
APPENDIX 9A

Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and
Response Matrix

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
<i>Emailed Comments</i>			
EM1	James Todd Jr.	While it is well known of the difficulty of going north on the frontage road from I15 NB at Centerville, may I point out that the 500 West exit SB from Centerville used to cross two lanes of traffic but now crosses five. During a high traffic load this is quite an adventure. Going from Centerville SB to exit 500 West might be addressed to not need such a maneuver.	9.2.1
EM2	Taylor Olney	My name is Taylor and I live on [REDACTED] between [REDACTED]. I know my neighbor's majority has said it over and over but I just wanted to repeat it one more time. I am highly against any type of underpass on 400N going under the freeway. If it is a road, that just gives more people the opportunity to speed and not use the roundabout correctly. It is a dangerous street already with all the speeding. We do not need another reason to bring more traffic. And I am also against a pedestrian crossing as well. That just opens up our neighborhood for all sorts of crimes. People can easily escape a cop or anybody in a car by running through it. It also is a great place for the unsheltered to set up camp. And I doubt we will have anybody willing to come and patrol that. Just please do not put anything there. I know there is no stopping this project, just people listen to the people that life in the actual neighborhood. Not people in Farmington. Thank you for taking the time to read it.	9.1.5
EM3	Tyler Cruickshank	Hello. I'd like to register my comments for the I15 EIS. I am completely against any expansion of the interstate. More capacity equals more cars. The money should be spent on any other myriad of options that would enhance quality of life. We need to move away from being a car centric City and a car centric UTA. Here are alternatives for the money: Finish the FrontRunner line between Provo and Ogden. Start a new FrontRunner line between Tooele and Park City. Extend the Trax Red Line to Herriman/Riverton. Extend the S-Line Streetcar to Sugar House Park Extend the S-Line Trail to Central Pointe Station. Complete the Trax Green Line loop to give west-siders a direct connection to the airport. Add a Trax stop on 1700 South. Add an east-west Trax line on 1300 South. Add a Trax line on 900 East. Add a Trax line on 900 West. Add a Trax line north into Davis County. Run Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on State Street. Run BRT on 700 East, Redwood Road, Foothill Drive. Install Lead Pedestrian Intervals (LPI) at our deadliest intersections (we know where they are). Give trains proper signal prioritization so they aren't held up at red lights. Build raised crossings everywhere the Jordan River Trail interacts with a surface street. Free Fares.	9.1.1 9.1.3 9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM4	Tyler Peterson	<p>Hello,</p> <p>First, I like the design of the new interchange.</p> <p>But the intersections at 600 North and 300/400 West leave something to be desired.</p> <p>I've had the opportunity to review the new renderings for the 600 North 300 West intersection, and I must express my concerns. This intersection poses a significant danger for pedestrians attempting to cross it. Rather than introducing an additional right-hand turn lane eastward, could we explore the possibility of implementing a bulb-out design to reduce pedestrian exposure to traffic?</p> <p>The same issue arises when heading north. Why is there a need for four lanes of traffic on 300 North within a residential neighborhood? Could this space be utilized for a bulb-out or pedestrian island to enhance safety while crossing the road? Instead of solely focusing on overall traffic volume and speed, we should consider incorporating bike lanes on 300 West and 400 West to help reduce speeds and make walking more accessible. Given the increasing population density in this area, I urge you to prioritize pedestrian traffic safety in our discussions about this intersection.</p> <p>The situation is even more noticeable at the intersection of 600 North and 400 West. Here, there are no designated bike lanes, yet there is additional space that could potentially be utilized for bulb-outs. I believe that seizing the opportunity to reduce this extra space and enhance pedestrian visibility while reducing their exposure to traffic is a missed chance in this regard.</p> <p>Could we, at the very least, prioritize reducing the amount of time pedestrians spend exposed to traffic in both of these intersections?</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	9.2.1 9.2.2
EM5	Richard Davies	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diamond entries to freeway are frightening in snow when there are drivers who don't understand how they work. They need very clear signs. 2. Multi directional lanes - good luck in Utah with our poor driving. They work well in Seattle and seem to be a better use of land. This will need a serious education process via social media, regular media, fliers, etc. 3. Better control over poor and dangerous drivers. Try to get the law back to allowing traffic cameras for speeding, poor driving, etc. Give tickets via camera. Same for HOV violations. 4. Sound walls for the poor souls who live close to the freeway. <p>Thank you, R. Davies</p>	9.1.3 9.2.1 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B 9.4 A
EM6	Shelley Costley	<p>The purpose of the HOV lane was to encourage commuters to drive together to reduce traffic and pollution. Allowing non high occupancy vehicles to use the lane makes it hard to enforce lane use. I'm tired of seeing so many single occupant vehicles in this lane and no one gets pulled over for using it incorrectly.</p>	9.1.3
EM7	Clysta Day	<p>The ramp going across I-15 to the south, then descending on the east against Northbound 1-15 traffic is too steep in its descent. With cold conditions or speed you will have cars spilling off the ramp. It's also hugely distracting for the I-15 drivers going 70mph to have visibly to cars moving and coming near them in another direction.</p> <p>Please fix this eyesore and the grading of the project.</p>	9.1.6 9.4 A
EM8	Barbara Hillman	<p>Why are you not considering a rail service expansion, making using rail more user friendly.</p> <p>We keep talking about air quality, yet we keep adding lanes. This in my opinion is not a long term solution.</p> <p>I am a Bountiful resident. Thanks</p>	9.1.3 9.1.6
EM9	WG	<p>This project will not solve long-term traffic problems. Basic economics shows that adding lanes will provide temporary relief, but as people change their behavior in response to the additional lanes, the traffic issues will return. Other large metro areas have had to learn the hard (and expensive) way, as documented in this New York Times article from January 2023: https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/06/us/widen-highways-traffic.html</p> <p>Please don't use our tax money to repeat their mistakes. Rather, invest the money to improve public transit. Double-tracking Frontrunner is a good start, but with careful planning and investment, public transit can mitigate many of the transportation problems we face now and in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Respectfully, WG</p>	9.1.1 9.1.3

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM10	Ralph Becker	<p>I-15 EIS Team,</p> <p>I submitted comments during Scoping re: billboards removal that I do not see addressed in the Draft EIS.</p> <p>In addition, the need for soundwalls is necessary along I-15 in residential and use-changing areas in Salt Lake City. I do not see that addressed either.</p> <p>I find this EIS questionable because you have not addressed the alternative of developing transit alternatives, e.g., bus or rail, to serve the traveling public needs.</p> <p>Please let me know what you are doing in the EIS regarding these issues.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Ralph Becker</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.3.7 A</p> <p>9.3.7 B</p> <p>9.4 B</p>
EM11	Chaise Warr	<p>The Fairpark community discussed and voted unanimously in opposition to any additional underpasses in the area.</p> <p>Those directly affected by this should have their opinions weighed more heavily.</p> <p>Many opinions have been and will be shared as to why this is a bad idea and bad for the neighborhoods. Camping, speeding, ect.</p> <p>I think it is extremely important to mention that the city spent a great deal of money on the pedestrian overpass at 300 N. An additional underpass would only funnel people away from the pedestrian bridge, and again toward crossing the railroad tracks, sometimes illegally.</p> <p>UDOT says they were going to do the underpass as a concession to the neighborhood it would directly affect. But the neighborhood that is affected doesn't want it.</p>	<p>9.1.5</p> <p>9.3.5 C</p>
EM12	Nathan Flint	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Study after study has found that adding more lanes to highways doesn't improve traffic congestion, but makes it worse. Why would we spend this incredible amount of money on something that is ineffective at best and detrimental at worst?</p> <p>Please use this money to improve mass transit and existing infrastructure rather than wasting it on expanding lanes to no benefit.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p>
EM13	Ashley Snyder	<p>Dear UDOT EIS team,</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposal to expand the I-15 corridor. As a resident of Salt Lake County and as someone who sometimes uses this stretch of I-15, I am concerned about this new proposal. My response to this proposal: NO, NO, NO, NO, NO!!! I understand we are facing challenges with commuting, but it is a problem across the area, not just on the highways. I do not like going out on 900 E., near my home, at rush hour because it is hard even to just leave the entrance to my neighborhood because of all the vehicles. I-15 is not the only place where we are facing severe congestion. We should NOT be focusing on expanding. We need to STOP providing building permits and LIMIT population growth.</p> <p>I moved to Millcreek in 2019. I realize that, yes, I am part of the problem of growth in recent years compared to perhaps a decade or two ago. However, I moved here with the hope that I could get away from the congestion and the extremely high cost of living in Denver. It turns out, Salt Lake City is on the same trajectory as Denver but a few years behind. We have now caught up to what Denver was like a few years ago. THIS IS RUINS THE CITY--IN BOTH PLACES. The appeal of living in Colorado USED TO BE that people were surrounded by nature. Now, nature is surrounded by people. Salt Lake City feels the same way, and it will only get worse if we encourage further population growth. I do not want to run again to avoid the problem of overpopulation. I am keeping my home here, and my answer to these proposals that will support growth is ABSOLUTELY NOT. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO!!!</p> <p>FURTHER, what does UDOT plan to do to help those families and businesses FORCED OUT by this project??? Are the taxpayers going to have to pay for each family to move to another home costing at least \$300,000? Why do I use \$300,000 as the minimum? Have you seen the housing market????!! You are going to force these people out, and where are they going to go???</p> <p>And in case you are wondering, no, I am not happy that the value of my home has gone up by around \$100,000 since 2019. My taxes are going up, and I do NOT intend to give up my place. Further, I DO NOT want to price people out of the housing market. We need to fix the housing market and fix the overpopulation problems. I realize that is not in UDOT's domain, but all the more reason to REJECT the proposal to expand I-15. Fix the current roads where they need to be fixed. Do not force people out of their homes.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my concerns,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.6</p>
EM14	Nickie Nelson	<p>Please reconsider the use of the money to widen I-15. I've lived in Los Angeles and in northern Virginia, where Interstates are many, many lanes wide. Try driving on I-10 or I-95 and see if widening the lanes reduced traffic!</p> <p>Use this money to create separate bicycle lanes, bus routes where buses leave every 15 minutes, double track Frontrunner and subsidize electric vehicles. Widening I-15 is not the answer.</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM15	Alice Hamilton	<p>Hello-</p> <p>UDOT seems fixed on going to measures that the public does not want (see Gondola debacle).</p> <p>""While adding lanes can ease congestion initially, it can also encourage people to drive more. A few years after a highway is widened, research shows, traffic — and the greenhouse gas emissions that come along with it — often returns.""</p> <p>""In 2015, a \$1 billion project to widen a 10-mile stretch of Interstate 405 through Los Angeles was completed. For a period, "congestion was relieved," said Tony Tavares, the director of Caltrans, California's Department of Transportation. But that relief did not last. Rush hour traffic soon rebounded, he said.""</p> <p>""The concept of induced traffic has been around since the 1960s, but in a 2009 study, researchers confirmed what transportation experts had observed for years: In a metropolitan area, when road capacity increases by 1 percent, the number of cars on the road after a few years also increases by 1 percent.""</p> <p>Please plan for the future.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.7
EM16	Linda Robledo	<p>Hello,</p> <p>This email is in regards to the proposed expansion of I-15 from Farmington to SLC. I'm writing to very strongly request that funding be transferred instead to improving public transportation along the same route.</p> <p>While Trax and Frontrunner itself are great, once you board and ride, there are many instances in which it is difficult, unpleasant or dangerous on the last mile or two to arrive at the train stations. Additionally, many bus stops do not provide adequate infrastructure during all seasons of the year.</p> <p>As a frequent user of public transportation, my family and I would personally benefit from said improvements. Public transportation will also be much more economically viable in the long-term than expanding the interstate.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM17	Donetta Okelberry	<p>Good afternoon. I'm emailing on behalf of Donetta Okelberry, living at [REDACTED], Midvale, UT, USA, 84047.</p> <p>The expansion of I-15 is not only prohibitively expensive, forcing a huge burden on hard working taxpayers, but it's also immensely harmful to local businesses that will be displaced, drastically increases unsustainable sprawl, exorbitantly increases local noxious gases and air pollution, and catastrophic to our climate. Words cannot express the opposition we feel to this harmful project. Stop expanding freeways.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.6
EM18	Christina Walker	<p>Unnecessary waste of time and resources! Invest in public transit or not at all! Insane to force relocate people for an expansion of a road that I'm sure will take longer than they've estimated and more than what the most recent estimate is, even though it's more than doubled</p> <p>Fix the lake, remove gold courses, quit building condos</p> <p>Do something productive instead of unnecessary</p> <p>Sincerely, all of Utah</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM19	Stephanie Peterson	<p>Nothing about the project will improve our air quality. My dream is of a Salt Lake valley with affordable, efficient mass transit. As we grow, that would make a huge difference in air quality - if it were a system that was practical for people to use. My local bus route has changed from every 30 minutes to once an hour. I know that is UTA, but you are the Department of TRANSPORTATION, not just highways. There has to be a way for us to have more options than one car with one driver.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM20	Andra Ghent	<p>It is an abuse of public money to expand the I15 before UDOT delivers on existing state commitments to improve mass transportation. Right now, taking mass transit from most of our suburbs into a destination in SLC typically takes 3-4X the time of driving a car. For this reason, most of our suburban commuters just don't have a viable mass transit option.</p> <p>This contrasts with several of the state's initiatives to encourage mass transit. Specifically:</p> <p>The state of Utah is mandating that cities permit significant density along fixed transit stations. Please review, for example, HB462 and SB84. Without a viable mass transportation network once in SLC, people will continue to drive from these new much denser developments. To have a viable mass transportation network, we need much more frequent bus service within SLC so that it doesn't take 3-4X as long to get from a destination in the suburbs in SLC. This requires the state of Utah to increase funding to UTA. It is disingenuous to mandate "transit-oriented development" without a viable mass transit network. It is completely reasonable for cities to resist such state mandates until the UTA is able to offer better bus service.</p> <p>The state of Utah has invested significant money in capital projects for the UTA such as doubletracking the Frontrunner. Without much better transportation connections within SLC, however, these capital projects are not realizing very high returns. We need, at an absolute minimum, 15-minute service on our main routes (e.g., bus 213) and the state would realize even better returns on the infrastructure projects it has already funded if we had 10-minute service on many routes that currently only offer 15-minute service (e.g., bus 9).</p> <p>UDOT has already committed to enhanced bus service in Phase 1 of the LCC gondola plan. Clearly, UDOT is not delivering on Phase 1 since it is allowing UTA to cut bus service up the canyons rather than increase service. UDOT needs to follow its own directives and transfer enough money to the UTA to allow the UTA to run very frequent bus service up the canyons during ski season.</p> <p>Expanding the I15 is ludicrous until we have started providing viable mass transportation from our suburbs to SLC. It's also inconsistent with past state legislation referencing transit.</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.4 A
EM21	Jim Haslam	<p>Dear Committee,</p> <p>Being a resident of Centerville, Ut for the past 30-years, I have become increasingly concerned about the traffic flow at the I-15 and Parrish lane interchange. I understand that you propose to widen the bridge, but I would hope that while things are being re-constructed, that you would also consider altering the final flow of traffic from the bridge going east-west into and out of Centerville.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>Drivers exiting northbound I-15 onto Parrish lane are immediately presented with a congested conflict and high level of merging traffic from cars traveling eastbound on Parrish lane over the bridge. There's currently no space allowed for how traffic in this area can maneuver with the current traffic lights and side-road options presented within this tight area. As it stands, it becomes a very dangerous hazard; and I propose that it be redesign during the upcoming reconstruction to eliminate the immediate choice of several multiple cross-lane directional options so as to present a much needed safer traffic flow to this area.</p> <p>As for your proposed alternative plan to widen I-15, please know that I am in agreement with all the additions and changes put forth.</p> <p>Finally, please restudy the Parrish Lane and I-15 bridge and its traffic flow, as this area is very dangerous to travel as it now stands. I thank you for your consideration of this important need.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>	9.2.1 9.2.2
EM22	Nathan Hatch	<p>I am a resident of North Salt Lake and I am absolutely LIVID at this proposed I-15 widening project. You are turning Utah into Los Angeles. This project is not necessary, it's a waste, it will be disruptive and do nothing but bring MORE TRAFFIC to an area that needs more access to transit. Utah has been very good the last two decades at expanding transit options which has reduced traffic loads on our freeways and streets, this money needs to be spent on expanding light rail access to TAKE CARS OFF THE FREEWAY NOT EXPAND THE FREEWAY TO HOLD MORE CARS ARE YOU PEOPLE STUPID. STOP THIS PROJECT YOU ABSOLUTE MORONS</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM23	Kyle Stowell	<p>I live in Farmington and work in North Salt Lake. I use the Center Street exit to obtain access to my workplace. Looking through the draft EIS, I see that the elimination of the Center Street exit is mentioned, but no specific justification is given. Possible joint projects include a grade-separated crossing, so I am speculating that eliminating the exit would give more room and make the crossing possible. Spelling out the specific justification for this would be a good idea.</p> <p>If that is the case, eliminating the exit and adding the North Salt Lake interchange will also greatly reduce the amount of traffic using Center Street. This may eliminate the need for a grade separated crossing. Even if it does not eliminate such a need, the design should be able to still incorporate an exit.</p> <p>With the amount of high density housing being built, the new NSL interchange will have a lot of traffic using it. There are limited mass transit options for those living in the new housing units being built in North Salt Lake. The Center Street exit will help ease the pressure on the new interchange. By the way, the new interchange needs to be built today. This is the best idea to come out of this project.</p> <p>I firmly believe that having more transportation options is better than having fewer options. Closing the Center Street exit will limit options for those needing to access businesses on the west side of I-15 and residences on the east side. It is a dangerous thing to try to make a left turn on to Center Street at the exit. But having the new NSL interchange will reduce the amount of traffic using the Center Street exit and will make using Center Street safer.</p> <p>Please reconsider the decision to eliminate the Center Street option.</p>	9.1.4
EM24	Randall Lalonde	<p>None of your plans for expanding I-15 are good ones, including the alternative plan. Adding another travel corridor will eventually increase congestion (and not reduce it), air pollution, and destroy the communities, especially on Salt Lake City's west side, through which it will run. To say that adding another lane of travel will not adversely affect air pollution all along the Wasatch Front is a joke, at best, and a full-throttle lie, at worst. This entire plan is just a boondoggle for gravel pits, construction companies, etc. An honest EIS would point out all the negative effects of your draft plan that I referred to earlier in this e-mail. I oppose this plan.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM25	Oziel Adrian Garza	<p>Since I moved to Utah over ten years ago, the I-15 has been in construction and expansion. However, none of the constructions and expansions have relieved the traffic coming to Salt Lake City. To the contrary, the traffic has increased. This proves that expanding I-15 is not the solution. The only way to reduce traffic is by creating multiple ways of transportation. This means improving buses, trains, and other methods of transportation. The front runner helps, but it is very inconvenient. It needs to pass more often. The more cars, the more pollution. This will only impact the health of Salt Lake City residents negatively. Expanding I-15 will only bring more cars to the city and more pollution. Please promote other transportation methods. I use my bicycle daily to get to work, and I encounter people using the bicycle lanes as parking. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>Cities are for people, not cars. Stop allowing the car industry to lobby for more roads. Reducing parking space in the city will deter people from driving because they will not find parking spots. Hence, they will slowly move to using trains and buses.</p> <p>This expansion will not solve the problem and will only move people out of their houses. The expansion will only increase pollution and accidents.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM26	Ian Fox	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>My name is Ian Fox and I live in Salt Lake City and have lived here for the past 8.5 years. I am writing to voice my opposition to I15's expansion. Blindly expanding I15 will only serve to induce demand for vehicle travel, allowing for the creation of more suburban sprawl that necessitates putting even more vehicles on the road. Expansion of I15 also creates an additional maintenance burden that will cost us tax-payers billions more over the life of its existence to make the problem worse. Additionally, the expansion is the antithesis of the action that is needed to combat climate change and improve air quality across the Wasatch Front.</p> <p>What Utah needs instead is to build sustainable, walkable, transit-oriented communities that can leverage existing and future Frontrunner capabilities. While there are already plans to expand the Frontrunner by adding additional double-track sections, that is the bare minimal action that can and should be done. The billions of dollars that will be wasted to create more problems for the state should instead be spent towards even further expansion of the Frontrunner and on the addition of new public transportation options.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM27	Frederick Jenny	<p>To the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT),</p> <p>My name is Frederick Jenny, I am a resident of Salt Lake City and am commenting today to talk about my concerns regarding the expansion of Interstate 15. After reading through the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), I have some major concerns about converting I-15 into a twelve (12) lane superhighway. My first issue is that UDOT says there will be no additional environmental burden on the area. How can that be true as according to the Sightline Institute's Clark Williams-Derry, "adding [just] one mile of new highway lane will increase CO2 emissions by more than 100,000 tons over 50 years" (Williams-Derry 1). Even with EVs you still have both the construction CO2 emissions and the microplastics from tire wear that will affect the health of those along the I-15 corridor and residents of the surrounding area. Therefore, UDOT's claim that this will not add an additional environmental burden on the area around I-15 is false and misleading to the general public.</p> <p>In a statement made in the Draft EIS, UDOT that states that the need for transit expansion is taken care of by the Utah Transit Authority (UTA). This is great news and I am all for it, but UDOT should be working with UTA to find better solutions. The Utah Department of TRANSPORTATION should be more than just cars. Why is this \$1.5 billion not being better spent to get people out of their cars and into more environmentally friendly and efficient mass transit? Expansions of FrontRunner, the backbone of the system, into branch lines like city streets to I-15 are needed. Trying to add more space hogging cars into a limited freeway is not the answer. (In my opinion, expansions to transit would be an alternative solution to expanding the freeway, period. If you fail to have mass transit as an alternative, then UDOT is doing the citizens of Utah a disservice. In summary, UDOT needs to not just be a car-based transportation entity, it needs to expand options for better alternatives because cars are an old solution to an environmental and population problem that needs better rail-based transit options like expanding Trax and Frontrunner. That \$1.5 Billion will go a long way in building out an advanced transit network.</p> <p>My final suggestion is one that should be considered if you add any bike lanes. Cyclists need to have their own right of way which means these new bike lanes need to be protected bike lanes. I have just bought a street bike and use it to go to work; grocery shop; work out. If we are going to be a more sustainable state then we need to make riding bikes safer and easier. By designing our roads to just be for cars we do those people, myself included a disservice and put them at greater risk of getting in an accident. A car will win every time, let's protect people by creating bike lanes with barriers to keep the cars away from cyclists.</p> <p>At this point, I am afraid the powers that be are moving toward expanding I-15 no matter what Utahans say in these comments. Please strongly consider my comments and not let my concern as a citizen go unheard. It just feels like UDOT is just accepting comments so UDOT can check a box and say they let citizens comment. I am concerned this letter will end up in the pile of the thousands of voices who pleaded against the Little Cottonwood Gondola EIS. Please listen to the citizens who are paying for this project. There are thousands of voices crying out against this and it feels like we are being ignored.</p> <p>Thank you for listening and please consider my comments. We need better solutions not the same old way of thinking</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM28	David Pedersen	<p>Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment on the DEIS for the proposed I-15 expansion.</p> <p>In a nutshell, I am firmly opposed to the expansion of I-15. Numerous previous expansions have NOT yielded improved transportation quality, but rather the exact opposite: more congestion, longer travel times, and more pollution.</p> <p>In chapter one of the DEIS, UDOT wrote: "The statewide transportation vision as defined by UDOT is "A Pathway to Quality of Life."". That vision is fundamentally incompatible with the goal of the project; freeways worsen quality of life, rather than improve it. In fact, every single one of the UDOT Quality of Life Framework Initiatives will be impaired, or even destroyed, if the I-15 expansion proceeds in accordance with any of the action alternatives.</p> <p>All the elements outlined in the Purpose And Need section will NOT be achieved by expanding I-15. As multiple past examples have shown, wider roads eventually lead to the same - or even worse - travel times, and increase incident* rates and decrease safety.</p> <p>The Wasatch Front is one of the most polluted airsheds on Earth, with horrific winter pollution episodes that look like those found in developing nations and summer episodes that turn the pristine valleys into smog chambers. This is important due to the Airshed Effect: when pollution is emitted in any part of an airshed, every other part of that airshed gets affected/harmed by the pollution. Much of this pollution - some estimates say up to 50% - is due to mobile sources (i.e. automobiles), which will only increase if I-15 is expanded. This is because vehicles also pollute via their tires, which cannot be mitigated with mere electrification of the vehicle fleet. https://e360.yale.edu/features/tire-pollution-toxic-chemicals</p> <p>photo 1</p> <p>I-15 also passes through West Valley City, which is widely regarded as an Environmental Justice (EJ) community now being examined by the federal EPA as such. A wider I-15 will further exacerbate the environmental disparities WVC faces and lead to no long-term economic benefits for it whatsoever. https://www.sltrib.com/news/2023/07/27/epa-confirms-environmental/</p> <p>I am appalled that the DEIS summary claims that expanding I-15 will not violate the NAAQS. For starters, the NAAQS are a sham; they are based on a section of the Clean Air Act that was knowingly enacted under false pretenses ("The Clean Air Act is based on the assumption, although we knew at the time it was inaccurate, that there is a threshold." [emphasis added] [1]) and do not represent scientific reality. Accordingly, they cannot be used as a reliable metric for gauging air pollution and the health damage therefrom. There is no safe level of air pollution, and the relationship between pollution levels and health outcomes is non-linear with the greatest health changes occurring at low levels of pollution (the slope of the curve is nearly zero - i.e. flat - at higher concentrations). Furthermore, much of the pollution emitted by motor vehicles is particulate matter, which is small enough to get embedded in cells and even (in the case of ultra-fine particulate matter) the nuclei thereof, where it cannot be removed and causes permanent cellular and genetic damage</p> <p>photos 2, 3, and 4</p> <p>Additionally, tires are now the leading source of microplastics in aquatic environments, which adversely affects the species therein and may violate the anti-jeopardy provisions of the Endangered Species Act. There is no remedy, other than ceasing the use of tired vehicles, that can completely redress the problem; however, investing in non-tired modes of transportation (walking, cycling, light rail, etc.) can reduce the severity of the problem.</p> <p>Lastly, the plans call for the installation of multiple sets of traffic signals at interchanges and intersections instead of roundabouts, which would make safety issues even worse without offering any acceptable justifications for not using roundabouts instead.</p> <p>The proposed I-15 expansion is an expensive and polluting boondoggle that nobody wants or needs, and I urge UDoT and all cooperating agencies to reject this egregious plan and select the No-Action Alternative as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS</p> <p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.6 A</p>
EM29	Crystal Beutler	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I will be out of the Country during the open houses and hearings. I request that a study be done to add a sound wall just South of the Parrish Lane exit. I live in the Peter Walton development behind Dave's Auto.</p> <p>There are a lot of homes behind the industrial area there. The sound from the freeway and the train is already unbearable at night. I have to wear earplugs to sleep and even with that, it is still so loud. Adding another lane of traffic will make the noise much worse.</p> <p>In addition, the dust that blows from the freeway is really bad. I am constantly having to hose off my patio and windows. I'm a senior and I'm very concerned the dust and exhaust will impact my Health. I would move if i could afford it</p>	<p>9.1.6 9.3.7 B</p>
EM30	Molly Ann Swonger	<p>I am strongly opposed to the expansion of i15. I think we should focus on double stacking the front runner and improving other aspects of interchanges and public transit first.</p> <p>I would site increased vehicle use and air pollution along with the impacts to an already heavily industrially burdened community.</p> <p>I do respect and appreciate the amount of community involvement and public hearing structure you are doing for this. I just wish this wouldn't be a mitigation(of harm) effort but one we could fully retool.</p> <p>With Mindfulness,</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM31	Eric Johnson	<p>Dear UDOT:</p> <p>Amphibian populations are declining worldwide, and amphibians are experiencing high extinction rates due to habitat loss, chytrid fungus, pollutants, pesticides and climate change. Amphibians are the most threatened class of vertebrates. As described in Section 2.3.4.1, I support the refinement of the alignment near 2100 North interchange in Salt Lake City to minimize impacts to aquatic resources. I also support the implementation of best management practices to minimize impacts to surface and groundwater quality. These measures could benefit amphibian populations.</p> <p>As described in Sections 3.12.3.4.2 and 3.12.4.3.2, Columbia spotted frogs were not located in the project area. Amphibian monitoring is recommended during and after construction to verify the presence or absence of Columbia spotted frogs and other amphibians in the project area.</p> <p>As described in Sections 3.12.3.5.1, 3.12.3.5.2, and 3.12.3.5.4, impacts to wetlands, streams, and open water ponds should be avoided where possible. These areas provide potential amphibian habitat.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS, I-15 Farmington to Salt Lake City.</p> <p>Eric Johnson Amphibian Refuge [Redacted] [Redacted]</p> <p>References: Catenazzi, A. 2015. State of the World's Amphibians. Annual Review of Environmental Resources, 40: 91-119. Collins, J.P., and M.L. Crump. 2009. Extinction in Our Times, Global Amphibian Decline. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Kolbert, E. 2014. The Sixth Extinction, an Unnatural History, Chapter 1. New York, NY: Bloomsbury. McCallum, M.L. 2007. Amphibian Decline or Extinction? Current Declines Dwarf Background Extinction Rate. Journal of Herpetology, Volume 41m Number 3, pp. 483-491.</p>	9.3.10 B
EM32	Layne Papenfuss	<p>If UDOT truly wants to maximize commuter capacity in surge periods each day, you would scrap the plan for reverse directional car lanes in the middle and do this: (Comment provided a link to a video that showed a train corridor in the highway median.)</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM33	Matt Monson	<p>Between the railroads and the I-15, East and West Salt Lake City are divided. These are remnants of redlining and segregation. We as a community are hard at work to heal that divide – and an expansion of the I-15 is just widening that gap. We talk of smarter, better transportation, but then show our true intentions in how we spend that money. The I-15 expansion plan should be put on a hard pause while other options are reconsidered.</p> <p>Here are a couple better ideas from a recent Building Salt Lake article that I fully endorse :</p> <p>Potential Ideas</p> <p>Bury I-15: Replace the aging I-15 viaduct with a cut-and-cover tunnel in Central Salt Lake City Extent could stretch from north of 600 N to south of Ballpark Create acres of space for housing, commercial uses, public services, parks, and public space.</p> <p>Reconsider freeway ramps: Reconstruct the 600 N interchange to be a safe and viable east-to-west crossing for all modes. Rebuild 500 S and 600 S to reduce intrusion and impact on the city. Reconsider the 500 S / 600 S interchange to reconnect the street grid over/under the highway and tracks while providing urban-scale freeway access. Remove the 900 S ramp to open land for public uses and development in the Ballpark/Central 9th neighborhood where the ramps consume 8+ acres.</p> <p>Thank you for (hopefully) taking these thoughts, and communities, into consideration.</p>	9.1.4 9.3.5 C
EM34	Kathryn Lindquist	<p>To the Powers that be at UDOT:</p> <p>Please do not destroy neighborhoods and uproot people so that you can lay more concrete. Faster movement on the freeway should not supersede human well-being. The crisis in northern Utah, especially in the Salt Lake region, is in affordable housing -- not how fast drivers can arrive at their destinations. Please put people's need for housing before your need to build and pave and destroy. Please do not expand I-15 between SLC through Bountiful.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM35	David Tate	<p>UDOT comes in to save us in the traffic world but yet makes a big mess of it then spends billions of dollars trying to fix it again. Example, Bangerter highway was to be a no light expressway in the beginning and now spending more now on bridges then what it would have cost to do the original plan. Legacy halfway completed on both ends, not really going anywhere to help the traffic flow. Can not access it in north salt lake and you made the Farmington interchange a traffic nightmare. Now you dump the corridor into my neighborhood that is not accessible to the north or south but we get the noise and bright lights from the overpasses. I am not sure if the steepness of the bridge meets federal guidelines and standards. Why is there not a way to get onto the corridor where it crosses Glovers land? That would help out at Parrish lane and traffic going north. To save billions of dollars is to get rid of the HOV lane, it is not what UDOT says how well it is working, If it is why are we adding lanes? Where is the third lane on Legacy? And the big question is how does the emergency service access the south bound of the corridor? How come there is not better access to legacy in North Salt Lake? access to I_15 along I-215 and make it a true alternative?</p> <p>When you say you are making the future better, you better get a reality check. When you destroy neighborhoods and that away from businesses. How is it getting better when less than 10 minutes will be added to my commute. You live in my neighborhood when the traffic is off the freeway to head north. and you are going to make it worse in my and my neighborhood thoughts and feelings.</p>	9.1.4
EM36	Isaac Myers	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I think 1 hour of traffic during rush hour is acceptable and does not warrant additional highway expansion.</p> <p>Thank you for doing all this work to create this EIS. I have read through the study and agree with its findings but do not agree with the assumption that the highway needs to be expanded. I am fine with the traffic models' no-action alternative.</p> <p>We are a young urban area and can learn from our predecessor's mistakes. There are few cities that have expanded highways and have fixed congestion in urban areas. Every city that expanded their highways needed additional expansion in the next 10-30 years. Urban areas that rely on only car transportation (Texas, CA) sacrifice so much for marginal benefits. A transportation plan that only develops transportation for cars will have traffic.</p> <p>Lets help the future generation by decoupling transportation from cars.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM37	Christina Mattson	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Thanks for giving us the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the i15 environmental impact study.</p> <p>We want to express our thanks for adding a new sound wall in our area. The wall was added because of the current West Davis Corridor project. It has already made a difference with the noise.</p> <p>I live in Centerville at [REDACTED] Drive. On the west side of our property it borders the frontage road that runs parallel to i15.</p> <p>We bought our home over 15 years ago and have been dealing with flooding issues from storms and spring runoff. There is a storm drain in front of our house and when it rains the water runs through a pipe and is dumped into our backyard which is an open field. There is also a small stream to the north of the Centerville Community Park and that stream will swell and cause flooding because it is an open stream without the infrastructure to support large amounts of runoff. There is also a "canal" that is to the west of our property that holds water and when full, that causes the flooding as well. So there are 3 sources of flooding we get: water from the storm drain, water from the creek, and from the "canal".</p> <p>We know there is a pipe that is under i15 to help with the drainage but it isn't effective in handling the water that can come when it storms. The opening for the pipe is full of weeds and debris.</p> <p>Whatever history the City of Centerville and the prior developer had with this property I am not sure. We have contacted Centerville City numerous times during the time we have lived here. We have tried to resolve the drainage/flooding issues and have offered suggestions for resolution but unfortunately they have refused to resolve the issue.</p> <p>Our suggestion would be to add the correct drainage/infrastructure or pipes, to all of the homes affected on Willow Valley Drive, that they will all connect and flow properly under i15. With what is being proposed for the coming i15 project the water drainage issues we are currently experiencing will need to be addressed.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact us with any further questions. We welcome any on-site visits to explain and show the issues we are dealing with.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and consideration</p>	9.3.9 A 9.1.6
EM38	Ryan Westergard	<p>I-15 EIS Team: Please see the attached Woods Cross City I-15 official comments as approved by the Mayor and City Council on October 17, 2023 (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	9.1.4 9.2.1 9.3.7 G

