
APPENDIX F
Scoping Comments

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMENT NUMBER	NAME	COMMENT	COMMENT ORIGIN
1	Matt Hastings	UDOT is clearly concerned with this interchange to come up with do many alternatives, and I think each offers a great concept to address all concerns, and I assume some of these concepts may be meshed together while eliminating. I believe Figure 11-15. Alternative C-8 with Optional Transit Ramps offers the best solution to the Kimball junction interchange, but may have drawbacks with phased development, keeping costs down, and traffic moving during construction. That said, I believe this could be meshed with a bypass option which could also add additional access on the west side post construction. Next in Figure 11-19. Alternatives D-4 and D-8, I believe bridging Ute Blvd is necessary, but also that access should be eliminated, an improved interchange at Kimball will I kely increase the speed that driver's choose to move at, and any weave between Kimball and other interchanges on the 224 need to be longer. Lastly additional east side access of I 80 connecting to the area would allow better access to businesses and homes in the area, and allow construction at Kimball junction, and later traffic incidents that could arise to have less of an impact of traffic by providing an alternative.	Web
2	Scott Lyon	1 your website comments has no send option for comments 2. My comment is on Kimball junction are plan report Please make your document not cut off on some pages that are wider. I am using a MAC computer	Email
3	Alan Agle	It Is great that UDOT is working on this project. The current traffic situation is horrid! Thank you! Quickly: "Alternative B" is the only one which makes sense to me. The central problem is that the accidental city of Kimball Junction is of no interest to the vast majority of I-80 to Park City traffic. There is therefore no reason for that traffic to be metered through two lights. It is the flow-restriction of those two traffic lights which cause miles of backup on SR224. Grammatical note – the word "alternative" means one or the other. Past two, the word "options" should be used. I doubt you'll wish to re-do all of your material for this project, but as a governmental body of dignity and education, next efforts by your department might wish to conform to correct grammar. Further, "options" has a nicer tone – it sounds appealing and suggests that the recipient is in control. "Alternative" suggests a lower-ranked choice; a less desirable backup plan. Back to the basic – the only option I think makes any sense at all in response to the clear issue is Option B, the underpass for through traffic. The critical flow to enhance is between I-80 and SR-224 south of the Kimball intersections. Only Option/Alternative B removes the capacity reduction / unnecessary restriction of the dominant traffic flow.	Email
4	Kenneth Johnston	Please keep me informed of the status changes and developments on this project as our driveway is in the area of the study	Web
5	Chance Jensen	I hesitate to want option A or B in this area because they would add additional complexity to this areas traffic. Alternative A seems excessive. Are you adding a new bridge? I would love to learn more about the traffic planning for this alternative. For alternative B I also hesitate to put frontage roads because I don't believe the businesses need additional access. Also, alternative B essentially turns this section of road into a stub of the freeway. I think there are other less drastic solutions to correct the traffic in this area. I think it would be beneficial to remove some of the driveways from 224 and close to the Ute Blvd intersection. Most businesses are already well served by other entrances and a frontage road widens the road significantly while only serving a handful of businesses (mostly car heavy chains). Mister Car Wash may be an exception and I question its location and current accessibility. I also think that encouraging wa kability is a good idea and alternative C seems invested in encouraging that without widening the road excessively. I would be interested in seeing a diverging diamond with alternative C's road layout. I would I ke to see the chosen alternative focus on optimizing signal timing and limit unnecessary business driveways. I think having an additional on and off ramp lane would be a huge factor in improving wait times, but I disagree with making them HOV lanes. I don't think this will encourage shared trips (this is coming from a car-free and biking enthusiast), and I think it would eventually revert to a regular lane.	Web
6	Leslie Blevins	This traffic is getting ridiculous. This was taken at Kimball Junction mid week at 11:30 am. We have lived in Park City for 16 years and are in Park Meadows. Our daughter attends the high school. Please, no more approvals for developers trying to change zoning. This ridiculous Dakota Pacific issue is a prime example of what no residents want - any city board members who are siding with Dakota need to be relived from their positions because they are not listening to residents who voted them in (and sounds like may be taking bribes). This traffic was backed up from the exit between Parley's and Jeremy exit, actually going up the hill. Hey 40 backed up from 248 exit to the Home Depot exit. This is dangerous since it blocks the only two exits in and out of town. Require hotels to have shuttles to get their guests into town and require them to DIScourage guests from renting cars. Give them some kind of tax benefit for doing so. New hotels should be required to provide shuttle services for guests. Make resorts pony up cash to shuttle people directly from empty parking lot off of Hwy 40 to their resorts. Do NOT use city funds or allow them to use high school. The city and resorts have created an environment where locals now HATE tourists - before they were a necessary evil. But at this point, no one except the downtown businesses want them, and frankly the town has grown large enough that they could sustain operations without them since Park City has essentially become a suburb of Salt Lake. Have our policemen patrol the roads and ticket visitors who disregard the laws by speeding on our city streets. And please put speed limit back up to 50 on hwy 240 - you have just created more traffic by lowering it. Coupled with even more crowds, the lower limit only slows things down more.	Web
7	Sheryl Johnson-Proffit	I have lived in the Spring Creek neighborhood for 22+ years and have witnessed a dramatic increase of both NOISE and LIGHT pollution! PLEASE install a NOISE BARRIER WALL and BETTER LIGHTING that doesn't light-up our neighborhood all night long!	Web

8	Sheryl Johnson-Proffit	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>I've lived near Kimball Junction for 22+ years and the amount of noise pollution from I-80 has increased a lot over the years!</p> <p>There are literally thousands of residents that live in close proximity to the interstate freeway, this noise pollution affects everyone, especially when trucks and cars drive over the safety divots on the edge of the roadway near the exit and when trucks use their engine brakes.</p> <p>PLEASE include the install of a NOISE BARRIER WALL in the improvement plan for Kimball Junction!</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Sheryl Johnson-Proffit ██████████ Park City, UT ██████████</p>	Email
9	Greg Johnson-Proffit	<p>Please mitigate noise for Kimball Junction neighborhoods. Also mitigate night sky (light) pollution. -- Greg - seek first to understand</p>	Email
10	Matthew Lindon	<p>Alternative B is the only possible alternative. Everything else is a Band-Aid.</p> <p>But this project is 10 years away. And we have a mess there now. Udot needs to go up and deal with what we have there now.</p> <p>Number one they have to time the lights better the lights are a mess it's a disgrace. Go to California and see how they time lights in California.</p> <p>Number two they need to open up all lanes through that intersection area. We don't need 12 foot shoulders on either sides in the middle of the winter. There a bike path in the summer. Use the entire roadway as we have it now. We can't afford the luxury of huge shoulders with nobody on them.</p> <p>Lastly there are sidewalks in the middle Of224 as traffic exit off of eastbound I 80 get rid of the sidewalks and get rid of the wide dividers get rid of all the extraneous pretty stuff and get a functional intersection working out there. Udot and the state have avoided this for years. They don't mind all the tax revenue that they get from Park City. but they give nothing up here. Now.</p> <p>When I complained about This to the governor he maybe you should vote Republican and you might get some more money. Stop politicizing this and get the job done.</p>	Web
11	John Krieg	<p>Alternative B is the best option but I have several questions. I believe the best outcome of any design is to have the actual road traffic follow the intent of the plan. Yes that sounds obvious. Let me explain. Alt B provides the best control of north bound traffic intending to reach I80 vs traffic intending to reach the shopping area. For lack of better words, you don't want a design where traffic can "cheat" the system. For example, you don't want northbound traffic to use lanes intended for traffic looking to access the shopping direct and vice versa. The trench/depressed lanes would provide the best control of shuttling traffic to I80.</p> <p>Here are my outstanding questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Explain the trench cover? Is it a lid or or more like a tunnel? 2) What is on top of the trench cover? I have seen covers like this with green space which would be ideal (less of a concrete pit and more like a park on top of a tunnel) <p>Green space on top of the trench also helps with the environmental impact and simply looks better.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) How many depressed lanes in the trench? 4) How many lanes on the frontage road? 5) Will all pedestrian traffic crossing 224 be above grade and why is the existing pedestrian tunnel moved so far south. 	Web
12	Amy Mills	<p>"Build it and they will come." Truer words were never spoken. If UDOT makes it easier to drive into PC, more people will drive into PC. I suggest leaving bad enough alone.</p>	Web
13	Colleen Earnshaw	<p>Have you ever tried to get out of Park City between 4-6pm? And you want to add how many more cars? Are you crazy??? There are only 2 major ways out and you want to completely block one up while the other is impossible. NO NO NO NO more building!</p>	Web

14	Marton Carroll	<p>I believe your alternative #4 would be the best approach with these caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Items D7 and D16 would require major revision to eastbound Newpark Blvd. 2. Item D10 should include pedestrian tunnels under Ute Blvd and SR 224. 3. Item D11 the northbound left-turn lane onto Olympic Pkwy. could/should be extended by at minimum 1/4 mi. south toward Bear Cub Dr. This seems to be a part of what is proposed in item D7. 4. Item D14 proposes a new signal at Bear Cub Dr. but I question that there is enough traffic coming from Bear Cub Dr. onto SR 224 to justify another light. The goal should be to move the maximum amount of traffic through this area (onto I-80) without stoppage. 5. D16A. YES YES YES. The left-turn lanes on Ute Blvd. currently create a major backup during heavy traffic times. Losing these lanes may increase volume at the roundabout at Landmark Dr. but it would be far better than the current backup. 6. Another item to consider is making entry/exit from I-80 eastbound directly to the Park & Ride lot at Ecker Hill. I feel it is critical to maximize remote parking/mass transit into Park City and the current layout is not effective (as evidenced by the extremely sparse utilization of the parking space there currently). 	Web
15	--	<p>We need to have a higher speed bike lanes through out these intersections, especially crossing I-80 and transiting east-west between Jeremy ranch and Kimball SR 40/ Promontory area.. Pedestrians and bicycle paths are focused on slower speed bicycle travel.</p>	Web
16	Matthew Mikulich	<p>I have traversed the transportation systems within the study area more than a thousand times over the last eight years in commuting from Salt Lake City to Park City for my jobs as a geotechnical field engineer and in mountain operations at Park City Mountain Resort. I have used the systems within the study area during all times of year in all weather conditions by transportation modes that include car, bus, truck, motorcycle, and foot. I am also a licensed professional civil engineer in the State of Utah.</p> <p>In my experiences transportation through the study area can be dangerous with extraordinarily low levels of service provided during the AM and PM peak traffic times during winter months, particularly during tourist seasons and / or after a winter storm. Ordinary commute times between Salt Lake City and Park City can increase from 45 minutes to well over two hours, much of which has to do with the multiple existing conflict points for traffic flows through the Kimball Junction study area. It is clear that the transportation infrastructure as it exists was never designed to be sufficient for both local commuter traffic and to serve one of the most visited ski towns and the largest ski resort in the United States. One must question how the poor safety and level of service provided on what is the only route between Salt Lake City and Park City will reflect upon visitors to the State of Utah, and how those impressions impact the sustainability of small businesses and tourism along the Wasatch Back.</p> <p>From a transportation engineering perspective, it would seem that reducing / eliminating the number of conflict points for traffic would provide the greatest benefits to safety and level of service. We should also be concerned with the performance sustainability of the study area over the design life and want to see a solution implemented that will have the best chance of being effective in the future. With those values in mind, of the alternatives presented in the scoping display boards I'm most excited about Alternative B, which places emphasis on grade-separated roadways that entirely eliminate the most dangerous intersections within the study area. We already have several sidewalks along the Wasatch Back that are grade-separated from collector and arterial roadways, and they are far better to use than their surface-street alternatives. Similarly it is far safer as a motorcyclist to be going under bridges rather than through multi-lane high-traffic intersections. While I do see notable improvements to safety and traffic flows presented in Alternatives A and C, my initial impression is that only Alternative B implements grade separation for all traffic types and will have the most lasting impacts on improving traffic flows in the study area. In 15 years having another lane on SR-224 might have lost its meaningful impact, but having eliminated several intersections could end up being the difference for many years to come. With grade separated roadways I envision meaningful improvements to traffic safety and flows for both through traffic and local traffic, and would perceive Kimball Junction as a pedestrian or motorcyclist to be a more safe, comfortable, and walkable place to eat or shop.</p>	Web
17	Shannon Crosson	<p>The first option for improvements that make the frontage roads one way would be terrible. When there are accidents or now, just a lot of traffic, these roads are used by those of us who live here to make it home or to the store in a reasonable amount of time. For instance, this first week of January, the Kimball exit was backed up beyond Ecker at 7:30 in the morning. Please don't take away travel options that then create additional havoc at the Jeremy/Pinebrook circles that are constantly impacted by freeway backup and people's poor understanding of the flow of traffic in traffic circles,</p> <p>Also, while these improvement options might eventually address traffic concerns at the junction, they do resolve the traffic problems created by visitors beyond the junction. I often do a check of how many skiers, workers and construction people are in cars driving in and out of PC and it is shocking how many of them are single drivers. Why not address carpooling or some other form of traffic mitigation. Why not have construction crews arrive before or after high traffic times? Add on the debacle of potential development push throughs by Dakota Pacific and you are taking what was once a pleasant place to live and turning it into a nightmare.</p>	Web

