of Lehi an opportunity to vote on this proposal or letting the city of Lehi build their own bypass road is just wrong and will cause a lot of friction between the communities you are trying to help. My vote on this issue the way it stands now is a resounding NO.

Comment 720

Comment 721

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 11-3073
Date: 1/3/2008
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Hi, I am calling in behalf of the corridor, the 21 N in Lehi. I'm, I am apposed to the 21 N connector, um, the proposal is a very um a negative um it will be a negative impact on the neighborhoods and it will destroy the wildlife and the habitat and and a and the property values will decrease and the part about the 29 homes that will be relocated. I can go on and on, but I am very much apposed. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.8D

35.24A
 35.13D
 35.31E

Comment #: 3405-3087
Date: 1/4/2008
Source: Website
Name: Hill, Farron
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
 It appears that the DEIS has not addressed the effect of the hyway on roads and property more distant than a fraction of a mile from the corridor. All new major roads in the salt lake city area when they were put in have generated a great increase in the secondary roads within 2-4 miles. Many have required expansion to more lanes. Others have experienced a large jump in the volume they handle. These changes have caused a large amount of land in the area to be changed in its use and have caused many traffic problems. At present, a large amount of business developement is occurring near the 58th west proposed location. This would most likely move if another location were to be used. The effect of the corridor on streets, residential property converted to business property is a deffenant impact and should be addressed. The impact of combined road noise and air traffic noise does not seem to be addressed. A major flyway passes up and down 7200 west in the valley. Some of the maps appear to be out of date and some of the current building are not shown

Comment 722

Comment 723

Response Section in Chapter 35

35.2.7A

Comment #: 4697-3056
Date: 1/2/2008
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Knutsen, David & Marsha
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 This is David Knutsen. My phone number is 801-768-8903. I do not want you to build a connector at 2100 N in Lehi. And my reasons are I believe my property value will decrease. I understand 29 homes approximately will be relocated. There will be nearly 15 acres of wetlands that will be impacted. I believe cars will speed through Lehi at a great a speeds of 75 or more. A I believe the socio-economic impacts are going to be severe on a our City of Lehi. The interchange congestion is definitely going to be very stifling and difficult. And I believe noise and air quality, the noise will dramatically increase and the air quality will definitely decrease. It will not be as good. So, I, I really a feel strongly against this 2100 N a connector in Lehi and I believe 48 N, if you have to put one in, would be a better option. A please consider this and a thank you. Good-bye.