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM39	Dave Alderman	<p>My concern is with the assumptions used for the design. You have assumed that the growth in Salt Lake and Davis Counties will continue for the next few decades. Recent trends show that the growth is occurring because of people moving to Utah from other states. A large reason for this is the outdoor lifestyle.</p> <p>However, there is a growing probability that this growth will not continue, with one major reason being the decline and possible failure of the Great Salt Lake ecosystem. If the Lake dries up, dust particles will cause major health problems to those living near the lake, especially in Davis County.</p> <p>Do your models take into account the possibility of slowed growth due to the problems with the Great Salt Lake? And does your model show any significant contribution to the effects (positive or negative) if the Action Alternative is followed?</p> <p>Assuming the assumptions are correct, I do appreciate that bicyclists, pedestrians, and community linkages have been incorporated into the plan.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.7 9.2.2
EM40	Leah Smith	<p>Please do not expand I-15. Please invest the money into public transit options that can effectively carry more people with less environmental impact. The Utah State Legislature should not give UDOT a blank check for the project.</p> <p>I live in the area and will be greatly impacted by the expansion</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM41	Diane Memmott	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Farmington needs a NB onramp on 200 West, not just SB. 2. There should be sound walls installed all along I-15, the noise is horrendous. 3. Farmington residents have to put up with all these lanes of traffic crammed into a small area, but are not able to conveniently enter I-15 or West Davis Highway. <p>With future development of the hillsides starting in south Farmington, the NB onramps will be needed more than ever.</p>	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
EM42	Sarah Thompson	<p>Hello,</p> <p>This is causing much distress for my neighbors and our family. Our home is showing in a "green" zone and all of our neighbors. If this is the case will Utah be paying market value + due to inflation for our homes and displacing us?</p> <p>This also causes mental distress of relocating, finding/buying another home and a place to live.</p> <p>It also causes depreciation of our home if decided to keep our homes and we will never be able to sell again or at a significantly lower cost than what we purchased the home at.</p> <p>Please do not expand the freeway in the North Salt Lake area near Frontage road please....anywhere else.</p> <p>We do not support this and it will ruin any chance we have of building equity and having a chance at buying another home in Utah.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.2 C
EM43	Tyler Yeates	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>Increasing freeway capacity in other cities has increased use of the freeway such that over time, often only a short time, the benefit of reduced congestion is eliminated by increased overall use. UDOT should be focusing on improving mass transit to decrease highway congestion and fossil fuels in the valley.</p> <p>With our air pollution problem, freeway expansion is a mistake for public health.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM44	Kyle Stowell	<p>I appreciate your monthly/weekly email newsletters.</p> <p>I had seen a little media coverage on the Draft EIS for the Farmington to SLC I-15 rebuild, but hadn't paid much attention. I finally took a look at it, and have a concern.</p> <p>I live in Farmington, and work at the Big West Oil Refinery in North Salt Lake. The preferred alignment adds a full interchange just east across I-15 from the Chevron Refinery. I really like that. But it also calls for closing the exit at Center Street. I like having options. Limiting options is usually a bad thing when it comes to transportation. That new interchange is going to be really busy. More and more high density housing is being added right in that area. And it is not close to FrontRunner or other mass transit options. Keeping the Center Street exit will help reduce traffic pressure on that new interchange and give another option for those who live and work in the area.</p> <p>Anything you can do to talk to UDOT and encourage them to leave the Center Street exit intact would be appreciated.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM45	Jeff Tolman	<p>The proposed solution has both the north and south bound connection to Lagoon drive at the 4 way intersection. If the proposed connection to north and southbound lagoon drive was converted into an on ramp to northbound I15, it would provide a much needed access to I15 that does not exist for most of south Farmington and north Centerville.</p> <p>Then if the the southbound lagoon drive only had the option of entering I15 southbound it would solve for the access needed to Lagoon for those going north on I 15 and for those leaving Lagoon going south on 115. Those coming northbound on I15 going to Lagoon drive would have the same access as shown in the proposed plan.</p> <p>This option of having the southbound lagoon drive only have access to I15 southbound and then having a northbound access to I15 at the 4 way intersection would serve those who go to Lagoon and more importantly the Farmington residence who live south of state street in Farmington. It seems this option would not ad much cost to construct and it would provide an all year solution for south Farmington residence and support Lagoon patrons during the summer months. Please do not discount the value this will provide to the residence of Farmiington.</p> <p>If this doesn't make sense or if you have any questions, please call or email me</p>	9.1.4
EM46	Cathy Norton	<p>Please do not add anymore to our freeway system in Utah. More roads encourage more driving. Much of the past construction, and the obvious trials that come with the road construction, were not worth the delays the project caused. After completion the increased freeway size was nearly obsolete. We were left with more damage to surface roads, more pollution and less time and money for a savvy, attractive and alluring public transportation system. Using up our very limited space may make it more difficult when UDOT comes to the inevitable realization that the road space is needed for public transportation. Not only will we have to compete with the road work and the infrastructure that builds around it for public transportation, we will also have a larger challenge to clean our air and water, deal with overcrowding and contend with the hardship of growing social problems the roads drag in.</p> <p>Please use our engineering expertise and valuable minds to develop in a way that sustains not only our health but also vibrant commerce.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM47	Fraser Nelson	<p>Der All</p> <p>While I deeply appreciate the public hearing you have held, the critical element, which seems missing, is listening to the communities.</p> <p>No one in the communities most impacted wants this 1-15 expansion. I live in the Ballpark neighborhood, where I-15 has had a tremendously detrimental impact on the neighborhood.</p> <p>new roads only leads to more traffic, a lesson so well documented it seems backwards that Utah is even considering this.</p> <p>And wasnt Legacy Parkway supposed to take care if this?</p> <p>There is a reason west siders (and for that matter everyone who commented on the Gondola) - and I imagine most of Utah - dont trust UDOT. You dont;t listen and you and the legislature will do what you do. People don't really have a voice, our lungs, don't matter to you, our communities dont matter and untimely our lives don't matter.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing this comment, Hope you actually read it.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.7
EM48	Alan Arbuckle	<p>I have commuted from Davis County to the South Salt Lake City Area for employment for about 35 years. I drove my own vehicle most of those days using mainly I-15 to get to and from my workplace. Very rarely, I would ride Frontrunner and Trax and walk to my employment from the Trax Station because it would take an extra 2-3 hours each day to achieve this type of commute. I have watched the traffic jams and situations move from the 6th North Area, to Beck Street Area, to the 1-215 Interchange Area, and then further north into Centerville and Farmington going home. I exit I-15 at the Highway 89 interchange in Farmington, so I don't see or care much what happens after that. If you are going to improve and widen this road, please take the time now to widen it the maximum you can. Don't inconvenience us and other drivers just to put one extra lane on this important road. Put two extra lanes on this road.</p> <p>Another thing, let's get rid of the Express Lane. Since there isn't any law enforcement patrolling it, that lane is just another passing lane on the road. I watch cars go over the double white line like it was a dotted line all the time. People are pulling trailers in that lane. There is no enforcement, just people trying to drive fast and using it to weave in and out of other cars.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration, I like most of your ideas for the interchanges. Keep them simple.</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.7 9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM49	Terry Marasco	<p>1. Another data set that applies to my comment regarding holding the I15 expansion until all new data and conditions are considered is th NASA study regarding the desiccation of the Great Salt Lake. This study makes clear that the westside is targeted by toxic dust as noted herein:</p> <p>NASA DEVELOP National Program, Virtual Environmental Justice</p> <p>Project Synopsis by Terry Marasco, served on advisory team</p> <p>Great Salt Lake Health and Air Quality Monitoring Lakebed Exposure and its Impact on Air Quality and Environmental Hazards in the Great Salt Lake</p> <p>Watershed Water flow into the Great Salt Lake (GSL) has rapidly declined in recent years, and fifty percent of the lakebed is now exposed. This contributes to increased frequency and intensity of dust storms and poses a public health risk across northern Utah. The NASA DEVELOP team applied satellite-sourced data and demographic data to quantify air quality, lakebed exposure, and community vulnerability. Deliverables supported the Utah Division of Air Quality and Utah Division of Forestry, Fires, and State Lands by informing targeted air monitoring, lakebed management practices, and GSL advocacy. The team found that increasing lakebed exposure correlated with elevated dust levels</p> <p>Summary: The findings revealed that declining lake levels are associated with an increase in intensity of dust events, and these dust events will particularly impact residents of Tooele County and the west side of Salt Lake City. Project resources support partner needs by informing targeted air monitoring efforts, lakebed management practices, and advocacy efforts for GSL stewardship.</p> <p>A map of the united states</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>A map of a city</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>PM2.5 Vulnerability - The above notes PM2.5 in dust, darker color indicates more vulnerability PM2.5 is 2.5 Microns of particles. Short-term exposures (up to 24-hours duration) have been associated with premature mortality, increased hospital admissions for heart or lung causes, acute and chronic bronchitis, asthma attacks, emergency room visits, respiratory symptoms, and restricted activity days.</p> <p>Note councils in darker colors-most vulnerable</p> <p>A map of a neighborhood</p> <p>Description automatically generated</p> <p>Nitrous Oxide Vulnerability Health effects - Breathing air with a high concentration of NO2 can irritate airways in the human respiratory system. Such exposures over short periods can aggravate respiratory diseases, particularly asthma, leading to respiratory symptoms (such as coughing, wheezing or difficulty breathing), hospital admissions and visits to emergency rooms. Longer exposures to elevated concentrations of NO2 may contribute to the development of asthma and potentially increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. People with asthma, as well as children and the elderly are generally at greater risk for the health effects of NO2.</p> <p>NO2 along with other NOx reacts with other chemicals in the air to form both particulate matter and ozone. Both of these are also harmful when inhaled due to effects on the respiratory system.</p> <p>Note how historical redlining overlays the most vulnerable communities.</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.3.6 C</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM50	Greg Stewart	<p>Please accept the following comments into the project public comment.</p> <p>South Davis Metro Fire Service Area 10/24/2023</p> <p>UDOT Public Comment 800 West 2600 South, Woods Cross</p> <p>During this public comment phase regarding preferred alternatives, South Davis Metro Fire Service Area would like to make comment on changes to 2600 South area of the project. We have two main concerns in this area.</p> <p>The 800 west diversion under I-15 creates difficulty for responding units to access the south east side of Woods Cross City. This would create two additional intersection exposures for our units to navigate while responding to high occupancy buildings namely, Hampton Inn and Motel 6. Similar problems exist for our units responding to residential areas in the south east portion of Woods Cross. Historically this was a simple response from 2600 S to 800 W.</p> <p>Another concern in this area is the added pressure that will be added to Wildcat Way. This is a frequent area of auto accidents with the additional concern of less experienced drivers making their way to the high school.</p> <p>Given the above concerns we would be impacted as an emergency response agency in this area.</p> <p>South Davis Metro Fire Service Area 10/24/2023</p> <p>UDOT Public Comment I-15 South Bound Exit Center Street North Salt Lake</p> <p>During this public comment phase regarding preferred alternatives, South Davis Metro Fire Service Area would like to make comment on the elimination of South Bound Exit 314 (Center Street North Salt Lake).</p> <p>The elimination of Exit 314 creates challenges for us responding to the industrial areas in North Salt Lake west of I-15. High risk areas such as refineries, regional Fed Ex hub and a large variety of private industry require additional response units from our agency and mutual aid agencies. By eliminating this exit, it will add additional response time to these high target hazard areas of our response area.</p> <p>The elimination of Exit 314 also creates challenges for us responding to high population density areas of North Salt Lake. This area of North Salt Lake contains many apartment and condo complexes. These residential occupancies create a frequent EMS impact as well as fire potential in these buildings. The elimination of this Center Street access would create challenges of access for additional units responding to fires and other emergencies at these high occupant locations.</p> <p>Given the above concerns we would be impacted as an emergency response agency in this area.</p>	9.1.4 9.2.1
EM51	Corey Andrews	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm pretty sure I've already submitted a comment, so I just wanted to add. I know the over goal is help the community at large, but with the closing of exit 314, and adding all the other traffic in both options of my commute, it will add probably 5-10 minutes to my commute. So it does not improve my quality of life and travel to my workplace.</p> <p>With improvements done to US89 and speed limit changes to Lloyd Rd. My quality of life in my neighborhood is disrupted also. My neighbors and I have been discussing the speeding problem with our city office. But they are saying that it was UDOT that changed the speed. Across the highway on Mountain Rd the speed limit remains the same at 25 mph. Why would Lloyd Rd be any different? And very rarely do travelers stop at the stupid cross over lane from Lloyd Rd to the Main Street off ramp.</p> <p>I've submitted comments and suggestions for SB off ramp to Main Street. It's just frustrating to go through the proper channels only to be dismissed so quickly.</p> <p>I would also hope the budget for material used for the roadway itself would remain the same as the Salt Lake and Utah counties. I love my community and proud of where I live. I also hate feeling like an after thought or inferior to the other counties. Why is they're budget for concrete corridors different from Davis county?</p> <p>Anyway if you look at any of my other posts or comments on your pages you'll know I have no trust in our government and government agencies and UDOT is no different, because you going to do what you do and the "public comment" only make you look good like you tried to get our input.</p>	9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7
EM52	Elizabeth Buehler	Can I have further information regarding why wall 21 is not being raised to 17 feet? I'm having trouble interpreting the data in the Noise Impact appendix	9.3.7 C
EM53	Hailey Wall	We can never outbuild the demand for more driving lanes – if you build it they will come, so please STOP expanding the freeway and expand transit options instead!!! Transit supports people from all walks of life, the poor, the elderly, the physically disadvantaged, not just those that have the resources and abilities to drive cars AND it is better for our air quality – we all breathe. Please consider how this affects neighborhoods, viewsheds, noise, etc. We can and should get by without taking up more valuable resources for one of the most resource inefficient transportation modes out there. More capacity means more cars on the road, which need more places to park, which means more hardscape and taking up room that could be used for people, plants & animals for cars. We can do better than this. If it is less convenient to drive people will start supporting transit in a virtuous cycle that can only improve the quality of life for everyone here in Utah. All people deserve options when choosing their mode of transportation, and as long as we continue to disproportionately invest in auto infrastructure, we will never have truly viable options for those who would like to take transit or active transportation modes but cannot due to practical considerations (time, distance to and from stops, etc.)	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
EM54	Kathryn Josephs	<p>More lanes means more drivers and more environmental impacts.</p> <p>It's proven. Just stop repeating the same mistakes other cities have made.</p> <p>Put it more bike lanes and make public transit more usable.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM55	Oriah Knorr	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Utah has some great freeways, but they are big enough. SLC, my home for 25 years, has made enormous progress providing transportation alternatives to the car to give Americans more freedom and equity. The state could spend the billions of dollars proposed for widening the freeway to build transit alternatives to driving along the northern corridor to get commuters out of their cars. The 1 additional lane will only reduce traffic for a few years before traffic is back to its current levels, this effect, induced demand, has been well documented. Please do not incentive people to drive and pollute our already bad air more, while destroying houses and wasting billions of dollars.</p> <p>Thanks you</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6</p>
EM56	Pat Annoni	Expanding I-15 exacerbates the challenges of climate change and worsens air quality by increasing greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging more fossil fuel-dependent transportation, while doing little to solve the congestion issue.	<p>9.1.1 9.1.6</p>
EM57	Chad Boshell	<p>Dear I-15 EIS Team,</p> <p>I have reviewed the draft environmental impact statement for the areas affecting Farmington City and have the following comments:</p> <p>On page 280 how is it possible that monitoring locations ML-3 through ML-6 do not see an increase in noise when projected vehicle volumes are increasing and no sound walls are being proposed. There seems to be something wrong in your evaluation. These areas will definitely be impacted and sound walls should be considered.</p> <p>On page 288 Table 3.9-4 proposed barrier 1 and 3 should both be considered and recommended for balloting.</p> <p>Existing barrier 4 south of Glovers Lane is a landscaped berm and wall and should be replaced with equal or better berm and wall.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>9.3.7 D</p>
EM58	Kristin Urry	This whole idea is ridiculous, why is trax expansion not happening in this valley? Continuing to build more and more freeways results in what is most of California!can you give me an answer as to why mass transit expansion is not being considered to deal with this issue? At least, in most of California, there was room to expand the freeway system. There is NO more room in this valley, we continue to build and build and build with no green space or urban planning occurring. My family is in LA and I've been trying to move there for the last 3 years. As soon as real estate becomes more affordable, I will be leaving this state which I have lived in for 40 years. The air quality is better in LA and people are actually leaving and coming to SLC and other mid size cities. What does that mean? Wasangeles!	<p>9.1.1 9.1.3 9.1.6</p>
EM59	G Alex Taft	Widening highways predicts a mythical future that has never existed. Switch your efforts to increasing transit infrastructure, supporting in-town development and ending your support of sprawl. Btw lower the speed from 70 to 60 in the city. So many have commented to me on how dangerous the highway is.	<p>9.1.1 9.1.3</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM60	Lilah Rosenfield	<p>I-15 EIS study team,</p> <p>I am submitting the following comment on my own behalf and not on behalf of any current or former employers, nor on behalf of any other organization with which I am affiliated.</p> <p>The stated purpose of the I-15 project is stated to be fourfold: Improve Safety, Better Connect Communities, Strengthen the Economy and Improve Mobility for All Modes.</p> <p>To fulfill these requirements UDOT has identified its preferred alternative as reconstructing I-15, making targeted improvements to on- and offramps, interchanges and crossings, as well as constructing one additional lane though the entire study area.</p> <p>At the same time, UDOT has stated it is committed to an all-users approach, whereby the needs of all users, not just private automotive and freight traffic, are considered in the transportation planning process. Nevertheless, the vehicular throughput of the I-15 corridor within the study area is already far greater than all other modes combined, and this disparity will become even wider upon completion of the project. While it might be argued that this matches mode-share demands, the preferred mode-share leaning so heavily towards the automobile is not an inevitability, and targeted investment in other forms of infrastructure do have the capability of shifting mode-share. We can reduce automotive demand on the I-15 corridor, instead of inducing further demand by widening the corridor further.</p> <p>UDOT has stated that the modeled outcome which demonstrates the need for an additional lane incorporates all transit and active transportation projects identified in WFRC's 2050 RTP (including Frontrunner Strategic Double Tracking and the South Davis Corridor Enhanced Bus Line). Despite the inherent limitations of modeling a complex region such as the Wasatch Front, I nevertheless have no doubt this is true. However, an all users approach requires going beyond simply finding that the currently planned transit & active transportation projects are insufficient to meet demand. Instead, UDOT must proactively seek an all users solution that will spread demand across modes.</p> <p>In the case of I-15, this means that UDOT must, at the very least, evaluate an alternative which fulfills all purposes not related to travel delay (improved safety, better connection to communities, infrastructure replacement, improved mobility and operations on mainline, interchanges and connected roadways) though an in-place infrastructure replacement that maintains or narrows the footprint of the motorway, keeping the current 4+1 lane configuration while implementing interchange, underpass and connected roadway improvements.</p> <p>This alternative should then address any travel demand caused by growth in the study area through transit, active transportation, and traffic diversion programs. To fulfill such demand, UDOT might consider the following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A full double-track with strategic triple track of the frontrunner to allow 10- minute headways (1.5+ millihertz frequency) 2. Creating a Davis County Trax line on the previously preserved Denver & Rio Grande Western Railway corridor, connected to Salt Lake City via Redwood Road, 300 West or an elevated segment along the I-15 corridor within the study area (constructed simultaneously with the in-place reconstruction of the roadway). 3. A strategic grade separation of UT-30, potentially with a westward extension connecting to I-15 in Portage to encourage southwestbound freight traffic from Idaho to avoid the Wasatch Front metroplex entirely by passing north around the Great Salt Lake. <p>Taken together, these projects may well be more expensive than the initially considered cost of simply adding two more lanes as part of a freeway reconstruction. But unlike said reconstruction, these projects (along with others that may be considered as part of this alternative) will ensure a sustainable mix of transportation options for centuries to come, limiting damage to the surrounding communities, and ensuring that UDOT will not have to implement even more costly projects (like stacking or undergrounding the I-15 Mainline, Widening I-215, or tunneling through the east bench) in the future.</p> <p>Evaluating an in-place reconstruction alternative with advanced transit to provide capacity would go a long way in assuring Utahns that UDOT is truly aligned with the all users approach, and ensure that all alternatives have been considered.</p> <p>Best,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p>
EM61	Erica Bindas	<p>In reviewing the DEIS, I have the following comments:</p> <p>I am in favor of maintaining and updating aging infrastructure! It is important that our roads are in safe condition for not only motorists but pedestrians, cyclists, nearby homeowners, and nearby businesses.</p> <p>I am pleased to see so much community feedback incorporated into the new plan, such as the addition of bike and pedestrian infrastructure</p> <p>For this plan to be equitable and justice-minded, we need to get the number of homes affected by relation and acquisition down to zero! Please consider further reductions in the scope of the highway expansion to allow people to keep their homes and businesses.</p> <p>As a state that values the health and well-being of its residents, the impact to air quality is absolutely unacceptable. The study indicates that tightening fuel and emission standards are expected to improve the overall air quality between now and 2050, and yet the study finds that the proposed action will result in ultimately worse air quality. We cannot be squandering the improvements being made in automotive and fuel technologies if we want to make Utah a sustainable and safe place for our kids to grow up. I would like to see the committee take these impacts more seriously and propose a plan that does not increase the amount of pollutants in our air when compared to no action being taken.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.2.2</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
()EM62	Kristin Riker	Good morning- I am reaching out to share some thoughts and ideas for the proposed 500 North underpass. Thank you for reviewing the attached letter to express potential opportunities for improving access to outdoor recreation in Salt Lake City. Best, Kristin (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.5
EM63	Tyler Haroldsen	Hello, I'd like to provide commentary on the action and no-action alternatives proposed. I support the no-action alternative, as I do not have confidence that an additional lane in each direction will properly address increased travel demand, and I do not have great confidence in the WFRC travel demand models. A far better alternative, in my opinion, would be to spend the billions on increasing the viability of other transportation options. This could be done in a number of ways, I would start by increasing the frequency of frontrunner trips, increasing public transit access and speed and increasing safety for those walking and biking on UDOT-managed city streets. If UDOT makes driving alternatives quicker, more pleasant, and more useful, fewer people will drive on I-15 and the theoretical traffic speed problems will not occur. I will also share a personal experience I'm looking at currently. I am currently considering moving jobs and was looking at transit options to see if I could take transit instead of driving on I-15 to a potential employer. I could take frontrunner and arrive about 3 blocks from the building, but those three blocks are separated by a massive, UDOT managed road and two other large city roads which would be extremely uncomfortable and dangerous to be near or to cross on a bike or on foot, primarily due to the fast speed of the cars and the large number of lanes (and thus crossing distance). I could take busses the three blocks if I was worried about safety, but they only come every half hour (if they're on schedule) and I'd still have to cross the large, expensive, and unsafe UDOT road at least once. For this reason, I will likely drive if I end up working there, despite the fact that i would much prefer to take a train to my work. I hope the no-action alternative is chosen and that the money is used to promote better public transportation, biking, and walking. Thanks for your time.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM64	Courtney Hoover	Please see attached for DOI's comments. If you have any questions, please reach out. Thank you! (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.3.13 A 9.3.14 A
EM65	Jory Johner	Please find attached WFRCs comments on the I-15 Farmington to Salt Lake City Draft EIS. Thank you for working for multiple years with WFRC and the communities within this study area. Looking forward to continued partnership and coordination. (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.4 A 9.4 G
EM66	Randy Farnsworth	I appreciate UDOT trying hard to keep the roads maintained in our state. However, I have very strong concerns about spending so much money to once again rebuild a freeway that will once again be too small not long after it's finished. Please reconsider this entire project. If you put in adequate mass transit, it would take much of the traffic off the freeway, and you'd only need to repair/replace the bridges and then maintain the road surface. It's ridiculous that you spend so much money continually rebuilding roads when you could upgrade the mass transit system to accomplish the same thing. Why don't you do something truly innovative: put in a world class transit system first, then see how many roads need to be rebuilt. Transit works very well in cities all over the world. But you need to put transit as your first priority, and roads second. You are the Dept of TRANSPORTATION, not the Dept of ROAD BUILDING. And transportation includes ALL modes, most importantly TRANSIT. Yes we need roads, but we need transit first. Secondly, your crazy idea of rerouting the southbound freeway off-ramp at Woods Cross onto the east side just won't work. The current underpass is already incredibly clumsy. Your new under-the-freeway tunnel idea might help some people who are going east on 2600 S, but most of the residential and commercial growth is happening on the west side. To have people go east and then turn back to the west is just absurd. This is crazy not just for residents, but especially for the heavy truck traffic that will be routed east under the freeway, then make a U-turn back to the west. And there is a LOT of heavy truck traffic. That idea won't work!	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.2.1
EM67	Eric Ewert	Freeway Expansions Have Failed to Improve Traffic Congestion in Other Cities; Freeways Create Urban Sprawl: UDOT's Value System Doesn't Reflect the Public's Value System; Expanding Freeways Contributes to the Climate Crisis; Freeways are Major Contributors to Air Pollution in Multiple Ways and Increase Urban Heat; Freeways are Not the Solution and they are a Poor Return on Investment.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM68	Dewey Reagan	<p>Tiffany and UDOT I-15 EIS Team Members,</p> <p>Thank you for reviewing the current construction plan incorporated in the: I-15; Farmington to Salt Lake City, Environmental Impact Study with Reagan Outdoor Advertising's staff. On behalf of our staff, I express appreciation for teaching us how to use the tools demonstrating the impacts to Reagan's Billboards and Real Property Parcels, then subsequently meeting with us in person to learn about Reagan's concerns.</p> <p>Should this construction plan be implemented, Reagan will have eighteen (18) Billboards and three (3) large Parcels of Real Property impacted to various extents. Required actions will include: Relocations, Condemnations and Access Changes. In some instances, all of these actions will be required (SEE ATTACHMENT).</p> <p>Implementation of these measures will be very expensive for the Tax Payers of the great state of Utah.</p> <p>Moving forward, Reagan hopes it can continue to collaborate with UDOT, creating an "Eminent Domain Reduction Plan" for this project. The purpose of the plan being to reduce to the greatest extent possible, both UDOT's need to relocate or condemn Reagan's Billboards and also acquire Reagan's Real Property through purchase or condemnation.</p> <p>Reagan looks forward to continuing the communication on this matter in the near future.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dewey A. Reagan G.M Reagan Outdoor Advertising Utah CC: Carmen Swanwick, Carlos Braceras Enclosures: Reagan Outdoor's Impact Description & Portions of UDOT's Impact Map (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	9.1.6
EM69	Cherish Clark	<p>Remove the blender zones on 600 N where cars changing into right turn lanes must cross a bike lane. The bike lane should be adjacent to the pedestrian path to increase cyclist safety.</p> <p>Cyclists and pedestrians need protection from cars to cross the ramps. In order to achieve this there should be a signal (or multiple signals) that pedestrians and cyclists can easily activate that would stop cars from turning onto the ramp so that these users can cross safely. Something like a lead pedestrian interval. Extra effort in the design should be applied to prevent cars from turning right on red in this situation. I think both of these recommendations are essential if the UDOT wants this to be a crossing people will actually use.</p> <p>Right now my neighborhood (Fairpark) experiences sound pollution because the 600 N overpass lacks adequate noise abatement. The 600 N overpass needs to have noise barriers that are installed all along the ramps and the sloping portions of 600 N. This would be different from the current design which has noise barriers at a lower elevation bordering residential properties.</p> <p>A noise barrier needs to be added to the North Temple Bridge. Sound from this area also creates a great deal of noise pollution.</p> <p>The current policy for placing and measuring receivers for measure noise abatement impact is inadequate. My neighborhood (Fairpark) is unique from others in that we are completely surrounded by state highways. My entire neighborhood experiences extreme noise pollution, not just the areas adjacent to the highway. This is further exacerbated in the winter when cooler temperatures force sound waves in a downward direction, concentrating them to the floor of my neighborhood. Please visit my neighborhood on a weekday morning in the middle of winter and experience the roar we hear from these highways. There should be receivers placed throughout the neighborhood, at least a mile away from the highways. Receivers should be measured during multiple seasons, especially winter when the noise pollution is worse.</p> <p>We need additional connectivity and the 400 N underpass should be included. The west side of i15 is economically devastated by the highway and any opportunity to increase connectivity should be implemented.</p>	9.1.4 9.1.5 9.3.5 C 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B
EM70	Glen Mikkelsen	<p>I want to share my thoughts on the I15 expansion project planning.</p> <p>At the present time there is the Legacy Highway, the Union Pacific Railroad, the front runner and I-15 running parallel for several miles. The four means of transportation are less than 200 yards from I-15 to the west of the Legacy Highway.</p> <p>Just this summer there was derailment of a train in Ohio that was loaded with hazardous product and started a fire that couldn't be put out for several days. If that was to happen on UP tracks there would be no flow of traffic in either direction What would that do to the traffic going both directions, for SEVERAL DAYS??</p> <p>My thought is to build a NEW freeway west of Legacy at least one mile.</p> <p>This is from Glen Mikkelsen [REDACTED] Woods Cross, UT 84087</p> <p>Our back property line is the west sound wall of I-15.</p>	9.1.3