18	Scott Buchanan	I've been a frequent user of the Kimball Junction area for about 25 years. I'm a police officer with experience in traffic enforcement, control and collisions. I'd like to submit a comment in support of Option A with the suggestion that it doesn't go far enough, even this stops short with what is likely needed. Please go "all in" and start that new, one way frontage road for eastbound traffic by merging it with the rest area across from the Hi-Ute Ranch. The current rest area exit should be the new exit for eastbound traffic and there should be at least two lanes heading east, as noted in the model - and at least one lane that allows traffic to queue for the Outlets, specifically. Please take this opportunity to end the mixing of Junction and Outlet traffic. This variant would allow cars to queue from the Hi-Ute all the way to the outlets without holding up the traffic heading to PC/ski traffic. Option A's "frontage road" starts where the current exit is placed, which is a waste of an opportunity to make things better in this area. While everyone is at it, let's get the old road from SR 224 back to Kirby Road in front of the old gas station, which is now roughly the area in front of the car wash, back in use. The new road should take over (condemn) the driveway leading to McDonald's on Landmark Loop - which is terribly maintained by the property owner - past the car wash and then merge with the little used asphalt walking trail until it meets with Kirby Road, probably just east of that pond or whatever that pit is right there. I'd suggest restricting it to passenger vehicles only, one lane each way, 25 miles per hour. The primary purpose of this road is to allow for a secondary route for eastbound traffic to exit the area.	Web
19	Joseph Plomin	please see attached file from the New York Times	Web
20	Rich Sherman	Alternative B is the best and only option here. Depressing SR-224 is a fantastic approach since it will allow the through-traffic (in both directions) to flow and not get stuck at the two intersections. I don't know if the "interchange improvements" include more lanes in the on/off I-80, but that may help the traffic flow as well. One final comment - I cringe when I see "HOV" in any option - sorry but I just don't think it works - so Alt C (to me) is not an option. THANK YOU FOR DOING THIS!	Web
21	Ron Shultz	Whichever option is chosen we need to have sound walls installed along the north side of the freeway.	Web
22	Jeff Rose	A 2 way fly-over from East bound I-80 onto Hwy 224 past Kimball. This will allow skiers and others to/from Park City to bypass Kimball Junction. Add a few remodeled pedestrian/bike paths under 224 and this will effectively turn back the traffic congestion clock 15 years.	Web
23	Bob Tackleberry	I SUPPORT UDOT IN APPROVING THE TRAFFIC AREA FOR KIMBALL JCT. I DO WANT TO SAY ONE THING. THE PUBLIC ROADS BELONG TO EVERYONE, NOT JUST THOSE WHO THINK THEY HAVE A SUPPOSED STATUS. IN OTHER WORDS, A SMALL HANDFUL OF THOSE THAT HAVE MORE MONEY THAN THE REST OF US, DRIVE A RANGE ROVER, DO NOT HAVE MORE SAY. IN THE PAST, I HAVE HEARD THIS OF BEING AN ISSUE. WE HAVE A HUGE TRAFFIC PROBLEM AND THE SOLUTION NEEDS TO BENEFIT ALL OF US. THE SAME THING NEEDS TO HAPPEN TO WIDEN SR 248 PAST THE PARK CITY HIGH SCHOOL. YOU CAN DIG INTO A WORTHLESS HILL OF DIRT TO WIDEN SR 248	Email
24	Bob Tackleberry	Hey, good evening to you. Bob Tackleberry calling [REDACTED]. Almost just about every day I'm commuting up from Salt Lake. I work in Kimball Junction, of course it's up there at the Wal-Mart, but then I also drive for Lyft and Uber rideshare, so I'm up there frequently using that area. I also sent you guys an email, kimballjunctioneis@utah.gov, but I want to follow up with a phone call. That way you have a recording of it and you can show and play this recording. Yeah, we have a huge traffic problem. But one of the things I wanted to mention and the reason I also brought up state route 248 is they were looking at widening it and you had a - from what I hear from some of the residents - that you had a handful of residents up there having a lot more money than we do supposedly and throwing a hissy fit about widening the road and everything and I think that same thing may happen in this situation and everything. The roads belong to everybody. In fact, my understanding is there's a law in place that if you need to widen it, it supersedes whatever influence they try to put on Park City or Summit County and everything- that if you need to widen the road you need to do it. But anyways, just like the state route 248, I know you've got the wetlands on one side but you can dig into that hill that's just east of Charter Mountain Middle School and the Park City High School on the north side of the road and everything. And then people go, well, let's say the Park City hill and everything, I don't know what's behind that but these roads need to be widened. We cannot have influence by a rare few who think they have more money than the rest of us. We all share the road, we're all taxpayers, so it needs to be so everybody's represented, not just the few who think they have some special status in that community. I just want to make that clear, that is what I've heard in the past, that is why I'm bringing it up. I am for the- you've gotta do something about the interchange and everything. I know you would have to work with McDonald's that is right there, then you have that building that's on the corner of Ute Park and on the Northwest corner of state route 224 and everything. Yeah, it's gonna be an inconvenience but ultimately it needs to be done. People are just sitting- [end of recording]	Hotline Recording
25	Kris Campbell	- Please consider tying into the Park + Ride. If we can divert more traffic there, it will ease traffic load into both Kimball Junction and Park City. - Can we add driver comfort/usability as a criteria. For instance, it may be ok to have slightly longer travel time if the overall experience is better. This could possibly be achieved by considering reducing conflict points, and/or similar criteria as is used to evaluate bike/pedestrian comfort etc. - Please continue to consider snow removal and maintenance through all of the alternatives. - Please consider the roundabout on the West side, on Ute blvd traffic backs up there often and impacts flow there as well.	Written (meeting)
26	Dmitriy S	Alternative A doesn't seem to fix a lot. The congestion doesn't dissipate enough. With a longer exit congestion will be able to build up but adding a lane to turn to the other side will make drivers stop. I see Alternative A moving the congestion somewhere else, but the initial problem of congestion is still prevalent.	Written (meeting)

27	WeiJiu Li	<p>Alternative A, in my opinion, will only move congestion more towards the outlets area, and will not solve the problem long term, and also make it harder to move from Summit Fork, and generally move congestion, but won't solve it.</p> <p>Alt. B will more likely solve the current problems the best, even if it is the most expensive, it will be more future proof and not need improvement, although I do have concerns about pedestrian traffic across 224, and the time it would take to build the tunnel and the resulting traffic issues.</p> <p>Alt. C does too little to resolve issue, will only postpone problem.</p>	Written (meeting)
28	Bob Martin	Alternate B is the only plan that I think can help at all. Traffic lights South of Redstone area must be synchronized properly to enable traffic to move through properly.	Written (meeting)
29	Craig William	<p>-> Add wildlife fencing all the way on I-80 to Coalville. (Except don't waste on the relocated pedestrian underpass its too far away. Use it for [this].)</p> <p>-> Need wildlife crossing on 224 by the farm to Swaner.</p> <p>-> Proposed pedestrian underpass @ Swaner should be lit so animals will use it.</p>	Written (meeting)
30	Anabel Biaggini	I like all alternative. But my favorite one is ALTERNATIVE B. Seem to be more projected to the future and help the current need. It is more safety, fluent [unclear].	Written (meeting)
31	Kelly Perkins	Please make sure cycling routes & safety are considered.	Written (meeting)
32	Bonnie Park	<p>Alternative B is the one alternative that will best serve traffic flow on 224, with the bonus of pedestrian/non-motorized sidewalks + trails to effectively move people from one side of 224 to the other.</p> <p>Alternative B may be expensive but it has the promise of serving the community for a longer planning horizon. There must be a way (Olympics or otherwise) to move it forward in the STIP and get it done.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	Written (meeting)
33	Kelly Gallagher	I have lived in Jeremy Ranch since 1993 & have seen the growth first hand. I have also spent quite a bit of time reading your information. Good data, well compiled. I feel quite strongly that 224 needs to be separated from the junction cross-streets. Alternative B answers this need well and is the ONLY ONE that really addresses the significant traffic currently (and in the future) in the Junction area. If you end up needing people to participate in focus groups, I would be willing to support with my time. thank you for your outreach!	Written (meeting)
34	Gary Peacock	Alternative B - Underpass Ute + Olympic Blvd - Totally idiotic plan since the traffic will just be pushed to the next light at Lutter, Bear Hallow + Old Ranch Road - Ski traffic will doom this thoughtless + shallow plan - This is being proposed by Dakota Pacific to justify their monstrous development - This is no plan at all.	Written (meeting)
35	--	I left you a voice message and sent an email on the Kimball Junction road impact study. It needs to be done. Please do not allow a certain few that think that they have money, that than can insert any kind of influence. We have a traffic problem and it needs a solution for all drivers. Also, when traffic gets backed up on I80, it is a public safety issue	Hotline Recording
36	Audrey Evans	Why are all businesses centered here?? Being plenty of open space (not including wetlands preserve) it's literally a 10mile radius of open space. If they aren't going to offer small business a place to open and keeping these businesses from the downtown they will continue to fail. Families driving out of Park City and even further those in Deer Valley for basic groceries. Moving traffic would be limited these places with vital needs where people would need to travel for WholeFoods, and affordable housing, recreation centers and shopping centers all concentrated in one place. Why not build more store driving into Park City? Why not more Affordable Housing off Main St. Why not light rail from the junction to Main Street. Redesigning the traffic would need to be moving these essential businesses and spread them out over SUMMIT County including Heber and I-40!	Web
37	Aja Martin	I think Reversible Lanes (flex lanes) would be a great consideration for the junction at Kimball. With all the ski traffic we could open and close lanes depending on the time.	Web
38	Lisa Sherman	<p>Alternative B is the best and only option here.</p> <p>thank you for doing this!</p>	Web
39	Mari Mennel-Bell	I am in complete agreement with. Save people save wildlife! I respectfully requested alternative B be given priority in the evaluation process, and that the relocated underpass we need to accommodate both pedestrians AND wildlife!	Web
40	David Bell	<p>There is a gas station on the north side of Jeremy Ranch exit. In order to receive fuel deliveries at the gas station, the fuel truck (typically tractor, trailer, and pup) comes from Salt Lake on east bound I-80. The truck must exit at Kimballs Junction, then follow Rasmussen road back west to the gas station. The truck has to enter the gas station Rasmussen road in this direction in order to be properly positioned to off load fuel into the tanks. It cannot exit I-80 at Jeremy Ranch and reach the gas station tanks.</p> <p>All plans must allow a long delivery tank to follow the route depicted above.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Web
41	Robin Filion	I've lived in Pinebrook for 13 years. The 3 problems that need to be addressed are: (1) traffic flow on northbound 224 to I80; (2) the left turn from 224 southbound onto Ute Blvd, which backs up and blocks southbound traffic; and (3) getting northbound buses to KJTC. It seems to me that the depressed roadway is the best alternative. It would eliminate the traffic lights that now stop northbound traffic. If designed with enough capacity, it should keep the people turning east onto Ute from southbound 224 from blocking other southbound traffic. Depending on the usage of the frontage road, the northbound buses should be able to access the KJTC, although we might still need a bus lane there.	Web
42	Micah Kagan	<p>Has the concept of induced demand been considered in the redesign of Kimball Junction? Because based on the plans released, the only solutions UDOT seems to be proposing is road widening and increasing traffic capacity, which, as we all know, will not alleviate traffic, but rather create more.</p> <p>You need to go back to the drawing board and come up with more 21st century solutions to traffic and stop looking at the 20th century rulebook which assumes "one more lane will fix it" (it will not).</p>	Web

43	John Holmen	<p>I apologize I've missed both meetings/ discussions. Can we watch recorded archives?</p> <p>My question is, it seems Traffic into and through Kimball Junction onto 224 is also complicated by congestion on 248, and visa versa. Is this combined problem being considered? It appears not for some reason , the two cannot be combined? Different jurisdictions/funding? How important is the interaction of traffic congestion on both routes into PC and DV. Can this be resolved?</p> <p>DV village construction and existing density in PC and DV continues to strain traffic as service and construction workers must reach these areas for daily work. Traffic changes alone do not seem adequate to manage congestion we are already seeing.</p> <p>What else is being suggested for our city?</p>	Web
44	Alexandru Marica	<p>Alternative B of the proposed improvement appears to be the only one that actually fixes the traffic problem of the area.</p>	Email
45	Phil Palmintere	<p>I've looked at all the alternatives presented.</p> <p>Regarding Alternative A:</p> <p>Absent an enforcement mechanism, HOV lanes will be abused on an ongoing basis. You need to provide for camera enforcement of HOV – single drivers who use the HOV will just laugh at the restriction. There is no need for pedestrian improvements. They are a waste of money. They will receive some recreational use, but they will not remove a single car from the road. No one will walk instead of drive to get to a restaurant or shopping or return home. Some will use it for exercise, but that is a non-objective.</p> <p>Regarding Alternative B:</p> <p>Absent an enforcement mechanism, HOV lanes will be abused on an ongoing basis. You need to provide for camera enforcement of HOV – single drivers who use the HOV will just laugh at the restriction. There is no need for pedestrian improvements. They are a waste of money. They will receive some recreational use, but they will not remove a single car from the road. No one will walk instead of drive to get to a restaurant or shopping or return home. Some will use it for exercise, but that is a non-objective.</p> <p>Regarding Alternative C:</p> <p>Absent an enforcement mechanism, HOV lanes will be abused on an ongoing basis. You need to provide for camera enforcement of HOV – single drivers who use the HOV will just laugh at the restriction. There is no need for pedestrian improvements. They are a waste of money. They will receive some recreational use, but they will not remove a single car from the road. No one will walk instead of drive to get to a restaurant or shopping or return home. Some will use it for exercise, but that is a non-objective.</p> <p>The major flaw with A, B, and C is they do not provide for any park-and-ride. There needs to be a direct access from I-80 into a parking lot with capacity for ~500 automobiles. From this parking lot, public buses would transport skiers directly to The Canyons, PCMR and Deer Valley resorts.</p> <p>You should turn SR-224 into a toll road. The toll could vary by time-of-day – for example, no toll from midnight through 6 AM.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Among the choices of alternatives A, B, C and the default of "do nothing," I like alternative B so long as you can address the major flaws (enforcement of HOV, establish a park-and-ride lot, etc). If you can not do anything about the major flaws, I vote for "Do Nothing."</p>	Email
46	Richard Gatnik	<p>Yes for Alternative B. Moving traffic to/from I-80 underground and out of sight from Kimball Junction is a quality of life improvement for residents and merchants alike. Any plan the segregate local from I-80 traffic is welcomed.</p>	Web
47	Natalie Clark	<p>The traffic is amplified because locals have no alternative than being on the same roads as skiers/commuters trying just to get to the highway.</p> <p>Exiting the highway to enter park city:</p> <p>I would propose removing the ability to turn left from 224 onto Ute or New Park. We should have a jug handle or force traffic up around the roundabout by the transit stop/Olympic park.</p> <p>We should also prevent left turns from Ute and new park onto 224. We could potentially add "frontage" roads to 224 that allow locals access to redstone/ Walmart and highway bound drivers a more direct route.</p> <p>Leaving Park City:</p> <p>I don't think a split diamond will do enough. I think we need a full ramp for drivers heading out of park city and onto 80 west. Frontage roads allowing locals to get to Redstone/Walmart without sitting in 223 highway traffic would help immensely. Or a dedicated lane, separated by a median barrier, would work too.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Web