Response Section in Chapter 35

35.2.7F

35.2.7A

35.31E

35.2.7A

35.6.3A

35.2.7B

35.13A

35.2.7A

Comment #: 5012-3088
Date: 1/4/2008
Source: Website
Name: Palmer, Bradley & Rachel
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 To Whom It May Concern, I am very much opposed to the 2100 North alternative of the Utah County Mountain View Corridor. Please find below my comments and questions. 1. Since the 2100 North alternative was originally eliminated (2.1.6.3) from consideration I would think UDOT would want to find a better solution than the 2100 North alternative. Shouldn't those same eliminating factors still hold some impact to the decision making process? a. From section 6.5.2-"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). "By building a freeway the "good and clean location, natural beauty..." will be eliminated. b. From section 6.6.4.2-"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." I agree that the residents will feel a negative impact from this freeway, but I do not agree that the residents will feel that the freeway will improve travel through this portion of Lehi. Interstate 15 is less than one mile from these adjacent communities. c. Adverse impacts to the economic and residential growth of the area. From the Purpose and Need Fact Sheet-"Secondary purposes were used to further refine alternatives and include: 1) Support local city growth objectives..." By building a freeway access points to possible commercial areas will be reduced significantly negatively impacting if not destroying commercial development altogether. Residential property values will also drop due to the decrease of quality of living and possible loss of future development. 2. How does Lehi benefit from the freeway? a. Why has no survey of residents in western communities such as Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain been conducted to see if people traveling to the Provo area would be willing to go north to go east to go south again if a freeway was built at 2100 North? Or would these people take the new 1000 South arterial or continue on Main Street? b. Will this connector only service Salt Lake County? If the people in the western communities are not willing to use the connector at 2100 North wouldn't this only serve Salt Lake County, and if so why is Utah County taking the impact instead of Salt Lake County? c. There has been a lot of development adjacent to 2100 North in recent years. Have all of these homes been taken into account when UDOT published the number of homes that will be impacted (i.e. noise study, air quality) by this freeway? If not will it be updated and the 2100 North alternative reconsidered? d. From section 27.6-"Mitigation is generally not offered to local governments that are adversely affected when lands are removed from their tax base." Again how will Lehi benefit from this freeway at 2100 North? I would think that an arterial would better serve this city by allowing commercial and residential development along this road. e. From section 27.6-"For residential properties close to the roadway that experience adverse noise and aesthetic impacts and associated loss of property values, no mitigation is specifically recommended." Why would UDOT pay fair market value to residents who have their homes and property taken but not compensate those who have to stay with a lower quality of life and loss of property value? 3. Freeway Impacts a. Depressed Freeway i. Many homes in the adjacent subdivisions have experienced flooding in their basements, has there been any investigation into possible drainage problems for the freeway, and if so, what type of solutions have been proposed? How will this impact the cost of the freeway? ii. At the public meeting in Lehi on 11/15/2007 I was told by UDOT staff that the noise from the freeway would travel upward rather than horizontally. If this freeway is going to be depressed wouldn't this increase the amount of noise in the adjacent neighborhoods? Was this taken into account with the noise study? iii. From Figure 13-19, why was there no noise monitoring locations near the neighborhoods north of 2100 North and wouldn't Redwood Road affect the results of ML-32 for these neighborhoods? The representatives at the public meeting I attended had no answer to this question. iv. With a depressed freeway, wouldn't the pollution from the freeway be more at human level? I moved here from the Los Angeles area and I lived near a depressed freeway. We could hear it very well and my daughter

Comment 723 (continued)

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.11A
35.2.10A
35.2.9A

developed asthma while living there. Since moving to Utah she has shown no signs of asthma. How will UDOT mitigate the health hazards this freeway will cause? The representatives at the public meeting I attended had no answer to this question. v. I was told at the public meeting of 11/15/2007 that there currently are no standards set for air pollution. UDOT can predict the air quality but there are no standards to compare to. Why are there no standards? We hear every winter of green, yellow, and red burn days indicating the impacts poor air quality have on health. Many doctors have compared certain days of poor air quality as the same as smoking cigarettes. vi. I saw nothing referring to light pollution. Was this considered and if so what were the results? If not considered, why? vii. The depressed freeway will go under the train tracks crossing 2100 North. I understand UDOT will most likely build a temporary arterial at 2100 North until funding for the freeway can be obtained (I was given this information from UDOT representatives at the public meeting of 11/15/2007.) Will the temporary arterial also go under the tracks? viii. How will this temporary arterial be converted into a freeway? Are the residents at 2100 North going to have to go through the construction process twice? How long will the arterial remain until it is converted into the freeway? ix. I was told by UDOT representatives that the freeway at 2100 would be depressed to "hide" it, to help the aesthetics of the area. However, at the connection with I-15 there will be a number of 20' to 50' high ramps. This will not help keep the area aesthetically pleasing. 4. Funding a. Does UDOT have any funding at all? I was told there currently is not funding available. Has the federal government promised any money for this project? b. Tolling i. What percentage of people would not use this freeway if it was to be tolled? ii. Will residents adjacent to this freeway at 2100 North be given any kind of compensation such as free passes to get to I-15? I would like to again state my opposition to the 2100 North alternative of the Utah County Mountain View Corridor. I am in favor of the alternative proposed by Lehi City which is not a part of this Draft EIS. I would hope that if the Lehi City proposal is found to be a better alternative (i.e. more capacity and cheaper) UDOT and FHWA will accept it. Thank you, Bradley Palmer

Comment 724

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

*Note:
Comment
number
724
was not
used.*

Comment #: 6805-3051
Date: 1/3/2008
Source: Website
Name: Parkin, Angie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
There are better alternatives! Most traffic consultants agree that no matter how BIG you make the road, it will reach capacity. Then people will end up using other alternatives anyway. Bigger is not better and the negative ramifications are great (noise, air quality, congestion, views blocked). Many residents are concerned about the 100+ acres of commercial land that would be lost. I'm greatly concerned about the wetlands that will be impacted. Please do one of the alternatives to the proposed 2100 North Connector!