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM71	Cherish Clark	<p>I am writing this email to demand that UDOT add additional connectivity in Salt Lake City despite the "pushback" received from the "community". UDOT must add the 400 N underpass or any other method to increase vehicle-free or vehicle-protected east/west connectivity for non-vehicle users. This type of connectivity is greatly needed in any location north of 300 N.</p> <p>The current process of relying on community meetings, poorly advertised pop-ups, and workshops with a handful of "stakeholders" is objectively not representative of all those who are affected by this decision.</p> <p>This process only represents people who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are aware the underpass is an option on the table. Strongly oppose the underpass. Have the time, resources, and knowledge to get their voices heard. <p>The current process does not represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People who do not know this underpass is an option, let alone a topic of debate. People who do not have the time, means, resources, or knowledge to have their voices heard. People who are afraid to damage working relationships in the community by openly voicing their views. <p>The future residents of this community.</p> <p>I have met with neighbors on 700 W directly adjacent to the potential 400 N underpass and they had no idea that was an option on the table. These neighbors support the additional connectivity, but will their voices be represented? Their next-door neighbor is battling cancer. Do they have the ability to attend public meetings or fill out comments on UDOT's EIS website?</p> <p>The problem we face is simply too important to leave to a handful of vocal constituents. This is a decision that impacts future generations of Salt Lake City. We will not have another opportunity to create additional connectivity for many, many years. Will we have to wait for another highway expansion to add this connectivity? How many of us today will still be around for that?</p> <p>This decision impacts more than the Fairpark neighborhood. Those who live in Rose Park are impacted. Rose Park is a neighborhood that currently has zero pedestrian or cyclist friendly connections to the east side and must travel to 300 N. Those who live on the east side of the I-15 are impacted. For many on the east side of I-15, the Smiths on 600 N is the closest grocery store. There are people on the east side of the city who want to access our amenities such as our parks, the Jordan River Trail, our unique restaurants, and our excellent Northwest County Rec Center. Are these voices represented?</p> <p>The reason there is opposition to this underpass rests squarely on the shoulders of the city and the state. Those opposed to the underpass have every right to worry they will deal with additional homelessness, crime, and dangerous traffic. Just look at what has become of North Temple, the Folsom Trail, and the Jordan River Trail behind the Fairgrounds. Look at how underinvested the west side is in lighting, traffic calming, and amenities. We have been given very little reason to trust that the city and the state will do the right things to take care of us and protect us. Yet all of these problems are made worse due to the lack of connectivity between the east side and west side of the city.</p> <p>This is UDOT's chance to step up and do the right thing. We need the state to actively tear down walls and end this tale of two cities in which we live as a result of the I-15.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>9.1.5 9.1.6 9.3.5 C</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM72	Keiki Jones	<p>Dear People at UDOT:</p> <p>I am reaching out to ask NOT to construct an underpass at 400 North in Salt Lake City.</p> <p>I live in the neighborhood, about half a block away from this location, and this will directly impact my daily life.</p> <p>We already have an underpass a block south at 300 North. And there is already a plan to improve 300 North throughout. 400 North is not a thoroughfare. It gets blocked by the trains at 500 West whereas 300 North just had a pedestrian bridge completed over the railroad tracks. There are no traffic lights on 400 North, and it is safer for pedestrians and bikers to use 300 North.</p> <p>Sounds like the city has eliminated vehicle use for the 400 North underpass (if there is such a thing). Some city council members are considering opening 400 North wide enough to put restaurants, pickleball courts, park, or anything that sounds enticing. But they are all bad ideas.</p> <p>This so-called underpass will open up to the very narrow streets north and south at the mouth. In other words, whatever they want to put there, whether it's a restaurant, pickleball courts, homeless tents, etc. will be in someone's front yard/backyard. Who would want to live with a crowd hanging at all hours right outside your home?</p> <p>If you look around, there is no "nice underpass" in the city. One person who lives in Poplar Grove said, "Under the freeway at 900 South is nice." But the freeway has a different structure there, and it's not in someone's front yard.</p> <p>The mayor of Salt Lake City and the city council members say they are against the I-15 expansion. But they are doing exactly the same thing to this neighborhood as the state of Utah is doing to us. As the I-15 expansion is concerned, you are making it a little more convenient for some commuters at the expense of this neighborhood. If they are truly against it, what makes them think it's ok to make it a little more convenient (just one block!) for some passersby at the expense of this neighborhood? We are already impacted hugely by the expansion. We don't need people to decide what THEY want in OUR neighborhood.</p> <p>Please listen to the people who live in close proximity.</p> <p>I don't know who I should be contacting. I've already sent an email to Smart Growth America and the city. But the city council woman, who was pushing for this underpass, told me it's a state issue and that they don't have any control over it. So who is deciding?!</p> <p>Thanks for reading.</p>	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
EM73	Florence Farnsworth	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I attended the Open House Oct. 18 at the South Davis Rec Center. I appreciate being able to see on a computer how the interchanges look now and how they will look after the proposed changes. I was mostly interested in the Centerville area changes. I am especially excited to see the pedestrian and bike path over the freeway in north Centerville.</p> <p>Thank you for the excellent work done.</p>	9.2.2
EM74	Linda F Smith	<p>Hello Utah Department of Transportation,</p> <p>I am submitting this comment regarding the EIS for I-15.</p> <p>I agree that appropriated funds should be spent to improve the safety of I-15 and address the need for repairs. I also agree that added bike lanes and walkways adjacent to I-15 are valuable additions. I am glad that the final plans have eliminated the need to condemn homes on the West Side of Salt Lake City.</p> <p>However, I am OPPOSED to the widening of I-15.</p> <p>Studies and experiences in other cities have shown that building wider highways does not permanently address the issue of too much traffic and traffic bottlenecks. Instead, "if you build it, they will come." Additional vehicles take to the roads when the roads are widened to accommodate more traffic. It is not possible to build our way out of over-crowded highways.</p> <p>The additional vehicular traffic will produce further air pollution for the West Side of Salt Lake City and will over-burden SLC's parking capacity.</p> <p>It is excellent that Front Runner will be double-tracked, improving public transportation and safety.</p> <p>MORE focus on public transportation is the only solution to too much vehicular traffic on our freeways.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM75	Josh Hancey	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I was able to attend the public meeting at the rev center and enjoyed a thorough conversation with the sound engineer.</p> <p>Two main comments related to freeway sound;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. want to express my support and interest in the tallest sound wall feasible (16' or greater) for the glovers lane and south 'rebuild'. I understand in the newest version of the plan there will be a "completion" of the sound wall where it currently stops short of glovers overpass. The noise (as you saw from the DB reader) is so intense in our neighborhood it is frequently difficult to have an outdoor conversation 2. Very supportive and in favor of quiet pavement solutions whether asphalt or concrete with quieter tining (perhaps north south vs east / west) <p>Thank you so much for your consideration</p>	<p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.3.7 A</p> <p>9.3.7 B</p>
EM76	Chelsea Howard	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Want to make my voice heard on the sound in Farmington.</p> <p>I would very much appreciate a sound wall from Glover's lane and south to where the sound wall currently ends. I also am in favor of building a tall wall (like Centerville's) to more adequately block the sound in our neighborhoods.</p> <p>When you walk over the glovers lane over pass you can really tell the difference in how loud it is on the east side versus the west side. We need some help in these neighborhoods on the east side.</p> <p>At the very least, using asphalt or a better concrete would also be very beneficial for all.</p> <p>Thanks for taking my opinion, with many of my neighbors agreeing with me, into consideration.</p>	<p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.3.7 A</p> <p>9.3.7 B</p>
EM77	Sean Slack	<p>While I appreciate the expansion and preferred alternative, I am in opposition to any expansion of I-15 in this section of the city. First, there is no indication for this other than desire by UDOT to facilitate big business and further the pollution woes faced in the northwest quadrant. Interstate expansion should be representative of the citizens, not government handouts like the inland ports. Displacing our west side resident who are already under represented is not an equitable use of UDOT resources.</p> <p>Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, UDOT is proving to be a bully to push through special interest projects instead of doing it's primary job of providing safe roads for the citizens of the state and this needs to stop.</p> <p>Thank You,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.1.7</p>
EM78	Joan Entwistle	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>I am a retired person who moved to Utah for its beauty and wonderful people. Though I am continuously amazed by Utah, the experience is dampened by the smog and pollution. I am worried about the impact of a warming climate causing more high heat days. Already I reduce my trips to visit communities in the Salt Lake valley due to these factors. PM2.5 and ozone exacerbate my health conditions. Expanding I-15 will clearly not solve our pollution issues in Utah. As a previous resident of another growing city, I saw newly expanded highways quickly filled up with even more traffic and more pollution. Even electric cars will still produce almost as much PM 2.5, considering increased road and tire wear, so doubling the number of vehicles will double the PM 2.5 and microparticles. This pollution has a life-long negative impact on the health and those exposed, especially children who live in the neighborhoods around the highway. I am opposed to sacrificing the health of our communities for the convenience of drivers.</p> <p>The money for this project should go towards expanding transit and rail. I try to use transit to go places, but often it does not go where I need to go. If Utah can solve its environmental problems and continue to grow, more modern transit will do much to support a thriving economy.</p> <p>Please do not expand I-15!</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.6</p>
EM79	Kathleen Boynton	Object to the concept of increasing traffic in Salt Lake City	9.1.2
EM80	Robert J Ellis	<p>After reviewing the proposed changes to I-15 at 2600 South and 800 West from the digital images on line, I feel it is an undesirable and confusing change, and I am very much against it! It is NOT in the best interests of the citizens using 800 West and 2600 South, nor the businesses located there.</p> <p>In 1951, my father owned and farmed 55 acres of land west of 800 West and north of 2600 South where the tank farm is now located. He was told by the "powers that then existed" they were taking our land for the betterment of the state and he could accept a pittance of its value or it would be condemned and taken anyway. It nearly bankrupted our family!</p> <p>It's not right that governmental agencies force changes (and your will) upon those of us without means or resources to prevent them. I am opposed to these changes.</p>	<p>9.1.4</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.2.1</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM81	Matthew Morriss	Hello, I wanted to leave my public comment with regards to the proposed I15 expansion. I do not believe that the proposed expansion will help Utah's economy, its people, nor its environment. I would challenge UDOT to think outside of the highway widening framework and consider options other than building car centric infrastructure. Consider additional train infrastructure and trax like lines through davis county; rapid bus deployment, and carpooling incentives before spending a large deposit of money on a highway widening project - which is well known to only increase congestion. Best Wishes,	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
EM82	Spirit Lipovich-Read	Hello, please don't go forward with the I-15 expansion plan. I live in Rose Park on the same block as Guadalupe park and this would take away my house. It would also ruin a beautiful coffee place, a community garden, a Mexican imports store and a Boys & Girls Club building. We don't need more highway we need to keep our neighbor whole.	9.1.1 9.1.6
EM83		This expansion is cruel and any company should be ashamed to force people from their homes. I just wanted to let it be known that a community member, like many others am voicing against this.	9.1.6
EM84	Elizabeth Buehler	I'd like UDOT to reconsider the planned sound wall height that borders the Guadalupe neighborhood from North Temple to 600 N. While additional 3 feet won't effect the decibals for the apartments taller than the freeway. The extra height will reduce the sound by 10 decibels for the others in the neighborhood, as shown in your study. 10 decibels in constant noise is a big difference for quality of life for those in the neighborhood. Thank you	9.3.7 B 9.3.7 C
EM85	Ken Garner	Thank you for taking public comments, and thank you for prioritizing bike lanes. I grew up in this area and still have family there. I also use I-15 to travel for work. My only comment is to please expand light rail into Bountiful and Centerville BEFORE expanding I-15. Since Light rail can nearly take as many people per hour as a freeway lane, I think that should be the first option, and delay I-15 expansion for a few years. thanks,	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM86	Ryan Barker	<p>Hello!</p> <p>My comments relate specifically to the Centerville area aspects of the plan and are colored by my experience living next to the 89 project before I moved to Centerville.</p> <p>The shifting of the Frontage Road east will be very high impact on residents of Centerville before and after the construction.</p> <p>The proposed course of the road puts it on top of several wetland areas, ponds, and stormwater retention basins in very high water level areas that will require intense backfill, compaction, etc. of the road base before the new road can be installed. This will take place very close to residents' homes and the temporary easement maps make it appear that you will be taking fences down as part of this, making it impossible for residents with dogs or children to actually utilize their backyards in the way they are used to.</p> <p>The frontage road through Fruit Heights for the 89 project was "built to plan" and residents were given various timelines, road elevations, etc. that ultimately led to them needing to drive on a one-lane dirt road for over a year, even during the winter. While Frontage Road in Fruit Heights didn't have many users, Centerville only has a few major arteries to get people to freeway entrances, and with new housing developments on the north end of Centerville, putting the Frontage Road out of commission for any length of time creates huge increases in commute times and congestion on other surface streets. This is easily observable looking at unsafe driving practices on residential roads when Frontage Road has been closed to accommodate the onramp from the West Davis corridor being built.</p> <p>If the Frontage road absolutely has to be moved. Please pave the new road first before tearing out the old one.</p> <p>The wetland and runoff areas where the road is supposed to be placed are essential in helping prevent flooding in those neighborhoods. The recent onramp for the westbound corridor project has also linked runoff from i15 to these same ponds. Please do a full runoff study before just moving the road and removing those essential stormwater detention areas. They didn't do a great job of that on the 89 project and it led to flooding of several homes as well as pockets of standing water on the road that caused accidents.</p> <p>Another major impact is that this project takes away half of the parking at the community park with the ball fields at its completion and with the temporary easements it looks like it takes away all of the parking at the bottom of the park during construction. This park is well-loved and already has issues of insufficient parking. People park along both sides of the frontage road for blocks during peak use creating unsafe road crossings. This project will only make that worse. From conversations with city leaders, it appears this has not been made clear to them and many of the negative impacts on the city were glossed over when UDOT met with them.</p> <p>Taking down the sound walls to perform this construction for the 2-5 years it takes to do the project will be a huge negative externality to residents.</p> <p>Because of how close the new road will be installed to existing houses with high water tables, the risk of damage to the foundations of houses 3-5 houses up from the new frontage road due to vibration of compacting the road base is high (from discussions with a soils and structural engineer.) Not to mention the noise and dust from the construction wreaking havoc on the lungs of residents.</p> <p>And finally, there's plenty of space between the existing lanes and the existing frontage road to just add new lanes. You'd have the exact same offset between the sound wall and the frontage road as you do where the new onramp was just built in south Farmington. Taking so much land seems a bit like a land grab to allow for potential future expansion instead of investing in double-tracking Frontrunner, increasing bus coverage, adding more trains, etc.</p> <p>Regardless, from my experience watching the 89 project and other UDOT projects (including ignoring residents in Lehi about safety issues on that project until several people died due to those unsafe conditions), I have no doubt you'll just go ahead with the project regardless of public input.</p>	<p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.4</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.1.7</p> <p>9.3.2 C</p> <p>9.3.9 A</p> <p>9.3.7 A</p> <p>9.3.12 A</p> <p>9.3.12 B</p> <p>9.3.12 C</p>
EM87	Alex Walker	<p>Please see the attached PDF for my comment on UDOT's proposed I-15 expansion.</p> <p>Thank you for the consideration of my feedback</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.4</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.1.7</p> <p>9.3.5 A</p> <p>9.3.7 D</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM88	David Osokow	<p>I am once again writing in opposition of the proposed I-15 expansion. Increasing the lanes will increase the pollution in the SLC area that is already disproportionately impacted and is shown on EPA maps to face many existing environmental injustices. I know that this project is probably happening regardless so I'm hoping some of the following can at least be included or improved in the final version.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased underpasses in SLC (ideally we'd connect the E/W at every intersection 400 N, 200 N and figure out a way around the 500 N technical hurdles). We should be tearing unnecessary walls down whenever possible in order to better connect the two sides of the city. • Improved sound walls on the 600 N interchange and North Temple bridge sections to help mitigate noise pollution to the community • sound walls that actually go up to the on and off ramps on 600 N that account for the elevation changes • Improve sound walls by 1000 N too • Quieter pavement and more noise testing near places that are elevated and the sound travels further (do it in the winter when sound waves bend down in the cold temperatures) • Protected bike lanes on 600 N interchange with concrete not just painted bike lanes • Truck engine braking restriction signs/ mitigation • figure something out with the small lake /retention pond on the 600 N interchange that is a breeding ground for mosquitoes • More creative East and west connections in general with safety as a priority • Clear and consistent construction information so we know what the impacts will be • Better long term maintenance plans for how UDOT will take care of their infrastructure (street sweeping on 600 N for example) and not further erode public trust <p>I'm also going to mention the erasure of the potential underpass at 400 N from the initial EIS was the wrong decision and the non transparent use of third party consultants to further study the idea seems to be UDOT's flawed way of checking a box without really properly getting community feedback. The consultant process seems very inadequate and rushed and has had very little public notice for their meetings that are going to take place sometime in the middle of November.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B</p>
EM89	Joshua Dunn	<p>Hi! I'm emailing about the planned i15 expansion. I live in Salt Lake in the fairpark neighborhood. I love how close I am to downtown, but the west side is already completely cut off from the rest of the city by the freeway and freight train lines. Burying the freeway wherever you can would be great, but if that can't be done then more underpasses need to be cut out between 600 north and 900 south, and we need to figure out ways to put up businesses and housing near those areas so they don't just become vacant and crime ridden. Murals and lighting would be a good start, a dream would be use those underpasses to create more amenities for our community, you could put greenbike stations, bus stops, and food trucks under there to provide these types of things in an already sheltered area.</p>	<p>9.1.4 9.1.5 9.3.5 C</p>
EM90	Stephen Sonkens	<p>Mr. Rob Wight & Mr. Ben Hout,</p> <p>Please see the attached file with comments from Thom Williamsen, of Bountiful Corner, regarding the recently released EIS Study in Bountiful, Utah.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.1 9.2.2 9.3.8 A</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM91	Lindsay Duncan	<p>Hello, I am writing to comment regarding the frontage road access going into Centerville. You're proposing taking her home, hers is the middle home at [REDACTED]. It's such a nice home. In fact my mom has completely redone the whole house a few times... by herself. The big shed in the backyard, she built it by hand with no plans to go off of. It's also next to where our childhood pets are buried, pur fur family.</p> <p>You see my dad and mom bought this house when I was 7 years old and I grew up here. My son was born here ❤️ My mom and dad divorced soon after and my mom was a single mom, having to go back to work at the school district as a bus driver and then and currently with the north salt lake police department, she did this to pay for the house and everything else, by herself. My mom paid off her home a few months ago (I'm now 38) and she has made it into our gathering place. Our safe place, always. It's home to us, to my kids. To my little sister who still lives with her. To my brother and his family and my nephews.</p> <p>I lost my home in the trailer park just across from the McDonald's on the frontage road 3 years ago, literally down the road less than a mile away. Developers came and took me and my kids home, and as a single mom I was then forced to try and find somewhere we could go which was ALOT more (6 times the amount in rent) than what I was paying there at our trailer and way more than I could afford. But my mom actually owned that trailer that me and my kids lived in... she bought it because she is always taking care of everyone else. I was newly divorced with 2 young kids and nowhere to go. She is the most selfless woman you'll ever meet. It was a very nice and completely redone (by her alone) trailer home. And now, you're going to take her home. I BEG you please, don't do this to her and to my little sister. Don't do this to our family again. I am afraid that this will be her breaking point, she has crawled into a hole watching everything she worked so hard for be taken from her. She is in complete shock and she is so stressed about it all, she's not sleeping, she has lost weight, she is just beat down and I am so worried about her... Please I beg you don't do this to her and my little sister. I am afraid of where this will put her. She also takes care of my elderly grandma who lives in Bountiful stopping by on her way home from 12 hours at the police department and taking care of her. I feel this will put her over the edge and I am so worried about her. Please reconsider doing this to my family.</p> <p>I would like to comment as well regarding the walkway the city would put in? But I know this is not your area and was in "city plans"... there is no way people will walk along cars coming off the freeway going 65+mph. Growing up there. I can tell you that as the city grew, it got more dangerous. Even just getting out of my car, going to the mailbox. There have been drunk drivers that have driven into my mom's yard (a few times actually) and when I was a teenager a girl was killed riding her bike on the sidewalk on the frontage road.</p> <p>The proposed plan to add the inlet to frontage road includes a light at the end from what I was told (by one of the very nice udot guys) so... there would need to be a 3 way light for the already traveling traffic ON the frontage road to allow the cars coming off to go access the frontage road, correct? This is a horrible idea. First of all, the light is only adding to the back up coming off the freeway? And southbound already driving on the frontage road (which would be oncoming traffic to these people coming off this access) would need to stop to allow them to drive either direction, correct? It will back up, in every way you're coming from. This is a horrible area.</p> <p>There is a blind spot at the curve right by McDonalds and ever since they put in Chickfila... Big Rigs and cars park along there in front, (on the frontage road after the light at parrish going towards the frontage road northbound) of the chickfila parking lot access, and their line backs up ALL the way down the road to the light at parrish. This is a recipe for complete disaster. The traffic before that blind corner and putting a light for the frontage road access you're proposing is going to cause alot of accidents. I know it. You cannot see oncoming traffic going out of chickfila parking lot because of the corner and people turning IN are waiting on the road.</p> <p>People don't care about the speed limit there either. It goes from 40/50? to 30 going south on the frontage road and people don't slow down. People are going 50 mph+, I have watched the police from my bedroom window at my mom's pull over car after car and they cant keep up with them. And it has only gotten worse over the years and officers have quit watching there. The city has grown. This frontage road access is also going to push traffic into the neighborhoods. There is a lot of families who's kids go to Jenny P Stewart who walk home from there. My 2 were a couple of them and I would worry when they did walk home since the traffic coming off pages and onto my street (which was 400 West) where people would speed to go to Farmington. There have been a few kids hit at the intersection on 400 W and Chase Lane. Because they're all trying to speed home on every access road and most likely going to Farmington.</p> <p>I'm failing to see how this plan helps, in fact I think it will severely hurt the traffic conditions... especially if this is to help people who LIVE towards Farmington. It would make ALOT more sense to put something down further? To bypass people's homes as well. To put an interchange down towards Farmington more. There is only the exit before the interchange to Legacy and station park and that exit consists of the old access to the main street in Farmington and the frontage road in north Farmington and also the access into southbound I15. There is a bridge before that as well at Glovers Lane. Wouldn't it be better for people to access closer to their homes? Not push traffic through the already busy Centerville? MAYBE... Do an interchange further north towards Farmington. Or even if you push it down on the frontage road further by the ballpark in Centerville (you're adding an unnecessary walk over the freeway there anyways, I mean where are they walking to? Legacy? I wouldn't walk over to Legacy and it's a waste of taxpayer dollars. Fix the road infrastructure instead) OR... what if you put the light at Chase Lane in Centerville, put in a little park and ride/bus access or something at the "pond" and didn't take anyone's homes at all? It would still cause traffic in the neighborhoods though. You're just pushing traffic into one neighborhood and it's sad.</p> <p>Also... We were always told the pond was protected wetlands by the city and there was nothing they could do with it nothing they could do to revamp it.</p> <p>We were also NOT told about their "walking path" that was added to this freeway/frontage road access. My mom also didn't know about her losing her home until right before the open house in Bountiful that we attended. No one contacted her from UDOT? She had to find out from the neighbor? Why? Why would she be the last to know? I don't understand why this is an option and the relocation/aquisition specialist (I think he was) she talked to for a minute (was very kind) but this is just a really horrible plan. This was not thought through and or studied enough. At least go sit on the frontage road and see what I'm talking about, please. You will see what a horrible idea this is. Please don't do this to her and to my little sister. And the other 2 families. There is a family next to my mom who has a daughter and a son the same age as my nephew, 8. They've lived there for a while as well. They are good people. No one deserves this I know this is your job but this not only is ruining their lives it is just a horrible plan all together.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and your kindness, Lindsay Baggett Duncan</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.2.1 9.3.10 C</p>
EM92	Ken Leetham	<p>Hello I-15 EIS Team,</p> <p>Thanks for all of your good work and support of North Salt Lake in its efforts to improve transportation in the City. We appreciate your efforts on this project and thank you in advance for considering the attached comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.4 9.1.6 9.2.1 9.2.2</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM93	Jacqueline Rosen	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Sweet Streets is pleased to submit the attached official comments to UDOT on the Draft EIS for the I-15 project (Project No. S-I15-7(369)309).</p> <p>Please reach out if you have any questions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.3.5 A 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A 9.4 D</p>
EM94	David Petersen	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>The State and Farmington City once contemplated a grade separated Farmington Creek Trail crossing under 400 West, but the state opted to re-route the trail to a less safe at grade crossing at 400 West and the Frontage Road, which crossing is also at times dangerous for pedestrians due to the length of the crossing and its site distance problems---and it is out-of-direction for pedestrians and bicyclists. Conversely, current trail configuration proposals will become more dangerous and less safe per both UDOT options set forth in the Draft I-15 EIS---1) the "400 West Option (Preferred Alternative)", and 2) the "State Street Option". Notwithstanding this, both options can accommodate a grade separated crossing for the Farmington Creek Trail at 400 West Street, and Farmington City requests that UDOT explore and possibly implement this improvement.</p> <p>Moreover, a new State Street overpass over I-15 connecting to the overpass over the Legacy Parkway will provide good pedestrian access on both the north and south side of the bridge. Subsequently, because of this, the Farmington Creek trail can connect directly to the sidewalk on the north side to safely lead pedestrians to points west of I-15. Under this scenario a pedestrian does not have to use the traffic signal to cross State Street at 400 West and/or a Frontage Road intersection. Furthermore, upon reaching the west end of the bridge, a pedestrian may achieve direct access to the Legacy Parkway trail without using the existing traffic signal at 650 West Street if UDOT provides a trail connection to Legacy on the flat land on the north side of the embankment, which land it already owns (Davis County Parcel #08-087-0026). This route across this parcel also provides a direct unimpeded course to the Frontrunner Station.</p> <p>Attached is a concept illustration for the proposed trail configuration under 400 West, over the State Street bridge, and the connection to the Legacy Parkway Trail.</p> <p>The Farmington Creek Trail is one the few major east-to-west regional family friendly active transportation trail facilities in Davis County as well as the entire Wasatch Front, and its success may meet every non-vehicular transportation goal espoused by UDOT. It provides tremendous access from east Farmington to the UTA commuter rail stop. It connects three north to south regional trails: Bonneville Shoreline Trail, Legacy Parkway Trail, and DRG&W Trail and soon will connect with the West Davis Corridor Trail as well (another, or fourth, north to south regional trail facility); moreover; the Farmington Creek Trail provides direct access to National Forest Service land east of the community and will soon offer access to the Farmington Bay Waterfowl Management Area west of the community.</p> <p>Please favorably consider this request. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.</p> <p>Dave</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.4</p>
EM95	Daniel Esparza	<p>Hi if this project does happen it would be a good opportunity to create more underpass to help connect the northwest side of the city to the rest of downtown</p>	<p>9.1.5 9.3.5 C</p>
EM96	Helen Peters	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Attached please find a letter from Salt Lake County for consideration as part of the public comment for the I-15 EIS Draft EIS and Sections 4(f)/6(f) evaluation.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions or need to discuss Salt Lake County's comments further.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.5 9.1.6 9.3.12 F</p>
EM97	Heather Mclaughlin-kolb	<p>Dear UDOT I-15 Draft EIS Project Team,</p> <p>Salt Lake City appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding the I-15: Farmington to Salt Lake City Draft EIS and Sections 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation via the attached letter. Thank you!</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A 9.3.7 A 9.3.12 F</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM98	David Barney	Dear Sir and Madam Please find enclosed I-15 Comments. (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.3.8 B 9.3.8 C
EM99	Gary Hill	Dear Tiffany and Katie Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the I-15 Draft EIS. Please find attached Bountiful City's comments. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask me. We look forward to talking more in the future. Best regards, (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.2.1
EM100	Brian Hutchinson	Hello Tiffany, Please accept the CHNC's input on the i15 EIS, attached. Thank you, (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.2 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.2.1 9.3.5 C 9.3.7 A
EM101	Duane Hoffman	Please find the official comments from West Bountiful City attached to this email. Thanks. (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.2.1 9.2.2 9.3.4 A 9.3.7 F
EM102	Sara Hoy	Please see the attached letter from NeighborWorks Salt Lake regarding the Draft EIS for public comment. Thanks, (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.12 B 9.3.12 F
EM103	Laura Margason	Good evening- The EPA R8 is providing comments on the Draft EIS for the I-15 Farming to Salt Lake City Draft EIS. Our letter and detailed comments are attached. Thank you for this opportunity to engage in the NEPA process. Regards, (For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).	9.3.3 B 9.3.6 E 9.3.6 F 9.3.6 G 9.3.6 H 9.3.6 I 9.3.6 J 9.3.11 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM104	Meisei Gonzalez	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>I am attaching a compilation of public comments on behalf of HEAL Utah that have been submitted by individuals regarding the current draft EIS plan for the expansion of I-15 from Farmington to Salt Lake City, Utah. We have collected these comments for the convenience of individuals, but it is important to note that each comment divided by a horizontal line should be considered a separate comment. We have extracted key aspects of all comments along with important demographic information.</p> <p>If you require any further clarification or information, please do not hesitate to reach out to our team. Thank you!</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.3.4 B 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A 9.3.7 A 9.4 A 9.4 C 9.4 F</p>
EM105	Nigel Swaby	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The Fairpark Community Council is still opposed to widening I-15 as part of the current EIS process. There are a number of reasons the community has concerns including air pollution, a lengthy construction process and traffic noise during construction. We're also concerned about the costs which have more than doubled in the past year.</p> <p>We're still not convinced an extra freeway lane will improve congestion. Through a process known as "induced demand," studies show extra lanes only encourage additional auto use, not less. Given the substantial cost of this construction and the minimal benefit of the price and years of construction, we prefer to see this money used for public transportation improvements instead of an extra road lane.</p> <p>We are still supportive of the Rio Grande plan to remove train traffic as another barrier our community faces and would prefer to see that implementation over I-15 expansion. The connectivity of a larger underpass is something our residents are deeply concerned about. The residents who live close to the freeway don't want additional openings made.</p> <p>We are thankful UDOT isn't forcing the sale of any residences but we recognize years of construction will be a strong incentive for people to move, whether they're required to or not. Those departures will have a negative effect on our community.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A 9.3.12 C 9.4 C</p>
EM106	Caitlin Cahill	<p>The proposal to widen I-15 needs to be abandoned. There are so many better things we could spend \$1.6 billion dollars on to improve the quality of life for all Utahns, and those who live near the highway who will be most adversely affected. Imagine if we had \$1.6 billion dollars to invest in quality public transportation for all, to address the shrinking of the Great Salt Lake, the affordable housing crisis, or the terrible air pollution we have now? What if we could invest in our public schools to reduce class size and pay teachers more? What if we planted 5,000 trees on Salt Lake City's West Side to capture the particulates in the air that are already causing premature death for neighbors. There are so many needs in Salt Lake City, Utah that are critical, which raises the question on why Utah legislators are funding the expansion of a highway, that will not solve congestion (as induced demand studies have demonstrated again and again), but arguably create more problems.</p> <p>There are serious questions about the models that are being used to demonstrate the need for I-15 and whether the model adequately addresses air pollution concerns. The problems the I-15 expansion will cause are well documented in the research, including contributing to the climate crisis, and increasing the particulate matter in the air, dramatically impacting West Siders who are already adversely impacted. How will UDOT address this issue?</p> <p>Of critical concern is the disproportionate impact upon communities of color. For the West Side, one of the most diverse zip codes in Utah, questions are raised as to what are the potential racial justice complaints under Federal civil rights law, specifically Title VI, the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that forbids discrimination on "the ground of race, color, or national origin." I-15 was part of the segregation and disinvestment of the West Side of Salt Lake City. The proposal to widen I-15, continues this pattern of harm exacerbating the critical problems of air pollution, contributing to health problems, and threatening the livelihood of small businesses owned by local residents (raising significant question about the economic impact study of the construction). Residents living on the West Side came together over the last forty years to repair, care, and build community in a site of state abandonment, now in return they have everything to lose!</p> <p>Further, it is a serious concern that UDOT and the Wasatch Regional Front Council did not engage with community members in a meaningful fashion before these decisions were made (years ago). The public deserves much more transparency on the decision-making process and an investigation into who specifically is benefiting from this \$1.6 billion price tag. It is certainly not the community who have been opposed to it from the beginning. If the proposal to widen I-15 is adopted, we deserve at the very least an audit of how this money is being used and who is profiting and at what cost. "Follow the money."</p> <p>In conclusion, we respectfully request that UDOT reconsider the proposal to widen I-15 and instead invest in public transportation, permanently affordable social housing, mass transportation, the Great Salt Lake, and our children's future city. This city belongs to all of us and we deserve better.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 A</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM107	Alexis Simontacchi	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed environmental regulations outlined in the draft EIS. As a resident of Salt Lake City, I have witnessed firsthand the impact of air quality on our community.</p> <p>Every year we experience severe air quality issues, especially on the west side, driven by air pollution. Poor air quality costs Utahns on average 2-5 years of our lives. The draft EIS claims that it will not impact air quality, but I would like to see the model used to determine that. The expansion of I-15 would increase the amount of traffic along the I-15 corridor, thus increasing air pollution. In order to reduce air pollution, I believe there are alternative approaches to reducing congestion on I-15, with a focus on increasing the usage of public transportation – diverting traffic from the interstate. For example:</p> <p>Bus only lanes on the interstate for Express Lines</p> <p>Expansion of the Frontrunner to include running on Sundays and additional stops along the route</p> <p>Creating more protected bike lanes that would make it easier for people to bike from one side of the city to the other</p> <p>Working with UTA to expand the light rail from east to west</p> <p>I urge the agency to consider these alternatives in the final decision making process to ensure a balanced and effective approach to decreasing travel delays along I-15 and creating a positive impact for Salt Lake City residents.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.4</p> <p>9.1.6</p> <p>9.3.6 A</p>
EM108	Lexi Dowdall	<p>Subsidize public transit.</p> <p>Build more of it. Build for bikes. Make biking more COMFORTABLE with less exposure to Utah’s reckless drivers. Incentivize e-bikes.</p> <p>But please please please do not widen the highway and build for more cars.</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.4</p>
EM109	Austin Kimmel	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am in favor of the proposal to connect the Guadalupe neighborhood to the Jackson Park area. However, I believe a connection would be better suited at 500 N. It will provide better connectivity to Guadalupe Park and Jackson Park.</p> <p>Additionally, 400 N is less advantageous due to the proximity to 300 N underpass connection.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>9.1.5</p> <p>9.3.5 C</p>
EM110	Melanie Hall	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the I-15 EIS Draft. Here is the link for HEAL Utah’s comments.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>(For this comment’s email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.1</p> <p>9.1.2</p> <p>9.1.3</p> <p>9.1.5</p> <p>9.3.4 B</p> <p>9.3.5 C</p> <p>9.3.6 A</p> <p>9.3.7 A</p> <p>9.4 A</p> <p>9.4 C</p> <p>9.4 F</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM111	Dave Iltis	<p>To the UDOT I-15 team,</p> <p>First, the executive summary maps are poorly done since they have no legend explaining what the colors etc are.</p> <p>Generally, the bike lane and pedestrian infrastructure plans are welcome! Thank you.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your FAQ comment on air pollution is false and really disingenuous as you are equating cars/trucks with other sources when transportation pollution is the number one cause of air pollution. Do better. 2. What efforts are you making to get transit done before I-15 is reconstructed? FrontRunner double tracking is expected to take years. It wouldn't take so long if the money you going to spend on I-15 was put there first. This also is disingenuous. Do better. 3. I understand that you need to reconstruct and repair I-15. However, you are wasting money by adding lanes which will only increase demand and sprawl. So, reconstruct it, but don't expand it. 4. Please make the bike lanes that are on the bridges over I-15 protected bike lanes that will be safer for cyclists. 5. Why are you doing a SPUI at Parrish lane and 2600 S? These are unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Do better. 6. Why is there no bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure at the 2100 N interchange? This is not ok. Please add this and do better. 7. The shared use path on Beck St/89 needs to be wide enough (12 Feet) so that bikes and pedestrians don't conflict. It's great that you are doing this. You will absolutely need to provided safe crossing of the street however for those that need to get to work or retail destinations on the opposite side of the street. Do not forget to do this. 8. At the 1000 N interchange, please guarantee safe crossing of this for bicycles and pedestrians. Yes, it's important here too. Do not forget to do this. 9. The Pedestrian Overpass at Community Park needs to be a bicycle and pedestrian overpass that can be ridden without having to dismount one's bicycle. Make sure that this happens. 10. Noise levels could be reduced if the Utah Legislature would do its job regarding inspections and motor vehicle regulations. That said, it is awful to see the increase in noise from the Action Alternative. 11. As part of this, you need to look at and improve UDOT streets and roads for bicycles and pedestrians for at least 3 miles in either direction of I-15 so that cyclists and pedestrians can have safe travels not only over I-15, but beyond too. 12. Please consider adding a shared use path parallel to I-15 along the entire length of the project. <p>Unfortunately, your public outreach wasn't great, so I just learned of the comment period timespan today, the last day of the comment period.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.1 9.2.2 9.4 C</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM112	Alejandro Puy	<p>“Re: Potential connections between east and west of the freeway To whom it may concern, I am writing to you both as an elected official and as a resident living near the potential 400 North opening under an expanded Interstate-15 freeway. Having extensively canvassed the area, I’ve engaged with countless neighbors, it is clear that the prevailing sentiment in the Westside is centered around the adverse impact the freeway has on our community. The barrier it creates has, in essence, separated us from the rest of the city, casting many of us onto the perceived “wrong” side of the freeway. I have recently been in contact with numerous stakeholders, including Fairpark neighborhood residents, bike advocates, and those who commute by foot and car. Unsurprisingly, they express support for the prospect of dismantling this barrier, even if only in specific areas. As our state and city undergo continuous growth with a greater number of people needing to travel east-west, maintaining the status quo will exacerbate the impact of this barrier, especially with an influx of new residents and commuters. The Diehard Pickleballers, a community group from the Westside, have conveyed their enthusiastic support for opening up spaces like these, envisioning opportunities for pickleball and other communal activities. They told me to share their enthusiasm about this as a possibility. In my capacity as a representative for the area, I wish to convey that the broader community is in favor of this idea but does harbor concerns. These concerns revolve around the maintenance and beautification of these spaces in both the short and long term, ensuring safety, and activating the areas for community use. From a personal standpoint, residing in this area, I strongly urge you to engage with the neighbors on the Westside of the freeway. They are the ones most profoundly affected by the current barrier and stand to gain the most from potential openings. Recognizing that the opportunity to open this barrier is a once-in-a-generation chance, it is imperative that we stand united in rectifying the historical wrongs inflicted upon this community during the initial freeway construction. This working-class neighborhood, subject to redlining and lacking the organizational means to prevent negative consequences, now has the chance to address these past injustices. I encourage those examining this issue to extend their gaze beyond the concerns of the east side of the freeway neighbors. While their apprehensions are valid, they have experienced the least impact regarding connectivity compared to their Westside counterparts. I wholeheartedly welcome any proposed openings and hope for an extended partnership to ensure the ongoing funding, care, activation, and safety of these spaces. The opening could take many forms to be determined by community input from a multi-use urban trail, a park, plaza, tunnel, or local street. Let us work together to reclaim some of the lost land for the benefit of our community. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to the positive changes that may result from our collaborative efforts. Sincerely, Alejandro Puy Salt Lake City Councilmember District 2</p>	<p>See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS</p> <p>9.1.5 9.1.6 9.3.5 C</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM113	Keiko Jones	<p>Hello all,</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to express my feedback regarding the idea of 400 N underpass and how we could increase the East – West connectivity.</p> <p>As I have previously expressed my opinion about the 400 N underpass, my thoughts haven't changed, and I am AGAINST opening the freeway at 400 North regardless of what sort of amenity someone is considering to put.</p> <p>Underpasses in the city are dimly lit, trash strewn, dingy places with a lot of homeless people seeking shelter from the weather elements. I don't have the heart to subject ANYONE to that kind of filth, especially a mere 20 feet away from their front door.</p> <p>Instead of looking at a map, please visit the site on foot.</p> <p>We will have a safer 600 North overpass, and the Rose Park residents will be able to use 600 N to connect to the East side easily rather than meandering into the Jackson and Guadalupe neighborhoods just to be blocked by a train at 500 West.</p> <p>You may think this is a different area from your division, but why not make UTA public transportation more Westside friendly?</p> <p>Free fare zone for the Trax stops at the Arena Station, which is still on the East side. You could extend the free fare zone into the West side so that the West side residents can take advantage of the service?</p> <p>Also, restore some of the bus routes that had been eliminated previously. UTA on Demand may sound convenient, but in reality the Fairpark and Rose Park residents cannot use it for commuting.</p> <p>Regular buses are more reliable in a way they come on set schedules so that you can organize your commute. But UTA on Demand is not a reliable source of transportation because it's too flexible if you have to get somewhere at a specific time.</p> <p>Rather than building an underpass only a block away from the already existing, much more convenient one, improving the public transportation will enable residents to move more efficiently.</p> <p>Thanks for reading.</p> <p>Keiko Jones</p>	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
EM114	Andrew Clark	<p>"My name is Andrew E. Clark.</p> <p>My comments below are on behalf of the following entities on which I serve and represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark Lane National Historical District, Farmington, Utah • Farmington Historical Preservation Commission – Farmington, Utah • Ezra T. Clark Family Organization – Based in Farmington, Utah <p>I was raised in and now own and live in the 167 year-old Ezra T. Clark home, the first and oldest home built in Farmington's Clark Lane Historical District. This home is also the oldest known existing rock home residence in Farmington.</p> <p>All proposed widening options thus far will destroy or run right through the center of Ezra T. Clark Park. This city park is heavily used for all Davis County residents and is an anchor and starting point for Farmington's (and Davis County's) most popular walking/biking/horse trail.</p> <p>This city park also marks the location where Ezra T. Clark, one of Farmington's first settlers built his cabin, next to the nearby spring, dug a well, planted his orchard and built the first log cabin school.</p> <p>The concrete bridge in the center of the park that spans Farmington Creek is the original Clark Lane route before the town was surveyed by Brigham Young in 1853/4. 400 West was added after 1945 and the bridge became disused until it was incorporated into the Clark Lane leg of the Farmington Trails system.</p> <p>A stone monument placed in 1948 currently marks this historic location. Ezra T. Clark and his 2 wives' posterity now numbers 70k-100k persons who belong to the Ezra T. Clark Family Organization which was established in 1901.</p> <p>To my knowledge, I have received no response regarding my requests and research showing that that the existing railroad/Fronrunner tracks can be shifted 50 feet west into the vacant land to allow space for all the required lanes.</p> <p>This is a true long-term solution and keeps Davis County's first and oldest historical district from being impacted.</p> <p>Please see my comments sent via the form at https://i15eis.udot.utah.gov</p> <p>Sincerely,"</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.1 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
EM115	David R. Scheer	<p>"To the I-15 EIS team-</p> <p>Attached please find the response of the Capitol Hill Neighborhood Council to the Draft EIS for the I-15 expansion project. We apologize for submitting this after the announced deadline. Such deadlines can be difficult for volunteer community organizations like the CHNC to meet, given our limited meeting schedules and goal of soliciting the widest possible range of comments from our members. We hope that our comments will be taken into consideration given the over 2,000 households we represent that will be directly affected by the project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>David R. Scheer, Chair"</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.1.2 9.1.4 9.2.1</p>
EM116	US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District	<p>These documents are sent on behalf of Mike Pectol, senior project manager, with the Utah Section, Sacramento District Regulatory Division.</p> <p>(For this comment's email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>9.3.15 A 9.3.15 B 9.3.15 C 9.3.15 D 9.3.15 E 9.3.15 F 9.3.15 G</p>
Website Comments			
WEB1	Claire Phillips	<p>I had a few thoughts on this proposal. You have some different types of bike lanes for different parts of the proposed development. As a frequent cyclist, I want to express that I do not feel safe in a bike lane where there is no barrier between me and the cars. They park in my lane, the swerve into my lane, and they don't see me in my lane. If the lane is just a painted line on a road, it isn't safe for families to bike together there. And to be clear, biking isn't something I do for fun, I use it to get around. I have a cargo bike and transport my kids in it. If there is just a painted bike lane on the road on State street, I'll bike on the sidewalk. There has to be a physical barrier so that the driver who isn't paying attention hits something else before they hit me.</p> <p>My second thought is that as a driver, I much prefer the diamond freeway interchange. The proposal for those interchanges would be very welcomed.</p> <p>Lastly, and I cannot stress this enough, we will never be able to expand our way out of traffic congestion. Study after study has proved that no amount of freeway widening will ease traffic congestion. The only way to meet our rising populations needs is MASS TRANSIT. A few little improvements here and there are not going to cut it. Buses have got to be consistent, frequent, and well connected. Nobody will ride a bus that comes once a day and is an hour late. There isn't even a bus that goes through my neighborhood anymore, though the bus stop signs are still there. We aren't moving in the right direction there.</p> <p>How about a dedicated bus lane on I-15? With multiple express buses that get people to the train stations or downtown or the airport? Reward people who ride the bus with an express lane so their commute ends up being shorter than those that drive.</p> <p>Road maintenance is so important, improving pedestrian and bike connections are so important, but let's not forget in the future that trains and buses are going to be our best friends when it comes to reducing traffic congestion and speeding up commutes.</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.7 9.2.2</p>
WEB2	Matt Holmes	<p>In regards to the 400 N project in Bountiful... While I agree that with the North and South options given, the North option is ideal as it impacts many fewer homes and businesses, has the potential impact of reducing the 12' walkway to 6', and possibly only using one bike lane being looked at? That portion of the street receives much less foot traffic than one would imagine, as no school zones cross through the area, and pedestrian traffic rarely has a reason to walk over the 400 N overpass OR up 400 N. The foot and bike traffic that commutes to the Frontrunner station almost exclusively use 500 S. I bring this up as it may be the difference in saving a residence as well as a couple of businesses on the north side of the street. Thanks.</p>	<p>9.1.4 9.1.5 9.2.2 9.3.5 C</p>
WEB3	Ashley Sheesley	<p>I would greatly prefer if you focused instead on improving public transportation, trains, more frequent buses, lower cost public transportation, etc. rather than spending billions of dollars, forcing families out of homes (IN THE MIDDLE OF A HOUSING CRISIS NO LESS! Where are they going to go?! Are you going to be their real estate agent? Are you going to get them a home exactly the same as the one they've built so many memories in? Are you really going to sleep soundly at night having done this?). Freeway expansion DOES NOT WORK and you know that even better than I do. And the fact that you'll more than quadruple the drive time to do this? And we won't have the "benefit" of the expansion until TWENTY FIFTY?! Please just get more trains and more reliable bus systems that run more regularly. Man this is a bad idea.</p> <p>Please please please reconsider.</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB4	Alex Burton	Induced demand. Induced demand. Induced demand. Induced demand. Thank you for your consideration.	9.1.1
WEB5	Jonathan Cornell	The Wasatch Front's air quality is amongst the worst in the entire United States. Incentivizing driving, which expanding the freeway certainly does, will only make that worse. The only hope to keep this area livable is to encourage more sustainable behaviors, such as using public transportation. This plan flies in the face of that, while increasing the size of the eyesore that is I-15 and causing lower income residents to lose their homes. It's been made clear to UDOT that there is strong opposition to this plan -- it's also been made clear, from the FAQs, that they have no intention of listening.	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.1.7
WEB6	Nate Talbot	Regarding the 200 West half interchange plan. Please consider converting this to a full interchange providing northbound access to I-15, and an exit ramp from Southbound I-15 to 200 West. Without those ramps, many Farmington residents and Centerville residents have to drive through several surface streets to get to the Park Lane interchange. The Park Lane interchange has terrible site distance at the ramps/corners, and gets heavily congested even today. We need more than just a half interchange at 200 West.	9.1.4
WEB7	Juan Sanchez	We need illumination on this part of I-15	9.1.4
WEB8	Dallas Bradbury	There needs to be an option to access northbound I15 in Farmington either at gloves or at the 200 west area. If not, it's not worth doing any work except making the two bridges wider.	9.1.4
WEB9	Kara Huff	This plan does little to help alleviate already congested traffic through Farmington. With projected growth, there is no way that the existing 2 exits will be able to keep up with demand. Changing the structure at the 200 W. exit doesn't do much to help either and looks to be a waste of taxpayer money. Widening State St. and Glovers Ln. will help a little, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists, but when continued growth occurs we will need more exits to handle the volume of people. We need an exit at Glovers Ln. in addition to the widening.	9.1.4
WEB10	Adam Kirk	I'm imagining this bridge would cost many millions to build when people can easily cross less than a football field away... https://share.cleanshot.com/b4H5Mn1JKCwYkBFILLP	9.1.4 9.3.5 C 9.4 A
WEB11	Adam Kirk	Seems like all of this could be very short sighted. What if you used all this money to innovate on how to move humans, not cars, between work and home.	9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB12	Troy Anderson	I believe this is a short sighted plan. Improvements in the roadway bed are necessary and needed, but the widening of I-15 is a poor choice for future growth of the salt lake metro area. Induced demand directly connected to AM-PM peak travel hours with negate all of the touted benefits by UDOT. More people will think it's fine to drive on I-15 during peak hours because of the then widened travel lanes, and because UDOT fails in every respect to think outside of the box no benefits will actually be gained. Billions spent on more traffic. You cannot outbuild traffic. You will not out build traffic. This DOT is not different than any other DOT. Why does the Katy freeway in Texas still have traffic; a 24 lane road still possessing traffic isn't a failure of construction. The road is built to code and is a marvel of construction technology, but building to a failed method of transportation is still a failure to a city and it's inhabitants. Stop widening these roads. UDOT is more than just highways and big roads. Invest in human centric transportation. Bike paths and public transportation are the only things that have higher carrying capacities than normal roadways. If you still don't believe me, give Bus Rapid Transportation lanes a try. Orem and Provo did it and they're great! Build a cohesive network and it will be something DOT can be proud of for future generations.If we continue on the path we are on there will be nothing but 10 lane roads to nowhere with a Wendy's and a Walmart at the destination.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB13	Molly Jones	Under no circumstances should we be widening the freeway. The only way forward is public transportation. Take this estimated \$3.7b and invest in long term, clean air solutions-massive expansion of TRAX, Front Runner, and light rail. Installation and expansion of urban trail systems for biking and walking. Thank you	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB14	Jared Poulson	Please can we look longer term than simply 2050 or 2060. If we invest in cleaner mass-transit options we will not only alleviate strain on the freeways, but also the air around here. As a Farmington resident even front-runner is not enough, it is inconvenient for many of us to get to. Imagine a light rail along hwy 89 / main street and how often that on-off rail would get used! We have an opportunity to be an example to the rest of the country that we are serious about taking care of our community and our environment by offering more mass-transit options and get rid of the "just widen the freeway" mindset. Thank you.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB15	Tanner Thompson	<p>Widening I-15 is the wrong approach. Instead, we should invest more in public transit infrastructure.</p> <p>Widening highways may alleviate congestion in the short term, but in doing so it induces more people to choose to drive, bringing the congestion back before long. Studies show that it takes as little as 2 years for congestion to return to original levels after a highway widening.</p> <p>On top of that, the additional car traffic brings more tailpipe emissions, more noise pollution, and more tire particulates. The additional traffic also results in more cars off the highway, on surface streets in our cities, especially SLC.</p> <p>To avoid these drawbacks while still allowing people to get around conveniently, we need high-quality alternatives to driving on I-15. At a minimum, the Frontrunner needs to be fully double tracked and electrified, so that it can run faster and more frequently. It needs to run on Sunday so that those who live near it can rely on it as a real transportation solution. In addition, we need longer-distance rail service that goes north to Logan and south to Nephi if not Cedar City. We need to increase frequency on the bus routes that feed the FrontRunner and add additional routes where they're lacking. And finally, we need a downtown SLC train station that brings riders closer to the city center and allows for more growth potential for transit - such as the laudable Rio Grande Plan.</p> <p>I acknowledge that many of these elements are already included in UDOT's upcoming plans. However, the decision to nevertheless add lanes to I-15 reflects a lack of vision and political courage. We will never build enough lanes to truly solve congestion on I-15. We will only continue pouring money - tons of money - into an unsustainable, nearsighted band-aid solution. On the other hand, every dollar we invest in transit infrastructure gives more Utahns the opportunity to skip the highway traffic altogether and use a healthier, more efficient, more sustainable way to get around.</p> <p>UDOT should remove the additional lanes from the proposed project and proceed with only the state-of-good-repair maintenance I-15 needs. UDOT should take the billions of dollars in capital money thus saved and use them to expedite the full double-tracking, electrification, and extension of the FrontRunner to Brigham City and Payson and to fund the Rio Grande Plan.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB16	John Horn	<p>The cost and negative environmental impact of the I 15 expansion should result in the cancellation of this project. These funds could be better used for expanding public transit. Additional public transit such as train and buses would reduce the need for the highway expansion and also reduce the climate impacts of additional cars on the road.</p> <p>The state would be served better by putting these funds into non automobile related transit.</p> <p>Expanding the highway will only encourage more cars on the highway and increase pollution.</p> <p>Please consider doing the responsible thing and cancelling all of this project.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB17	Gardner Brown	<p>I have lived in Davis County for 25 years and I fully support the widening and expansion of I-15 from 400 S in Salt Lake to Shepherd Lane in Farmington.</p> <p>Gardner Brown</p>	9.2.2
WEB18	Brittanie Lewis	<p>I live in Davis county above the proposed road improvements and the stretch of 2-15 North of Farmington is almost unusable during rush hour as motorists tend to drive at 45-50 mph or lower regardless of actual capacity on the road. They don't use the passing lane correctly. Basically unless you want your commute to be an extra hour you have to use the HOV/Express lane where you're typically deal with other drivers going the actual posted speed limit. From my understanding of the current plan, it would mean pushing more traffic this way without mitigations to these roads. It will be an absolute nightmare. Farmington doesn't get as congested and I commute this road at least 4-6 times a week both to and from and have never had higher than normal congestion through North Salt Lake to Farmington it's always after Farmington/before that there are serious issues. I'm in favor of looking for more public transportation options as this state poorly runs theirs and does not invest like they should. Public transportation has never been convenient or made any sense for me to take even when I'm somewhat close to a station because of how slow and unreliable the services are. So when Utahans ask for more investment in public transport we don't mean pretend to make it better we actually mean we need more available trains/faster pick up times, WAY more convenience for public transport. Why does it make sense to take a train if I have to wait 15+ minutes when I can drive to the same place in 15 minutes? That's not what public transport is like in other places that actually use it to ensure people can take it to get to work. We already have quite a bit of public transport in place but it's run as if someone is trying to prove it doesn't work so they can fun terrible road projects like this one.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
WEB19	Alec Ladonde	<p>I am a SLC resident and strongly oppose the widening of I-15 for two primary reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the increasing pace of technological and social change over the past two decades, the assumptions laid out in the "Project Background" (e.g. 2050 population growth estimates) are not much better than guesses. We are going to see massive shifts in the employment landscape over the next three decades whose effects are unpredictable. • Widening roads just puts more cars on the roads. It doesn't actually alleviate congestion in even the medium-term. Population growth (if it occurs) would force more creative solutions, such as increased localization, which would in turn have cascading quality-of-life impacts. Let's not plan to further the completely unsustainable status quo 	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.3.5 A
WEB20	Peter Fowles	<p>This funding would be far better spent invested in improving and expanding our currently available public transit. I'm disgusted by this proposition.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB21	Aja Williams	<p>I like the changes to the freeway itself and the better and safer access in many cases, but it seems the Bountiful/ West Bountiful area is disproportionately having a lot of business being relocated. I would hope there is a way to make the roads near the freeway a bit wider without moving so many businesses.</p>	9.1.4 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB22	Silas Robison	Please don't expand the highway. Put the money you would do that with into improving public transport! When you widen the highway it just encourages more people to use cars and to go that route, causing the traffic to go back to normal and more cars to be on the road. Its called induced demand.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB23	Charlotte Serage	Please invest in public transit instead of car infrastructure. This execution is a horrible policy from an otherwise very capable and responsible department. We need to be investing 3.7 billion in the Fronrunner, TRAX, and bus services, NOT optimizing car traffic. Do your research. The world shouldn't be built for cars, it should be built for the quality of life for people. Please listen to your citizens.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.7
WEB24	Frederick Jenny	<p>To the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT),</p> <p>My name is Frederick Jenny, I am a resident of Salt Lake City and am commenting today to talk about my comments regarding the expansion of Interstate 15. After reading through the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), I have some major concerns about converting I-15 into a twelve (12) lane superhighway. My first issue is that UDOT says there will be no additional environmental burden on the area. How can that be true as according to the Sightline Institute's Clark Williams-Derry, "adding [just] one mile of new highway lane will increase CO2 emissions by more than 100,000 tons over 50 years" (Williams-Derry 1). Even with EVs you still have both the construction CO2 emissions and the microplastics from tire wear that will affect the health of those along the I-15 corridor and residents of the surrounding area. Therefore, UDOT's claim that this will not add an additional environmental burden on the area around I-15 is false and misleading to the general public.</p> <p>In a statement made in the Draft EIS, UDOT that states that the need for transit expansion is taken care of by the Utah Transit Authority (UTA). This is great news and I am all for it, but UDOT should be working with UTA to find better solutions. The Utah Department of TRANSPORTATION should be more than just cars. Why is this \$1.5 billion not being better spent to get people out of their cars and into more environmentally friendly and efficient mass transit? Expansions of FrontRunner, the backbone of the system, into branch lines like city streets to I-15 are needed. Trying to add more space hogging cars into a limited freeway is not the answer. (In my opinion, expansions to transit would be an alternative solution to expanding the freeway, period. If you fail to have mass transit as an alternative, then UDOT is doing the citizens of Utah a disservice. In summary, UDOT needs to not just be a car-based transportation entity, it needs to expand options for better alternatives because cars are an old solution to an environmental and population problem that needs better rail-based transit options like expanding Trax and Fronrunner. That \$1.5 Billion will go a long way in building out an advanced transit network.</p> <p>My final suggestion is one that should be considered if you add any bike lanes. Cyclists need to have their own right of way which means these new bike lanes need to be protected bike lanes. I have just bought a street bike and use it to go to work; grocery shop; work out. If we are going to be a more sustainable state then we need to make riding bikes safer and easier. By designing our roads to just be for cars we do those people, myself included a disservice and put them at greater risk of getting in an accident. A car will win every time, lets protect people by creating bike lanes with barriers to keep the cars away from cyclists.</p> <p>At this point, I am afraid the powers that be are moving toward expanding I-15 no matter what Utahans say in these comments. Please strongly consider my comments and not let my concern as a citizen go unheard. It just feels like UDOT is just accepting comments so UDOT can check a box and say they let citizens comment. I am concerned this letter will end up in the pile of the thousands of voices who pleaded against the Little Cottonwood Gondola EIS. Please listen to the citizens who are paying for this project. There are thousands of voices crying out against this and it feels like we are being ignored.</p> <p>Thank you for listening and please consider my comments. We need better solutions not the same old way of thinking.</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7
WEB25	Hannah Thomas-Hollands	Hello, I live in Rose Park, and I do not want to see ANY expansion of I-15. We need to move away from personal vehicle traffic and incentivize public transit and [safe] bicycle travel. Any dollar spent to accommodate more cars is a dollar wasted. The better funded a public transit system is, the better it will work, and the more it will be utilized - and the converse is true as well. Please help us all make responsible choices that improve our air quality and better connect our communities; don't make it more difficult to do the right thing. Thank you.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.1.7
WEB26	Keiko Jones	<p>I am against the under-path at 400 North in Salt Lake City. I emailed our mayor and city council members as well.</p> <p>We voted as a community in one of the Fairpark Community Council meetings, and residents on both sides said "No." I thought UDOT took the idea off the table at that point. So I am really surprised to see the under-path being "under study."</p> <p>The residents in the Guadalupe Neighborhood (between North Temple and 500 North, and between I-15 and the railroad tracks) will be most impacted by this "expansion." It's an insult beyond comprehension that UDOT is even considering putting an under-path in the already negatively impacted neighborhood, which the residents clearly don't want to have.</p>	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
WEB27	Steven Higgins	I do not think we should spend \$3.7Billion on widening a freeway. I feel that money can be better utilized improving public transit.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB28	Hannah Dwertman	<p>If a connection is made along 400 N under the highway, I'd encourage a bike and pedestrian only passing. It would be such a lovely change of pace from the huge highways and roads, and could actually 'pave the way' for a more pedestrian-focused community vibe.</p> <p>This message does not endorse the actual highway widening, which I oppose</p>	9.1.1 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB29	Sarah Thompson	I highly disagree with this, this will effect our quality of life living near the freeway already but having it be even closer will decrease the value of our home significantly and be even louder for us and disrupt our neighbors and our sleep. It will decrease our value and depreciate our home being even closer to the freeway and the loudness. We cannot afford this if we sell one day and lose out on what we have spent. I know my neighbors and all of us would agree. Also being closer to the freeway would cause more homeless to come and live under the freeway passes. It causes more crime and them living there and is a safety concern.	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB30	Jeff Deitz	Why is widening Legacy Parkway not an option? Since more of the growth is west of I15.	9.1.4
WEB31	Oriah Knorr	Please do not widen the freeway. You identify several viable transit alternatives to driving in this analysis that can be expanded to meet the traffic needs past 2050. The front runner expansion, increased buss services (maybe adding dedicated buss lanes on the freeway), adding trax lines from front runner stations in cities north of SLC, and increasing bike safety to front runner stations. The two billion dollars it will take to get just one extra lane on the freeway could be used to reduce air pollution, increase equitable transportation access, and create long term transit jobs. If Utah chooses to build one more lane, that will only increase traffic through induced demand by 2050, Utah has chosen to worsen it's air quality and abandon the American ideal of offering the freedom of choice to its citizens.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB32	Olan Kane	If your study concluded transit options would not be sufficient in reducing I-15 congestions by 2050 you did not an to build enough viable transit alternatives to driving. Induce demand of non-driving options to reduce traffic along I-15, please don't burn 2 billions dollars on incuraging more people to drive and make Utah's air worse.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB33	Austin Scott	I strongly oppose expansion of the I-15 corridor.	9.1.1
WEB34	Justin Strunk	I live at [REDACTED] in North Salt Lake and our property is marked for a temporary construction easement. Can you help me understand what impact that will have on our property? There are 6 townhome units at this location.	9.1.6 9.3.2 C
WEB35	Joel Salem	No lane additions. The community does not benefit from more lanes. Providing alternative modes of transportation, e.g. rail systems, vastly improve the transportation options. More lanes to not quell the traffic issues.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB36	Jan Bradfield	We attended the open house on Oct 18, 2023 and looked at the maps. We live at [REDACTED], [REDACTED], North Salt Lake, on the property called Silver Pines Townhomes. There are six units on this property. Our question is why is all this property shaded in green. And what does this mean? The green is just on this property and not on any other property surrounding it. Why is just this property being singled out? Could we get a response please. No one at the open house could give us a straight answer. It must be a mistake	9.1.6 9.3.2 C
WEB37	Rebecca Davis	I listened to the U-DOT presentation of the planned I-15 expansion by Tiffany Pocock at a panel discussion presented at the League of Women Voters of Salt Lake City on September 20, 2023. The information presented was very helpful in understanding the need for repairing and replacing aging freeway infrastructure and improving and/or adding freeway interchanges and new pedestrian and bike paths. But the negative health consequences of adding lanes to the freeway are too great to be ignored. Instead of spending money on widening the freeway, money should be invested in new and improved public transportation options.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB38	Casey Carrigan	We should not expand I-15. I live in Fairpark a couple of blocks away from the highway. I do not understand why "connecting communities" is so important when the clear trade-off is to negatively impact all the communities touched by the connecting infrastructure. Who cares that somebody, or even thousands of people, save 1 minute moving themselves and 200 square-feet of truck from Syracuse to Murray when every community in between was subjected to construction, increased noise, increased pollution, increased off and on-ramp traffic dumped onto our surface streets, highway litter, and yes, decreased property values. Any public expenditure of this size is an expression of values. UDOT values the movement of cars, and nothing else. There is no quest for alternatives, despite the fact that examples of alternatives abound in countries magnitudes happier and more efficient than our own. Furthermore, this expresses a judgment about our future. When we decide to spend four billion dollars on widening a miserable stretch of highway (increasing, I'd argue, the day-to-day misery both of those near it, AND the quantity of miserable drivers on it) We also choose NOT to spend four billion dollars on other things. Would the people of the state of Utah prefer to buy out enough water-rights to save the Great Salt Lake? Would they rather investigate the creation of a train from Tooele to Park City? Or accomplish the Rio Grande Plan and perhaps seven other projects of similar scope and ambition? Could we double bus service frequencies? Any of these alternate possibilities work TOWARDS solving the many problems faced by our state. The proposed widening solves only the problems imposed by the existence of the highway itself: Will a 2035 greenfield development in Tremonton and it's accompanying strip mall pencil if we don't spend this four billion dollars? the highway helps justify the existence of communities where the ability to own and operate a car is required to participate in society. If the highway justifies this way of living, how can there not be more demand on the highway when it is expanded? Is getting from Murray to Syracuse a couple of minutes faster really that great? Let's not deceive ourselves: this is not a "practical" or "technical" allocation of funds. It is a value judgement. It expresses that life should be lived a certain way (in a car, I guess), and subsidizes the development of cookie-cutter exurbs at the expense of heritage neighborhoods and agricultural land. It's foolish, and a mistake.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB39	Annette Plummer	<p>1) UDOT has prepared a thorough evaluation of the I-15 alternatives and I commend them for doing a good job.</p> <p>2) I FAVOR the "NO ACTION" alternative for the 1-15 expansion. I believe that making the interstate bigger is a 1950's solution to a 2050 problem. Utah has an opportunity to take more innovative solutions to traffic congestion in the forms of mass transit and van pooling. The \$3.7 billion cost to expand I-15 could be better utilized to expand mass transit and incentivize people to use it with low-cost or no-cost options.</p> <p>The cost of the expansion option is already twice what the legislature has allocated. Projects always cost more than the estimates and with inflation rates as high as they are, this project will only increase in cost. This will become an increasing burden for Utah taxpayers not to mention the adverse effect that more traffic will have on air quality in Salt Lake City.</p> <p>3) The expansion option includes the possibility of an underpass at 400 North in Salt Lake City. I STRONGLY OPPOSE any type of underpass at 400 North. As a resident of Hodges Lane who will be directly affected by this, I am concerned about neighborhood safety. An underpass will draw homeless encampments and drug activity. It will also increase traffic in a quiet residential neighborhood. Building an unwanted underpass will also increase the cost and duration of the project.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.5 9.3.5 C 9.4 A
WEB40	Levi Marsing	Support mass transit options like high-speed rail systems going from Idaho to Las Vegas	9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB41	John Bortell	<p>I don't see how you can start this study with the existing major construction not being completed.</p> <p>Some suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start aggressively ticketing drivers who camp in the left lane. Put signs up like outside of town that say "slower traffic keep right." They are impeding the flow of traffic and its marginal capex for likely a non-marginal improvement. Make the HOV lane a general lane for passenger cars only. No Semi-trucks, No pickup trucks with trailers. The HOV lane is regularly empty and, if not, it's someone wanting to drive 70mph AND they have to cross (impede traffic) all the other lanes to get to that lane. Revert Legacy to being passenger car traffic only, unless there's an accident on I15 Send police officers down the highway every 10mins, or some interval, to control the speed of traffic. Plenty of data supports that if everyone drove the same speed, there would be a net decrease in travel time for all drivers. (cheaper and less intrusive than construction) 	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
WEB42	Brody Steidley	Increasing the width of the highway will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the long run. When the road is widened, more drivers will come to fill it. You can not stop us. We are legion. The only alternative to congested driving is public transportation. Utah deserves an operational and convenient train network.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB43	Polly Parkinson	The people of SLC do not want this expansion. It seems like you ask for comments and then ignore the responses. I attend a lot of community council meetings on the Westside SLC and I haven't heard anyone support this. Why is this being pushed ahead anyway? The people impacted are lower income families--with either threatened loss of residences or increased noise and air pollution, and they receive no benefits from the plan. The people who benefit are commuters in the north who have nothing to lose. Studies show that wider roads just lead to more commuters. This is not a problem-solver. You are making our community worse.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.1.7