48	Angie Erickson	<p>I'm disappointed that UDOT has not included the Ecker Hill park and ride in their plans for a Kimball Jct re-do. In alternative A, the split interchange should be moved back to the Ecker Hill park and ride so skier traffic can exit the highway, immediately park, and catch transit. This would help alleviate winter traffic around Kimball Jct. Plus, there is already room at that spot (the truck parking), and it would provide easier access to the school and surrounding neighborhoods. There should be a round-a-bout instead of a light at this spot, too.</p> <p>Alternative B, while a good solution to keep traffic moving towards PC or towards I-80, does not address the issue of too many cars wanting to go into PC at the same time. So it only addresses one small sliver of the problem, since more room at Kimball Jct. means the traffic bottle neck will move into town (PC). It is a lot of money to spend for very little long-term benefits, as more roads invites more cars and traffic. Alternative A (if the exit is moved to the Ecker park and ride) is a better option since it will reduce cars into town.</p> <p>Alternative C with transit/HOV lanes is a good idea in theory, but to get people out of their cars and into transit requires easy parking and reliable transit with good route planning. Our Summit Co/PC transit does not provide all of these things yet. I think it is premature to build transit/HOV lanes without county/city participation in the planning of how to make transit easier and better. Where are the park and rides? They are at Kimball Library, Jeremy, Ecker, and Richardson Flats. Busses to these locations is not always quick and easy. We need more options for park and rides, better bus routes, more busses, and more amenities to get skiers out of their cars and out of the traffic at Kimball Jct.</p> <p>Building bigger roads without increasing parking/transit is not the answer. If we are looking at bringing back the Olympics to Park City in the future, we need to look more holistically at the traffic problem, not just put a million dollar bandaids on Kimball Jct.</p>	Web
49	Michael Atkin	<p>I am a full-time resident of Park City, UT. While I would welcome improvements to the I-80 interchange to allow traffic to flow more freely in and out of Park City, I have two concerns about the current proposals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an existing bicycle/pedestrian tunnel under SR-224 connecting the Olympic Parkway with Newpark. This is an extremely valuable tunnel as it links a large number of trails on both sides of the road. The road up to the Utah Olympic Park is a very popular climb with cyclists from the region. In the winter the trails on both sides of 224 are used for X-C skiing. The tunnel is very well located and I hope it can be retained or, if moved to the south, it is moved as short a distance as possible. Crossing 224 at grade anywhere near Kimball Junction is increasingly hazardous for cyclist and pedestrians. There certainly needs to be an additional pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard, but this would not be an acceptable replacement for the current tunnel . 2. Park City and Summit County have spent a lot of money on transit and are trying to get more people to use the transit network. Easier access to the transportation hub (Kimball Junction Transit Center) located at the corner of Ute and Landmark has to be part of the planning for a more efficient Kimball Junction. A new pedestrian tunnel under SR-224 at Ute Blvd would be a step in the right direction. 	Web
50	Linda Talling	I live in Foxpoint, and I feel that option B would be the most effective for local Kimball Junction residents.	Web
51	Annette Royle-Mitchell	As you consider the best scenario to move vehicles through the Kimball Junction area, please do so alongside scenarios that will provide safe crossing alternatives for pedestrians. I've lived in the area >25 years and observe too many transit dependent residents and tourists who utilize the Transit Center off of Ute Blvd and try to cross the roads north or west (across Ute Blvd or through the roundabout) or east (across 224) in very unsafe conditions, and often in the dark at night. For this reason, the EIS's scenarios A and C (which provide a 224 pedestrian tunnel near Ute Blvd) make the most sense to me if they can adequately move vehicles through the area). I realize that other solutions with the County around the Transit Center will also be needed. Thank you!	Web
52	Steve Issowits	<p>This has been a topic for many years and it seems having a separation between I-80 traffic flow and the Kimball Junction local street/business access is most needed so traffic can free-flow onto and off of I-80, particularly during rush hour (morning-in; evening-out, from the Park City area). Fly-over ramps seem to make the most sense to reduce the amount of traffic lights and stop & go traffic, separating with frontage roads, etc.</p> <p>I was unable to make the open house so the alternatives are a bit confusing to me. Part of what I am suggesting seems to be contained within Alternative B with the depressed roadway, one-way frontage roads, and grade separated bridges for the cross streets. However, I'm not sure if that means traffic will free-flow onto and off of I-80 with flyover ramps or if there will still be traffic signals there? I appreciate all the work UDOT is doing to study this and come up with the best traffic solution for us all in this area. Thank you.</p>	Web
53	Robert Umstead	<p>I believe option B is the closest thing to an improvement, however there are inherent flaws.</p> <p>The inbound traffic to Park City backs up from the Canyons, not Kimball Junction so improving flow thru Kimball in the mornings will still lead to the back up to the canyons light to Kimball anyway. It can improve traffic exiting town in the afternoons.</p> <p>The oneway frontage roads is a great idea so long as frontage roads feed directly into the 224 flow in the form of a clover leave design,(no left turns). Same thing need to apply to exiting. I propose taking the one way concept a step further, make Ute Blvd West bound only and Ute Eastbound only.</p> <p>My idea is to have traffic be one way between the roundabouts at Ute and Olympic Blv (South only)and do the same on the East side roundabouts between Newpark and Ute Blvd (north only). That would make the roads over 224 ,UTe westbound and Olympic East bound only. These would tie in seamlessly with interchanges on and off of 224. Making these "overpasses" one way would require less lanes overall and give more room for engineers to design the needed changes. This design will also eliminate left turns which is the biggest traffic error on most Utah roads.</p>	Web
54	Jamie Rubin	This will just make things worse!! Wider roads mean more cars, construction means more traffic. This is Park City - not Los Angeles!	Web
55	Mari Mennel-Bell	I concur with the opinion of "save people save wildlife." I am in favor of alternative B as long as it includes an underpass not only for people, but also for wildlife.	Web

56	Art Brothers	Hello UDOT, Option B is the one most likely to reduce congestion for Kimball Junction. Call me if you have questions.	Email
57	Sheryl Johnson-Proffit	To Whom it May Concern: Please consider building a noise wall through the Kimball Junction area and use environmental friendly lighting. Right now there is WAY TOO MUCH lighting at the Kimball Junction freeway exits and entrances it lights up the Spring Creek neighborhood all hours of the night, it's just not necessary! Thank you! Sheryl Johnson-Proffit	Web
58	Meredith Hughes	You will need to make a bus lane that provides a faster option for people using 224. If you make the bus move faster than traffic maybe people will ride it. Use the European ski resorts as a model. If you are a day visitor you need to park outside of the city. If you have a permit or parking reservation you can use the lane. Locals and workers must get a permit to drive in town.	Web
59	David Bell	We have a business located on Rasmussen Road that takes deliveries several times a week using a large Tractor, Trailer, and Pup combination. The ONLY access that this truck has to the business is to exit at Kimball Junction, and take the access road (Rasmussen) back to the west and into the business. All Kimball Junction interchange proposed plans must allow trucks of this size to exit I-80 and access Rasmussen Road.	Web
60	David Kizer	I support option B.	Web
61	JEFF NIELSEN	Take all freeway traffic underground to eliminate the bottlenecks at the Junction.	Web
62	Galvin Clancey	After attending the Zoom open house on January 12, and reviewing the materials on the UDOT website, I strongly prefer Alternative B as the best option for re-making Kimball Junction. Fully separating through traffic from local traffic will enable Park City locals to utilize the services of Kimball Junction without having to worry (as much) about traffic when buying groceries or taking the dog to Run-A-Muk. It will also enable both sides of SR-224 to feel like part of the same neighborhood without a heavily-trafficked highway acting as a significant physical barrier. I acknowledge that losing the tunnel at Olympic Pkwy will make it a little less convenient for Newpark residents to cross SR-224, but with the significantly reduced traffic on the frontage roads I expect that the crossings won't be that stressful anyway. From my vantage point, Alternatives A and C come across as band-aid solutions that do little more than throw more lanes at the problem and see if that works. I doubt that making these large intersections even larger will make Kimball Junction a more pleasant environment (on the contrary I think it will make the area feel even more like a giant highway), and I doubt that forcing I-80-bound traffic through the same intersections will result in magical efficiency gains. Increasing the number of lanes from 2 to 3 will increase capacity by 50% but we're still going to end up with huge lines at the same intersections that already block locals from using the area. We need to separate through traffic from local traffic and make Kimball Junction feel like a community and not just a busy freeway exit.	Web
63	David Breslauer	Option A, which can allow traffic to access Landmark drive, is a horrible idea for early morning, particularly on "powder" days. Currently local traffic from Pinebrook is able to access 224 and the Kimball Junction area without too much difficulty, even eastbound exit traffic on I-80 is backed up. that is the problem you need to solve without moving the problem elsewhere. You have not even mentioned then possibility in any of the plans of an additional lane Westbound I-80 to Jeremy Ranch. A lot of the traffic that enters I-80 from 224 ultimately exits at Jeremy Ranch. An additional lane would eliminate the the double merge that is currently required.	Web
64	Chris Sammartino	Good morning. After reviewing the materials, attending the open house, and attending the webinar, I have decided that Alternative A is the option that would most negatively impact me and fellow residents of the Powderwood Drive area. I think that having additional traffic put onto Landmark Drive is a terrible idea as the road is already crowded with through traffic. I believe that Alternative B is the best option presented, as it would address the auto driver and transit rider without negatively impacting my community. Thank you.	Web
65	Mark Morgan	It seems unreasonable to study kimball junction separately from the whole corridor into downtown and the ski resorts, including parking. Without that all you will do is get people to the traffic backup faster.	Web
66	Gregory Proffit	mitigate the noise and light pollution for neighborhoods surrounding kimball junction	Web
67	Joel Greenbaum	Please consider option (B) Grade-separated intersections with one-way frontage roads to the I-80 interchange, with separate wildlife and people underpass access.	Web

68	Monika Brickson	<p>As a local, I'm hoping for a traffic solution that allows me to drive to Kimball Junction and run errands, such as grocery shopping, necessities, children drop off for school and sports and doctor's appointments. A HOV concept has zero benefit for me, a local resident. The HOV concept can function for visitors, but not for local people. There also needs to be satellite parking for people, otherwise how do you use a bus system especially when there is no bus service in the ranch place/silver spring neighborhood? We have so much skier traffic, that satellite lots with direct bus service is a must. We did it during the Olympics and it wasn't ideal, but it worked. As a local, there is no direct bus service for me to go skiing. From my neighborhood, the nearest bus stop is 1 mile away. So I would need to walk or call high valley transit. I can't drive to the bus stop, because there is no place to park my car. Then say I get to the bus stop, I have to transfer once or twice to get to a mountain to ski or hike or go into old town. Then I get there and I get to do it all over again on the return. I live off of [REDACTED]. I'm always in traffic to get into and out of Kimball. If the green arrow doesn't work (the sensor is not that reliable) to take a left onto Cutter from 224, then I'm there for the whole light and I usually have to wait until the light goes yellow to red to turn. And then it's Russian roulette, because 99% of the time people run red lights. Try teaching your teenagers to drive in that stressful situation! There's maybe one hour in the day from December to April that there is little traffic in Kimball junction. Then during the summer, it's downright scary turning at stop lights because pedestrians and manual and electric bikers just go ahead without looking. So if I am in my car, want to take a left at a light, I need to watch for cars, which is understood, but also pedestrians and bikers who don't look or stop, flying through the intersection and they definitely do not have the right of way. Taking a right on red is also frightening with the b kers wizzing by. I don't know the solution, but if you have a HOV lane, which Park City government seems to love, it has to be clearly marked, because right now cars go out on the shoulder to turn right or the middle 'suicide' lane to turn left at the kimball junction lights almost a half a mile before it's even legal to do so. It's so irritating to see people make that move, driving way too fast well before it is even logical and legal to do. I feel like alternative B has the best bang for the buck, since it has pedestrian tunnels, a tunnel type road for cars going through Kimball junction as well as side roads for people to turn, run errands and shop. BUT that will take forever to construct and living through 10+years of construction is not desirable, so much so, that I would consider moving from a place I have lived for 27 years and call home. But something has to be done, so think about local access, tunnels for pedestrians and b kers, satellite parking so people will use buses, clearly marked roadways, better sensors at traffic lights, stop gates at traffic and roadway intersections so b kers slow down and look out for vehicles. With all this potential growth, plan B could work, but please do it in sections and don't let it take 20 years to construct.</p>	Web
69	Kyle Osborne	<p>Is there a way to be added to an email distribution group that can get updates as the project progresses?</p>	Web
70	Ann Crooks	<p>None of your proposed changes reflect the need to reduce the number of vehicles entering/exiting Park City and Kimball Jct. The environmental impact of allowing the ease of vehicles inside this area doesn't address where all these vehicles will go. Instead, I believe there should be more talk and proposals for mass transit into/out of this area. As the population increases, that seems to be the more prudent choice, e.g. build more Park and Ride lots and encourage people to use them . Right now, your proposals are only going to exasperate the problem of too many vehicles on our roads. I live and work in the Snyderville Basin. I drive 2 miles from work</p>	Web
71	Stuart Stanek	<p>Traveling through Kimball Junction can be challenging. While I appreciate all of the entities involved at trying to improve traffic flow I think this is an entirely faulty plan. This serves to pump more traffic into an already congested area with 224 at capacity. The plan shouldn't be how to we funnel more vehicles into Park City but how do we reduce the flow of traffic!</p> <p>My suggestion which would save millions of dollars and REDUCE CONGESTION is to funnel more vehicles to Richardson Flats off of Hwy 40 with an exit ramp that ends right in a massive parking lot. People can then be transported with mass transit (light rail or buses). I know some people would be frustrated and then learn to deal with it. If you want to observe a template look at Zermatt Switzerland.</p> <p>If you drive in Park City now in ski season be prepared to wait and get frustrated. Pumping more cars, trucks, suburbans and SUVs into the city is not the answer. The complications of "fixing" Kimball Junction would be enormous/impossible/incredibly expensive. Building a custom off ramp for Richardson flats would be easy and way cheaper.</p> <p>We need less traffic on 224, not more!</p> <p>I live in Summit County and regularly take the bus to Main Street. It is a great experience. I'm not sure why we can't force more of this behavior. We have no choice.</p> <p>Thanks for listening.</p> <p>Stuart Stanek - Summit County resident for 35 years.</p>	Web