Comment 725

Comment 726

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6835-3016
Date: 12/29/2007
Source: Website
Name: Budge, Ryan
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
 I am a resident that will be affected by the freeway that is planned for 2100 north in Lehi. I understand that we need a freeway so that people can get to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, however, I do not feel that 2100 North is the best location. I do not feel this is the best location because: - Homes will be relocated - Jordan River Parkway Trail will be disrupted near my home - Cars will speed at 65+ MPH - Air Quality will be affected - I will have a view of a cement wall or freeway from my home - My property value may decrease - Alpine School may not put in a school near my home on 2300 W in Lehi - Lehi would be divided North to South, it is already divided East to West. This affects the sense of community. - Future Commerce could be affected. - There is a better alternative I don't want to be a "not in my backyard" resident and wouldn't be if there wasn't an alternative. I went to the UDOT open house at the Junior High and researched and feel that 4800 N would be better. This wouldn't affect homes and schools and would get people out to Eagle Mountain. Please consider this option.

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6836-3017
Date: 12/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Decker, David
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

35.2.7C

Comment:
 I support the 2100 North Freeway. We travel south as often as we travel north. The other alternatives are useless to us. Obviously we would have preferred the Utah lake front approach. However, we realize that that is not going to happen. Therefore, 2100 North.

Comment 727

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6837-3018
Date: 12/30/2007
Source: Website
Name: Decker, Judith
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I agree with my husband's comment re 2100 North. We are former Provo residents; and still do more personal business there than we do in Salt Lake et al.

Comment 728

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6838-3019
Date: 12/31/2007
Source: Website
Name: Briggs, Tyler
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I do not want to build the connector at 2100 N in Lehi for these reasons: -There are other better options - Property values will decrease -29 homes will be relocated -60 approved dwelling will be lost -Health risks will threaten our families -14.75 acres of wetlands will be impacted -Cars will speed through Lehi at 75 MPH -100+ acres of commercial land will be lost -Noise walls will be added ruining views -The socioeconomic impacts will be severe -The cumulative impacts will be extreme -Interchange congestion will be stifling -Air quality will diminish -Noise will dramatically increase

Comment 729

Comment 730

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6839-3020
Date: 1/1/2008
Source: Website
Name: Sabey, Casey
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for many reasons. My greatest concern is the negative impact on our neighborhood; increased traffic, noise, pollution & the division of our city. My wife & I both grew up in Lehi, we built our house & stayed because of the safe, quiet neighborhood. Please find another option & do not displace our neighbors & endanger our children.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6840-3021
Date: 1/1/2008
Source: Website
Name: Raehl, Ben
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Building a connector along 2100 N. in Lehi will not cure (or greatly reduce) traffic congestion. Commuters entering Utah county from the Salt Lake area already have an option to access Redwood road, Bangarter Hwy. Also, should it be necessary to build a redudant access point, a connector near the point of the mountain requires less commercial/residential property to be possessed by a freeway. Please do not favor the mayor of Saratoga Springs, they risk virtually no land, housing, commercial, and wildlife land to build a connector closer to their city, but reap all of the benefits. NO TO 2100 N. CONNECTOR!

Comment 731

Comment 732

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6858-3050
Date: 1/2/2008
Source: Website
Name: , Jeff
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 As a new resident of Saratoga Springs I'm appalled by city lack of commercial development and bad driving condition. Sr 73 thru Lehi is just short of nightmare, backcountry "secret" roads during rush hours are just as bad. So convenient connector to I-15 is badly needed, any proposed connector further north of 2100N doesn't make any sense as few miles down the Redwood Rd. there is Bangerter Hwy. The sooner Udot will start building connector the better for most of us, not excluding Lehi residents most likely not happy with heavy traffic on Main Str.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1D

Comment #: 6861-3055
Date: 12/31/2007
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: Bentley, Richard & Nancy
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
 Hello, I am trying to comment on the MVC um alternatives to go through Lehi. And my preference is to have the MVC freeway a go down to Saratoga Springs and then go east a approximately 1000 South in Lehi, Lehi address. A just north of the Utah Lake and connect over to American Fork Main St. That's my first preference. The second preference is to have the MVC go through Lehi at 2100 N. A to go east a from MVC over to I-15, a that's my, my preference. Ok, and the um you wanted my name and phone number I think, right? My name is Richard Bentley. My phone number is 801-789-5418. Thank you. A and the address is in Eagle Mtn UT. Thank you, good-bye.