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB44	Thomas King	<p>I live in the Fairpark neighborhood of Salt Lake City, two blocks west of I-15. Given the choice between the current preferred alternative and the no build option, I strongly prefer no build. I rarely use I-15, so I have little to gain and lots to lose from this widening project.</p> <p>First, I have a couple specific comments about the preferred alternative, assuming that UDOT will go ahead with this project despite the opposition from my neighbors and I.</p> <p>Comment 1: This concerns Noise Wall 20 (between 600 North and South Temple on the west side of I-15). This wall is what protects my home from traffic noise, so my quality of life depends heavily on it. I see that UDOT analyzed wall heights between 14 and 17 feet, and settled on a 14-foot wall. This is despite the fact that an extra \$240,000 to build a 17-foot wall results in a \$1.7 MILLION increase in allowable cost according to UDOT's own formula, presumably because more receivers are better protected from noise. If there's going to be more traffic on the widened I-15, shouldn't we get something better than the existing 14-foot wall? If UDOT is going to spit in the eyes of Salt Lake's west-siders by building this project, you can at least give us three more feet of wall. You guys were willing to dig a mini Grand Canyon for I-215 to protect Holladay and Cottonwood Heights from noise, so surely this isn't too much to ask.</p> <p>Also, I hope this would go without saying, but please don't leave us for years with no wall at all while you work on this project.</p> <p>Comment 2: I strongly support adding another crossing of I-15 at 400 North or 200 North, or both, in Salt Lake City. I live on [REDACTED] and would love it if some of the traffic that currently gets funneled through that underpass was spread out. But I would also be happy to see, and would frequently use, crossings for pedestrians and bikes only. And I bet UDOT could build car-free crossings at both locations for less than the price of a single road crossing.</p> <p>And here's my argument for no build:</p> <p>UDOT is narrow-minded in its assumptions about how people will travel in the future. I understand that UDOT is accounting for the full build-out of transit projects in the 2050 RTP. The total estimated cost of ALL these projects is \$5.5 billion (https://wfr.org/VisionPlans/RegionalTransportationPlan/Adopted2019_2050Plan/RTP_2019_2050_ADOPTED.pdf). But I don't see any indication that UDOT has modeled what would happen if the \$3.7 billion cost of the I-15 widening was ALSO reallocated to transit. This would advance our transit development by decades, and especially if these investments were concentrated in the same Farmington to SLC corridor, I imagine there would be a much greater shift in travel modes than UDOT is currently projecting. California is currently spending \$23.9 billion to build 171 miles of high-speed rail - so at the same price per mile, this \$3.7 billion could turn FrontRunner into a literal bullet train that would travel 220mph between Farmington and Murray.</p> <p>Also, I seriously doubt Utah will stop growing in 2050. So what happens then? Salt Lake City neighborhoods are avoiding wholesale destruction this time around because the I-15 right of way has some room to grow built in. But that'll no longer be the case after this widening project. So with business as usual, our children will face a choice between unacceptable congestion on I-15 or unacceptable destruction through our urban core to widen it yet again. Or, UDOT can start moving money NOW from band-aid road projects like this to generational investments in transit. We have to stop widening I-15 at some point. Why not now?</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.5 9.1.6 9.3.5 C 9.3.7 B 9.3.7 C 9.3.12 C</p>
WEB45	Trisha Thompson	<p>The North Salt Lake Center Street off-ramp needs to stay in order to best serve the southern North Salt Lake area. Especially, with all of the new construction happening in the southern end of North Salt Lake. The w 2600 s traffic is already too much and becomes even dangerous during the mornings and afternoons with pedestrian and vehicle traffic during the South Davis Junior High school schedule.</p> <p>Also, TRAX should be extended into the North Salt Lake/Bountiful area (perhaps at the end of Beck St) with parking so that there is an alternative method to go downtown during high traffic times, such as events downtown, Utah Jazz games, Concerts, etc. this will help reduce congestion especially while leaving the Delta Center and more.</p>	<p>9.1.3 9.1.4</p>
WEB46	Therese Martin	<p>I strongly oppose the expansion of I-15.</p> <p>Highway expansion projects in other cities have done very little to help mediate traffic problems. Our best LONG TERM solution is to improve mass transit and make it make sense to use it. Utah has a bad reputation of very polluted air, this change could really make a difference. Let's think a little further into the future before wasting tax payer dollars.</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6</p>
WEB47	Lisa Peterson	<p>I don't see any information about wildlife road crossings. Are these being added anywhere to the road expansions? If not, can they be? If so, where?</p> <p>During the construction processes, what precautions are being taking for bird migration patterns?</p>	<p>9.3.10 A 9.3.12 D</p>
WEB48	Madi Lamb	<p>When I first heard of this expansion, my immediate thought went to the families of those that would be inconvenienced with having to relocate out of their homes. People work hard to get where they are today and shouldn't have to stress about losing their homes to a city that is showing the obvious disregard of that. The city is growing, we know this, and starting this massive project is not the answer. The demolition and construction alone that it would bring will inconvenience many for much longer than would be worth it. I-15 is already such a massive entity in the valley, making walking and biking unsafe and inaccessible in most areas to cross. Making the interstate larger would only worsen the problem. People are willing to commute with an alternative to driving, there are just obstacles in the way. I-15 and an unorganized and shortage of bus routing system are a couple of reasons why there are more people driving. I hope there is consideration to improving our public transportation before ongoing with discussion of widening I-15.</p>	<p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.5 C</p>
WEB49	Sergio Gutierrez	<p>Whichever alternative is selected, just please replace the asphalt with long lasting concrete, like down in salt lake and Utah counties. And adding some lights would be great</p>	<p>9.1.4 9.1.6</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB50	Tyler Hoggan	It seems ridiculous that there is a plan proposing to widen an already 12 lane highway in the first place. This project will ultimately be a waste of time and money on UDOT's part. There are several examples throughout the United States and Canada that show that freeway widening projects do NOT reduce congestion. Take the Katy Freeway in Houston, TX. That monstrosity has 26 lanes in some parts and it still frequently has traffic jams due to the fact that there isn't any viable modes of transportation in that area. A similar thing could be said about the 401 highway in Toronto, ON. The only way that traffic congestion can be reduced is to provide several alternative modes of VIABLE transportation so that there are less people driving vehicles. As far as the highway is concerned, I support the 'no build' alternative, given that this highway is already wide enough. There are certainly better solutions to traffic instead of bulldozing people's homes and creating unsustainable asphalt deserts, such as creating dedicated bus lanes, and further expanding transit, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure as a whole. I've lived in SLC for well over 12 years now, and I am extremely irritated that we seem to be stuck in a never ending cycle of car dependency, and I see this project as doing nothing but reinforcing this. No amount of population growth will ever be enough to justify expanding a highway past 8 lanes in any rational city.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB51	Amy Wilson	This is insane. You are horrible "stewards of taxpayer money" and life on the planet as we know it. Who gives a goddamn fuck about the traffic congestion (not that any expert believes in this effort anyway--it is absolutely not a solution, just a waste) ... that is not one of the immediate problems we need our representative and state bodies to research and fund. You are killing us. You are killing life. You are criminals. The public does not support this action, anyone with any amount of actual learning. We do not want you.	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB52	Ryan Gallant	In a part of Utah where air quality and long-term health/environmental impacts seem to always be top of mind, why are we considering a project that would encourage driving? Why not move forward with improving and expanding the state's public transit infrastructure, which is badly in need of both?	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB53	Therese Martin	I strongly oppose the expansion of I-15. Highway expansion in other cities has done very little to improve traffic and the real solution is to improve public transit. Utah struggles with our air quality, it seems to be the best long term solution to try to get folks out of their cars in into mass transit. Not make space for more cars	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB54	Monica Hilding	I would encourage all who are involved in this project to read Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environmental (UPHE)'s comments on why expanding highway 15 will not help our congestion. It will also deprive residents in the area of their homes, which will add to the shortage of housing along the Wasatch Front. We are living in a climate crisis and we must deal with it in intelligent ways. Increasing the width of highways will only add the the crisis. Increased public transportation could do so much to improve the quality of life along the Wasatch Front. Please do not expand Hwy. 15 between Farmington and Salt Lake City.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB55	Alexis Lee	The expansion of I15 will contribute largely to polluting emissions on the west side of Salt Lake City and the Valley. The EIS is flawed for the following reasons noted below and needs to be redone as new data and conditions indicate that Impacts and benefits to EJ communities would be great. Ideally, the project needs to be mostly replaced by mass public transit in order to mitigate pollution on the west side of Salt Lake City and the valley overall. This project puts west side residents, who are already disproportionately exposed to pollutions and other environmental hazards at even greater risk. The EIS does not consider emissions of other point sources such as oil refineries. UDOT has not been transparent in its public presentations and has left Ozone out of the analysis entirely, which is a huge oversight because the Salt Lake airshed is entering serious nonattainment for Ozone. Additionally, ozone has massive health complications for residents who are exposed. Lastly- research shows that if you build larger roadways it makes traffic worse.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 B
WEB56	Tatum St James	DO NOT BUILD THE EXPANSION	9.1.1
WEB57	Britton Gardner	No Build please	9.1.1
WEB58	Jake Luman	This plan will disrupt a community and cause people to lose their homes. Do not go forward with this plan.	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB59	Nicholas Walton	Please don't build this	9.1.1
WEB60	Jonah Janeway	You're threatening to evict people in a relatively impoverished area. What are they supposed to do? I have friends trying to make a career through college who's lives will be turned upside down by this. Please reconsider.	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB61	Clover Taylor	DO NOT EXPAND. the community does not want this.	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.1.7