72	Erin Ferguson	<p>Save People Save Wildlife (SPSW) is pleased to submit comments on the proposed Kimball Junction Area Plan alternatives. SPSW Respectfully requests that Alternative B be given priority in the evaluation process, if the relocated underpass be made to accommodate both pedestrians and wildlife.</p> <p>Save People Save Wildlife is a registered 501 (c) 3, non- profit, which was started in 2015. Full information can be found on the web at: www.savepeoplesavewildlife.org.</p> <p>Save People Save Wildlife has as our mission reducing or eliminating vehicle/wildlife collisions and promoting wildlife connectivity where highways cut across wildlife habitat and mobility and connectivity paths.</p> <p>SR224 has been identified as the fifth worst highway in Utah for wildlife vehicle collisions at 2.97 wildlife vehicle collisions per mile per year. See:</p> <p>Cramer, P., E. Vasquez, and A. Jones. 2019. Identification of wildlife-vehicle conflict priority hotspots in Utah. Final Report to Utah Department of Transportation. URL: https://drive.google.com/file/d/15K9yjM9kDRE8KVDvpUnFWn9RUyo1SkRL/view?fbclid=IwAR062_EPriFmHPGc_uohMpEvoEsHNKWqVZGK5mfGVIEkgzFwF-A4QwFhRk</p> <p>And UDOT's website, scroll for Report 2019-27: https://udot.utah.gov/connect/about-us/technology-innovation/research-innovation-division/</p> <p>Additional research UDOT commissioned by BIO-WEST (see attached) shows that the worst point on SR224 is between milepost 7 and 8, and the second worst is between milepost 9.5 and 10.5. The latter is in the vicinity of the Kimball Junction alternatives.</p> <p>SPSW is specifically concerned about reducing and eliminating wildlife vehicle collisions, which is a key issue. Of all the alternatives currently being presented, only one offers the possibility of reducing vehicle wildlife collisions. That is Alternative B, also known as the grade separation option. And the possibility of reducing wildlife vehicle collisions is because the option calls for relocating existing grade separated pedestrian crossing to the south. Simply expanding the relocated underpass when it is moved to the south to accommodate both pedestrians and wildlife will increase safety on SR224 and allow for wildlife connectivity.</p> <p>The current existing pedestrian underpass at Redstone is approximately 25 feet wide and 10.5 feet high at center. When re-creating the existing pedestrian underpass, a combined pedestrian and wildlife underpass may only need to be 2.5 feet taller and 5 feet wider. Wildlife underpasses when combined with wildlife fencing, cattle guards and escape ramps are up to 92% effective.</p> <p>The BIO-WEST report shows that at MP 10 there were 75 crashes reported from 2010 to 2020. If all those crashes were property damage only, the cost of those crashes comes to 75x12,300=\$922,500. If merely five of those resulted in minor injury and the rest property damage only, the total cost comes to 70x12,300+5x131,700=\$1,519,500. Either amount could easily cover the cost of expanding a new pedestrian underpass to create a combined pedestrian and wildlife underpass with associated wildlife fencing.</p> <p>SPSW respectfully requests that Alternative B be given priority in the evaluation process, if the relocated underpass be made to accommodate both pedestrian and wildlife. The resulting effect would make SR224 safer and provide environmental improvement by protecting and providing connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Save People Save Wildlife</p>	Email
73	Michael Fisher	<p>I am a year-round resident in the Bitner Ranch area of Park City that regularly commutes to I-80, skis PC and uses the Kimball services. The intersection functions well except during high volume ski traffic. Based on my experience, I would think Alternative B would function the best. Moving high volume ski traffic through the intersections to I-80 without lights solves the biggest problem. SR-224 South will backup in the morning without resort parking improvements, so separating local Kimball traffic is important. HOV use will be motivated by resort parking rules - not Kimball HOV lanes.</p>	Web
74	Frank Mitchell	<p>The design should take into account the typical movement pads of wild animals, such as elk deer and moose in this area.</p>	Web
75	David Sutherland	<p>Plan A primarily seems to fix traffic backup onto I-80 EB, but doesn't really address NB SR 224 issues nor solve the two 4-way intersection problems. Seems like it might even make that worse by driving more traffic onto 1-lane Landmark.</p> <p>Plan B is close to what I'd recommend. We need to get rid of left turns to keep traffic flowing. See attached PDF.</p> <p>Plan C is not really a fix in my mind. This is what should have been done 30 years ago, but now much more is needed to address the volumes.</p>	Web
76	Claudia Nielsen	<p>I am a long term resident in Jeremy Ranch for 40yrs. IMO Redstone East and Redstone West need a separate entry/exit onto I80. Both would connect to each other via overpass or under 224 tunnel. All traffic would exit I80 and have a straight shot w no lights until Cutter Lane intersection.</p>	Web
77	Debbie Duke	<p>In looking at the 3 options, my vote is for Option B. It would be nice to keep the area visually similar to how it is now. My biggest concern is if Dakota Pacific is approved to build in the area (which I am firmly against). Then any of these options will be obsolete before you even begin.</p>	Web
78	Camille Rasdal	<p>Why has this not already been fixed. ?♀Im losing faith in City engineers. It goes on and on. Bureaucracy?</p>	Web
79	M. V. Janulaitis	<p>Solution is a direct connect to and the freeway with no lights. Plus a large multi-story FREE parking lot next to the bus route.</p>	Web

80	Aldy Milliken	<p>Thank you for studying Kimball Junction roadway. Please do a thorough analysis that includes multidirectional options for tourists and locals. Kimball Junction is our shopping center but it's also a thorough way nexus point for others who want to move past and ski or MTB at PCMR or Canyons.</p> <p>East and westbound 80 traffic must be considered with the increase of development East of the Junction.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Web
81	Sean Scholte	<p>I live and work in park city and the biggest issues I've found are as such</p> <p>At the intersection where the McDonald is, when people are trying to turn left towards the smiths the lane is not long enough for the amount of people trying to turn so it gets backed up.</p> <p>Do not add any lanes park city is to small for more traffic we need to make public transportation more accessible and limit parking on Main Street to ONLY residence parking special parking passes that the city gives to locals that live up that way.</p> <p>The reservation system at canyons and park city is what is causing traffic, issues with reservations cause cars to back up. When you could just drive up and park there wasn't this much traffic.</p> <p>It takes me 30 minutes!!! To get from Home Depot to St. Mary's to drop my kid off to school. These tourists need to use public transportation, ban people from having cars and force them to use public transportation. ldk just do something because this is terrible</p>	Web
82	Emil Chuang	<p>I reviewed the 3 current proposals and each has pluses and minuses. Diverting traffic from I80 westbound earlier is appealing, but Landmark Dr is already congested. It needs some expansion of Landmark Dr and cars must be able to get in and out of the businesses on the road.</p> <p>The HOV lane is attractive, but I believe 224 has to be expanded to 6 lanes all the way to Canyons, otherwise it will not solve anything.</p> <p>The underground proposal will be incredibly disruptive. Have you considered a series of overpasses. I80 eastbound to 224 southbound, 224 northbound to I 80 westbound?</p> <p>As an additional option, have larger dedicated carpool parking near Jeremys and also Richardsons flat and have dedicated buses that take commuters to KJ, Canyons and Main St.</p>	Web
83	Catherine Greenwald	<p>I suppose I would favor C because it takes pedestrian and bike traffic into account. However, all these solutions will funnel more cars into Park City, where there is nowhere for them to park. Any split that does not consider integration with mass transit options (which are barely functional but better than nothing) are a complete fail and do nothing to address the bigger problems of the community. All you care about is getting cars from one place to another!!</p>	Web
84	Jerome Velosky	<p>The project does not address westbound I-80 traffic trying to access Kimball Junction shopping center. Please include on-ramp access from W Ute Blvd to eastbound I-80 and extend the acceleration/merge lane. Please provide a solution from the westbound off-ramp to hwy 224 to through the left turn onto W Ute Blvd. It takes several light cycles to make it through. There is development and population growth on the east side that needs to be accommodated. I see not planned improvements for this.</p>	Web
85	Steph Donovan	<p>Widening the road at Kimball will make it feel less like a community/neighborhood. Option B is best for walkers bikers and the natural environment. As the gateway to Park City let's get this right!</p>	Web
86	Clay -	<p>Alternative B, while probably the most expensive and tim consuming, I think will best improve both vehicle and pedestrian traffic. All new pedestrian walking paths should be wider than normal.</p>	Web
87	Marion Klaus	<p>I live off [REDACTED] on the north side of I-80 and go through the mess at Kimball Junction almost daily. I vastly prefer Alternative B but with additional pedestrian enhancements. In particular, the tunnel under I-80 between the Bitner Rd/Glenwild junction and Basin Rec. in Newpark need improving; the boards break leaving dangerous holes, the water can be up over my ankles in spring, it's icy and dark in winter. Many people use that as access between Newpark and the Spring Creek Trailhead. The illustrations make it hard to see how a left hand turn onto Ute Blvd is made from Kimball Junction. Traffic needs to run more smoothly there as it often takes me 3 lights to make that turn. Also, the lights that do exist do not prioritize that turn long enough. I sometimes see traffic waiting in line to make that turn that is backed up into the junction itself preventing through traffic.</p>	Web
88	Cory Shorkey	<p>I'm interested in knowing why an alternative directing traffic from I-80 into Redstone (field house, smiths, etc) without a left turn onto 224 wasn't proposed here. It's my assessment that the interactions between those turning across 224 to enter redstone have the most detrimental impact on 224 traffic patterns. I agree that a back way into the outlets is great, but that seems to address a non-existent problem because those drivers are just making right turns from I-80 all the way to their destination and move rather quickly. I would love to suggest (with no expectation of serious consideration) that Alternative A have some access into the Field House area instead of, or even as well as access into the outlets from a frontage road.</p> <p>For reference, I am an engineer with the wastewater district who spends more time on the roads in this community than the average bear. My opinions here reflect my views as a resident and commuter, not as a district employee.</p>	Web

89	Julie Turner	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for this major focus on improving the traffic in Kimball Junction and the opportunity to comment. As a nearby resident in the Silver Springs neighborhood and with children in the local schools and ski team training at UOP, we are very familiar with driving this area daily.</p> <p>A few observations re the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All proposals benefits specifically mention I80 back-up reduction - None of the proposal benefits specifically call out SR 224 into KJ northbound traffic. This is a major pain point daily in the winter. Why do the proposals vaguely state "traffic reductions"? As a resident I am unable to differentiate which proposal would be the best to address that 224 northbound problem, too. - Another question/issue is the back-up on 224 southbound at Ute blvd (aka the left-turn onto Ute blvd.) This is another major PM back-up issue (as flagged with a D/F grade in the study). Unclear how option B/C any of these solutions specifically fix that problem, as the language is vague. Perhaps A is the best here? <p>Some ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wish some of these solutions, showed areas to expand the park & ride options in KJ so more people that reside nearby in KJ, Silversprings, (etc.) can use the express busses to the ski areas. - Wish the diamond interchange proposal were better explained. Hard to envision as an average citizen. When I goggle that it brings up divergent diamond interchange examples in SLC valley. Is that the idea? If so, please clarify with taxonomy that's the same. <p>Thank you so much. Look forward to learning more.</p> <p>PS - Good luck also tackling the I40 / I80 traffic issues that seem to emerging every morning due to all the increased development & traffic at that interchange.</p>	Web
90	Jack Fenton	<p>Please enlarge the left turn lane from southbound 224 onto Ute blvd.</p> <p>Please keep the green arrow active long enough to empty the queue.</p> <p>This is an easy fix that won't be millions of dollars, doesn't require a study, and should have been done 10 years ago. PLEASE DO THIS!! DO IT NOW!!</p>	Web
91	--	<p>There is only 1 way to really help out the traffic. It is to build a 1 lane flyover that connects to both directions of I-80 and goes over both lights on the 224. You could this 1 lane able to be switched for the traffic depending on time of day. The mornings the traffic is going 1 direction and the opposite direction in the afternoon. So you do a bypass lane in the middle of the freeway and people would get off I-80 and drive the flyover bypass to the middle lane of the 224 after both lights. You would have gates to drop and keep traffic flowing the way you want. In the afternoon you would stop traffic from east bound I-80 and have it be the on-ramp to I-80 going west. This allows for the lights to function the way they already do. People can choose if they want to bypass the lights with the flyover. Makes the most sense. I know no one wants that high of a structure but the traffic is out of control. It's not pedestrian traffic that's causing this.</p>	Web
92	Miriam Eatchel	<p>We need much more user friendly public transportation. Directly to both resorts and Park City (an express bus with three or 4 stops) running frequently. I have lived in Pinebrook for 2 decades. Traffic has never been worse and the bus situation has gotten less easy to use.</p>	Web
93	Rafael Canseco	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I live in the [REDACTED] by Kimball Junction and have experienced first hand the bad traffic in HW224.</p> <p>I am supportive of options B and C, and would be even more supportive of an option D that would take advantage of directional lanes or roundabouts.</p> <p>Please by all means avoid option A and having one way lanes around kimball will make our life miserable for the many people that actually live by the Kimball Junction</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Web
94	--	<p>The less interference to neighborhoods and frontage roads, the better this project will be. There is no reason to have I-80 traffic interfere with outlets, whole foods, and residential condominiums.</p>	Web
95	Dan Huerlimann	<p>SR224....make the 'Bus' lane on the northbound available to cars for right turns into Newpark Blvd. The Busses do not use this lane anymore as now they all turn left into Tech Center Drive.</p> <p>Extend the left turn lane when coming off I 80 and turning left into W Ute Blvd</p>	Web
96	Matthew Crandall	<p>As someone who owns a significant amount of property at Kimball Junction and commutes to Park City, everyday I believe Kimball Junction needs a Commuter Lane similar to that of the one leading to Highland via point of the mountain. People exiting the 80 will have the choice of by passing the first cluster of lights at the junction who are going into Park City. Creating a commuter lane that by passes the junction with reduce traffic significantly for both those going into town and those visiting the Junction.</p>	Web
97	Colton Winters	<p>I don't see and option for transit, but working at a company in Park City with many others that commute, we would all prefer something I ke a trax line to commute into Park City. We don't want to be on the roads especially when they're are dangerous. They become exponentially harder to keep safe when we just add more lanes. Any consideration is appreciated.</p>	Web