Comment 733

Comment 734

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 11-3169
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Hello, I would like to comment against the Mountain View Corridor. Though we all understand that a new roadway is needed, I believe that the Lehi City proposal has the best interest of everybody in mind. Thank you.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 11-3148
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
 I am opposed to the 2100 North connector proposal through Lehi because it negatively impacts neighborhoods, destroys wildlife habitat, and damages the fragile ecosystem along the Jordan River.

Comment 735

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 11-3129
Date: 1/9/2008
Source: Website
Name: , Anonymous
Location: , UT

Comment:
The Lehi City Mayor and Council have asked residents to write opposing the 2100 North connector to the Mountain View corridor. I disagree. I favor the placement of the connector at 2100 North. It seems a logical option and provides for me personally the greatest convenience and the most potential for useage.

Comment 736

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A

Comment #: 368-3143
Date: 12/12/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Woods, Cecil
Location: Yuma, AZ

Comment:
I own a home on Schuler Avenue which I would like to sell. I thought you guys were going to make a decision on December 8th? I have to disclose what will happen to this home if I want to sell it.

Comment 737

Comment 738

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A

Comment #: 877-3144
Date: 11/30/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Manning, David
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 My property is in the neighborhood where the "spaghetti bowl" is planned, by 2100 North. I talked to someone at the hearing about an early buyout. The design shows that my property butts up against the footprint. I just want clarification on impacts to my property.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 3261-3162
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Cavanaugh, Jack & Connie
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
 Hello we were at the meeting at hunter high and were told they were going to have a meeting for the people that live on Bills Dr in Jan 2008. We were wondering if that has been set up and for what date.....we would be interested in attending. thank you

Comment 739

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 5972-3138
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Aydelotte, Nanette & Michael
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 To Whom It May Concern: My family and I are very much apposed to the 2100 North connector that is being proposed. Our house would be about 100 yards from the connector if installed. We do not want the extra noise (we have to listen to a train already), pollution, view blockage, or damage to the ecosystem that this connector would cause. We are also concerned about the impact on the value of our home. In addition, we are also apposed to the physical division that the connector would cause in Lehi which would also disrupt the ease of local traffic flow. We are far less apposed to a boulevard or smaller, slower road if needs be which would lend more of a connected city feel (like University Ave in Provo) instead of one of division that the proposed 2100 N. connector would cause. My recommendation is to consider either the 4800 North connector proposed by Lehi or multiple, smaller, slower arterial roads. Please, please, do not build the 2100 North connector! Sincerely, Michael Aydelotte and family

Comment 740

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.8C

Comment #: 6606-3168
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Toll Free Line
Name: , Wendy
Location: , UT

Comment:
 Hi, my name's Wendy. My phone number is 427-7984. I just wanted to comment on the MVC connector at 2100 N. I do not um support this proposal. I think that there are so many other um better options and why would we build a giant freeway that's going to take 10 years to build when if we just start by building smaller roads um in many different locations, that would be a lot more helpful than one big freeway and it would cut down on um pollution and destroying different properties and just be a much better um proposal for Lehi and everywhere else. I don't know why Saratoga and American Fork and Eagle Mtn. even have a say in say in this. It's not affecting them, it's affecting us. So, I think we should not give them a say and not have this in our neighborhood. Thank you, bye bye.