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB62	Janice Law	I strongly think that UDOT should forgo this project. Therefore, I support the No-action Alternative. Since the freeway's initial construction, the highway has had a disproportionate impact on the westside of Salt Lake City. UDOT's and WFRC's current approach to making transportation decisions that prioritizes reducing commuter time above all other considerations exacerbates these inequities. The health and well-being of the residents of the westside, its businesses, and its housing stock have disproportionately been harmed. UDOT should be representing the best interest of the communities it suppose to serve. Our state's approach to transportation needs a major shift. Cities are no longer planning for cars and commuters. Mitigating the climate crisis should be its number one priority. The proposed transportation project does not promote the wise use of funds in a way that enhances public health and mitigates greenhouse gas emissions or other potential environmental impacts that Salt Lake City and Wasatch Front residents will face from the region's projected growth. Therefore, I support the No-action Alternative. UDOT should continue to maintain and improve the safety of aging infrastructure. As part of these improvements, UDOT should also mitigate impacts to those who directly face challenges created by UDOT construction in and around their neighborhood. New pedestrian and bicyclist improvements that improve safety and mobility should be made. In addition, it is time to address the noise and pollution impacts that the westside of Salt Lake City continues to disproportionately face.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A
WEB63	Katherine Rockwell	NO BUILD. The area being threatened by this construction is inhabited by a lot of people with no where better to live. Find a better solution. Make public transit more accessible. No one wants more road construction in Utah.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB64	Jessica Petersen	I am highly against the building of the I15 expansion. This is an ongoing issue that should be dealt with by creating more efficient public transportation instead of kicking families out of their homes	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB65	Joseph Rockwell	Do not build this expansion.	9.1.1
WEB66	Olivia Raines	Don't build	9.1.1
WEB67	Bianca Galindo	This highway expansion project is the most egregious waste of taxpayer money for the most useless infrastructure project I've heard of since I moved back to Utah. I have a friend who lives in the path of this project; you would be evicting them just to make a few extra lanes. What if instead of pouring fossil fuels into the atmosphere and making our city more automobile-dependent, we invested in some decent public transportation?	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB68	Melanie Crawford	I live on [REDACTED] (Wildcat Way) in Woods Cross. I am concerned with the proposed plan to re-route 800 west under I-15. This will add more congestion and traffic close to the high school and consequently on my road. Traffic is already heavy during the school year and adding more traffic on that road does not make sense because of the proximity to the high school. I have grown up and lived in this area of Woods Cross for over 20 years and based on my experience, it does not make sense to connect 800 west there. I am also concerned for the safety of the children in the neighborhood. Traffic on the street already speeds, cars are parked on the street adding to all the congestion, and adding more traffic would not be a smart decision.	9.1.4 9.2.1
WEB69	O Conner	Please DONT BUILD this is going to harm a lot of people and take a lot of housing	9.1.1 9.1.6
WEB70	Ryan O'Hara	We should not be widening i15. Doing so will risk the health of not only the adjacent residents but those of the valley in general. Expansion will not decrease congestion and pollution but rather increase it as more people use the new roads. This phenomenon has been demonstrated in other cities throughout the united states. What we need instead is to expand our public transport system. We have a beautiful light rail that is underutilized because it has not been made convenient. We need to expand the rails and branch our east-west with improved stops throughout the valley.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
WEB71	Norene Riedle	still had a hard time navigating your map and proposals...i feel the proposed changes to wildcat way are a problem. There is always a traffic jam in this area and when there are school functions, i think this will make it worse. i would hope you can find a better alternative. Thanks for letting us have some input.	9.2.1
WEB72	Alex Bean	I support adding an underpass at 400 N. Having east/west connectivity at multiple points is very important! It might not seem like much to go down to 300 N in a car, but as a pedestrian going that far out of your way can add a quarter mile or so to your walk!	9.1.5 9.1.6
WEB73	Ben Whiteman	A major point of frustration and disagreement with UDOT's Preferred Alternative plan, is the plan asserts the expansion of I-15 is required assuming other projects are implemented to improve transit, biking, and walking options; however, fails to articulate alternative plans which rethink how \$1.6-3.7B in funding could be leveraged to drastically expand transit options and eliminate the need for highway travel. With such a budget, UDOT's stated goal of improving quality of life through transportation is far more likely to be met if that money were used to reimagine transportation up and down the Wasatch Front and implement (and integrate existing) high-person density transit options. A failure to do so as part of its analysis of alternatives again illustrates UDOT's inability to see past fundamental discrepancies between our current transportation paradigm and that which will be required by 2050 to avoid severe environmental and climate-related impacts to the Salt Lake Valley which will jeopardize the health, safety, and well-being of its residents.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 A
WEB74	Les Christensen	We have a home at [REDACTED] in Centerville, it's on the frontage road north of Parrish lane, will it be affected by any of the proposals?	9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB75	Lynne Morse	Sirs: Removing affordable housing requires replacement with equivalent housing. I am retired and on a fixed income. I currently live in a mobile home park, and if it was eliminated due to freeway expansion, I would find it very difficult to find another home that I could afford. I hope the plan includes appropriate monetary compensation, and help to seniors and other low income people, to find replacement housing.	9.1.6
WEB76	Glenn Rice	There needs to be a north bound onramp and a south bound offramp near exit 322. This will help with traffic near lagoon and farmington station.	9.1.4
WEB77	Courtney Henley	Adding more lanes to I-15 should not be on the table for accommodating future growth. As UDOT has conceded it will not solve congestion problems. If the Wasatch Front is going to grow by millions of people between now and 2050, now is the time to full stop on past poor decision making that has gotten us here and put all of these new people on alternative transportation. Or better yet invest in local economies that do not require or incentivize people to travel many miles to work, school, church, and entertainment. The interstate highway system was conceived in the 50's as a war machine to move large military equipment around the US. Now it is a war on our health and well being that we are waging on ourselves. If we envision a better world for our communities it starts with looking forward in a way that does not duplicate or expand on past mistakes.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WEB78	Caitlin Cahill	The proposal to widen I-15 needs to be abandoned. There are so many better things we could spend \$1.6 billion dollars on to improve the quality of life for all Utahns, and those who live near the highway who will be most adversely affected. Imagine if we had \$1.6 billion dollars to invest in quality public transportation for all, to address the shrinking of the Great Salt Lake, the affordable housing crisis, or the terrible air pollution we have now? What if we could invest in our public schools to reduce class size and pay teachers more? What if we planted 5,000 trees on Salt Lake City's West Side to capture the particulates in the air that are already causing premature death for neighbors. There are so many needs in Salt Lake City, Utah that are critical, which raises the question on why Utah legislators are funding the expansion of a highway, that will not solve congestion (as induced demand studies have demonstrated again and again), but arguably create more problems. There are serious questions about the models that are being used to demonstrate the need for I-15 and whether the model adequately addresses air pollution concerns. The problems the I-15 expansion will cause are well documented in the research, including contributing to the climate crisis, and increasing the particulate matter in the air, dramatically impacting West Siders who are already adversely impacted. How will UDOT address this issue? Of critical concern is the disproportionate impact on communities of color. For the West Side, one of the most diverse zip codes in Utah, questions are raised as to what are the potential racial justice complaints under Federal civil rights law, specifically Title VI, the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that forbids discrimination on "the ground of race, color, or national origin." I-15 was part of the segregation and disinvestment of the West Side of Salt Lake City. The proposal to widen I-15, continues this pattern of harm exacerbating the critical problems of air pollution, contributing to health problems, and threatening the livelihood of small businesses owned by local residents (raising significant question about the economic impact study of the construction). Residents living on the West Side came together over the last forty years to repair, care, and build community in a site of state abandonment, now in return they have everything to lose! Further, it is a serious concern that UDOT and the Wasatch Regional Front Council did not engage with community members in a meaningful fashion before these decisions were made (years ago). The public deserves much more transparency on the decision-making process and an investigation into who specifically is benefiting from this \$1.6 billion price tag. It is certainly not the community who have been opposed to it from the beginning. If the proposal to widen I-15 is adopted, we deserve at the very least an audit of how this money is being used and who is profiting and at what cost. "Follow the money." In conclusion, we respectfully request that UDOT reconsider the proposal to widen I-15 and instead invest in public transportation, permanently affordable social housing, mass transportation, the Great Salt Lake, and our children's future city. This city belongs to all of us and we deserve better. Sincerely,	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 A
WEB79	Cole Robison	Please reconsider spending billions of dollars on a roadway widening project. That money could be far better spent on better driver education and enforcement of existing laws. Perhaps spend a billion on the roadway, a billion on enforcement and driver education, and 2 billion on alternative forms of education. Please reconsider this project. I am a Midvale resident who uses this stretch of road regularly and I strongly disapprove of this use of \$3.7 billion	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB80	Roger Borgenicht	<p>For more than 25 years, Utahns for Better Transportation (UBET) has worked to promote balanced transportation choices that serve and respect our neighborhoods, our environment, and our future quality of life along the Wasatch Front. UBET challenges the wisdom of the status quo philosophy and practice of a business-as-usual decision-making model exemplified by UDOT’s current project to add lanes to I-15, which attempts to accommodate the predicted increase in VMT instead of providing incentives to reduce those numbers. UBET believes a more effective and successful effort to improve service and lower emissions would be to invest in “shared solution” incentives to reduce traffic at peak hours by double tracking and electrifying FrontRunner now as the top priority.</p> <p>UDOT participated in Mountain View Corridor Growth Choices, an effort that endorsed a Balanced Transportation priority emphasizing the importance of sequencing of transportation investments.</p> <p>The sequencing of transportation investments needs to be studied to recommend the most effective and cost-efficient way to meet future travel needs, reduce the rate of growth of vehicle miles traveled, and improve air quality through a better balance between auto, transit, walk, and bike trips. The phasing and implementation of transportation investments over the next decade will affect land use development patterns and therefore affect future travel needs and the availability and effectiveness of other viable transportation choices.</p> <p>Widening Highways is a Temporary Fix Resulting in More Traffic, Not Less</p> <p>UDOT’s plan to widen I-15 from 400 South in Salt Lake City to Farmington in order to improve traffic flow is flawed. Increasingly, studies show that expanding the number of road lanes does not in the long run reduce traffic congestion but instead acts as an incentive for people to drive more. Research articles showing the failure of road-widening projects are growing more plentiful every day. The title of a recent (January 9, 2023) New York Times article, by Eden Weingart, says it all: “Widening Highways Doesn’t Fix Traffic. So Why Do We Keep Doing It?”</p> <p>Another study, If you build it, they will drive: Measuring induced demand for vehicle travel in urban areas, reviewed in the April 2019 issue of Transport Policy, found that “aggregate vehicle miles traveled increase in exact proportion with lane-mileage” and that “congestion relief from capacity expansion vanishes within five years of capacity expansion.”</p> <p>Since 1995 UBET has worked in collaboration with other public interest groups on Shared Solutions—promoting reliable, convenient, and affordable transit choices along with safe and extensive bicycle pathways and walkable mixed-use communities—all to reduce the number of vehicle miles travelled (VMT) each day in our region.</p> <p>Success stories include the Legacy Parkway and Trail project and the sequenced Mountain View Corridor project, both using the “shared solution” model to provide better balance between auto, transit, walk, and bike trips, and reducing rather than attempting to accommodate growth in VMT.</p> <p>If, as one of the fastest growing states in the country, Utah tries to manage population growth by continuing our auto-centric plans and investments, we will fail with ongoing congestion even on expanded highways. If, on the other hand, we prioritize investments in first class transit options to offer viable alternatives to driving a car, especially at the peak travel times, it is easy to manage growth by creating more transit capacity, by adding trains, or by increasing frequency.</p> <p>Making FrontRunner a viable alternative to I-15 for many trips could lead to a better-balanced outcome in how people get around—by car, transit, bike, or walk.</p> <p>Transportation Goals and Model Forecasting</p> <p>The main goal of most transportation improvement projects over the past decades has been to move more cars faster. Automobile congestion and delay were the main red flags to attack and solve. Bigger, wider, faster roads have been designed and built to accommodate the auto-dependent lifestyle of the majority of Wasatch Front residents.</p> <p>As Utah grows, our future quality of life will, in large part, depend on the viability of alternative transportation choices to always having to take the car. Our goal should be to invest now in transportation projects that will incentivize alternative transportation options as we grow. The projections that come from travel demand model forecasting should focus on operational and infrastructure improvements that will increase transit and active transportation trips.</p> <p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</p> <p>We support the effort being made to retrofit interchanges that were originally constructed for maximum car throughput and often ignored safe bike and pedestrian community connections altogether going east-west across I-15. We note, however, that in at least three locations, the DEIS calls for wider bridges to accommodate “future” bike and pedestrian improvements, i.e. 1600 N/Pages Lane; 1500 S; and Main St. The sequencing of investments is critical to travel mode outcomes. We need to prioritize our improvements for safe bike and pedestrian pathways with first class design for these facilities, not as an afterthought, as has been the case too often in the past.</p> <p>Prioritizing bike and walk investments in the project scope and budget is especially important because of the increased projected cost of the Action Alternative, now \$3.7B. In the past, project designs that didn’t move more cars faster often got cut out of the project first. That should not happen this time.</p> <p>We support the elimination of the SPUI at 600 N in SLC, and in general, believe the continuation of the SPUI interchange configuration should be eliminated because they are inherently unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians except, perhaps, where there is a first-class grade separation for the bike/walk pathways.</p> <p>Housing, Business and Air Quality Impacts</p> <p>With potential residential relocation numbers up to 36 and business relocations up to 26, the costs to individuals and communities will be significant. In addition, the increased traffic on a freeway that is proposed to have a typical 7-lane roadway cross-section in each direction (5 general purpose, 1 HOV, and 1 auxiliary merge/exit lane) will result in detrimental air quality impacts from the increased automobile and truck traffic on the surrounding community.</p> <p>Thank you for providing the opportunity to make comments.</p> <p>(For this comment’s email attachment, see Appendix 9B, <i>Attachments to Emailed Comments on the Draft EIS</i>).</p>	<p>See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS</p> <p>9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.2 9.3.5 C 9.3.5 B 9.3.6 A</p>