98	Phares Gines	Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (SBSRD) owns, operates and maintains both transportation and recreational trails that will be affected by any of the proposed options. It is important that a representative from SBSRD be included in the planning, design and construction of the trails in this area. I can be reached either by email or phone, [REDACTED]. Thank you.	Web
99	David Maxfield	I prefer alternative B, because it would solve the stoplight standstills at Kimball Junction with the fewest downsides for the residents of Kimball Junction—where I live. However, I don't think that a single tunnel relocated so far from where people want to go will work. There needs to be excellent pedestrian and bicycle options on both of the overpasses as well.	Web
100	Kathy Becker	I live in Kimball Junction in the Fox Point Community along 224. I will be directly impacted by these changes. Alternative B is the preferred alternative as it addresses congestion without introducing lots more traffic noise into high-density neighborhoods. It is important to also include a pedestrian and bicycle lane on the 2 new roads going over 224—or have other ways to cross over the access roads. People won't all choose to walk to the north or south pedestrian/bicycle tunnels. Options to widen 224 above ground will just degrade our community and all of Kimball Junction by adding more traffic noise and car lights. I expect that DOT will then be back to build noise walls along both sides 224—creating an unsightly above ground tunnel entrance to Kimball Junction and the Greater Park City Area.	Web
101	Dwight Hbdon	I would prefer the traffic solution to minimize visitor cars and emphasize public transportation. Ski resorts have eliminated most parking spaces and we need to eliminate the large number of cars in the area, not make it easier to get more car into the already car crowded greater Park City area. More walking, biking and public transportation, keep the cars out.	Web
102	Alan Ni	<p>Thank you for both holding the physical and virtual sessions for the important project. Based on my attendance, I have a few comments.</p> <p>WRT, the 3 plans presented I have the following anecdotal reactions, based on traveling through that intersection on the average of 4 to 8 times a day (weekdays and weekends).</p> <p>Alternative A: Is probably my least favorite option. My perception is that it doesn't alleviate the current traffic flow conditions (primarily to/from i-80 and into/out of Redstone/Newpark). This option appears to benefit traffic in the Landmark Dr area which is measurably less vis a vis Redstone and also any new development that may occur as a result of the Dakota Pacific High Density housing project - something I would have no desire to fund. I'm skeptical that this design would alleviate the majority of the present problematic traffic flow conditions (to/from Redstone, Old Town and the ski resorts).</p> <p>Alternative B: Fanciest of them all. I can understand how separating the thru traffic from signals at Ute and Olympic can achieve a better desired outcome. However, I am concerned about cost and the prolonged construction period sinking the roadway could cause. During the Draft EIS, it would be nice to understand the length and amount of disruption for all 3 alternatives during the construction process. Also a question was raised during the Zoom, where you guys said that all 3 options provided a similar outcome. I was a little surprised with the response. Hence, I would like to see more details around the efficacy of all 3 options prior to selecting the most elegant, expensive and arguably disruptive construction project. As a suggestion, it would be good to see a letter grade service assessment broken out by each alternative in the next study.</p> <p>Alternative C: The allure is that it would seem to be the least disruptive and potentially finished the quickest. However, it seems to heavily rely on HOVs and transit. On the weekends, many cars are occupied by multiple riders, hence outside of adding an additional lane (or worse yet repurposing a full access lane), I'm not sure if the desired relief can be achieved. On weekdays, there is certainly more single occupant vehicles due to commute patterns. Carpooling may be more difficult for commuters, so not exactly sure how much relief this could provide to all. I'm also worried that lane cutting to/from HOV (e.g. from the HOV lane to making a left turn into Redstone from i-80 @ Ute would create bottlenecks).</p> <p>At this point, given the 3 options, I'm slightly leaning towards Alt B with the grade separation. But am concerned of the cost and disruption. And if Alternative A or C can be proved with additional study to be similar in terms of traffic relief to the existing condition (not just anticipated growth), I would be a supporter of those.</p> <p>One last comment. I am looking forward to the upcoming BRT improvements for SR224. The decisions from the project will heavily weigh on the success of high frequency and on-time transit. It would be good to see in the draft EIS more on how the two projects overlay and rely on one another for all 3 alternative.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Alan Ni</p>	Web
103	Larry Moffitt	I would like to ensure on any new plan for Hwy 224 at Kimball Junction that there is a safe and continuous bike/wide shoulder lane on both sides of the main road for bike traffic without having to use crosswalks etc. at intersections and is not in the HOV lane. Thank you.	Web

104	Matt Dombrowski	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am a resident of the Bear Hollow neighborhood in Kimball Junction and I commute every day into old town Park City on 224. I've lived in Park City for 15 years where I've observed the traffic problems becoming worse every year.</p> <p>I feel strongly that Alternative C should be chosen given that it prioritizes and incentivizes HOV and public transportation. My concern with Alternatives A and B is that they do not address the root cause of congestion (too many vehicles), and instead just alleviate the acute congestion problem at the Kimball intersection. Alternative C has the opportunity to reduce traffic in Kimball junction and all upstream/downstream intersections on 224 and beyond to Park City by reducing the number of vehicles on road. Simply look at any of the intersections in Park City during peak times to see the congestion I'm talking about (Deer Valley Drive, Kearns Blvd, Park Avenue, Bonanza etc...). We should view this as an opportunity to improve traffic on 224 as a whole, not simply Kimball Junction, otherwise we will have to do another project like this at the next congested intersection on 224!</p> <p>In addition, I'm highly skeptical that Alternatives A or B will actually help alleviate AM inbound traffic. Does the study take into account the throughput of subsequent inbound intersections on 224, such as Bobsled/Cutter Lane, Bear Hollow, and Old Ranch Road? Those intersections are already congested in the AM. My suspicion is that increasing the throughput of the Kimball Junction intersection will simply shift the bottleneck to those subsequent intersections, and not reduce the congestion on 224 between KJ and PC.</p> <p>One more thing: given the condition of Utah's air quality we should be investing in solutions that reduce emissions. Alternative C is the only option that encourages public transportation and carpooling.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Matt Dombrowski ██████████ Park City, UT ██████████ ██████████</p>	Web
105	Staci McIntosh	There are too many cars in Pack City already. We don't need to make it easier to get more cars in, but continue improving walkability, biking, and public transportation.	Web
106	Joseph Rametta	Dedicated fly overs from all directions for vehicles coming and going onto and off of the freeway. Completely bypass the traffic that wants to visit the Kimball junction retail spaces.	Web
107	Chuck ESCOTO	A bypass needs to be built to allow skiers traffic to bypass the Kimball Junction area and drive from the resort to I80.	Web
108	Alan Courage	In favor of alternative B.	Web
109	Jon Burke	This project is well thought out and option B makes the most sense BUT the first step needs to be getting Summit County Council and Park City government to address the fact that more access just means more vehicles! This has been seen all over the country, build more lanes, get more cars. There is also a proposal for Udot to participate in building a dedicated bus lane from Kimball to downtown PC, but no new parking to get people on those buses! These projects, IF they go forward must be coordinated, why tear things up twice where the construction traffic disruption will be huge. Udot is just doing its job but the County and City officials need to do theirs: address the fact that the ski resorts have already brought too many vehicles to the west side of the county and there must be limits placed on future development.	Web
110	George Chase	Highway 224 and 248 going into Parkcity. There's an extra lane not being useful. In the morning that middle lane could be use as third lane for traffic going into park city. In evening that same lane could be use as 3rd for traffic to exit Parkcity.	Web
111	George Chase	Two main highways going into Parkcity. 224 and 248. They both have middle lane. That middle lane can be useful by making it a third lane going into Parkcity in the morning commute. In Evenings can be reversed as third lane leaving Patkcity	Web
112	Karl Stien	<p>Hello. My family of 4 lives in silver springs in Park City. We feel that mass transit + commuter parking and pedestrian/bike flow should be prioritized with any plan. Improved traffic flow will also be appreciated. Option a seems like it would be best for traffic however the fact that it necessitates moving the pedestrian tunnel too far away makes option less desirable unless something could be adjusted in the plan. Option b seems like it is a reasonable compromise bn traffic and pedestrian flow, however we would prefer adding some of the mass transit features from option c into the design.</p> <p>Suggestion - consider adding a commuter lot with mass transit directly off of the intersection.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration!</p>	Web
113	Eric Iverson	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you for providing some options for improving traffic in Kimabll Junction. Traffic has a serious negative impact on the quality of life for those living near, or transiting the Kimball Junction area of Summit County. I live full-time in the Bear Hollow community just to the south of the impact study area, and frequent the Kimball Junction/Redstone, for grocery shopping, restaurants, etc.</p> <p>I vote for option B. I feel that option A, and B would agreed be improvements (almost anything would!), however they don't do enough to future proof transit in the area. I feel that they would be more like band-aid fixes that would still ultimately fail again in the near future. I understand that option B would have the highest cost, and longest construction time for the changes to be completed, but I think it would be worth it.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Eric Iverson</p>	Web

114	Jesse Morse	As a Park City resident, I believe that Alternative B is the best solution for the Kimball Junction area. Alternative A does not address the significant amount of traffic that is coming from I-80 and going to east Kimball Junction, and Alternative C does not sufficiently address the volume of traffic that goes straight through Kimball Junction, and does not address the traffic going southbound on UT 224 and turning left at Ute Blvd. Alternative B is the best solution to keep everyone moving. Thank you!	Web
115	Brent Fern	As a resident of Bear Hollow Village since 2015, the continuous expansion of roads (particularly 224) is reducing the beauty and value of this area. The bigger the roads are, the more cars you will attract. Conversely, providing more public and mass transit options will limit construction of new roads, which will just bring more cars, leading to the need for more roads. It is a paradox that governments have thus far failed to understand. Think bigger and keep the value of this area - which is its environment/beauty - intact while solving the problem.	Web
116	Victor Method	Here is a comment. Kimball Junction is a disaster. Let Dakota Pacific and their payoffs to the Summit County Commission and to Gov. Cox add more traffic and congestion. The golden goose of Park City will be killed because UDOT is incapable of doing anything to plan roads and unscrupulous elected officials bow to influence from developers. The traffic lights are a joke, the frontage roads are a joke, it all reflects horrible decisions by bureaucrats who are inept in their work.	Web
117	Jose Garcia	I've attached a 2 page pdf file with feedback to the entire committee involved in helping our community resolve of traffic issues with Kimball Junction. Please confirm that you have received my feedback by email. [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] Thanks for listening. Jose	Web
118	Sara Gabrielle Truett	There should be shuttle buses departing every 20 minutes with a stop in Kimball junction and PCMR, departing from a designated parking garage in SLC or near foothill for those wanting to get to Park City. The parking garage should provide some sort of incentive so that people are more provoked to utilize rather than their own personal transportation.	Web
119	James Keese	This is a well thought out presentation... Clearly something needs to be done as traffic is horrr ble here every day... so doing nothing is not an option. I tend to favor Plan A as it features a protected pedestrian/cyclist tunnel and it would appear to be the least invasive in terms of road construction. I'm seeing it pretty close to the comment deadline, but would like to know the estimated impact on travel times and emissions for each of the proposals AB and C. But if the other alternatives (B,C) reduce travel time or environmental impact then I'd like to know that. JP Keese - Hideout, UT resident.	Web
120	Brad Washa	Please see five recommendations in blue comment boxes on attached pdf. These a smaller and lower cost alternatives to three alternatives.	Web
121	Eileen Kintner	Would I ke to see a tram that goes up from SLC Trax to PC Transit station., continuing along HWY 224 into PC.	Web
122	Rochelle Jonswold	Of the 3 plans presented the only one that will move traffic better is Alternative B that depresses Route 224. The traffic jam is caused by the traffic lights especially the 2 lights by the Redstone and Ute Blvd. The other alternative puts more traffic by housing and on Landmark Dr which is insufficient to handle any more then it currently has.	Web