Comment 741

Comment 742

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6881-3089
Date: 1/5/2008
Source: Website
Name: Comer, Janene
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I do not want the connector built at 2100 North. I believe the option which runs more to the north is much better. I believe there are too many homes which will be relocated, the wetlands impacted by the 2100 North connector are far greater than the other alternative. The property values will decrease, and speeds will be excessive! There is a much better alternative out there, and that is the one proposed by Lehi City. It fits with the master plan of the city, it has far less impact, and will cost less. Please use my tax dollars efficiently and do not build the 2100 North Connector.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6882-3090
Date: 1/5/2008
Source: Website
Name: Reynolds, Frankie
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I do not want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi. As a resident who lives in close proximity to the proposed connector, I am concerned about the negative impact the connector will have on the area. Increased traffic and noise are two ramifications unwelcome by the residents who live in the area. I do not want to see noise walls obstructing the landscape which originally encouraged my move to Lehi, nor do I want to see wetlands destroyed. I am also concerned about the value of my property decreasing. Above all, with the numbers of children who live in the area and walk to school just up the road from where the proposed connector, the safety issue alone tells me this is not a reasonable proposal when other alternatives exist. If such a connector were proposed for your neighborhood, would you be in favor of it--truly?

Comment 743

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6883-3091
Date: 1/5/2008
Source: Website
Name: Franzen, Paul
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I think that the 2100 North corridor is a great idea and am anxious for the Mountainview corridor to be completed. I work in West Jordan, and my commute will be much quicker and safer than the current option along the 2 lane Redwood Rd. Usually, I drive all the way to Draper because busy Redwood scares me. 2100 North will impact less homes, businesses, wetlands and views than any other option I have seen so far and seems to be a more economic option. In addition, it will hopefully decrease traffic around my home near Main Street in Lehi. Lets get it going ASAP!!!

Comment 744

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6884-3092
Date: 1/6/2008
Source: Website
Name: , Ryan
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
I would like to express my support for the 2100 N option for the Mountain View Corridor in Utah county. This really is the only option being offered that makes sense. And it is a minimum at that. We need to be looking into the future much more than we are right now and adding additional alternatives and better roads. Don't worry about the environmental issues. I am sure it is the loudmouthed minority that is concerned with that, not the commuting majority. Traffic solutions are already long overdue. Something needs to be done ASAP.

Comment 745

Comment 746

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6897-3110
Date: 1/7/2008
Source: Website
Name: Furness, Rob
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Dear Sir or Madam, I am a resident of Lehi and wish to voice my opinion about the 2100 N Connector. I live near the 1200 W exit and it is fairly quiet now. If this connector route is built, it will increase traffic significantly and will cause other issues such as decreased property values, increased pollution near my home, increased noise, etc. There are other alternatives that would be suitable and would cause less problems around this area. Thank you for your attention to my concern.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A
35.2.10D

Comment #: 6898-3111
Date: 1/8/2008
Source: Website
Name: Wursten, Curtis
Location: Orem, UT

Comment:
 I am a resident of Orem who wouldn't be a frequent user of the Mountain View Corridor, but is interested in its ability to ease congestion on I-15 and improve mobility in Utah County. 1) I prefer the Southern Freeway Alternative, because I just don't see the 2100 N Freeway helping much with traffic in Utah County. However, if it isn't built there needs to be a Bangerter Highway like road built along 1900 South. 2) I think the tolling proposal is acceptable but the rates seem quite high. I can't see myself paying \$8 or more to drive to the airport and back on the Mountain View Corridor.

Comment 747

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6899-3112
Date: 1/8/2008
Source: Website
Name: Thacker, Jan
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
I am opposed to the proposed Mountain View Corridor. I have lived in Lehi for 45 years. I feel there is a better alternative. Our community has already lost its "small town" feel, and adding this corridor will only diminish it more. I also feel, the quality of life we now enjoy will be drastically changed due to environmental and socioeconomic impacts. So much property will be lost, and our property values will decrease. Please, listen to Lehi City's proposal and the citizens of Lehi. I realize there is traffic congestion problem, but don't punish us who have lived here for a long time because people choose to build homes and a community in an area where there were no road structures in place.