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WEB81	Patti Hobfoll	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed I-15 expansion from N. Salt Lake to Farmington. I remember years ago, the fight over building the Legacy Parkway. It was built anyway. So, we DO already have somewhat of an I-15 expansion. It is high time for Utah to start significantly investing in public transportation and infrastructure. Stop building bigger and bigger roads- it is putting more and more pressure on our environment and our already-near-collapse Great Salt Lake. Endless expansion is not sustainable, and widening I-15 is not the answer. Legacy has already gotten its expansion, the truck ban lifted, and the speed limit increased. This will mitigate I-15 traffic sufficiently for the time being- while PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION is developed.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
WEB82	Andrew Clark	<p>"My name is Andrew E. Clark.</p> <p>My comments below are on behalf of the following entities on which I serve and represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark Lane National Historical District, Farmington, Utah • Farmington Historical Preservation Commission - Farmington, Utah • Ezra T. Clark Family Organization - Based in Farmington, Utah <p>I was raised in and now own and live in the 167 year-old Ezra T. Clark home, the first and oldest home built in Farmington's Clark Lane Historical District. This home is also the oldest known existing rock home residence in Farmington.</p> <p>All proposed widening options thus far will destroy or run right through the center of Ezra T. Clark Park. This city park is heavily used for all Davis County residents and is an anchor and starting point for Farmington's (and Davis County's) most popular walking/biking/horse trail.</p> <p>This city park also marks the location where Ezra T. Clark, one of Farmington's first settlers built his cabin, next to the nearby spring, dug a well, planted his orchard and built the first log cabin school.</p> <p>The concrete bridge in the center of the park that spans Farmington Creek is the original Clark Lane route before the town was surveyed by Brigham Young in 1853/4. 400 West was added after 1945 and the bridge became disused until it was incorporated into the Clark Lane leg of the Farmington Trails system.</p> <p>A stone monument placed in 1948 currently marks this historic location. Ezra T. Clark and his 2 wives' posterity now numbers 70k-100k persons who belong to the Ezra T. Clark Family Organization which was established in 1901.</p> <p>To my knowledge, I have received no response regarding my requests and research showing that that the existing railroad/Frontrunner tracks can be shifted 50 feet west into the vacant land to allow space for all the required lanes.</p> <p>This is a true long-term solution and keeps Davis County's first and oldest historical district from being impacted.</p> <p>Please see my comments sent via email to i15eis@utah.gov</p>	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.1 A
Written Comments			
WRI1	Dennis Hooper	<p>Please Consider doing a collector system between 400 No and 500 So instead of the braded system.</p> <p>Please consider a single point interchange at 500 So instead of the diamond interchange. I worry about increased traffic on 1500 So in Woods Cross, when 500 is slow traffic uses 1500 South.</p>	9.1.4 9.2.1
WRI2	Stephen Bradford	<p>It isn't apparent to me that continous expanding of I-15 is viable in the long run, especially in the Davis County areas where the freeway already gets so close to residential areas. I wish more agressive expansion of public transportation options were more prioritized.</p> <p>If the State Street option in Farmington is pursued, it seems a shame not to add an option for a more convenient northbound option. That said, it feels morally inappropriate to impose so much on the rest home that is directly in the construction impact zone.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6
WRI3	Scott Ogilvie	<p>Location of intersection: Rebuild and improve I-15 access at 200 W in Farmington.</p> <p>Neet to be able to get on and off I-15 North bound. This would be a lost opportunity.</p>	9.1.4
WRI4	Melanie Crawford	<p>Our home will not directly be impacted through easements or relocations. However, I am very concerned about potential noise, light, and ground movements/settling from night construction or construction on the road. I have 2 young children that will negatively be impacted by night construction. When I-15 was repaced a couple years ago, our house shook and the noise was disruptive. I was unable to sleep through it. I went to our basement, hoping the noise would be less. It was just as loud and the shaking was unnerving. I can only imagine how much worse it will be with all of the road expansion and the prolong road work.</p> <p>I saw the sound wall is expected to be moved to the road (625W). When would that take place? Will it be up the entire time construction is taking place ro reduce some of the sound?</p> <p>On another note, you will be taking out a row of trees on our street. What do you plan to do to remedy these negative environmental impacts? Will you be planting trees elsewhere to compensate?</p>	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.12 B 9.3.12 C

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WR15	Polina Konuchkoua	<p>I'm very happy to see that the revised plans are saving homes and businesses. I'm still concerned that not enough alternatives are being considered. With population increasing and moving from various places, I want to see a lot more study into the impact of expanding public transit rather than expanding the freeway.</p> <p>Current projections may show that not enough people use public transit - but it is currently not sufficient. Expanding it would help the communities and it is better for the environment.</p> <p>People will gravitate towards what's easy - building out freeways would encourage more and more people to drive, putting us in the exactly same position years down the line. Building out public transit would encourage more people to use it.</p> <p>Now is the time to set us on the trajectory that will save our current communities and future generations better than adding more lanes. Thank you.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WR16	Kyle Deans	<p>UDOT and the state of Utah continue to push more and more car capacity, despite study after study showing that increasing capacity actually leads to more congestion in the future than had the capacity remained the same (Induced Demand). UDOTs own modeling shows that while pollution will decrease from current levels will reduce pollution not expanding actually has greater reduction numbers. "One more lane" is always UDOTs approach and 10 years later they once again need "one more lane" to fix it.</p> <p>People will not change their habits of being car dependent unless a pain point is created. That pain point needs to be created sooner rather than later. A full double track and electrification of Front Runner along with the Rio Grande Station plan will reduce commute times much more than an expansion of I-15.</p> <p>UDOT is hard to trust with anything when a Deputy Director stated that Utah needs to widen its roads to avoid becoming California. That is the stupidest comment I have heard.</p> <p>Stop adding "one more lane" because it doesn't help, it hurts. Look at the Katy freeway in Texas as the perfect example.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WR17	Greg Sanchez	<p>Please consider extreme traffic calming measures along 600 N between I-15 to 400 West. Although free right is removed, it is not enough to slow traffic EB and WB on bridge. Both directions are an issue today and will be in the future. Reduce lane width, planted medians, etc. so traffic can move at 35 mph, not 45 mph like today.</p>	9.2.1
WR18	Rodger F Miller	<p>I15 EIS Study Team,</p> <p>Pollution of air and sound were mentioned in the I15 EIS, but only in the confines of limited variables. Air pollution was discussed as decreasing over time as a consequence of factors in the development in technology related to pollution. Sound pollution was mentioned as being a consequence of factors related to road surface materials and building of sound barriers.</p> <p>Never was speed of vehicle travel mentioned as an essential variable in levels of air and sound pollution. Speeds on I15 of 60 miles per hour for autos, and 55 MPH for trucks, could reduce air pollution of up to 15%. Sound decible levels would be reduced as a consequence of reduced speed on the I15 freeway.</p> <p>Failure to include vehicle speed as an essential factor in the EIS is a disturbing shortcoming.</p>	9.3.6 D
WR19	Ann Suley	<p>Concerning the I15 corridor. It's big enough!!! You have gone to the effort of public transportation via trax and bus service. People coming and going into and out of SLC needs to use these; especially the younger people who don't have a problem walking or riding bikes to these services. Maybe a reduction in your passes (NOT paid by the tax payer) could be implemented instead of more road construction. The public transportation is available give them incentives to use it. Tey are capable - make them pay - like a toll fee for commuters who use it every week day or 4-5 times a week or for everyone. We don't need a wide bigger I-15. Make (incentivize them tu use puvlic transportation.</p> <p>Also against the gondola - have pepole share the canyon. You have ??? sign up a month in advance. Take turns.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.3.5 C 9.4 A
WR11	Dennis Hooper	<p>Please Consider doing a collector system between 400 No and 500 So instead of the braded system.</p> <p>Please consider a single point interchange at 500 So instead of the diamond interchange. I worry about increased traffic on 1500 So in Woods Cross, when 500 is slow traffic uses 1500 South.</p>	9.1.4 9.2.1
WR12	Stephen Bradford	<p>It isn't apparent to me that continous expanding of I-15 is viable in the long run, especially in the Davis County areas where the freeway already gets so close to residential areas. I wish more agressive expansion of public transportation options were more prioritized.</p> <p>If the State Street option in Farmington is pursued, it seems a shame not to add an option for a more convenient northbound option. That said, it feels morally inappropriate to impose so much on the rest home that is directly in the construction impact zone.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.5 9.1.6
WR13	Scott Ogilvie	<p>Location of intersection: Rebuild and improve I-15 access at 200 W in Farmington.</p> <p>Neet to be able to get on and off I-15 North bound. This would be a lost opportunity.</p>	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
WR14	Melanie Crawford	<p>Our home will not directly be impacted through easements or relocations. However, I am very concerned about potential noise, light, and ground movements/settling from night construction or construction on the road. I have 2 young children that will negatively be impacted by night construction. When I-15 was repaced a couple years ago, our house shook and the noise was disruptive. I was unable to sleep through it. I went to our basement, hoping the noise would be less. It was just as loud and the shaking was unnerving. I can only imagine how much worse it will be with all of the road expansion and the prolong road work.</p> <p>I saw the sound wall is expected to be moved to the road (625W). When would that take place? Will it be up the entire time construction is taking place ro reduce some of the sound?</p> <p>On another note, you will be taking out a row of trees on our street. What do you plan to do to remedy these negative environmental impacts? Will you be planting trees elsewhere to compensate?</p>	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.12 B 9.3.12 C
WR15	Polina Konuchkoua	<p>I'm very happy to see that the revised plans are saving homes and businesses. I'm still concerned that not enough alternatives are being considered. With population increasing and moving from various places, I want to see a lot more study into the impact of expanding public transit rather than expanding the freeway.</p> <p>Current projections may show that not enough people use public transit - but it is currently not sufficient. Expanding it would help the communities and it is better for the environment.</p> <p>People will gravitate towards what's easy - building out freeways would encourage more and more people to drive, putting us in the exactly same position years down the line. Building out public transit would encourage more people to use it.</p> <p>Now is the time to set us on the trajectory that will save our current communities and future generations better than adding more lanes. Thank you.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WR16	Kyle Deans	<p>UDOT and the state of Utah continue to push more and more car capacity, despite study after study showing that increasing capacity actually leads to more congestion in the future than had the capacity remained the same (Induced Demand). UDOTs own modeling shows that while pollution will decrease from current levels will reduce pollution not expanding actually has greater reduction numbers. "One more lane" is always UDOTs approach and 10 years later they once again need "one more lane" to fix it.</p> <p>People will not change their habits of being car dependent unless a pain point is created. That pain point needs to be created sooner rather than later. A full double track and electrification of Front Runner along with the Rio Grande Station plan will reduce commute times much more than an expansion of I-15.</p> <p>UDOT is hard to trust with anything when a Deputy Director stated that Utah needs to widen its roads to avoid becoming California. That is the stupidest comment I have heard.</p> <p>Stop adding "one more lane" because it doesn't help, it hurts. Look at the Katy freeway in Texas as the perfect example.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
WR17	Greg Sanchez	<p>Please consider extreme traffic calming measures along 600 N between I-15 to 400 West. Although free right is removed, it is not enough to slow traffic EB and WB on bridge. Both directions are an issue today and will be in the future. Reduce lane width, planted medians, etc. so traffic can move at 35 mph, not 45 mph like today.</p>	9.2.1
WR18	Rodger F Miller	<p>I15 EIS Study Team,</p> <p>Pollution of air and sound were mentioned in the I15 EIS, but only in the confines of limited variables. Air pollution was discussed as decreasing over time as a consequence of factors in the development in technology related to pollution. Sound pollution was mentioned as being a consequence of factors related to road surface materials and building of sound barriers.</p> <p>Never was speed of vehicle travel mentioned as an essential variable in levels of air and sound pollution. Speeds on I15 of 60 miles per hour for autos, and 55 MPH for trucks, could reduce air pollution of up to 15%. Sound decible levels would be reduced as a consequence of reduced speed on the I15 freeway.</p> <p>Failure to include vehicle speed as an essential factor in the EIS is a disturbing shortcoming.</p>	9.3.6 D
WR19	Ann Suley	<p>Concerning the I15 corridor. It's big enough!!! You have gone to the effort of public transportation via trax and bus service. People coming and going into and out of SLC needs to use these; especially the younger people who don't have a problem walking or riding bieks to these services. Maybe a reduction in your passes (NOT paid by the tax payer) could be implemented instead of more road construction. The public transportation is available give them incentives to use it. Tey are capable - make them pay - like a toll fee for commuters who use it every week day or 4-5 times a week or for everyone. We don't need a wide bigger I-15. Make (incentivize them tu use puvlic transportation.</p> <p>Also against the gondola - have pepole share the canyon. You have ??? sign up a month in advance. Take turns.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.3.5 C 9.4 A
UDOT Contact Tool Comments			
UDOT1	Steven Williams	<p>It would be a Great Idea to have Toll Lanes, but it likely will NEVER happen. The Legacy Parkway was originally proposed to be a Toll Road, it also was supposed to remain a 55 MPH speed limit and with restrictions to oversized vehicles and was, up until a group of UDOT brain dead genius' turned it, along with the I-15 HOV lane into a Deadly RACE way for the Rich and influential above the LAW drivers.</p>	9.1.3

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
UDOT2	Kristeen Lindorff	<p>Dear UDOT,</p> <p>I want to thank you for listening to the citizens of Farmington, Utah about the Alt. B on Glover Lane, and not choosing that option. To have all that traffic from an interchange with off and on ramps into a bedroom community, would have been a nightmare for the people that live there. I truly appreciated your open hearings and you sending some of your people to meet with us. You listened and that is a huge thing from Government. So, thank you very much!</p> <p>I have a question about the West Corridor Construction. It is looking wonderful and I love watching the progress. My question is the area right under the bridge before it crosses over the I-15 going north, will you be putting a sound wall there to meet the existing Farmington wall on the frontage road? I notice at night how the light from cars on the freeway shine right in our eyes as we head south on the frontage road in our cars and the sound seems to funnel through that opening. I tried to find plans for that but haven't found them. Have you decided yet how you are going to close off that section from the freeway? If it isn't too much trouble, could you please answer that question for me or direct me to where I can find it?</p> <p>Again, thank you for the work you do and for listening to the public.</p>	9.2.2 9.3.7 B 9.4 A
Public Hearing Comments			
PH1	Kyle Deans	<p>So two concerns based on the displays out there. The first one is that the second board -- or the third board, I believe -- shows the 2019 current commute times and the 2050 estimated commute times with no change. However, there are no boards that actually indicate what those 2050 commute times will be with an upgrade in the system. And my guess, based on induced demand across the country, is that those -- those commute times will actually increase. Perfect example, worst case example in the United States, the Katy Freeway in Houston. It expanded to 27 lanes total, and by the time it was done, within three years, morning commute times had increased by 55 percent over not -- over -- before the expansion -- and evening commute times had increased by 34 percent. So adding capacity never, in the history of ever, has reduced overall commute times within five years of expansion. The second one is, is there's an air impact quality board out there -- perfect -- that actually states that, with no change, that all of the environmental air quality items, with no change in 2050, air quality -- or pollution will reduce. But the 2050 with action, they'll still reduce, but not less. So UDOT's own numbers state that air quality will be reduced more with no change to I-15 than if they add lanes to I-15. Thank you.</p>	9.1.1 9.4 A
PH2	Lucy Cardenas	<p>Yes. Hello. My name is Lucy Cardenas, L-u-c-y C-a-r-d-e-n-a-s. And I grew up in Rose Park, and I live on [REDACTED], right along the freeway, and my business is also right off North Temple and South Temple. My business is Red Iguana. And I'm sure I'm not going to say -- I don't have anything profound to say except that I am absolutely 100 percent opposed to expanding the I-15. I believe that there are areas that can be improved, as far as walkability. But as far as building -- making it wider, it's just going to invite more vehicles. And I've lived in major cities where walkability is a wonderful thing, where public transportation runs at a good pace, and I think it's a matter of reeducating our people to not depend on cars as much. So thank you.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.3.5 C
PH3	Ben Wood	<p>Ben Wood, Salt Lake City, B-e-n W-o-o-d. My question is about 600 North. The city is reducing that street to one lane in each direction. If I understand the graphic correctly, you guys are dumping three lanes in each direction onto what will be a one-lane street, which will make 9th West -- or 10th -- I'd have to look at the diagrams -- a mess. I mean, there's just -- it's hard for me to understand why you would dump three lanes into one lane in the space of about two blocks. So that just seems like an obvious failure design right there. There's high school students crossing right there. There's a lot of neighborhood connectivity -- a library on one side, houses on the other. So that just seems like a mess waiting to happen. I would plead with you to not do that. Thank you.</p>	9.1.4 9.2.1
PH4	Michelle Watts	<p>Michelle Watts, last name W-a-t-t-s, and I live half a block from here in the ZIP code 84116. Billions of dollars on this spent is just ridiculous. Like, the federal government is working to redirect -- reconnect neighbors and work on neighbors who have been redlined. This goes exactly against what every other city right now is trying to do to repair relations. We haven't opened the Davis Corridor yet. We don't know if people are going to stay on Legacy and loop around. We haven't double tracked FrontRunner yet. We haven't worked on that last mile of when you get onto a train or get off a train to make it any better. No one should lose a house. No one should be inconvenienced by the construction. We are going to lose good neighbors who have lived here forever. We're going to hurt private businesses. We're going to hurt so many things that will have a lasting effect that my kids are going to have to live with the decision. And so I really think, if we're going to spend billions of dollars, we should put a better train. We rushed where we put FrontRunner. Put a train in between the freeway. Have it go up and down to Provo, back up to North Ogden. You guys don't even have a real connect from North Ogden. Like, we don't even know how this is going to benefit us until the other things that are in play are complete. So let's not knock down houses. Let's actually fix the damage that freeways do to communities instead of making it more. Thanks.</p>	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.3 A 9.3.5 C
PH5	Maria Garciaz	<p>Maria Garciaz with NeighborWorks Salt Lake, G-a-r-c-i-a-z, but also I'm a resident of Guadalupe neighborhood. So I'm not going to comment necessarily on the EIS or the Draft. I read all hundreds of pages. I reviewed all of the different boards that you presented. I've read a lot of the comments. What I do want to share with you is what I've heard throughout the community -- is that the majority of residents that live in this community don't feel like their comments have any value anymore; so you're not going to get a lot of comments. You're not going to get a lot of people that are going to come up and speak and tell you how they feel. Those who have, I appreciate. But those that we have, you know, worked with over the past 12 months to come out and make comments don't feel like they're being heard and no longer feel like what they have to say has any value. So those are the comments I wanted to share with you. I mean, there's a few folks in here who have told me, "Maria, will they listen to what I have to say?" I just want to share that with you in terms of -- you've heard before about the trust level. So please take that into consideration in terms of the outreach meetings that you're offering in the next few weeks, that -- for folks to actually come up and say something, I think it'll be difficult and challenging. Thank you.</p>	9.1.7
PH6	Robert Goodman	<p>My name is Robert Goodman. I'm a homeowner in Salt Lake City. R-o-b-e-r-t G-o-o-d-m-a-n. First off, I'd like to thank you for providing a kids' area and the food. I think that's an important part of the public and community engagement process. I do find -- I've never been in a meeting kind of designed this way before with kind of the info graphics in the front and the public area in the back. I kind of would like to see a little bit more prioritization of the public comment area, personally. Really quick, I encourage the -- the bike lanes in West Bountiful, North Salt Lake, and Farmington as well. I hope you guys keep that within the plan. I do kind of share the sentiment that I hear quite a bit that \$3 billion is a lot of money, and I hope that, moving forward, public transportation and other kind of transportation, alternative opportunities, are considered for kind of developing for our growing state. Thanks once again, Tiffany, Robert, everyone. Thanks so much.</p>	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.3.5 C 9.4 C 9.4 H

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
PH7	Nick Mecham	Hi. Nick Mecham. Last name is M-e-c-h-a-m. Resident of Salt Lake City, Rose Park area. And I think -- I'm just going to echo some of the sentiments that have already come up, but I think a lot of the people here do not feel heard, especially from this area, and there are a number of reasons that people don't feel heard. First off, we can go back several years to the prison relocation commission, when they held hearings pretty much in this same spot, and nobody felt heard, and now the prison is in, essentially, our area. Secondly, we're now dealing with the fact that, here in Salt Lake City, especially in this area, we're looking at school closures, public school closures, which will affect our neighbors. And then, third, given the fact that all the research and data shows that freeway expansion does not reduce commute times once it's actually done, it seems like a really bad idea to start taking people's property, businesses, and -- and residences. Frankly, I think eminent domain is an evil practice because we're taking people's property that they always pay taxes on. It's almost like you never own the property because the government's always collecting money from you, and then, on top of that, they can just take it whenever they deem it, quote/unquote, "necessary." So I think this a bad idea all around. Too much money spent on something that we haven't looked at all the solutions for. Thanks.	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.3.3 A 9.4 C
PH8	Chaise Warr	Yeah. My name Chaise Warr, last name W-a-r-r. I am the vice chair on the Fairpark Community Council, and I also live in the Guadeloupe neighborhood, which is just adjacent to the freeway, in a nationally historic registered home. I'm just here to reiterate the fact that most of the constituents in this area don't feel heard. I mean, we had a meeting -- a Fairpark Community Council meeting, and they asked if we wanted to give you guys more time to come and speak at us, and it was outwardly spoken the fact that it doesn't do any good for you guys to just come and talk to us and tell us that basically the decision's already been made and whatever -- what left -- what decisions are left to be made out there in the lobby is up to you guys. It's not up to us in the area, and it's just a big slap in the face. I think to call this a public hearing, we need to be heard, and none of us feel heard.	9.1.7
PH9	Taylor Olney	All right. My name is Taylor O-l-n as in Nancy-e-y. I live in Guadeloupe -- I live in Guadeloupe. And, honestly, I do just want to kind of echo everything. I want to speak directly to my neighborhood, because I don't feel like saying anything here actually matters, because something that directly impacts my street, less than a block, I've been outwardly against it -- putting an underpass under 4th North. And I get all the comments from you guys going, well, that's brand new from other people that like it. Who are those other people? I get there's a bunch of people you are interviewing, a bunch of people you are talking to. But as something that directly impacts my neighborhood, I feel like that should be a louder voice. And then to kind of to echo other things, it's kind of weird to see all these other -- 215, Legacy -- all these things that are not really being utilized and we're throwing -- it seems like we're throwing everything at the wall. Let's throw I-15. Let's throw the second FrontRunner train up there. We're throwing everything at the wall to see what sticks. Why don't we see what works, take one step at a time, instead of just spending all this money on all these other things and hoping one of them actually works. Thank you.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.5 9.1.7 9.3.5 A 9.3.5 C
PH10	Keiko Jones	My name is Keiko, K-e-i-k-o, Jones. So I live in Guadeloupe neighborhood in Fairpark. And I've heard that 4th North underpass has gone to the City to consider, but either way I want to express my opposition because I'm in the neighborhood right there that would be impacted. And, you know, our city's parks department is not doing, really, a good job to keep up even, like, nice, wholesome trail, and I'm afraid it will create more opportunity for unwanted activities and people hanging out. So I think immediate neighbors should be heard. That's my opinion. Thank you.	9.1.5 9.1.7
PH11	Jessica Wallace	Hi. Jessica Wallace, last name W-a-l-l-a-c-e. I live in Rose Park on [REDACTED], near the Tacos Daniel and the community center. I guess to echo the comments around not being heard. Are there any considerations for having community members on your panel or out there with a table, with a booth, talking about how it's going to affect our property values, talking about how it's going to impact our lives? Is my comment to hopefully move forward from just the not being heard -- is actually inviting us to be at the table when these decisions are being made. Thanks.	9.1.6 9.1.7
PH12	Courtney Jacobsen	Thank you. My name is Courtney Jacobsen, C-o-u-r-t-n-e-y. Jacobsen is J-a-c-o-b-s-e-n. I'm currently serving as the president of the Utah Independent Business Coalition, and so my questions and concerns are for the small and independent businesses along the corridor. One of the things that has stood out, as I watched this process over the last six, seven months -- I guess it's been longer than that because the last EIS came out last November -- is that so much of what we talk about in the -- in the economic impacts are in this future economic impact. And I'm curious if we are sacrificing and hurting our current economy, specifically within those local, small businesses, as we look forward to the future. As we look to 2050, are we making choices now that impact those local and small businesses along the corridor? Thanks.	9.1.6 9.3.4 A 9.3.12 E
PH13	RON McCormick	My main concern here is I live right near the 600 North junction, right near the new Marmalade library. I see a lot of traffic going both directions on 300 West and then on to 600 North, and that traffic goes both north and southbound. But mainly the issue I have is a safety issue and a neighborhood residential issue, and that is that the industrial trucks from Statefair, from ExxonMobil, from Tesoro, all of the industrial people that are down the corridor of 3rd West, and then as it turns into -- what is the name of that street? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Beck Street. RON McCORMICK: Beck street. Yes. So all those vehicles -- 18-wheelers, concrete trucks, gravel trucks -- all use that 600 North junction, and it's a mix with, you know, civilian -- I call it civilian -- but residential sedans. It's a safety issue, and it's a noise issue. So my encouragement is that we really look at the 2100 North junction that crosses the I-15 and enhance it, as I see it was proposed. I would be highly in favor of that so that those trucks could use that junction more frequently than they do the 600 North junction. Thank you.	9.1.7
PH14	Ernesto Ortiz	Hi. My name is Ernesto Ortiz. Last name is O-r-t-i-z. I'm a member of the Guadeloupe District. There's a sign out there that's indicating that there's still -- indicating how to access between east and west between North Temple and 400 North. I know in previous meetings, a lot of the locals that live along 600 West have addressed that we were against an underpass on 400 North and that was going to be relayed. Speaking to a UDOT member out there, he indicated that that's really something that the city is proposing and the city is behind and that's their call, but it's on the UDOT information. So, as a local resident, somebody who actually lives on 600 West, is there information that UDOT can provide, or specifically is that information accurate, and do we need to bring those concerns to Salt Lake City directly because they're the ones that are looking at having that alternate east-west access? So I -- as a resident, I would like to know how I can voice my concern as well and more information on that and whose final call that is, so to speak. Thanks.	9.1.5 9.1.7
PH15	Courtney Reeser	My name is Courtney Reeser, C-o-u-r-t-n-e-y R-e-e-s-e-r. I live on [REDACTED] in Salt Lake City, right in Rose Park, right between the 10th North and the 6th North offramps interchanges. The impact that this will have is not being addressed with the fact that it's only incorporating cars. We're not talking about possibly using mass transit and that sort of thing to reduce the emissions. I was looking at the numbers that you have on your board out there, and the percentages are not going to get any better the way that they are put out. They are not addressing the fact that we are building this for single-occupied vehicles, and we really need to -- if we want to make a better impact for our communities, we need to make sure that we are addressing other transportation opportunities, especially for people that live along that corridor, which has been historically environmentally impacted with noise, with industry, and with single-occupied vehicles. Thank you.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.5 C 9.3.6 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
PH16	Kim Hitchcock	My name is Kim Hitchcock. It's K-i-m H-i-t-c-h-c-o-c-k. My concern -- one of my concerns is about accessibility during this massive project. We had a -- there was a project -- I think it was just a repavement a couple years ago on 600 North, and the accessibility of that intersection -- we had to go super far. It's not -- when you're going northbound, you can't get off on 10th; right? You have to go basically all the way to Bountiful. It wasn't a quick fix. It impacted a lot of people during the project. And this is obviously a much longer time line. So I would want to be sure that there's still accessibility from the west community -- I live in Rose Park, by the way -- to easily get downtown; right? Like, we're trying -- the whole goal of this project is to decrease your commute. So during this project, I would hope that we're not increasing commutes dramatically, especially from our community to a very close in proximity downtown. And if there's any way to address 600 North and 10th North at different times, even that would be beneficial. Obviously, there's a lot of impacts. This affects things environmentally. It affects our neighborhoods, and it sounds like, the way the conversations are going, it's happening. So if we're thinking about it in those terms, at least let there be accessibility throughout the project as well.	9.1.7 9.3.12 A
PH17	Charlotte Jacobsen	Hi, my name is Charlotte Jacobsen, C-h-a-r-l-o-t-t-e. Last name J-a-c-o-b-s-e-n. I'm not from this area, like along this strip. But I am 12 years old, and as the daughter of a former small business owner, I know how hard it is for businesses that are small or independent businesses, even just normally after COVID, and this could greatly impact their normal income and the way that they'll be able to function. And it could also affect their customers that they would normally have that couldn't possibly be able to get there in the same amount of time. So they could choose a shorter, possibly easier thing, like Amazon or something, or something that has already made enough money that it can already support itself, instead of a small business that maybe has a harder time getting enough income. Thank you.	9.3.4 A 9.3.12 E
PH18	James Longstaff	My name is James Longstaff, J-a-m-e-s space L-o-n-g-s-t-a-f-f. And I actually live in Sandy, which is not close to here. But the public comment that I'd like to make is I am -- one of the reasons I showed up today is I'm concerned about induced demand, especially with the fact by expanding the highway, we will be incentivizing people to live further away from Salt Lake rather than live closer which would be more convenient and less costly to use the highway. Congestion definitely makes it more costly to drive into Salt Lake, as far as people's time. And so I just wanted to say I spoke a little bit with the man who did the modeling, and, you know, one thing I would love to see is modeling that isn't just based off of on- or off-switches at -- of -- of the project, but also modeling that kind of takes into account the population -- the possible population increase that will -- that will be induced in Davis County and outside of, because of the higher -- the higher population and easy -- ease of getting between the two counties. And so that's all I wanted to comment for you guys to consider also a little further, if you haven't already, because maybe the benefit isn't going to be as much as previously calculated. I understand, with modeling, there's a lot of -- there's a lot of assumptions you have to make anyways. And so I am not saying that you guys haven't done a good job, but I would love to see some -- a lot more rigor with that to consider how people are going to move further north and then, therefore, will actually make the time shorter to travel. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.3.5 A
PH19	Clark Ward	Thank you. It occurs to me that an elevated causeway on the east side of Great Salt Lake could reduce the traffic burden between -- let's see -- Kaysville and North Salt Lake, because a lot of people that commute from Ogden to Salt Lake really don't need or have any -- any point in the traffic flow between Kaysville and Bountiful, and we'd just as soon bypass all of that. We can make that easy for them by building an elevated causeway just over the Great Salt Lake. Why elevated? Well, the smog is practical reason number one. But, number two, I think it would not disturb the ecosystem. Okay? And, number three, you could make it a toll road, and that would help pay for it. At some point in time, we're not going to be able to keep widening and widening and widening as we grow and grow and grow. Something has got to give. Okay? Something has got to give. I would also comment that we need to have a moratorium on building -- thank you -- a moratorium on building because Utah simply cannot accommodate everybody that may want to move here. More is not always going to better. I think that we have reached that saturation point. Evidence is the poor quality of air. It's only getting worse as each year goes on. The inversion becomes -- comes sooner, and it's more intense every year, and a lot of that is the heavy traffic. So I think we have to address some of those problems as we consider just building wider, building wider, and building wider. Thank you.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.3.6 A
PH20	Larry Dupaix	Larry Dupaix. I live in Bountiful, but my business is on the I-15 east side on the 311 exit. Atlas Machinery is where we're at. We've seen some preliminary things here and there. We have to really seek them out. It seems like there's not a lot of information coming our way, and we would definitely be impacted by this, as we hear and see some of the projected elevated exits and other things that really would have a definitive effect. We've got five hundred foot of frontage on the freeway there, which is very critical to our -- our needs and what we'd like to have, and it's been there for 30, 35 years. And we do -- we see the swampland to the west of us. They talk about, you know, squeezing up toward the mountain more, but all that swampland is hundreds of yards wide, and it seems like a national expansion might work more in that way than coming east and infringing and creeping up close to our buildings and all the other businesses that are there. So that's crucial to us. More information sooner and know more definitive plans and how that might affect the way we do business and what we're used to for -- for those 35 years there. And so I'm -- and the way -- the way the offramp is going to work. That would be -- that's pivotal for us as well because we rely on that. Just more information sooner. But that west land is just swampland. That can be expanded easier than cutting into us. So thank you very much.	9.1.6 9.2.1
PH21	Glen Mikkelsen	Glen Mikkelsen is the name. Our residence is at [REDACTED]. Our property is right next to the wall, the sound wall they put up. Can you tell me if they're going to be moving that sound wall and if any houses along Sorrento Drive there is going to be going by the wayside? Somebody commented already that they need to look at some other highway areas than I-15 because, as the gentleman said before, they can only expand so much. It's time that they start looking for another north and southbound freeway. That's all I've got to say	9.1.1 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.7 E
PH22	Chase Hathaway	Chase Hathaway from Bountiful. I would like UDOT to inform us whether or not they have considered changing the 215 issue on I-15 that is currently a problem right now for anyone going south from here to Lehi area, that kind of stuff. That interchange right now is a major issue. I would like to understand why UDOT budget is being allocated to fixing a future problem when there is a very clear problem downtown right now. That's all.	9.1.4 9.4 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
PH23	Clark Perry	Okay. My name is Clark Perry. That's Perry, P-e-r-r-y. Anyway, I'm from Farmington. Anyway, about a year ago, they decided to build an inland port. Now, I don't know how many people go out west of the airport and see all the building -- the cement buildings that are going in out there. The normal working man can't get a load of concrete if he wants to pour a new driveway without going through a contractor because all the concrete's being used to build this inland port out west of the airport. This is bringing added truck traffic to the Salt Lake area. Now, a lot of it's coming from the north, coming right through Davis County, right through our highways, our freeways, and they're just making havoc to our freeways. We've seen what it's done to Legacy since they've decided to let truck traffic on that. That highway, Legacy Highway, that 12 miles was perfect. The asphalt was perfect five years ago, and now there's repairs on every lane that you go through. I think we need to make the people that are building here in Utah pay for these roads. That inland port -- that's big money, or else it wouldn't have come west. There used to be a highway or a road that went on the west side of the airport at one time. It went down the north side of the airport, and then it went around and tied into I-80. They've taken that access away. And so I think, yeah, building west, you're going to have a lot of duck hunters and bird hunters that aren't going to be happy with, you know, invading their wetlands, but something seriously has to happen, and that's a good way to expand it. The access on and off of the west corridor -- they're going to have to address those. I mean, we can't do anything about that because this is an I-15 issue, but they need to look into the interchanges from Legacy getting onto I-215 and then getting on southbound I-15 and vice versa, from I-15 going northbound on the 215 getting onto Legacy. So -- thank you.	9.1.3 9.1.4
PH24	James Rohletter	R-o-h-l-e-t-t-e-r, J-a-m-e-s. Centerville. I'm wondering if any of the engineers or if UDOT has ever looked at implementing the EVR roads. Are you familiar with those at all? For those of you that may not be familiar with them, can you -- oh, you can't talk, can you? MR. WIGHT: This is a public comment. So -- JAMES ROHLETTER: Well, it's been developed in a couple countries in Europe and up at Utah State University. It's a road that has electric charging system built into the road. And so when an electric car or vehicle drives over that road, it's automatically charged. And there's several benefits for this. Electric cars cost a lot less because the batteries don't need to be so big. It's -- I mean, if you had a road from here to Los Angeles, you could stay on that road the whole time, and it reduces CO2 emissions. We have such a problem with -- with the pollution here along the Wasatch Front. I'm wondering if -- if that's ever been considered as implementing that as a part of this new infrastructure to use -- Oh, I didn't know it was timed. Thanks. -- to use that technology to develop it even further to be on the edge of -- of road -- this type of road construction to look beyond what is -- now we do and to look into the future. That's all I have to say.	9.4 E
PH25	Bryan Paul	Yeah, Bryan Paul, P-a-u-l, Farmington. So, really, just to reiterate some of the comments that have already been made, I think looking to the future and planning for the future is great, but I think there's a lot of things that we're missing short term. I think my friend here touched on the interchange there by Flying J and whatever the other refineries are -- is a more immediate need than, you know, what some of the stuff that's going on now. If there's accidents between North Salt Lake and Kaysville, anybody on I-15 northbound or southbound is in trouble. There's nowhere to get off and get somewhere else. So I think that's more of a need now than, say, 20, 10, 15 years from now. Also, a gentleman made a comment earlier, if we're looking for alternate routes and things that will take traffic -- traffic out of this area and -- instead of just widening roads, we need to look at alternatives. You know what? They have bridges that connect the Florida Keys. We can run a road through the Great Salt Lake without impacting the environment. If they can do it in Florida, we can do it here. And so I think those are things that need to be so that we can have traffic that doesn't need to come through Salt Lake just bypass and keep moving south, if that's where they're going, or north if they're going north. Anyway, those are my comments. Thank you.	9.1.3 9.4 A
PH26	Dean Williams	D-e-a-n W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s, Centerville. Okay. I grew up out here when the I-15 was just two lanes, one each way. And as the road has expanded, so has the traffic, because people will get on that because it's convenient, but I think we've reached a point where the freeways isn't a good way to do it anymore. So what I'm pushing or what I'd like to see is more mass transit. And the problem with the mass transit we have here with FrontRunner is nobody's going to sit at the stop and wait for a half hour or an hour for a train when they can drive ten minutes to get into Salt Lake. It has to be convenient or people aren't going to use it. So whether you're planning on going for two lines, if there's room, then that, hopefully, would speed things up. So that's the big one that I'm looking at. Thank you. I have an express pass because I was driving a lot from Murray to Centerville, and the express pass won't work if you're going from American Fork to Farr West, because if you're just doing the short distance here, you can't get out of it, you can't get off. So what they've done in Salt Lake, where the little 5th -- 4th South exit so the high occupancy vehicles can get off on that. You need to make it convenient. For me to have the express pass, it didn't do any good. You think, well, we'll just wait, and we'll get over when the traffic breaks. It's not going to break. That's the reason that I'm in the express lane -- is because it's stacked up on the right. You need to figure out some way to let those people get off. Thank you. Now I'm finished. Maybe. Maybe. Let me think for a moment.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
PH27	James Rohletter	James Rohletter. I've done a lot of traveling and driving throughout the United States, and so I've seen a lot of different types of roads, and you can say what you want to say about California, but they -- they -- they engineer their roads well. And when I -- when I -- when I say that, I mean that they -- instead of dumping all the traffic onto several main intersections, they have exits and entrances on, for instance, like on Pages Lane in Centerville. It would be so convenient for an exit to be, and an entrance, to be on Pages Lane in Centerville, but it doesn't need to be a large intersection. In California, you've got a -- you know, you get over to the exit, and sometimes you've got to slow down to 20 or 25 miles per hour to make that loop, you know, because they don't have a lot of real estate to give away. But they make it convenient in other places, besides main intersections, to get on and off, and it doesn't have to be on and off both ways every way. It can be what is -- what will work, you know, just -- just find a way to get more traffic off the I-15 at different places. Thank you.	9.1.4
PH28	Dennis Hooper	I'm Dennis Hooper, [REDACTED] in Woods Cross. My comments are basically around the 5th South interchange. I noticed that they're planning a graded on- and offramp between 400 North and 5th South. And I talked to one guy up there, and he said -- and I suggested that they do a collector's system like they're doing in Roy now so that there's one offramp for 5th South and 4th -- or 500 South and 400 North rather than a graded system. I think that if you added one lane, you could probably solve some of the problems, even though there will be an onramp, but, you know, they're handling it in Roy that way with the new construction at that interchange. Also, my concern is with the diamond interchange at 5th South. I live off of 1500 South in Woods Cross, and I note when -- when they had a diamond interchange before, traffic would slow on 5th South. And when it slowed on 5th South, traffic would come up 1500 South through a residential area in my neighborhood. And I'm just worried that if they go back to a diamond interchange, even though the lanes will be wider, the traffic will still bypass 5th South and go on 1500 South. Thanks.	9.1.4 9.2.1