123	Jeffrey Cedeno	<p>I am a resident in Highland Estates and have owned property in the trailside area for 15 years. These plans are extremely exciting to see and I have very strong needs for this to succeed as a community member.</p> <p>The only viable plan path I see as a local resident is Alternative B, or a variation thereof. This method addresses that the highway needs a more robust exit solution and that as much traffic as possible must have an immediate bypass option that skips all Kimball Junction traffic lights. Local traffic must also have a way back and forth across 224, where there are severe backups that can make a 7 minute drive from my house in Highland Estates to Walmart or Whole Foods take 20 minutes or more. There is no public transit option that can bypass or support local residents without ready access that bypasses traffic lights and the ability to exit or enter the highway with no traffic lights in Kimball Junction, and to get across 224 without any traffic lights in either direction, has to be included in the final consideration to best support local residents.</p> <p>Split Diamond intersections are already in place on Route 40 and have fundamentally failed as a method to drive the current volume of traffic we see in the area. Traffic backs up for 1-2 miles on both the 80/40 interchange and the 40/248 exit ramp, with absolutely no method for cars to even reach the exits and regularly causing accidents at each location. There is no viable way traffic can clear the intersection at current levels, let alone future levels (2050 plan) with there being continued backups that happen starting in Park City and at the ski areas. Alternative A does not permit local residents to viably access the grocery stores or shopping centers on alternate sides of 224, and will have no positive impact on my ability to travel or use public transit on a resident. I regularly (daily between 8am and 10am, the school year and all winter on both weekends and weekdays) cannot access town in under 1 hour despite it being a 15 minute drive due to the poor design and inadequate capacity on the Quinns Junction intersection and its inability to deal with traffic lights several miles down the road which back traffic up onto Route 40. Similarly, this whiplash and the inability of traffic to filter from 40 to 80 cause severe backups and accidents daily on the 80 to 40 ramp. Neither design would be adequate even if scaled to improve traffic flow in Option A from any measurable perspective.</p> <p>Similar issues exist with Alternative C. There is no area up stream for users to board public transit and it is not adequately planned today to provide off-highway parking or buses that adequately move users to ski areas quickly. Quinns Junction is only accessible through stop sign control on the frontage road, which is inadequate to clear or support backups, and an off-ramp that regularly backs up 40 minutes or more onto Route 40 at the hospital. It is already a safety hazard and shows transit planning is not able to get users to our Park & Ride options (Richardson Flats) today. There are no additional Park & Rides to support bus trips from Kimball Junction, Pine Brook, or Jeremy Ranch, so high capacity HOV would need to purchase land and further improve flow through the residential communities in these areas to support this option.</p> <p>Simply put, the county and state need to accelerate traffic flow and relieve blocks from the highways to the highest capacity parking areas, and then back again in the opposite direction. Every light will cause a bottleneck, and locals need optimized, 0 left turn against traffic options to get through every intersection and towards any expected HOV or Public transit option. Anything other than this consideration, which is one provided in Option B, will result in more heartache for residents and will fail to support our needs as residents.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the hard work and thought that has gone into these plans so far. I am excited to see these proposals and will be attending future feedback sessions where I am happy to provide photographic and video proof of the complete inadequacy of every surrounding intersection in the area today.</p>	Web
124	Emilia Cedeno	<p>I live in Highland Estates and need to see an option that improves access back and forth across 224 without waiting for highway traffic. This takes several light cycles to clear and causes huge problems running errands like going to Whole Foods, and will only get worse if the county makes the incred bly poor decision to put Harmons in the Outlets, where traffic is already terrible, instead of making them build in the community-friendly spot near Home Depot where there are no grocery stores and traffic would actually thin out and probably improve.</p> <p>It would also be really nice to get cleaner options to turn from our communities both left, into town, without forcing a left turn at a traffic light across traffic, and to get traffic getting into Smiths and the shopping plazas on that side to clear out so they'd stop backing up into the highway off-ramp.</p> <p>Option B looks like the only option that addresses these problems at all; there is no way we can expect people to use HOV transit in the future and there is nowhere further away for people to use Park & Rides to make buses a better option than they are today.</p> <p>Anything is better than nothing, but we need to get people straight through Kimball in every direction without crossing oncoming traffic at lights. Neither other option gives enough bridge or tunnel crossings to solve the huge issues we are already struggling and wasting time with every single day, even when it isn't winter.</p> <p>I am not sure where the traffic estimates in the study come from but they seem I ke they area already underestimating how bad the traffic backups and time wasted are today. The intersections get backed up year round, not just in winter, and if we don't plan around rush hour it can take 1-2 hours each way to get anywhere including go shopping or go skiing for us locals. There isn't a public transit option that gets us anywhere in less than an hour even with our circulator buses and it's impossible to effectively get our kids where we need to without using our own cars due to how unreliable the local bus routes get once you're in town.</p> <p>Thank you for your support in solving these problems</p> <p>Emilia</p>	Web

125	--	Attn kimball junction survey. I've been a driver for 15 years and honestly, I would think, if you added these off ramps and maybe a west bound on-ramp (highlighted in red) and utilize the tunnel, people from highland estates, Blackhawk, canyon creek, and everyone that needs to access kimball junction Redstone, smiths, Newpark could avoid kimball exit. This would eliminate the huge left line turn onto Ute Blvd which causes the massive back up.	Hotline Recording
126	Mark Maziarz	Thanks for your in-depth study and ideas. As some of the thousands of residents who live in the Pinebrook/Jeremy Ranch area, we use the Kilby frontage rd to access Kimball Junction and Old Town Park City. It seems that Alternative A would add much more traffic to the Kilby Rd area and this would keep us from choosing to access Kimball Jct and Park City. Alternatives B & C would not make our commute longer, however Alternative B looks much more expensive and seems to be a much more intrusive construction period, so we all vote for Alternative C. Thanks.	Web
127	Richard Gatnik	Please move US80 destined traffic underground on Rte224 and leave local traffic above ground. The earlier the US80 bound traffic rerouted off of Rte224 the better. Commuters and tourists not living/shopping Kimball Junction want and need to be facilitated to US80 to everyone's benefit.	Web
128	John Craigle	Since most of the traffic going through KJ is headed to Park City, I suggest making an overpass at Ute Blvd (two lanes) with a traffic circle under the overpass for people turning right or left on Ute. The same configuration at Olympic/Newpark. This would allow non-stop traffic for cars headed into PC and much less slow down for people going into Redstone and Walmart/Whole Foods, etc. Sounds complicated, but I think this is an easy fix for the backups with the current traffic pattern. I'm happy to provide more details if you want them.	Web
129	Lee Barber	If we could connect the road off Olympic circle to Bear Hollow Road at least we locals would have a way to stay off 224 longer!	Web
130	Lilah Rosenfield	I urge UDOT to scope the Kimball Junction EIS to reduce personal automotive traffic in the broadest sense possible. That is, any alternatives considered should ultimately be analyzed on minimizing overall use of personal cars throughout Summit County and the Wasatch Front, while maximizing the accessibility of the Kimball Junction area to individuals using other modes. Our 50 year experiment in auto-centric development has failed. Cars hurt communities, they hurt the environment, and they hurt people. Most of these effects are not mitigated with the adoption of electric vehicles, and they are certainly not mitigated with the addition of one more lane. While the previous proposals are certainly a good start, especially Alternative B, they ultimately do not go far enough. UDOT needs to holistically plan a series of improvements to both regional transit and Kimball Junction infrastructure that will reduce the automotive traffic utilizing Kimball Junction both as a proportion of the overall traffic mix and in raw numbers, in favor of substantially increased pedestrian, transit and bicycle usage. Let this EIS be the first step in the process of moving the Wasatch Back (and Wasatch Front) as a whole away from personal automobiles in favor of a healthier and more sustainable transit mix.	Web
131	Ken Canada	The fact that for two hours every night I have to risk my life to pull into my neighborhood is a massive failing on your part. The fact that traffic backs up every day going into or out of park city is a planning failure. The infrastructure has not kept up with the fact that every contractor working in town commutes. Consider a third lane into and out of town every day. Put lights into silver spring north shore. Put another exit and entrance lane into the middle and high school. Thanks for giving us the opportunity to voice concerns	Web
132	Joan Entwistle	All of the proposals for Kimball Junction are flawed in that they just get cars to 224 more directly, where they will be stuck. Traffic is backed up all the way from Park City to Kimball Junction and two miles back to the Jeremy Ranch exit on some mornings. We need direct access for skiers and workers to a park-and-ride from the highway with express bus service if we are to alleviate congestion.	Web
133	Terry Fritz	Thank you for taking on this project and attempting to make improvements, very much needed. As a resident, my needs are to get to the grocery locations on the east and west side while going both south and north. You're making improvements at this location but couldn't some of the traffic pressures be reduced by widening 248 allowing more traffic to exit Park City the back route?	Web

Good afternoon....I attended the open house at Ecker Hill Middle School earlier this month. Thank you for providing this opportunity for public review and comment.

After my review and engagement with one of the UDOT engineers on the project I want register my strong support for Alternative B. There are several reason for my support for this alternative. I have listed them below, but first I would like to share some background that led to my strong support for Alternative B.

In 2017 I was appointed by the Summit County Council to their newly formed Kimball Junction Neighborhood Planning Committee. As the Committee launched the planning effort four key objective review areas for the plan were set down.

Land Use
Transportation/Transit (including parking)
Neighborhood Connectivity
Way/Finding Signs

While transportation was clearly an extremely important component of our planning objectives, it was not the only one. At the same time we were addressing the transportation/transit issues, we were concerned about related issues that, if appropriately addressed, would transform Kimball Junction in to a more cohesive and livable neighborhood community. Over the next 20 months the Committee addressed these four areas with excellent support from Summit County staff, and when requested, from UDOT. Our final plan was focused to forge new direction in each of these areas:

A Sustainable Community
A Mixed Use Neighborhood
A People Oriented Built Environment
A Seamlessly Connected Neighborhood
A Walkable Neighborhood

Understanding a creative and suitable solution to the transportation issues long resident in SR 224 at Kimball Junction was key to the right solutions for these other issues. Burying SR 224 was among the solutions we favored as a Committee and in my mind was the most appropriate. In later deliberation at the County Council the affirmed their support for this approach.

The three major transportation benefits that I see from Alternative B are:

1. It eliminates the intersections of SR 224 at Ute Blvd and Newpark Blvd. As a Snyderville Basin resident who frequently travels to and through Kimball Junction these two intersections are the most critical obstructions to appropriate traffic flow. During our planning studying in 2017 , UDOT reported that 13,000 cars pass through these two intersections each morning and again each evening that are going to Park City, or accessing I80 from Park City, that have no interest in contact with Kimball Junction. Surely now, six years later, the number is even greater.
2. For residents of Snyderville Basin, or Park City who want to go to Kimball Junction, traffic backups on SR 224 heading north are a major issue. Even in periods when the numbers of non resident visitor is low, northbound traffic frequently backed up well past Cutter Lane. During peak visitor periods, these backup extend often to Old Ranch Road and beyond.
3. For people coming to Park City from I 80 the backups can also be severe. I attend an early morning meeting each Thursday in Quarry Village, as I leave for home about 8:30 am, traffic on I 80 is backed up for at least a mile and sometimes all the way to Quarry Village.

If Alternative B is put in place, it allows Kimball Junction to become a viable neighborhood that has obtained the important qualities that our Committee set forth and that the County Council adopted. Moreover, the way that you have proposed to depress SR 224 in Alternative B presents a couple of opportunities that I believe are special and important. First, greater Park City lacks an attractive front door. I see the possibility of, rather than simply providing a roadway across SR 224 at Ute Blvd and Newpark Blvd, expanding each of those bridges a bit to the north and south. These expanded areas could be used in several ways: a.) perhaps as a base for a new and dynamic front door to great those who are exiting I 80 on their way to Park City, or b.) as developed public/civic space, or even perhaps c.) as commercial space. Think of this last possibility as resembling the Ponte Vecchio over the River Arno in Florence. Any of these would be wonderful ways to further bind the east and west sides of Kimball in to a more cohesive neighborhood.

Nelther Alternative A or Alternative C contain the necessary foundation elements to either solve the traffic conditions that now concern us, or to assist in turning Kimball Junction in to a viable, sustainable and livable neighborhood.

Thanks your work on this critical problem.