Comment 748

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

35.2.8C

Comment #: 6906-3119
Date: 1/8/2008
Source: Website
Name: Prettyman, Eric
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
The 2100 N Freeway alternative in Lehi is not the best option for residents of Lehi or the surrounding communities. It cuts Lehi into thirds, wastes precious land, destroy homes and ruins newly developed neighborhoods. Rather than build one massive freeway system that will take years to complete and be inconvenient for everyone coming from the south end of the valley, multiple alternatives need to be provided beginning in Saratoga Springs and moving North. The alternatives that Lehi has provided are the best to meet current and future traffic needs.

Comment 749

Comment 750

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6913-3126
Date: 1/8/2008
Source: Website
Name: Price, Lindsay
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Dear UDOT, I do NOT want you to build the connector at 2100 North in Lehi for the following reasons, property values with decrease, cars will speed through Lehi at 75 MPH, Noise walls will be added ruining views, Noise will dramatically increase, and air quality will diminish. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD IT!!!

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.4B

Comment #: 6915-3128
Date: 1/8/2008
Source: Website
Name: Lai, Jennie
Location: WVC, UT

Comment:
 As a resident I strongly disagree with the 5800 West location. This plan will negatively impact 3 schools in the process, increase our no burn days which also means no recess for our children during school, increase the noise level, and increase asthma rates. Sure 7200 West has less traffic now but also has less impacted residents!! If you build it, they will come ...

Comment 751

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6918-3133
Date: 1/9/2008
Source: Website
Name: Miller, Louise
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 Please consider alternatives other than 2100 N. in Lehi. I feel that it impacts too many homes and neighborhoods in a negative way. Lehi city's alternative at 4800 N. is a much better option. My kids have to walk to school along 1200 W. which will become a major access road to the on/off ramps of where the new roads would meet the freeway. I am very concerned for the safety of our children. The traffic that will increase in our area concerns my greatly. Please help keep our children safe.

Comment 752

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.13A

35.2.10A

Comment #: 6919-3134
Date: 1/9/2008
Source: Website
Name: ,Harvest Hills Resident
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 Being a resident of Saratoga Springs, I know that there is a definite need for both the North and South Freeways. If the North Freeway is the best choice, then please consider the South Freeway arterial as well. Being a commuter to both Orem and West Valley/Salt Lake City, each freeway would alleviate much travel time. Trying to get to Orem takes an extra 15 to 20 minutes just to get through SR73. Most people who live here have to commute in either direction. Lehi Main street cannot handle more traffic than it already has; and it's going to get worse as the population grows--which it will. I also don't think it's fair to make this freeway a toll freeway. This freeway is needed as much as I-215. We pay our taxes and should be able to have a freeway to use as well, without additional cost. Many businesses such as Thanksgiving Point and Cabelas will greatly benefit from having a North freeway from Redwood road. This would also greatly decrease the traffic from SR 73. I do like the plan of the depressed sections of the freeway. It is very considerate to the home owners and the schools that the freeway will pass through. Thank you for that. It makes sense for the area and makes me feel less anxious about having a freeway so close to our schools and homes.

Comment 753

Comment 754

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6920-3136
Date: 1/9/2008
Source: Website
Name: Budge, Kimberly
Location: Lehi, UT

35.2.7A

Comment:
 I am a resident that will be affected by the freeway that is planned for 2100 north in Lehi. I understand that we need a freeway so that people can get to Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, however, I do not feel that 2100 North is the best location. I do not feel this is the best location because: - Homes will be relocated - Jordan River Parkway Trail will be disrupted near my home - Cars will speed at 65+ MPH - Air Quality will be affected - I will have a view of a cement wall or freeway from my home - My property value may decrease - Alpine School may not put in a school near my home on 2300 W in Lehi - Lehi would be divided North to South, it is already divided East to West. This affects the sense of community. - Future Commerce could be affected. - There is a better alternative I don't want to be a "not in my backyard" resident and wouldn't be if there wasn't an alternative. I went to the UDOT open house at the Junior High and researched and feel that 4800 N would be better. This wouldn't affect homes and schools and would get people out to Eagle Mountain. Please consider this option.