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
()PH29	Michael Bentley	My name is Mike Bentley. I live in Farmington. I'm on [REDACTED], right there by the 400 West. I live in a house that I grew up in. So I remember back in the '60s when I-15 was 89 where State Street went in there and they decided to redo I-15. So they started work on I-15. Brought in their earthmover because they wanted to lower it down. Well, they lowered it down, and they ran into water. And this wasn't a little bit of water. It was a large -- I don't know if you remember. MR. WIGHT: We've worked in the -- sorry. MICHAEL BENTLEY: Yeah. It was -- it was a mess. And so my comment is if they go back in on that hill, you're going to run into water, major water, because you go along the road there, just before you get to that State Street overpass, there's standing water along the side there. And, in fact, we -- my neighbor that lives east of me, you know, a couple years ago, he would see sink holes in his backyard because there was an aquifer that goes through there, a water aquifer. So my comment is if they cut into that hill, they're going to run into major water problems because, I mean, this wasn't a little bit of water. I remember as a little kid looking down there, and there'd be 4 feet of water down there. And every morning they'd have to come in and pump it out, and they had to finally dredge it -- dredge the water out, and it was -- it was a big concern. Another thing I was -- I was upstairs letting some of the people know, there on Clark Circle, just to the south of us, we used to own a strip of land from State Street to the junior high. From 3rd -- from 3rd West, when you come into that cul-de-sac, on the east end to the west end, there's a 9-foot drop. So when they were designing that to put the storm water, they couldn't take it east because of that 9 foot. So they built a coleberg (phonetic) in between the two houses that were going to be impacted, dropped it down, and drained it off. And you can go up there, and you can see where they put that. It's covered with cement, and the people use it as part of their driveway. So when you get in -- when they cut into that hill, they're going to run into that situation, where they're going to have to redo all that piping for the storm drains but -- And then the house that we live in, the main concern we have is it's a real old, old home. My grandfather moved up from up 2nd West down on the property, and what we're concerned about is what kind of impact it's going to have on our house. Yeah, the foundation. You know, after you guys get through, we're going to have a pile of rubber -- rubble for a house. So we're -- we're very concerned about that because part of the house foundation is rock and mortar. It's that old foundation. And -- and that's what we're mainly concerned about is the impact it's going to have on the house. Yeah. And then I don't know if you noticed. Before my -- my mother used to live in that house, and she would have to back onto State Street, and it was a disaster. So the city came in and made a circle to -- to the house to the west of us, a circle, so we back out of our driveway, go in the circle, and then go up. So how is that going to impact getting out of the driveway? Are we going to have to back out again? Because it's going to be a nightmare. On the east end, there's a fire -- because I talked to the guy upstairs. He said we're okay to bring the driveway on the east and in front of the house because we have a carport on the west side and make it so we can get out that way, but then you've got a fire hydrant about 3 feet away from the curb, which -- which they're going to widen State Street. So they're going to have to move the fire hydrant. So -- but that's our main concern is -- is the impact it will have on our house. How big is the sound barrier wall, you know? We'll just put plants in front of it, but our main concern is getting out onto that busy road because State Street is busy. I don't know if you've been there. We sat out on our front porch, and it's a steady stream of cars. They put a three-way stop. They put a -- last summer, they put lights up on 400 West. So if you come down State Street, if the light turns red, you have to stop, from north end, east and west. And then coming up on 400 West, there's a light there. So, you know, they're going to have to -- when you -- when you go in and you move that all around, you have to put a light back in there. And our main concern is how are we going to get out of our driveway? We don't want to back out on the road. We want to be able to pull out, because right now, when we pull out there, sometimes we have to wait up to a couple of minutes for traffic to come through or the light to turn red and go out. So that's our concerns right now. Thank you. You know, and I don't know if they're aware, you know. As the gentleman right here probably remembers, back in the '60s, when they redid that, it was a mess, and -- and there -- they would even come up and talk to my dad and get mad at my dad, saying, "You're watering" -- because back then we didn't have secondary water. We brought it in from the ditch. And -- and they said, "You're watering too much." And my dad said, "No, no." And he says, "And then you're going to run into an artesian well." And they go, "No, no." Because my dad was a school teacher, and there in the summer he worked for the Water Rights Division, and so he knew where all the water was. And so -- and sure enough, they ran into an artesian well over there. So it was -- it was a nightmare. It took a lot longer. They just -- they fought that water. And then they end up digging a big trench and put probably 12-inch pipe in there to drain the water in there and go over to the creek. So, you know, and their -- and I know if they go in there and start into that hill and they're going to have to go below the road to put road base in and everything, they're going to run into water again. It's a concern. So that's all I have to say.	9.1.6 9.3.12 B
PH30	James Stock	Awesome. J-a-m-e-s S-t-o-c-k, and I'm from Farmington. And I wanted to make a comment specifically on the 200 West. The plan that they've got up there is the revision or the addition to I-15 access. From the plan that I see, it doesn't really add any access to I-15. It basically maintains the same access that we have. Although it makes it safer as we go through a light and it allows us to have a little bit better access, there's no northbound access. And then coming south, there's no exit or offramp to get to that intersection. And so I think that's a missed opportunity. If we're going to create this huge intersection area in the area that is currently on 2nd West, or 200 West, I think we definitely need to think about what northbound access to I-15 -- what you could provide and what southbound exit we could have as well. It seems like it's available and it's possible. I just -- I just don't know why it's not there. So that's the only thing that I had -- is just making that accessible for north and southbound for both directions.	9.1.4
PH31	David Doty	Yep. David Doty, D-o-t-y, and I live in Centerville. And I just have two comments that I guess are kind of related. So I live just to the west of where the -- just to the south of Parrish Lane, along the -- just behind the Frontage Road, just west to the Frontage Road townhomes. So that's residential zone, but it's one block from the Frontage Road and where this is going to be expanded. So as I understand it from talking with the gentleman upstairs, there's no plans for a sound wall there. There's not one now. It's extremely loud. And he explained, I guess, that there isn't one planned because that's commercial there, and they're not planned for commercial areas. But it really isn't -- I mean, it's -- yeah, it's a commercial area right along the Frontage Road, but there are literally homes one block away from there, and I think that's really going to increase sound and pollution a lot there to an almost unacceptable level. Because as I look at that, that expansion, because of the railroad tracks there in Centerville, it's all going to come east, and that extra lane is literally going to be right next to that Frontage Road. I mean, in essence, that Frontage Road will, in essence, become part of the freeway, especially if there's no sound wall or barrier there. So it's -- my concern is -- is noise -- noise and pollution there without any barrier. I guess my second comment is I'm really happy to see the additional bike access with the proposed bridge across 2nd North, I believe, which is fantastic, but I would just love to suggest if there's any way possible to add it in to actually include elevated access across Parrish Lane as well. Because right now, there's access there, and it sounds like there still will be lanes on both sides, but you still are going to have to cross the ramps, which is extremely dangerous as it is now. With additional traffic and another lane, that's going to be impossible. You might as well not even put those extra, you know, paths in on both sides because it's just too dangerous to cross those -- those ramps. I mean, I've been hit -- I can't even tell you how many times on broad daylight trying to cross on a green light there. So if there's any way to change that so that that's elevated all the way across on Parrish Lane above those ramps, that would be fantastic. That's all I have.	9.1.4 9.1.7 9.3.7 D
Open House Comments			
OH1	Robert Goodman	Well, I appreciate the initiative to put more pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along north Salt Lake and Farmington as well as the west Bountiful area. Really, all of the suggested bicycle and pedestrian paths in those areas I strongly encourage, and I hope those come to fruition for the project. Ultimately, considering the critical sort of context of our air quality and our changing climate, I would like to see UDOT kind of collaborate with the UTA and see if there's any opportunities to get more ridership on UTA FrontRunner by, you know, giving people access to public transportation, you know, free public transportation, in that area. I would make the inference that one would be able to provide incentives for public transportation and still save money in the end considering the project costs over 3 billion. Yeah, I'm a homeowner in Salt Lake City, and I've been kind of following this project for about a year. I'd like to thank Tiffany and Robert for facilitating this meeting and getting the food and the kids area online for the public.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.4 C 9.4 H
OH2	James Longstaff	I think it's great that you guys are going to add protected bike lanes underneath highways, but could you also add lighting to that, because otherwise I don't feel safe going underneath it. That would be great.	9.1.4 9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
OH3	Margaret Holloway	Positive things. Awesome. Sarah Rigard did an absolutely awesome job answering all the questions under stress. She had a smile on her face. For 1000 North, I'm okay. I was afraid they were going to take it out. That was in one of their options. That was in the first option, and it was the cheapest. The third option is the one that they're doing now, which doesn't cut out too many houses. It's okay. I think it's going to flow better.	9.2.2 9.4 A
OH4	Krista Flavin	So I also want to say Sarah Rigard helped me tremendously and answered all my questions. I was okay with any kind of major expansion. I was in the Cottage Park HOA. We're in that zone where it was possible that we were going to get expanded into, part of that HOA. We have a CC&R, and even if 1 foot got taken up, the whole thing has to go; so I was paying attention, but I was going to be fine if they had to do something more major. You know, I understood it. I can definitely see the need, you know, with the time it took to get here today, trying to get to the highway through the neighborhood where my house is already. I would also really like some kind of traffic light by 600 North, the exit where -- what is that? I just think they should have some sort of traffic light here between 600 North -- I know there's another project going on -- and Eighth West, because we get a lot of accidents there. So I know, like, the other lights down might also help because some folks find it very difficult to share the lane and move correctly here. But it's just an added bonus. I like the frontage road addition on the left side as well. If they have a better noise barrier for materials, you know, if they have upgraded materials for the noise wall, I'm game for helping pay for that too because I don't know if it's going to get more intense.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.2.1 9.4 A
OH5	Tom Devroom	600 North, I'm opposed to rebuilding the bridge with two intersections, two lights. I prefer the single point interchange that it has now, and the improvements could be made for pedestrians and bikes to more safely navigate without changing the intersection or changing the interchange. The way it is works very efficiently, and I would prefer to keep a single point as opposed to rebuilding it with two lights. So this is about where I-215 meets I-15. Rather than making that an intersection or, well, interchange with a light, now would be the time to make the flyovers and make the connections from I-215 to southbound I-15 rather than lights and intersections. And then a third one is I would prefer to see Highway 89 parallel to I-15 at on- and off-ramps similar to those on Cloverleaf so that people can merge in and out of Highway 89 with a single lane. I really like having the 21st North interchange to Beck Street, but in general the smoothness of accessibility between Highway 89 on the south end of Davis County onto I-15 on and off is going to be made more difficult by your new proposed interchanges. If access to on and off 89 could be more streamline, as it is now, that would be better. Thank you.	9.1.4 9.1.7
OH6	Ron McCormick	The concern that I have at the 600 North junction is with a duel light system and being backed up into the neighborhoods, specifically on the east side during the LDS General Conference, the games at the Delta Center, and all the activities downtown. Yeah, it's already backed up somewhat, but it would be doubly so with this new double light. As a resident, I'm not happy about that.	9.1.4
OH7	Reed Mckay	My concern is the traffic that's going to be involved when they take 11 lanes in Bountiful and Centerville and west Bountiful and drop them down into three or four lanes in Layton, because I really don't think that the West Davis Highway or the new 89 freeway is going to take much pressure off that area. It's going to get really congested.	9.1.3 9.1.4
OH8	Suzanne Roskelley	Because in high peak travel time we can travel through west Bountiful. Centerville slugs a little bit, Farmington a little more, and then right now you're at a dead stop when you start into Kaysville.	9.1.3 9.1.4
OH9	Reed Mckay	Because if they build this, when they funnel the road down to those three lanes, that's going to back everybody up into our area.	9.1.3 9.1.4
OH10	Suzanne Roskelley	So I'm sure they've thought of it. This isn't new. What's the plan for that specific concern?	9.1.3 9.1.4
OH11	Reed Mckay	They told me that West Davis Highway and U.S. 89, the new one going to Ogden and 84, that would be -- the gentleman I talked to told me U.S. 89, which goes into Highway 84 and then south Ogden along with the West Davis Highway, which they're supposed to be done this year -- he said that and I-15, as it exists now, will be able to handle that. I've seen the growth in Layton and Kaysville and south Ogden. I don't think it will handle it.	9.1.3 9.1.4
OH12	Suzanne Roskelley	West Weber too.	9.1.3 9.4 A
OH13	Reed Mckay	All that property, all those homes between Farmington and Ogden, are going to be affected with the traffic, because I don't think those three interstates are going to handle it. I don't think so.	9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.5 A
OH14	Suzanne Roskelley	Well, my thought along with what you're saying, maybe it could, but changing that human pattern of getting off I-15 needs a lot of educational and promotional things to help educate and alert the public that, if you live here, go here. I mean, currently, we watch now and people stay on I-15, but not us because we're smart; so we jump off on Legacy. You know, people really just detour off when I-15 is backed up. I just think, if we had some type of educational campaign or something to help with the human aspect of behavior, it will probably help.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
OH15	Reed Mckay	My thought is, when there's an accident on I-15, we're dead, and basically my road where I live, 600 West, becomes a freeway.	9.4 A
OH16	Suzanne Roskelley	Well, a lot of this will help with that. I mean, I think your concern is really valid.	9.2.2
OH17	Reed Mckay	I just don't want to see it backed up, because there was a time when an oil tanker blew up there on Pages Lane, and they shut the freeway down and I could not get home. It took me two and a half hours to get home from 2300 North to Fourth North. 2300 North in Salt Lake to 400 North in Bountiful, it took me over an hour to get there because everything is jammed.	9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
OH18	Unidentified Man	I had a friend that worked at Costco, the depot, on 5600 West. He lived in Fruit Heights. Guess what he had to do? He had to backtrack, go all the way up over Parley's, all the way around, and come all the way back to Fruit Heights to get home when that tanker blew.	9.2.2
OH19	Reed Mckay	Yeah, he had to go through Weber Canyon. A lot of people did that, and that's a concern because you're pushing everybody into one section and with no alternate routes. As you notice, people are getting crazier nowadays.	9.2.2
OH20	Unidentified Speaker	Road rage.	9.4 A
OH21	Suzanne Roskelley	They're saying that we have three highways. I think there needs to be a campaign for each highway to be used.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
OH22	Reed Mckay	So you understand what I'm saying and what she's trying to explain for my point.	9.4 A
OH23	Suzanne Roskelley	I feel pretty good because we're out of it.	9.4 A
OH24	Unidentified Speaker	I feel what other people feel. They're going to be hurt by this.	9.1.6 9.4 A
OH25	Reed Mckay	I'm the same way. It doesn't affect my household, but it affects my transportation to and from.	9.1.6 9.4 A
OH26	Clark Perry	My comment is they need an interchange down where 215 northbound enters into I-15. They need an interchange right there so that you can come off of I-15 going northbound, get on 215, and then get on Legacy, so another spaghetti bowl just on the other side of Redwood Road; and vice versa, you've got to be able to get off of Legacy going northbound, go down 215 and hit I-15 going southbound. So those two interchanges, that has to happen. Noise pollution, they put up sound walls. Where I live, they're elevating the freeway. You can't put a sound wall on an elevated freeway. Where the west corridor hooks in, that's right where I live. Where that west corridor is they've elevated, noise pollution has doubled. Now, I was talking to somebody about the train whistles going off, the frequency of them. Now, apparently they have Union Pacific people, that are employed by Union Pacific, telling these trains that they need to blow their whistles through that construction zone. They've never done that before; so I don't know if that is a safety thing, but the frequency is just all night long, all morning. You know, and where I live, it's just that narrow neck of land between 200 East and the frontage road. There's, like, five blocks, and I'm right in the middle of it. It's the frontage road that runs on the east side of I-15 all the way from Bountiful to Farmington.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.2
OH27	Brian Paul	Those are my same concerns.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.1.7 9.2.2 9.4 A
OH28	Estelle Rigby	My comment is I just think they need to focus on doing transportation differently, and we need to focus on mass transportation, moving people faster on FrontRunner and TRAX to get where they need to go rather than widening freeways all the time, building more roads. We have to start getting people to think big city transportation, like London and Paris and Rome and New York and Washington, D.C., and all those cities that have lots of people. They do not focus on roads. They focus on trains and getting people where they need to go, and there's not anyplace where you can't get to. It's the same thing with going up the canyons. Use trains so you don't worry about parking. So we've got to think of transportation differently instead of just trying to put a Band-Aid on the problem that we have right now, because we can throw dollars we have at this problem, but five years from now we're going to do it all over again. That's my comment.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
OH29	Scott Lucas	Yeah, I'm curious why there is no specific hot lane exit to Salt Lake downtown. I mean, previous versions, I thought there were going to be specified or hot lane exits, like, at Fourth South or something, but now it appears there's not. So what happened to them, and why are they not being put in is my question. I think they should be.	9.2.1
OH30	Cameron Petersen	At 2600 South there is a street called Onion Street that they're looking to turn into a cul-de-sac. I work at the Best Western right there, and a lot of truckers bring their truck in and come straight in on that road now. The way it looks is there won't be -- there's not going to be access for them to turn around; so if they could make that cul-de-sac big enough for a large truck, that would make things a lot easier, or not make a cul-de-sac, but I don't know if that's an option. Right now it's very easy for a trucker to come in, take a quick right off the freeway, and park on the street. If they do it the other way, they're going to have to come around and drive into a cul-de-sac and have nowhere to go. It's very tight to get out of there for a truck. It's not good for us.	9.1.4 9.1.6
OH31	Bridget Fowers	Off of Parrish Lane on 400 West we immediately enter residential houses. The speed limit in the industrial area is higher than the residential. I suggest we add a 25-mile-per-hour flashing sign for speed to notify the drivers they've entered a residential area.	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
OH32	Courtney Lund	I really like a lot of the interchanges, how expanding pedestrian and bicyclists impacts. The actual expansion of the freeway itself, I feel like it's not needed. I feel like we need the double tracking you guys are working on for the FrontRunner. I feel like we need to add more bus routes, especially in Davis County. Davis County struggles with that bus route section. I know we just had one put in for going up to Weber State, which is really good, that express line. I feel like there needs to be more options. Especially as a student at the U, I would love more bus options going into Salt Lake and going to the different parts of the city; so I feel like an expansion in some sort of way along with public transit, taking some of this money and transferring it over to UTA. Like, taking some of this funding and trying to put a little bit more impact on public transit, I feel like it would help some of the impacts that you're predicting for 2050.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.2.2
OH33	Zig Sondelski	Three comments. The first one is I notice on some of these pictures they're showing green grass strips about trees. I don't know that's appropriate for our water situation. The next comment is I don't believe sound walls work as well as we would like to because it's wave propagation, and sound will hit the wall and then start spreading out again; so, yes, we'll have a very quiet zone, but the sound waves will come back down. The third comment is a lot of people don't use mass transit because they say it's inconvenient, and maybe we need to make vehicle transportation less convenient to make mass transit.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.7 A
OH34	Karen Davis	I'm thankful you're not going to take those houses. I saw on the computer that all of them was going.	9.1.6
OH35	Ellen Mcconkey	So I live on ██████ in Centerville, which is frontage road, and it looks like they're going to take part of my yard, although Utah has a lot of land straight across the street from me that they could use; so I would like them to use that before they take my yard. Are they going to put up walls, more sound wall, because it stops right at McDonald's, and I don't know why they wouldn't put it past there the last time when they put it up, but I would like to see it go because we have a lot of traffic noise. It's hard for people to talk to me in my yard when they come over.	9.1.6 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B
OH36	James Stock	So I want to talk about the 200 West rebuild where we're supposed to have better access to I-15. Right now the proposal has basically the same access as we currently have, although it's a little safer, but it seems like a missed opportunity to not have a northbound I-15 access and a southbound exit on that south side of Farmington; so I think we need to keep that intersection the way they have it but add some sort of access entry to northbound I-15 from there and an exit from southbound I-15 to that intersection so those on south Farmington can access the interstate better on the north side, because we can access it on the south just fine, but we don't have any ability right now except for going through Farmington and catching I-15 on the north side. So if we're going to do this huge rebuild, I think we definitely need to have a full intersection where we can access north and southbound. That's my comment.	9.1.4
OH37	Scott Ogilvie	I echo that.	9.1.4
OH38	Mark Adamson	2600, the bike path, you have 6 feet. I would prefer 14 feet. The 14 feet is excellent, the 14-foot wide. The one with the barriers and it's a 14-foot, that's beautiful. We need that more for bikes.	9.1.4 9.1.6
OH39	Kimberly O'reilly	Instead of the smaller, we would like the larger that's barricaded for safety.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.5 C
OH40	Mark Adamson	Because Eighth West you're doing, and that's good because what it is is the bike path is up here and the road is down here, and that's a good idea. Yeah, I like the 14-foot where it has both a section for the bike and the pedestrians. They're kind of split so the walkers can be here and the bikers can be here, and that's an excellent idea because when I go up the bike path, see, we have to share it with the walkers. That's a great idea.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.2.2 9.3.5 C
OH41	Elaine Watts	The off-ramp into Farmington, they should make an access going northbound from that off-ramp. Right now we have to go clear through either in front of Lagoon or up Main Street in Farmington to get on Park Lane to go northbound. We would like to have an access to get on going northbound. The other thing is apparently the sound wall is going to stop at Glover Lane and not continue north to where you go into Farmington along the frontage road. Right now there's a barbed wire fence, and I live right in that area. They shouldn't stop with the sound wall before you get to where the barbed wire fence is.	9.1.4 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B
OH42	Matthew Gore	My comment is replacement of variable time message boards need to be placed at Park Lane in Farmington and State Street and Second West in Farmington to tell motorists which route to take, whether it be Legacy or I-15, due to congestion, like you see on other highways. I think it should also be implemented at the new system interchange at I-215 and I-15 in south Davis.	9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
OH43	Kevin Palmer	So two things. So, one, we were talking about, when they put sometimes the concrete barriers that divide north and south on I-15, they used to be so high. You could see over them basically. Now, in most places they have made them taller and, if you're in the inside lanes, the peripheral vision of your surroundings and everything, when you're looking all around and when you're going down there and you've got a car here and you're right here and you can't see over that to get your bearings better, it really is dangerous, to me. If they could go back and shave off another 8 inches of those dividing barriers, I think, you know, you could at least see a little bit of the mountain or whatever so you could get your bearings a little bit. You know, the more vision you have, the better your driving will be. And then the second thing is the sound walls are all made of concrete, I presume. They put them up down where I live, which I don't like. I've got traffic noise, but I can deal with it, and it was spread out. But since they put the sound walls in a few years ago, that sound -- I'm not right next door to it, but I'm, like, three or four houses down -- I think it's worse because I think that sound goes right up and over, passes the first couple of houses, and dumps right into my backyard. It's doing its job, deflecting the sound, but it's dumping it right in my yard four houses down. It probably helps the ones right next to it but not mine. So, I guess, if they could make them out of -- like I said, they look like concrete, but if they could make them out of a sound-absorbing material, that would just grab the noise and suck it in and hold it instead of deflecting it. That might help a lot, especially where it's going by homes. Well, all of the sound walls are by homes, I guess. Yeah, some sort of something to absorb the sound instead of magnifying it and reflecting it to somewhere else.	9.1.4 9.1.6 9.3.7 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
GIS Map Comments			
2817	Daniel	I support the 400 West Option as it will have the most minimal impact and continue to encourage Lagoon patrons from using the surfaces streets. I feel the other option would create more congestion.	9.2.2
2818		This is a good solution that helps slow down traffic coming off the freeway.	9.2.2
2819	Brian Bean	Thank you for creating a way to travel from 215 to SB I-15. However, I find it highly unusual unusual to require an individual traveling on a freeway (EB 215) to hit a stoplight to continue on the freeway (SB I-15). The design should allow for free-flow of traffic without lights.	9.1.4 9.2.1 9.2.2
2820	Brian Bean	Thank you for eliminating this off-ramp. It never made sense.	9.2.2
2821	Brian Bean	Braided ramps make a lot of sense. Thank you.	9.2.2
2822	Brian Bean	Braided ramps make a lot of sense. Thank you.	9.2.2
2823	Brian Bean	I'm not sure why we are perpetuating this funky interchange. Sure, you improved it by eliminating the left bound offramp, but this design continues to over-complicate by creating inconsistent on/off ramps in multiple, closely-proximate locations. Consolidating NB/SB entrances and exits into a single location makes so much more sense. Please consider closing this offramp and moving it 1/4 mile south to finish out the 400N intersection.	9.1.4
2824	Brian Bean	I'm not sure why we are perpetuating the funky interchange at 500W when there is a perfectly good offramp opportunity here at 400N. Sure, the design eliminated the left offramp for 500W, but this design continues to over-complicate by creating inconsistent on/off ramps in multiple, closely-proximate locations. Consolidating NB/SB entrances and exits into a single location makes so much more sense. Please consider closing the 500W offramp and moving it 1/4 mile south to finish out this 400N intersection instead.	9.1.4
2825	Brian Bean	Please consider finishing this intersection out by creating a NB onramp here and closing the 500W onramp. It make so much more sense here.	9.1.4
2826	Brian Bean	Thanks for eliminating the left lane offramp. However, this exit shouldn't exist in the first place. It should be moved 1/4 mile south to the 400 N interchange, which is STILL incomplete in this design.	9.1.4
2827	Brian Bean	Great design! Giving me a straight shot off the freeway to go north on the frontage road eliminates my need to pull superman lane changes to hit the Marketplace Drive left turn.	9.2.2
2828		What about an onramp/offramp to Glovers from Legacy? Less traffic to clog roads but still helps filter off a little traffic from the Parrish exit and from I-15 to Legacy..	9.1.4
2829		Would it be helpful here to add another lane connecting the onramp to Frontage road? It would give those exiting from SB i-15 a way to go straight to frontage road and skip a light and minimize backup on Parrish to turn left. Or have a 3rd exit late that goes under the onramp and connects to frontage road without causing too much crossover traffic on the onramp.	9.1.4
2830		Brilliant! I love it!	9.2.2
2831		While the overall design solves a lot of the eastbound traffic on Parrish, I'm not sure we've sufficiently fixed the westbound traffic that so often gets backed up. Maybe we need two turn lanes onto either 400 W of Marketplace, even if it merges soon after the turn (like Parrish turning north onto Main).	9.1.4
2832		Are there 2 left turn lanes here? I feel like that would be helpful for people getting to the freeway. Northbound/legacy people can choose the right lane turn lane and those going south can choose the left turn lane.	9.1.4
2833		What about a connector ramp from I-15 to Legacy somewhere between the Parrish exit and the West Davis Corridor? Since traffic starts to build up along that area, that would allow people to easily switch to the other freeway to avoid traffic backups or give them a way off when traffic is bad. So often when traffic gets bad here, cars end up getting off in Farmington and taking Main street all the way to Parrish. It causes so much traffic in a more residential area for a number of miles. This could help alleviate and spread out the traffic in multiple directions.	9.1.4
2834		Maybe I'm in the minority, but I love this onramp! The offramp is horrible, so I'm glad that's changing, but I use this onramp often!	9.2.2
2835		While I'm sad to lose this section of 800 W, I hope you replace it with lots of soccer fields, pickleball courts, parks with walking paths, maybe even a fishing pond, and plenty of parking for all those amenities..	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
2836	M.Thompson	Exit Lane - South bound to Park Ln. needs to be extended all the way back to Kaysville (just like the north bound lane to Kaysville Exit) Traffic is horrible right here! This should be in consideration to this project.	9.1.4
2837	Brian Bean	Great design. I'm so eager for this interchange. This fixes SOOOO many terrible problems with this intersection.	9.2.2
2838	M.Thompson	I feel your going to want TWO lanes going this direction one day soon, so why not build it into the plan?	9.1.4
2839	Brian Bean	Agreed. Should be two turning lanes here. I'm in the Legacy crowd that would appreciate an outside turn lane that I knew would help me get around all the I-15 traffic without changing lanes unnecessarily.	9.1.4
2840		How will traffic be managed at this intersection? When I-15 is busy, the frontage becomes congested. But even with routine traffic, there will be substantial traffic needed to turn both directions. Will there be separate turning lanes left/right?	9.2.1
2841	Charity M.	I support the 400 West option. While having frontage road access at this spot would be great for locals, building a full intersection at this spot will increase Lagoon and Station Park traffic onto smaller street. This option also impacts farmington homes in a negative way.	9.2.2
2842		There are a significant number of cars travelling south that enter at 400 North and exit at 500 South. This braided ramp alternative appears to prevent that. This will lead to more cars on Onion Street which has portions that are residential.	9.2.1
2843	Eric Godfrey	Capacity for I-15 traffic to transfer onto Beck Street is significantly reduced. Direct connection is gone and both interchanges now involve multiple stop lights. Traveling south on I-15, the 215 to 89 interchange seems the most direct route onto 89/Beck and does not have good planning for this movement.	9.1.4
2844		Where is the north bound on-ramp?	9.1.4
2845		How do we get on the freeway to go north? Park lane or Parrish lane are too far away.	9.1.4
2846		What is the purpose of this road?	9.2.1
2847		Can there be a belt route for east Farmington?	9.1.3
2848		Please add a North bound on ramp here.	9.1.4
2849		What work being done here? Is it just temporary use or permanent?	9.2.1
2850		Best little farm around! Please don't remove!	9.2.1
2851	Dallas	What options have been discussed for a north bound I15 on ramp?	9.1.4
2852	Ben Thompson	Thank you for keeping these on and off ramps here and NOT moving them to 400 N. Otherwise, 400 N would get much more congested with traffic heading to NB I-15. Also, without ramps here there is no where for 500 W to continue on, it would just dead-end... no thanks.	9.2.2
2853	Ben Thompson	Braided ramps are the best option here, thank you	9.2.2
2854	Ben Thompson	Braided ramps are the best option here, thank you	9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
2855	Kat Thomas	While I understand the desire to alleviate current traffic congestion, I firmly believe that this approach is not the solution we need, and will lead to severe negative consequences to underrepresented communities. First, the concept of induced demand cannot be overlooked. History has shown that expanding road infrastructure attracts more drivers, which ultimately results in exponentially worse traffic congestion over time. This counterintuitive effect not only fails to address the issue but exacerbates it. Furthermore, the proposed freeway widening threatens to decrease the overall quality of life in our residential areas, especially in low income areas that are located close to I-15. The increase in traffic and associated noise and air pollution will have severely detrimental effects on the health and well-being of our community members. Additionally, the expansion will destroy our parks, green spaces, businesses, and homes, further eroding the character of our neighborhoods. I urge decision-makers to reconsider this preferred alternative and explore alternative, sustainable transportation solutions. Focusing on public transit, carpooling incentives, and cycling infrastructure could offer a more effective and environmentally friendly approach to reducing congestion while preserving the residential quality of life that makes our community special. I implore you to prioritize the long-term well-being of our people, our community over short-term fixes that ultimately do more harm than good. You are *not* Robert Moses. Let's work together to find *innovative* and *sustainable* solutions to our transportation challenges.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.6
2856		I wanted to share my thoughts on the I-15 widening. To put it simply, I think it's a dangerous move. Here's why: You know that saying, "If you build it, they will come"? Well, that pretty much sums up my concern. Widening the freeway might seem like a quick fix, but it often just attracts more traffic in the long run – induced demand. So, we'd end up with even worse congestion than before. Leading to even worse air pollution. Plus, there's the destruction of the quality of life for people who live near the interstate. Many of those people can't afford to uproot their lives, even with UDOT paying them fair market value for their property. They live near the freeway for god's sake. They're impoverished. More cars on the road means more noise, pollution, and a lot less green space (not to mention the massive negative impact on the flora and fauna). It will really mess with the vibe of our neighborhood. Instead of going down this road (pun intended), I think we should look into car-free future - better public transit, carpooling incentives, and improving bike lanes. It's called alternative transportation for a reason and can help us reduce congestion without sacrificing our community's charm. Let's keep our neighborhoods awesome and find smarter solutions together.	9.1.1 9.1.3 9.1.6
2857		I agree about keeping this little farm.	9.2.1
2858		The least minimal impact makes the most sense here. It shouldn't become a high use area, but leaving the option open to locals is super helpful.	9.2.2
2859		Something should really be done to help pedestrians from Frontrunner to see the benefits of taking State Street. Even in its current state it's better suited to pedestrians than Park Lane, which many seem to assume is the quick way. I often see people walking the Park Lane bridge where there is no pedestrian walkway. Many probably going to work at Lagoon who missed or don't want to wait for the shuttle. Taking State Street is a shorter route too.	9.1.2 9.1.3
3217		What is happening in this area? The map is not completed in the same manner as the other portions. Is the frontage road moving again? Will the sound wall remain? Does this change the new offramp?	9.2.1
3617	Ben Thompson	It seems this new ramp from I-215 EB to I-15 SB should separate sooner and have a more gradual design curve so that traffic heading to I-15 SB doesn't have to slow down and conflict with traffic stopping at the new intersection over I-15.	9.1.4
3618		You have done a great job here. Love we don't have to cross those getting off 200 West to get on the Freeway.	9.2.2
3619	MP	This is already a dangerous crossing for pedestrians and this design appears to make circumstances much worse. Traffic calming strategies should be the priority here so we don't have vehicles racing from 70mph on interstate straight into our backyards. Pedestrians, cyclists, and the residents of the community need to be the top priority—not the blight that is the commuters cutting through our streets to try to save an extra minute. Bluntly: this road is too wide. This design encourages the reckless and dangerous driving habits we're all too familiar with, both under heavy traffic scenarios and for the almost ubiquitous light traffic, which is more than 95% of the day. This road, at its 110-foot width becomes a drag strip with drivers blasting through at high speed having little regard for other road users. The solution is not to add more lanes and exacerbate the problem(!!!), it's to narrow the road and bring speeds to a consistent and reasonable rate. Dual turn lanes will make crossing here an absolute battle for foot traffic. We see this at other poorly designed interchanges throughout the city: outside turning traffic is blinded by inside turning traffic, and jumps obliviously into the intersection at the signal change, intercepting pedestrians in the crosswalk with right of way. There are curb-tight community businesses here. Patronizing them should be a pleasant and enjoyable experience, not a battle with speeding highway speed traffic. How long does it take a person to walk across 110' anyway? Whatever it is, it's too much time for a neighborhood street. Remove one of the protected turning lanes and add a median with a pedestrian island. Narrow all the lanes to slow traffic. We know that reckless driving behaviors do not get enforced by police in this community, and the careless and inconsiderate design of our roads, just like what's proposed here, encourages traffic to aggressively speed through our community and put our lives in peril.	9.2.1
3620	MP	This is already a dangerous crossing for pedestrians and this design appears to make circumstances much worse. Traffic calming strategies should be the priority here so we don't have vehicles racing from 70mph on interstate straight into our backyards. Pedestrians, cyclists, and the residents of the community need to be the top priority—not the blight that is the commuters cutting through our streets to try to save an extra minute. Bluntly: this road is too wide. This design encourages the reckless and dangerous driving habits we're all too familiar with, both under heavy traffic scenarios and for the almost ubiquitous light traffic, which is more than 95% of the day. This road, at its 110-foot width becomes a drag strip with drivers blasting through at high speed having little regard for other road users. The solution is not to add more lanes and exacerbate the problem(!!!), it's to narrow the road and bring speeds to a consistent and reasonable rate. Dual turn lanes will make crossing here an absolute battle for foot traffic. We see this at other poorly designed interchanges throughout the city: outside turning traffic is blinded by inside turning traffic, and jumps obliviously into the intersection at the signal change, intercepting pedestrians in the crosswalk with right of way. There are curb-tight community businesses here. Patronizing them should be a pleasant and enjoyable experience, not a battle with speeding highway speed traffic. How long does it take a person to walk across 110' anyway? Whatever it is, it's too much time for a neighborhood street. Remove one of the protected turning lanes and add a median with a pedestrian island. Narrow all the lanes to slow traffic. We know that reckless driving behaviors do not get enforced by police in this community, and the careless and inconsiderate design of our roads, just like what's proposed here, encourages traffic to aggressively speed through our community and put our lives in peril.	9.2.1