Best....Gordy Mills
Gordon E. Mills, FAIA, Hon. RAIC

134

Gordon Mills

Email

135	Jane Sagerman	I went to the open house at the Middle School a few weeks ago. Although i cant say i favored one plan as being best, my biggest objection to all the plans is that UDOT is only concerned with alleviating the traffic jam on the 80 getting off at Kimball Junction. With the three plans that were shown, they are only pushing the traffic up on 224 to the the Canyons or right before that when the road goes from 4 lanes in one direction back down to 2 lanes. It will be horrendous for anyone who lives in Synderville. I do agree with either a fly over or more lanes leaving Park City to alleviate the awful backup that occurs every afternoon, 12 months a year. My husband and I lived on Deer Valley Drive for 13 years and took the bus everywhere with a couple of mile radius. The micro transit takes way too long, and i dont want to wait up to 30 plus minutes and then have stops for something I can usually drive in 10-12 minutes. The fact that one of the planners at the middle school said she couldn't understand why that would be a problem. Taking public transit with over an hour involved is an issue. When i used to take the bus to SnowPark it was much faster than driving and parking. Public transportation needs to be as fast or faster to be a realistic option.	Web
136	Kathleen Mears	I like Alternative B At the online public meeting, I found answers regarding the projected future growth questions to be inadequate. I feel there is a predisposed idea that the large development proposed by Dakota Pacific is being considered as a done deal by UDOT. It is not and is strongly opposed by local residents. Please do not move forward on your recommendations to somehow backhandedly help them get an approval. The proposed development is a nightmare for that are and no amount of transportation adjustments could mitigate the huge impact to Kimball Junction and all of the Park City and Snyderville Basin residents. Thank you for your time.	Web
137	Carol Giffen	Thank you for the open house at EHMS. It was very helpful and informative. Although I am a big fan of roundabouts, I do think the 3 options all have their merits. I struggle with picking the best solution without the context of the wider area transportation and population studies and associated plan. What are the underlying usage assumptions? What is the broader context into which modifying Kimball Junction roads will fit? Where are the transit centers and express bus routes that will get people out of their cars so they don't drive past Kimball Junction? That said, I favor Alt C. I hope it is enough to address the safety and traffic issues while enabling a much more effective transit system for the area. Thanks!	Web
138	Larry Hardebeck	I believe that alternative B would be the best alternative because of the depressed roadway. This would appear to eliminate the severe slowdowns caused by the traffic lights. It would also be less visible and would mitigate the traffic that pedestrians and bicyclists would encounter.	Web
139	Sylvia Dambrosio	Design an overpass that travels by skullcandy building then back onto the main road again.	Web
140	Murray Gardner	In my opinion, Alternative B is far superior to other alternatives. It will result in a smoother flow of traffic, better separation between local and through traffic, and less visual impact. It should have been implemented ten years ago. Get moving!	Web
141	Ramsey Tate	I support either taking no action or an alternative to options A, B, C that focuses on upgrading only public transit and walking/biking transportation. The idea that widening roads and adding lanes improves traffic is outdated and not supportable. I am a resident of the Blackhawk Station neighborhood adjacent to the 1-80 traffic interchange. I use multi-modal transportation (public transit, walking, biking) in the area. I have lived in cities like Houston where my shifts as an emergency medical physician had to be scheduled around gridlock on the 10-lane highways that were ever-expanding. The Park City area is blessed to have free, frequent public transit and pushing incoming traffic towards its use should be the priority, a strategy that will actually improve traffic flow.	Web
142	Rudy Lehfeldt-Ehlinger	Option B is the only one that will help the flow of traffic from Park City get on the highway smoothly. this is clearly the best option.	Web
143	Greg Ehlinger	please prioritize work here. i am a biking fan so please tend to that, but it really is the winter traffic that needs most attention -- the separate grade option looks great.	Web
144	Savannah Martin	Option B	Web
145	Bea Mayes	I'm sure you've considered a bridge from before, east of, the NewTown Road to the intersection with I-80. It would probably be a lot cheaper than the trench shown in Plan B. It could be prettified and be made palatable.	Web
146	Gavin Manes	Great information Alternative B seems the best for local residence like me. Alternative A appears to significantly increase traffic on Landmark as it also might be used to access 224. I do not understand Alternative C really at all except that 224 get wider. Look at the success in Dallas TX of moving interstates and highways underground for through traffic. We don't need wider lanes just deeper stacked ones. Thank you.	Web

147	Stephanie Monasterio	<p>Most of these options push the funnel down the road, not solving the root problem. Why are we not funneling some PC traffic from 40 and exit 4 (248) or exit 10 for resorts? Why does ALL Park City traffic come thru Kimball Junction? It could be more efficient. Adding bridges/overpasses will make Kimball Junction go from a small mountain town to a place with gas stations, fast food, and interchanges. That will kill any property value and quality of life. We don't want a mini SLC that you just stop at on the way to PC. The Kimball Junction intersection can be a problem, but the bigger problem is the overall flow into Park City. They are building more resorts (Mayflower) and expanding existing ones (St. Regis Residences) why are the resorts not paying for improved traffic flow infrastructure down the road at say, 248?</p> <p>Things that could make a quick easy difference- signage that tells drivers to use other options for Park City- directing them to 40 and those exits like 248. Signage that tells people wanting to go over the Kimball Junction overpass to the Rasmussen side to be on the left earlier in the process. Improved signage going to i80 that there are two lanes, not just the far left- often people assume it is just one lane. The shopping area has two left hand turns onto 224, one straight, one right hand to go off towards i80 near the Olympic intersection. Why? The right hand turn is always backed up and the straight can't be accessed because of that. Improve that to be two right hand turns and a more obvious straight option. You don't need to add lanes to the 224- you need to make accessing them easier. The one that get backs up the most is the first left hand turn coming into Ute. Most locals go to the next at NewPark to turn left to avoid the mess. I'm not sure that there is an easy solution to that unless you add another exit father down i80 and come back to shopping area via Highland drive.</p> <p>As someone who drives into PC and into SLC, but lives full time as a homeowner in Kimball Junction it would be a shame to see it become the gas/burger stop mini SLC devoid of charm for the benefit of 30 million dollar part time resident homes and resorts.</p>	Web
148	Aidan Lehfeltd-Ehlinger	Option B!!!!	Web
149	--	<p>Please don't do anything at this intersection, we don't need it to be worse, have you thought about the semi trucks who make deliveries? This will be a nightmare! This only happens during ski season, due to the influx of workers coming from SLC, because the ski resorts refuse to pay a decent wage for employees to live locally, so please don't try to appease them at a cost to the true full and long time locals who live here year round and can't afford this fiasco you are suggesting! Please, stop listening to the complaints of those who don't even live here just because it takes them longer to get to and leave from work! This should NOT be our community problem, it should be the resorts employers problem!</p>	Web
150	Christine Miles	<p>We live in Pinebrook and have driven these roads multiple times a day for the past 7 years. Every time I have driven the kids to doctors/dentists/or sports practice I have wished there was an underground tunnel for people not needing to go the Kimball area- those that want to go directly to Park City- or more importantly leave Park City at the end of the day and head to SLC. All of the options will come with huge travel disruptions. The most upside will come from Alternative B. It will provide the most benefit for the longest period of time and can include benefits for all future developments that seem to be in the pipeline. Please choose B.</p>	Web

Hi UDot team - I watched the recorded video the other night. Thank you for putting that on.

The problem with Kimball Junction is simple overgrowth. For some reason Park City - land of the great outdoors - "needs" more commerce, fast food, and condo building on every square inch of open real estate. In the meeting it was even mentioned the implied expectation of even more housing next to Skull Candy, bringing the traffic even further destroying the great landscape.

One easy fix to congestion is to allow more, longer, better LEFT HAND TURNS in both directions off 224 into Redstone, McDonalds, Hugo Coffee building etc. Much of the I80 backup is due to thwarted traffic simply trying to turn left into Redstone.

One main issue is not addressing the overgrowth problem downtown - someone in the meeting asked about addressing the backups at Bear Hollow and Canyons (and beyond). The response was there are no plans.

The only problem 'streamlining' traffic in Kimball Junction will solve is moving traffic more quickly to the backups at Canyons and into town.... causing those to back up faster and longer... pushing the traffic right back into Kimball Junction. The bottlenecks continue to Kearns Blvd, Park Ave, etc. Solving Kimball Junction problems will not solve Park City's traffic problems.

In the meeting someone asked about traffic for the potential 2030 Olympics, which was passed off as a "special event". (Just like Sundance where it takes an hour to travel from the outlets to downtown). I'm guessing 2030 Olympics traffic will become the norm in 25 years according to the projections that spawned the Kimball junction discussion in the first place.

Likewise plans are heating up about Harmon's Supermarket coming to the outlets, cutting in yet another rotary by Whole Foods, impacting yet another piece of the larger kimball traffic pie. I don't understand why we need yet another grocery store with Walmart, Smith's, and Fresh Market within 4 miles of each other - where will the employees live - I guess next to Skull Candy in the 1000 unit complex causing even more traffic woes. Plus the traffic will spill over into the residential roads from Powderwood to Skull Candy - that will become another traffic nightmare through residential areas that will require yet another study. But I digress...

I understand there is no easy solution, but re-configuring a piece of Kimball Junction with massive construction / tunnels / new I80 lanes / bridges / inconvenience / extreme cost / residential impact on Kilby Rd., etc will not solve the real problem - unrestrained overgrowth.

There is no Industry per se in park city - only daily-living needs and recreation/hospitality. The area can only sustain so much influx before no one can ski because there is no parking. All the while traffic gets worse and worse at the downtown destinations (6 miles from the Kimball project).

Look at Lake Mead and Lake Powell and the almost certain water depletion. Yet builders keep building because it's not their problem. Has anyone looked up from the simulations of projected inbound/outbound traffic flow to check out the water level at Jordanelle?

At some point enough is enough. How much more tax revenue does Park City need? How many more \$10 million vacation rentals? How many more low-paying jobs with nowhere to live?

Just because you can massively reconfigure Kimball Junction doesn't mean you should.

Try longer dedicated left-hand turns first. (It's free.)

Perhaps I missed it during the presentation, but I did not hear any "total effectiveness comparison" of plans A, B, C... Are they all equally effective in traffic mitigation? What did the simulations show? I'm confused on that front. The general public has no idea from yellow and green lines on a PDF and "diamond interchanges" what the 'right' approach is.

I did not proofread before sending, so this is a bit rambly, snarky and aggressive, but without larger consideration Park City will suffocate itself. These are the moments where as a regular Joe Citizen you feel like "what's the point". All that said, my uneducated view is option C would have the least disruptive impact at lowest cost. Digging underground (B) or messing up Kilby/Outlets/Landmark (A) seem wholly unnecessary.

The wheels are already in motion, but thanks for listening.

- Chris

151

--

Web

152	Chris Mega	<p>Hi UDot / Kimball Junction project folks - I submitted the comment form online but didn't get any confirmation that it was successful. Just in case here is what I supplied:</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Hi UDot team - I watched the recorded video the other night. Thank you for putting that on.</p> <p>The problem with Kimball Junction is simple overgrowth. For some reason Park City - land of the great outdoors - "needs" more commerce, fast food, and condo building on every square inch of open real estate. In the meeting it was even mentioned the implied expectation of even more housing next to Skull Candy, bringing the traffic even further destroying the great landscape.</p> <p>One easy fix to congestion is to allow more, longer, better LEFT HAND TURNS in both directions off 224 into Redstone, McDonalds, Hugo Coffee building etc. Much of the I80 backup is due to thwarted traffic simply trying to turn left into Redstone.</p> <p>One main issue is not addressing the overgrowth problem downtown - someone in the meeting asked about addressing the backups at Bear Hollow and Canyons (and beyond). The response was there are no plans.</p> <p>The only problem 'streamlining' traffic in Kimball Junction will solve is moving traffic more quickly to the backups at Canyons and into town.... causing those to back up faster and longer... pushing the traffic right back into Kimball Junction. The bottlenecks continue to Kearns Blvd, Park Ave, etc. Solving Kimball Junction problems will not solve Park City's traffic problems.</p> <p>In the meeting someone asked about traffic for the potential 2030 Olympics, which was passed off as a "special event". (Just like Sundance where it takes an hour to travel from the outlets to downtown). I'm guessing 2030 Olympics traffic will become the norm in 25 years according to the projections that spawned the Kimball junction discussion in the first place.</p> <p>Likewise plans are heating up about Harmon's Supermarket coming to the outlets, cutting in yet another rotary by Whole Foods, impacting yet another piece of the larger kimball traffic pie. I don't understand why we need yet another grocery store with Walmart, Smith's, and Fresh Market within 4 miles of each other - where will the employees live - I guess next to Skull Candy in the 1000 unit complex causing even more traffic woes. Plus the traffic will spill over into the residential roads from Powderwood to Skull Candy - that will become another traffic nightmare through residential areas that will require yet another study. But I digress...</p> <p>I understand there is no easy solution, but re-configuring a piece of Kimball Junction with massive construction / tunnels / new I80 lanes / bridges / inconvenience / extreme cost / residential impact on Kilby Rd., etc will not solve the real problem - unrestrained overgrowth.</p> <p>There is no Industry per se in park city - only daily-living needs and recreation/hospitality. The area can only sustain so much influx before no one can ski because there is no parking. All the while traffic gets worse and worse at the downtown destinations (6 miles from the Kimball project).</p> <p>Look at Lake Mead and Lake Powell and the almost certain water depletion. Yet builders keep building because it's not their problem. Has anyone looked up from the simulations of projected inbound/outbound traffic flow to check out the water level at Jordanelle?</p> <p>At some point enough is enough. How much more tax revenue does Park City need? How many more \$10 million vacation rentals? How many more low-paying jobs with nowhere to live?</p> <p>Just because you can massively reconfigure Kimball Junction doesn't mean you should. Try longer dedicated left-hand turns first. (It's free.)</p> <p>Perhaps I missed it during the presentation, but I did not hear any "total effectiveness comparison" of plans A, B, C... Are they all equally effective in traffic mitigation? What did the simulations show? I'm confused on that front. The general public has no idea from yellow and green lines on a PDF and "diamond interchanges" what the 'right' approach is.</p> <p>I did not proofread before sending, so this is a bit rambly, snarky and aggressive, but without larger consideration Park City will suffocate itself. These are the moments where as a regular Joe Citizen you feel like "what's the point". All that said, my uneducated view is option C would have the least disruptive impact. Digging underground (B) or messing up Kilby/Outlets/Landmark (A) seem wholly unnecessary.</p> <p>The wheels are already in motion, but thanks for listening.</p>	Email
153	Craig Philkill	<p>Proposal B is clearly the best alternative proposed. It will reduce wait times for those traveling along 224 in both directions, as there will be no need for traffic lights along Rt. 224.</p> <p>Proposal B should include an exit lane and ramp from the proposed frontage roads that allow travelers to make a left turn across the proposed bridges to NewPark area or Olympic Park Rd.</p>	Web
154	Susan Steinke	<p>Reflective or solar powered lighting would help tremendously! After 4 pm in the winter, traffic 1-80 west is a white knuckle adventure. It is very hard to identify lanes. We need lighting in an environmentally friendly way.</p>	Web
155	Keren Mazanec	<p>3 Park City residents in favor of Alternative B. This will make a positive impact for the extended future (the others will only have an impact for a few years then traffic will be congested again).</p>	Web
156	Russell Boggs	<p>I dislike B because it makes the existing pedestrian tunnel much less convenient. A & C add a pedestrian tunnel which is good. On the whole, I prefer A. I live in Kimball Junction.</p>	Web