35.2.9A

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



Comment #: 6921-3137
Date: 1/9/2008
Source: Website
Name: Lichtenfels, Brian
Location: , UT

35.1.1A

Comment:
 I think this highway is a great idea (just don't make it like Bangerter). The west side of the valley is the only place for growth at this point, and this project needs to be completed sooner than later before more housing developments are completed. I actually wish this was done years ago, as more and more relocation is going to be needed for all the housing that has been built in the last few years, which is only going to increase the cost. There is a legitimate concern, however, for the lack of east-west routes in the southern part of the valley, which this highway does not currently address. I also feel that the Salt Lake Area should be proud that it doesn't have to force its commuters onto toll road, and this road should follow suit as a non-toll highway. Recent tollways in other western metropolitan areas, specifically Denver, have not lived up to the billing for a lack of use.

35.2.10A

Comment 755

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7A

Comment #: 6923-3139
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Lima, Eileen
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
When a government entity plans something as grand as a new freeway, local residents and leaders must be considered. Their suggestions should come foremost. The Mountain View Corridor's route will impact Lehi, and UDOT needs to realize Lehi needs to be able to approve the route. Our children and life will be affected for years to come. I recommend to UDOT officials that they heed the Lehi City Officials on the route taken through OUR city. Obviously the route at 2100 North will by far affect us negatively and is not the more efficient way. Therefore, I voice my disapproval of this plan

Comment 756

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.6.3A

Comment #: 6928-3145
Date: 12/4/2007
Source: Telephone
Name: Archuletta, James
Location: West Valley City, UT

Comment:
Our home is affected by the 5800 West alternative and we are looking at another property to buy. Can UDOT acquire our home early so we don't have to sell it or rent it out?

Comment 757

Comment 758

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6931-3149
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Adams, Darlene
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 My husband and I are against UDOT's proposed mountain view corridor. I think there has to be a better way to do this, and make most people happy. Listen again To the proposal Lehi has came up with. Thank you Darlene and Richard Adams

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.9A
35.1.1A

Comment #: 6933-3154
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Shepherd, Cheryl
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
 The location for the Mountain View Corridor will effect our property value and our quality of life negatively considering the freeway is going to be DIRECTLY behind our backyard fence. We are concerned because this our dream home that we just invested \$400,000 in and our now sick because of the noise and traffic that will occur because of this freeway. The real traffic issue is East/West this far south in the valley.

Comment 759

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6934-3155
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: beal, dave
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
Don't listen to those idiots-You guys have alot more sense than the mayor and those who think your goin to screw up their wildlife and scenery-hogwash-get it done -I been here for 57 years and your plan is super

Comment 760

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.31C

Comment #: 6935-3156
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Lehnardt, Grant
Location: Eagle Mountain, UT

Comment:
This freeway would help commuting problems for people who live west of Lehi and have to drive through town with 20k+ other people. I believe that it would keep pollution down, which would be good for the environment.

Comment 761

Comment 762

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6936-3157
Date: 1/10/2008
Source: Website
Name: Eccles, Brandon
Location: Highland, UT

Comment:
 I support the UDOT preferred alternative to Utah County at 2100 South in Lehi. After reviewing the arguments for and against it as well as the "Lehi alternate", it is clearly the least impactful and makes the best sense for the citizens of Utah County and Utah. This is an area where I regularly drive and a further north alignment would be useless for the needs of Utah county commuters.

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.1H

Comment #: 6937-3159
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Rowe, Matt
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
 I would love to see a TRAX or something like it from Saratoga Springs to Lindon, Orem, Provo.

Comment 763

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.11

Comment #: 6937-3158
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Rowe, Matt
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
We moved to Saratoga Springs to get away for the noise of the city. We recognize that there is a great need to address increase of traffic, but does it have to go one (1) foot behind my yard? There is an open field from Harvest Hills to the mountains. Why can't the new corridor follow the power lines that are at the foot of those hills? It is very disappointing that Saratoga Spings and Eagle Mountain were developed with out a plan for the increase of traffic. Now that it is obvious that new roads are needed lets plan better than we have in the past. Don't impose upon residents where it can be avoided. Harvest Hills does not need a freeway right on its edge. Plan for the future not for the present. By putting the freeway out by the mountains, Saratoga Springs is allowed to develop the field with out a scar of a freeway, as well as accommodate the current and future traffic. Matt Rowe

Comment 764

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.7C

Comment #: 6939-3160
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Dansie, Gary
Location: Saratoga Springs, UT

Comment:
2100 North is far the best choice. It will benefit Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs and Lehi the best.