157	Eric Hoffman	<p>I've lived in Park City for about 30 years and have watched as Kimball Junction has grown along with the rest of the Park City and the interchange and flow of traffic through KJ has gotten more and more congested. We know that more development in the immediate KJ area is still coming and that will only bring more vehicles along with the continuing growth around KJ. For that reason I believe we need a very drastic upgrade as I think we need to split the traffic that is exiting 80 and heading straight south on 224 as well as the traffic heading north on 224 and heading directly onto 80. This would allow visitors and residents in KJ to more effectively pass through the Ute and Newpark Blvds as the traffic through those intersections should see a much reduced 224 flow. This is what I believe Alt B proposes and I think that just improving intersections or adding additional lanes will not fully address even the current traffic let alone what is still to come. I do also think pedestrian improvements are much needed as I often see people crossing from one side of Ute Blvd to the other across 224 and with multiple lanes of turning traffic at various times along with the speed of traffic on 224 I think the danger to pedestrians is really high and it's only a matter of time until we have a serious pedestrian incident there. Thanks for soliciting input!</p>	Web
158	Rhea Cone	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>The Swaner Preserve encompasses 1,200 miles of critical wetland and upland habitat protected under conservation easement for wildlife, a 10,000-square-foot state of the art environmental education facility, a historic farm, and 10 miles of trails. The Swaner Preserve is a registered 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and extension site of Utah State University with a mission to "Preserve, educate, and nurture". Located in Kimball Junction, wildlife coming to and from the Preserve are frequently involved in collisions with motorists on Interstate 80, Old Ranch Road, and Highway 224. Such collisions include elk, mule deer, white-tailed jackrabbits, coyote, badgers, and others.</p> <p>The Swaner Preserve and EcoCenter supports option B proposed in the Kimball Junction EIS with the addition of wildlife crossing in the form of a dedicated tunnel or overpass. Approximately 0.4 miles of the Preserve boundary parallels Highway 224 in Kimball Junction, and a crossing for wildlife in this location would connect the habitat of the Preserve to protected open space on the western side of 224 owned and managed by Summit County while protecting wildlife and reducing injuries, property damage, and even death to motorists. The improvement of traffic patterns and flow is imperative in this area of Highway 224, and we are hopeful that option B can provide the best traffic solutions as well as much needed pedestrian safety improvements.</p> <p>SR224 has been identified as the fifth worst highway in Utah for wildlife vehicle collisions at 2.97 wildlife vehicle collisions per mile per year. See Cramer, P., E. Vasquez, and A. Jones. 2019. Identification of wildlife-vehicle conflict priority hotspots in Utah. (Final Report to UDOT).</p> <p>The relocation of the pedestrian underpass in option B allows for the expansion of the underpass for use by wildlife, or the inclusion of a separate underpass nearby for wildlife only. Whichever option is chosen should consider the feasibility of wildlife crossing. While this exact location may not be the center of the collision hotspot from data collected by DWR and UDOT, this project is a unique opportunity to allow for the inclusion of critical and necessary wildlife infrastructure into an already planned improvement project.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p> <p>Rhea Cone, Conservation Coordinator, Swaner Preserve and EcoCenter</p> <p>Nell Larson, Executive Director, Swaner Preserve and EcoCenter</p>	Web
159	Craig Williams	<p>Go with option B. Save our money with the underpass which is too far away from the population center and spend it on more wildlife fencing from Wanship to Coalville. That is a killing field for deer. Put lights in the animal tunnel under hwy 40. Animals won't use it if they can't see the other side. Put lights in the tunnel under 224 by the barn. Maybe animals will use it. otherwise, build a new tunnel with lights.</p>	Web
160	Ted Palomaki	<p>Please state clearly how long the construction is expected to take once all the approvals are received and the funding is in place. By this, I mean once ground is broken, how long until the job is 100% done, and normal traffic flow will be possible.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Web

161	Ted Palomaki	<p>During the (assumed) several years of this construction project, PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE incorporate meaningful traffic mitigation. This is a time to get creative and show real leadership. You can do much more than the typical signage, barrels and flaggers.</p> <p>Incorporate some of the lessons learned during the 2002 Winter Games. Make a real attempt to keep a significant amount of vehicle traffic out of Kimball Junction.</p> <p>Get some serious park and ride lots and bus service in place, as we had during the Olympics. That arrangement was very successful. Of course, it was costly, but it worked. If we're serious, we can do something similar during this construction project.</p> <p>Think about how to route traffic around to SR248 without choking that artery.</p> <p>I live less than 1 mile from the KJ interchange. This construction will have a major impact on my daily life, as well as thousands of others. UDOT's goal should be to minimize this impact, and not just tell us all to collectively "suck it up".</p> <p>If you need a nearby and recent example of poor traffic mitigation during a large road project, just have a look at the 300 West re-do in SLC. That was basically a disaster, and caused misery and economic suffering to a large number of people. Please, lets' avoid a similar situation here.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Web
162	Ted Palomaki	<p>Please keep the pedestrian paths open and active during the KJ road construction project. Don't destroy them, block them off, or make them otherwise unusable.</p> <p>Many residents will walk or bike to KJ during the job, which is exactly what you would hope for. This will reduce the amount of vehicle traffic through the construction zone, and make it safer and more convenient for everyone.</p> <p>Walking and biking access during construction will be a key element of traffic reduction. Let's not shoot ourselves in the community foot by destroying that access and forcing even more people into cars.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Web
163	Ted Palomaki	<p>Of the three alternatives presented so far, we support Alternative B, with the depressed road and trench cover. This is the best combination of traffic flow, reduced visual impact, and maintaining/improving walking and biking access around KJ.</p>	Web
164	Leslie Wellauer	<p>The left turn lane at kimball junction hurts locals primarily. We have recently (2 months) waited up 10 minutes to turn left in order ti get my local children to their practices, healthy outlets and peers. Please- think about adding at turn lane.</p>	Web
165	David Cushing	<p>To our way of thinking, the grade-separated solution is best because through traffic on SR-224 could move rapidly along to I-80 while cars heading for east and west Kimball Junction commercial establishments could access those areas directly. Sincerely, - Dave Cushing and Diane Ercanbrack</p>	Web
166	Marc Bathgate	<p>Of the three proposed alternatives, B is the only one that will actually solve the problems present. A and C will simply push traffic into different places but won't solve the congestion (and resultant pollution) from too many cars going to and from I-80 and 224 at peak hours. HOV lanes could be added to Alternative B but simply converting current lanes into HOV lanes will create more overall congestion and pollution.</p> <p>In addition to option B, left turns off 224 (and the future frontage roads) should be eliminated in favor of routing all traffic through roundabouts and back across/over 224 (this could eliminate the need for lights on the proposed bridges). This might require expansion of the existing roundabouts but would eliminate dangerous left turns and the back-ups, especially from 224 Southbound to Ute Eastbound, which backs up to the light at the I-80 ramps at peak hours and badly obstructs southbound through traffic.</p> <p>The two way stop at 224 and Rasmussen should also be reconfigured into a roundabout to better improve traffic flow and reduce potential accidents in what is currently an awkwardly-wide intersection that confuses people as to right-of-way.</p> <p>Finally, the bus-only shoulders on 224 between Olympic and Cutter Lane should allow HOV/HOT and/or right-turning or frontage-round bound/originating traffic at peak hours.</p>	Web
167	William Ciraco	<p>UDOT almost has the solution. Ingress and egress to 80 WEST of Kimball Junction is better option (near term - less disruptive to active traffic) EXCEPT you can't put that volume on Landmark Drive. To windy, hilly and most importantly NARROW.</p> <p>The owner of the Tanger Outlet Park City is running the property into the ground because the want to redevelop mixed use around a new Harmon's Grocery store. UDOT and Summit County need to approach Singerman Co. (owner of Tanger) and ask what they would want in return for a 60'-70' ROW of way through the center of the property. Cut and cover and trench it through the property and under the hill behind Walmart - DIRECTLY INTO THE DAKOTA PACIFIC PROPERTY - Summit County should ask for a 1,500 spot underground parking structure (co-funded) with direct access from 80 as outlined above. This is the beginning of how we fix Park City traffic and transportation issues. BTW the ROW is to accommodate 2 lanes of traffic in each direction and a FUTURE rail line into Dakota Pacific Property. If we do that Summit County can give them 1,000+ units of density. Please seek a better and more creative solution. Fixing the flow of cars on to 80 and out of Kimball is great but if you do the same to the inbound you will be creating a bigger problem.</p>	Web

168	Judd Werner	<p>Hello, and thank you for the opportunity to comment. I live on [REDACTED]; within approximately [REDACTED] of the Hwy 224/ Cutter Lane traffic light. I travel to/through Kimball Junction multiple times daily. I have reviewed the current and 2050 forecasted Travel Speeds and Levels of Service, Que Lengths and Travel Times through Kimball Junction, as well as the three modification alternatives being considered, the project objectives, etc.</p> <p>I would like to express my preference for Alternative C. However, I suggest you add the proposed additional exit and entrance lanes between I 80 and Hwy 224 without specifying them for exclusive public transit or HOV use. My reasoning is as follows:</p> <p>1) Alternative C is obviously least disruptive and least expensive of the three alternatives being considered. In addition, it targets specifically, and most cost effectively the primary objectives of speeding commute period traffic through Kimball Junction. The other two alternatives involve substantial additional costs in order to address the secondary objectives of supporting a transit hub and additional development and East/West traffic at Kimball Junction.</p> <p>2) As a long term area resident I value what is left of our rural and undeveloped local environment. Had I, and many of my neighbors been involved in the development of the objectives for this project, preserving as much of the local environment as possible would have been voiced as a high priority objective. On more than one occasion over the past year I have seen wildlife (moose, elk and deer) frequenting the area around Hwy 224 and Olympic Parkway. I don't want to see all of the extra concrete and urban design elements associated with the Alternative B. Alternative C offers the most minimally invasive option for solving the commute traffic problem. We are trying to solve a two hour/ 5 day per week problem. Let's please do it in a manner that preserves as much of the current environment as possible for the other 23 hours of the day, for as long as we can. That is important to those of us who are here 24 hours per day.</p> <p>3) I don't believe any significant funding or design consideration should be given in this upgrade plan to supporting the transit center at Kimball Junction. The Kimball Junction Transit Center is in the wrong place. It should be South of Olympic Parkway on Hwy 224.</p> <p>4) Alternative C does not preclude or substantially alter the design of Alternative B for possible future implementation.</p> <p>5) Although Alternative B offers some de-coupling of of East/West and North/South traffic through Kimball Junction, it adds merging, transition and likely signalling complexity between the frontage roads and both Hwy 224 and the East/West bridges. Probably 25-30% of my trips through Kimball Junction involve entering I 80 Eastbound; which would be more complex in the Alternative B scenario than currently.</p> <p>6) I see Alternative A offering more traffic complexity and cost with a lower proportional impact on commute traffic congestion.</p> <p>7) I support sensible public transit. However, the idea people are going to commute together to Park City in order to gain access to dedicated turn lanes at the I 80 Kimball Junction interchange is mis-guided. The new turn lanes will provide the most benefit toward solving the commute related traffic issues if their use is unrestricted.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Judd Werner [REDACTED] Park City, Utah [REDACTED]</p>	Email
169	Tracy Leheldt	I like option B	Web
170	Julie Smith	<p>Good day, Carrisa1 Thank you so much for allowing EPA the time to review the NOI and other project information in order to provide our cooperating scoping comments. Please find those comments attached and do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns. We look forward to working with UDOT on this Project planning effort and Draft EIS. Best regards - Julie</p> <p>Julie Ann Smith, PhD Physical Scientist</p> <p>U.S. EPA Region 8 (ORA-N) [REDACTED] Denver, CO [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>	Email

171	Janna Young	<p>January 4, 2023 Ms. Heidi Spoor HDR, Inc. 2825 E. Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 200 Salt Lake City, UT 84121-7077 Re: UDOT Project Number S-0224(50)12/UDOT PIN 19477</p> <p>Dear Ms. Spoor: Thank you for the invitation to serve as a participating agency in the environmental review process for proposed improvements to the Interstate 80 (I-80) and State Route 224 (SR-224) interchange at Kimball Junction and on SR-224 from Kimball Junction through the two at-grade traffic signals at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway in Summit County, Utah. Summit County has a strong interest in this project, and emphatically accepts the role of participating agency. The Kimball Junction is the gateway to the Wasatch Back, one of the major economic engines and regional destinations in the state of Utah. As we evaluate the SR-224 corridor it is critical that we consider how transportation infrastructure connects our communities and improves the livability in the Snyderville Basin. As Utah gears up for a potential Olympic bid, this project will be transformational for this unique opportunity and for future generations.</p> <p>Summit County looks forward as a participating agency to be involved in the development of the alternatives, identifying issues of concern, and providing input on unresolved issues. We request that the study area be extended to include the segment of Landmark Drive between the Factory Outlet Mall and West Ute Boulevard instead of disconnecting the corridor as currently reflected in the study area map, depicted as "Figure 2: Project Area Close-up" in the agency invitation and attached to this correspondence.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you on a solution at I-80 and the Kimball Junction. Please also accept this letter as the RSVP to the agency scoping meeting on January 9, 2023. Carl Miller, Summit County's Transportation Planning Director will participate in that meeting as Summit County's representative. Please contact Carl at [REDACTED], if you have any questions. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important project for Summit County.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Janna B. Young Interim County Manager</p>	Written (mailed)
-----	-------------	---	------------------