Comment 765

Comment 766

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Response
Section in
Chapter 35
↳

Comment #: 6945-3171
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Wood, Matt
Location: , UT

Comment #: 6946-3172
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Harper, Wayne
Location: West Jordan, UT

Comment:
I support either the Southern Freeway Alternative or (reluctantly) the 2100 North Freeway Alternative. The Arterials Alternative does NOT, in my opinion, present a long term solution to the increasing growth west of Lehi and I-15. I am concerned about the impact the corridor may have on the wetlands surrounding Utah Lake, but given the limited availability of access alternatives due to the natural barriers (mountains and lake), the Southern Freeway Alternative presents a true north-south companion for I-15. I recognize the difficulty of the situation. I have lived near Pittsburgh and in Columbus, OH where rivers restrict the roadway solutions. In much the same way, we live in a pair of valleys where land is limited by nature. I believe limited sacrifices now (i.e., a roadway that impacts the wetlands as little as possible) averts greater sacrifice in the long run. If we don't do it correctly now, our children pay for it later. In my opinion, there is no point to the Arterials Alternative, given the fact that Bangerter Highway is so close to the "Porter Rockwell" arterial. What is the point, really? I recognize that Lehi wants this alternative, but serving that city's short term desires compounds an increasingly complex and difficult problem. Furthermore, I do NOT support tolling for the new roadway. If there were an abundance of roads and taking the freeway alignments were a matter of choice rather than necessity, I could support tolling. As it stands, if the alignments were toll roads, they would present an additional economic burden to the people who find them necessary to maintain themselves and their families. Finally, I know less about the trail proposals, but I personally would appreciate the opportunity to ride my bike to work, something that is prohibitively dangerous now, considering the amount of traffic, narrow roadways, and lack of shoulder space. Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Comment:
I appreciate the fine work and planning that has gone into this study and the proposal to build the Mountain View Corridor. I have been watching and supporting that road's development for many years and have worked with west side cities to identify and align the corridor in the best area for current neighbors and future growth. This road must be built and the state has taken bold steps to start the planning and funding processes and the local entities to identify and preserve the corridor. The 5600 West Preferred Alignment is what I support and request formal approval of that alignment in SL County. In Utah County I support the 2100 North Freeway Alternative or the Arterial Alternative. As the Chair of the Transportation Appropriations Committee in the Utah House of Representatives, I commend all involved in the process, request expedited approval of the EIS and prompt construction of the Mountain View Corridor

35.2.13A

35.2.4A

35.2.6A

35.2.7C

35.2.10A
35.11A

Comment 767

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

Comment #: 6947-3173
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Braithwaite, Kent
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I/we are very much against, for many reasons, putting the connector at 2100 North. It seems the plan proposed by Lehi City in putting it closer to the "point" makes much more sense. Please consider putting it there instead. Sincerely, Kent & Hannah Braithwaite

Comment 768

Response
Section in
Chapter 35



35.2.9A

35.2.7A

Comment #: 6948-3177
Date: 1/11/2008
Source: Website
Name: Pearson, Grant
Location: Lehi, UT

Comment:
 I have been following the 2 proposed routes of the Mountain View Corridor through Lehi. The routes do not appear as though they will have a major impact on me personally. However I feel the need to speak up for the individual citizens who will be affected. The problem stems from no foresight or prior planning by UDOT and elected officials and I'm concerned about the people who will have their private property confiscated. I favor the Lehi City officials recommendations further north simply because it appears that fewer residences will be affected. If however, UDOT proceeds to take the connector through Lehi then the biggest concern I have is that the residences that will lose their property are compensated for fairly. It has been my observation in the past the compensation given to those affected by eminent domain confiscation is never just or fair. I encourage you to take the least invasive route, which I believe is NOT at 2100 North in Lehi but rather the route at point of the mountain. However, whichever route is selected please be fair to the residence who will lose property or are otherwise negatively affected.