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
4017	Corey Shayman	I am still worried that making it easier for individuals to drive will induce demand and necessitate greater land use for cars. I hope that we can dedicate less land for car-centric travel and instead put money into transit.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
4018	Brian Bean	The braided ramps make sense, but this design will massively overload 300W. In West Bountiful. Currently, anybody who lives west of I-15 who needs to go into major shopping centers (Lowes, Costco) jumps on the freeway at 500 South and gets off it 400 North. Since there's no connector between the braided ramps, this will push all of that traffic onto 300 West in West Bountiful. That road is already overloaded and underbuilt. Please put a simple connector between the braided ramps so residents west of I-15 can still jump on the jump on at 500S and off at 400 North.	9.2.1
4019		This will slow down people getting off the freeway. Great job!!!	9.2.2
4020	Ryan Trinnaman	Why not make this a SPUI?. Utilize the ramps already in place for traffic flowing vehicles getting on/off I-15.	9.1.4
4417		We need an interchange at Glovers. With the high school and increased traffic on Park Lane we need an additional interchange.	9.1.4
4418		Can we add pedestrian/bike lanes to Park Lane. There are a lot of kids who walk on the shoulders unsafely.	9.1.4
4419		bro. y'all are crazy—only 17 lanes? why not add a second deck? you could have 34 lanes! i think 36 lanes just might do it.	9.1.1 9.4 A
4420		UDOT, for God's sake invest in multimodal transit you complete psychopaths. Look at widening projects in CA and TX—do you seriously spend 4 billion in tax dollars without doing any research?	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
4421		CONGESTION PRICING. You should have diverted through-traffic to i215 and away from downtown. Instead of expanding the width of i15, you should be implementing a road TOLL and you should CHARGE commuters for using the existing roadway and causing the traffic you're attempting to solve for. If you want to reduce traffic and solve for exponential growth, you need to be honest about effective ways of doing so. Congestion pricing is effective and works well. Adding freeway lanes just induces more demand and we all end up paying for it.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
4422		CONGESTION PRICING. You should have diverted through-traffic to i215 and away from downtown. Instead of expanding the width of i15, you should be implementing a road TOLL and you should CHARGE commuters for using the existing roadway and causing the traffic you're attempting to solve for. If you want to reduce traffic and solve for exponential growth, you need to be honest about effective ways of doing so. Congestion pricing is effective and works well. Adding freeway lanes just induces more demand and we all end up paying for it.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
4423		Why no noise wall?	9.3.7 B
4424		Still no north bound on ramp?	9.1.4
4425		Still no south bound off ramp?	9.1.4
4426	David Pedersen	I agree with the other commenter. This should be a full free-flowing interchange with no traffic signals.	9.1.4
4427		These three intersections should be roundabouts. Traffic signals are dangerous and should not be used.	9.1.4
4817		Why is the right turn lane now behind a traffic light? The way it is currently requires no stopping, just yeilding. Please try to keep that	9.1.4
4818		I support any change that removes this motel. It is a crime/drug haven	9.2.2
4819	Mary Sizemore	Thanks for consolidating this extra-wide interchange! Speeding is the number one factor in severe/fatal crashes and I am glad to see right-turn lanes behind a signal rather than a slip lane. I would have preferred to see a smaller freeway because we're only incentivizing SOV travel while destroying our communities at the same time, but I'll put that in a different comment. This comment does not support freeway expansion, only praising less land used by removal of slip lanes.	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.2.2
4820	Mary Sizemore	Very inappropriate roadway width! Please do not design around peak hour (it's the 21st century) and rather recognize that you're creating barricades through neighborhoods. I'm sure the City will apply for a Reconnecting Communities Federal Discretionary grant aimed at fixing infrastructure just like this. I'm shocked that this is allowed in today's era.	9.1.1 9.3.3 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
4821	Mary Sizemore	Thanks for taking up some of the West Side's few trees with suburban folks' CO2 machines. I'm sure the EIS reflects similar and numerous widespread numerous negative environmental impacts. This comment is not in support of the project.	9.1.6
4822	Mary Sizemore	Please don't take up more room for impervious pavement for CO2 emitting cars. The negative impacts on underrepresented neighbors is great.	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.6 A
4823	Mary Sizemore	Don't pave over grass terraces AND remove a TWLTL - this is the opposite of a road diet (I guess the whole project is). Would prefer calmed traffic and nice places to live.	9.1.4
4824	Mary Sizemore	Transportation Engineer here: I'm very shocked Utah is allowed any Federal dollars with a project like this. Freeway expansion only induces car travel - if serious about improving the environment, carpooling or car-free travel would be promoted. You're now in the UTA business, put these dollars there. Billions of federal dollars are being spent to remove historic projects like this. Please don't repeat past mistakes. If you need work to do, please work on transit or biking. There's plenty of infrastructure and subsidies for cars in Utah already. Please come up with a different modal solution to our "congestion problem". This project will only make matters worse.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.3.3 A 9.4 C
4825	Mary Sizemore	Concerned about impacts to the West Side - one of the few redlined places in all of Utah and you're going to expand a freeway into it? Doesn't seem very equitable to me. Please read any RCN, NAE, or other Federal discretionary grant out there aimed at correcting past infrastructure mistakes like this. These are all WFRC Equity Focus Areas. Spending decades planning for a project like this doesn't mean it's the right thing to do as we learn more and more as transportation engineers. I know it would be fun for you to push this project forward but please honestly consider the environmental justice impacts to real people who have been underrepresented for generations. Is this the legacy you want to leave? This project is sure to be deconstructed within a generation - is this a good use of tax dollars?	9.1.1 9.1.6 9.3.3 A
4826		This is a huge mistake removing this off ramp. At peak hours all the traffic will be added to 2600 South off ramp	9.1.4
4827		Is this a bridge or an at grade crossing?	9.1.4
4828		Where does this trail even go?	9.2.1
4829		Why does this 1/2 interchange stay and the NSL Center St off ramp have to go?	9.1.4 9.2.1
4830		How will trail/cyclist safety be prioritized over the numerous gravel pit entrances?	9.1.4
4831		There should be a pedestrian/cyclist access from the new cul-de-sac to the trail	9.1.4
4832		Sidewalk and pedestrian access needs to be continued south with a park strip between the sidewalk and the street. There is an existing sidewalk here now.	9.1.4
4833		This is great solution putting 800 west under the freeway.	9.2.2
4834		This should go under, not over	9.1.4
4835		Going under, instead of over seems like it would be utilized better and could be a shorter route.	9.1.4
4836	Clayton	Adding more lanes to I-15 is an expensive band-aid that will not solve the problem. UDOT should invest more money in alternative means of transportation. The answer is less cars not more lanes.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
4837		This is already a huge disaster with the frozen custard shop. I live around the corner and witness a near miss every other day. With increasing traffic this is going to eventually be a fatality.	9.1.4 9.4 A
4838		The absence of a NB on ramp and SB off ramp here will drive traffic through the middle of town as the southern end of Farmington is developed putting commuter traffic going through school zones or major school crossings.	9.1.4
5217		I like the new separated lanes for merging/exiting traffic at the 400 N and 500 S. This should help keep the flow of traffic on the freeway moving much smoother so that people won't be slamming on their brakes to try and exit the freeway with the on coming traffic.	9.2.2

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
5617		Love this new Beck Street set up. This will also make the West side of NSL have better options for getting on and off I15 instead of getting stuck at the train forever on 2800 and Center Street.	9.2.2
5618		Great that there is a better way to exit I15 and head to the West side of NSL without getting stuck and the endless trains on 2600 and Center. This is a great new option!	9.2.2
5619		This interchange is 100% better than currently! I'm not a commuter but need to go through here at peak travel times for kids classes. It is such a mess right now and this looks like it will remove a lot of standing traffic and flow much smoother! Very excited for this change.	9.2.2
5620		Love a direct access for walking/biking from the west side to the retail on East side without having to cross on the overpass. Much safer!	9.2.2
5621		Thank you for removing this slip lane. It is probably the most dangerous part of navigating this interchange on a bicycle or on foot.	9.2.2
5622		The bike lane must be physically protected where possible. We cannot expect our most vulnerable road users to navigate this massive interchange with no physical separation.	9.1.4
5623		Love the new shared use path. It would be great if there was a way to cross the street here to continue south in the bike lane on 300 West.	9.1.4
5624		Please do what you can to calm vehicle traffic as it enters the Fairpark/Rose Park community.	9.2.1
5625		Please add traffic calming elements to slow down vehicles as they enter the Marmalade neighborhood.	9.2.1
5626		Stripe the crosswalk with high-visibility paint.	9.1.4
5627		I support the underpass. Restore east-west connectivity!	9.1.5
5628		Please consider how cyclists will easily and safely navigate south down 900 West off of this shared use path	9.1.4
5629		Add high-vis MMA or thermoplastic paint to make the shared use path crossing more visible to drivers.	9.1.4
5630		Would love to see a shared use path exit here and a way to navigate to 2300 North.	9.1.4
5631		How will northbound cyclists access the shared use path?	9.1.4 9.2.1
5632		Build the medians out of concrete, not paint! :)	9.1.4
6017	Grant Farnsworth	There are many tight diamond interchanges (600 N, 2600 S, 500 S, 400 N) in the preferred alternative. Where does it show the reduction of the hours of delay for the different options considered? Many of these tight diamond interchanges have dual right turns. Is it assumed that the utilizations of both turn lanes is the same or different? Are the utilization rates consistent for other locations where dual right turns exist? The tight diamond intersection has insufficient storage for left-turns without backing through the interchange. How is sufficient traffic storage accommodated without blocking other movements through the intersection?	9.2.1
6018		Why does the sound wall stop of Glovers Lane? The area between Glovers and the junior high school also needs sound mitigation.	9.3.7 B
6417	Frederick Jenny	Why is UDOT not even considering the Rio Grande Plan as an alternative to this expansion? We have \$1.5 Billion to spend. This could be accomplished for less and move more people into Salt Lake City than this I-15 Expansion Ever could. Please stop this expansion and invest in something that will be a positive impact to our City and State.	9.1.3
6418	Frederick Jenny	Paint is not protection. These bike lanes need to be protected with concrete barriers.	9.1.4
6419	Frederick Jenny	This needs to be an overpass. No need to expand a crossing that can be dangerous to both trains and cars. It also can slowdown the frontrunner trains.	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
6420	Frederick Jenny	Expanding the road here is not going to do any good for NSL. A trax line would be great to have going north into the towns of NSL and Bountiful to allow for better connections for those who live there.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
6421	Frederick Jenny	Removal of this grade crossing needs to be a priority for this project. Cant have cars crossing trains. This is where we had that accident with the FedEx truck a few years ago.	9.1.4
6422	Frederick Jenny	The better solution is a branch street car/trax line that goes from the Fronrunner station to downtown Bountiful. This will be better for moving people than an expansion of I-15. This should be done along the corridor instead of expanding the freeway.	9.1.1 9.1.3
6423	Frederick Jenny	This should get removed. No need to have the highway dumping people off here and letting them on.	9.1.4
6424	Frederick Jenny	Remove this grade crossing	9.1.4
6425	Frederick Jenny	You are building into the right away of the FrontRunner. Look how much space the freeway takes compared to the train. The train is much better when it comes to moving people. Why not just invest in that instead of more lanes?	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
6817		Extend the Sound Wall south to 1950 S. This will help better isolate the residents from freeway noise while allowing the dealership to have freeway visibility	9.3.7 B
6818		Has the Traffic study on this relocate of 800 W taken in account of the school traffic? This negatively affects the entrance into Woods Cross. A better relocation is going through Thomas Petroleum and utilizing the existing intersection with Overland.	9.1.4
6819		Why not include a bridge over the tracks as part of this project? The bridge is on the long term plan and constructing it during this project would save millions, rather than waiting. This will eliminate a grade crossing between I-15 and Legacy Hwy for better traffic flow between 2 major highways.	9.1.4 9.2.1
6820		if 800 W is to be relocated, turn this into a passive walking path with trees and plants. dont just throw turf down.	9.1.4
6821		This needs to have a Traffic Light. With the UTA double tracking project putting more class 8 trucks on 700 W to enter the fuel loading dock. its already a dangerous intersection trying to make a left turn onto 500 S now, let alone adding 60 -100 big fuel trucks utilizing it once the double tracking is completed.	9.1.4
6822		Many people get on at 500 S and quickly exit at 400 N. Taking away this option will increase traffic on 800 West in West Bountiful. That is a residential street and the intersections at 500 S. and 400 N. on 800 W. are not designed to handle much traffic.	9.2.1
7217		A sound wall from 400 N to 500 S on the west side of I-15 would dramatically reduce the noise pollution from the interstate. It is to the point now that being outside is not enjoyable.	9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B
7218	Andre A.	Focus on the I-15 as the sole solution to traffic safety is misguided. Cars make roads unsafe for bikers and pedestrians. Providing alternative modes of transit, such as expanding the reach, and increasing frequency and accessibility of the UTA light rail, trains, and bus network are necessary for alleviating stress on the car-centric system. Effective public transit and higher density housing surrounding these stops reduce commute distance and the number of cars on the road. Finally, if bike lanes and walkways are to be added to high traffic areas, a physical barrier must be built to protect them from cars.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
7617	David Hawkes	The new interchange needs to have a NB on ramp and SB off ramp. There really is a large gap between Parrish Lane and Station Park and this would also help those driving to the high school from the North. These ramps would also reduce the traffic at Station Park interchange, which is one of the goals of this project, since residents and those going to the high school would more likely use this interchange. During a Local Area Working Group it was stated there "wasn't enough space" to build the needed ramps. There is more space in this area than most interchanges along I-15. There's also no issues putting in the direct Lagoon on/off roads? Seems like the interchange is designed around what Lagoon wants more than anything. During the meeting last year at Farmington City Hall it was mentioned that our comments are just as important as Lagoon's. This sure looks like Lagoon get's what they want and those that live can't get the full access to I-15 that's needed and desired. To be clear, I'm fine with the direct off path to the frontage road, We're doing this in other areas. However, don't pretend like it "can't be done" at the same time making sure Lagoon get's everything they want. This only solves access to the frontage road which in my opinion is the lowest priority to solve. Why spend all this money if we're not going to fix all the issues that need to be addressed, namely the full access to I-15.	9.1.4 9.1.7
7618		We need a SB off ramp. This will help those going to the high school and reduce traffic at Station Park.	9.1.4
7619		Is there a reason we're turning this entire intersection into a bridge? wouldn't it be more cost effective to put this on ground level and have a small bridge go over for the direct frontage road access?	9.2.1

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
7620		If there "isn't space" for the NB on ramp and SB off ramp, couldn't this intersection be moved to the North East to provide more space?	9.1.4
7621	Andy	There will be just as much freeway noise here as there is south of Glover Lane. We need a sound wall added here from Gover to the new 200 W. intersection.	9.3.7 B
7622	Andy Evans	It looks like Lagoon got what they wanted here with no stopping in or out of the park, but the local residents didn't get what they wanted. We wanted to have NB and SB access to I-15 from this intersection. Very frustrating.	9.1.4 9.1.7
7623		Please connect the parrish lane bridge crossing to the legacy parkway trail	9.1.4
7624		Please put a bicycle crossing on N Frontage Rd! Line of sight next to the curve is bad and cyclists will and should be able to cross to go to target and walmart to avoid the death trap on parrish lane.	9.1.4
7625		Please make this into a shared path to connect the park to the parrish lane buisness area. With speed humps/raised crossing to calm traffic going from the frontage road into residential neighborhoods. Cars consistently go 60 mph on this frontage road.	9.1.4
7626		Improving access to FrontRunner will do more for reducing traffic than any widening project	9.1.1 9.1.3
7627		Pedestrian space is needed on Park Lane	9.1.4
7628		Making cyclists take a "W" shaped route says they are not a priority. While safer to separate from vehicles, these users are apparently an afterthought.	9.1.4
7629		I do not feel safe biking on 600 North today and I will not feel safe biking on 600 North with this design either. Cyclists need to be protected by a physical barrier, not by paint.	9.1.4
7630		The only sustainable future of north-south travel in the region is double-tracked, electrified, frontrunner.	9.1.1 9.1.3
7631		This width invites drivers to speed in a growing community.	9.2.1
7632		Agree with the other commenter. The shared use path could be better utilized if it were connected with the cul-de-sac rather than of continuing onto E. Eagle Ridge Dr.	9.1.4
7633		???	9.4 A
7634		Is there not a way to turn onto Warm Springs Road? This is a major access to multiple businesses and the only way to get to the west side of North Salt Lake without crossing train tracks. All of these changes effectively cut off the west side from the east side of the city and create safety issues in the event of an emergency.	9.2.1
7635		Eliminating this off-ramp effectively cuts off the west side of the city from the east side. It also eliminates the only offramp that truly serves North Salt Lake. You could have done better. Instead you chose to make it even harder for west side residents to feel a part of their city .	9.1.4
7636		Nothing on these plans address the issue with the train tracks. UP doesn't do anything to mitigate their impact on traffic and communities, often blocking multiple crossings for upwards to an hour at a time. This is a significant safety issue that no one is addressing. When will UP be held accountable for their traffic impact? Why aren't they trying to be part of the solution, instead of being a major part of the problem. This comment goes for every crossing that UP operates at, not just center street.	9.1.4
7637		I agree. Consider promoting other multimodal means of transportation, increased carpooling efforts and frontrunner expansion/updates please.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3
8017	Emily Hase	Any changes to this intersection need to include traffic calming. Cars coming off the freeway, or south on 300 W already drive very fast through the Marmalade neighborhood resulting in noise pollution and unsafe roads. I live one block from this intersection, and see first-hand on a daily basis how cars speed through this area. Additionally, the walk lights at this intersection are too short for the road width, we have many elderly and wheelchair-bound residents of this neighborhood who can barely make it to the other side in the current time allotted.	9.1.4 9.2.1 9.3.7 B
8018		This is a community center and home to several small businesses. Should be saved at all costs	9.1.6

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
8019		This can definitely be demolished	9.3.2 B
8020		can this be pushed east, to avoid on ramp right by residential properties?	9.1.4
8021		Please make while this is under construction to coordinate with Trax/trains and NOT block our access to the city (previous closures of 6th north bridge cut us off to the city because trains were blocking alternate routes)	9.3.12 A
8417		In general, any homes for sale in the block should be flagged. Please provide info to sellers on how to disclose this plan	9.3.2 A
8817	Jeff Tolman	Farmington residents need a north bound entrance onto I15. Currently all Farmington residents are forced to go pass Lagoon or Station park to be able to enter I15. Please put a northbound entrance to I15 here or at Glover lane. Otherwise there are consequences where we force people to go thru heavily used roads to get to the freeway. My son was killed crossing the crosswalk at state street and 400 west by a person who works for the Davis school district. whomight be alive if this driver was not forced to use that route to the freeway. My point is the effect good or bad of the road system will impact the community for years after construction completion. Please, please reduce the traffic on the city streets by putting this northbound on ramp.	9.1.4
8818		Why not a sound wall here?	9.3.7 B
8819		Sound wall?	9.3.7 B
8820		We need a sound wall here	9.3.7 B
8821		I think we need a soundwall here for the noise.	9.3.7 B
8822		Why not a sound wall here?	9.3.7 B
8823		Sound wall?	9.3.7 B
8824		Thank you for this design!!!!	9.2.2
8825		We need a sound wall north of Glover Lane	9.3.7 B
8826		With the added lanes on I15 we need a sound wall here.	9.3.7 B
8827		With added traffic why not a sound wall here?	9.3.7 B
8828		We need a sound wall for noise here	9.3.7 B
8829		Please put a sound wall here.	9.3.7 B
9217	Jeff Tolman	Building a road the primarily serves Lagoon should not be paid for by public funds. Lagoon should be responsible for the off road line up of cars that want to enter their park. Today, the road is used by Lagoon to stage the cars that are entering their park. They have the space on the north west corner of their property to build more entry gates that would allow the cars to get off Lagoon drive and into the park. This is a problem because there are only 2 routes to get to I15 northbound, by station park or by lagoon. So residents of Farmington are impacted by not Farmington traffic to Lagoon when trying to get on I15 northbound and using Lagoon drive as the route to the freeway. Instead of buliding this new road to lagoon, use the existing road and put in a north bound onramp to I15.	9.1.4 9.1.7
9617	Scott Mershon	Cars cars cars. What if we spent money on projects that would decrease our dependency on cars? What if everyone could take a bus, ride a bike, or walk to work? To the store? Well then our roads that only function for cars would no longer be needed. Let's try an break the mold with urban planning.	9.1.2 9.1.3
10017		Build underground	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
10018		I do like the preferred northern option more as it seems to make less people/businesses move	9.2.2
10019		A sound wall or at least cement barrier needs to be put here to protect the trailer park	9.3.7 B
10020		I like that the braided ramps will increase the safety of getting on and off I-15 at this area, but I'm concerned about it causing more overload on 500 West in Bountiful/West Bountiful	9.2.1
10021		What about a Northbound on ramp and southbound off ramp? Park Lane cannot handle all the traffic for Farmington! The southbound lanes back up every night on the freeway with people waiting to exit since it is the only off ramp between Kaysville and Parrish Lane! There needs to be another southbound off ramp. There also needs to be a northbound on ramp the people who live between Parrish lane and Station Park. They need a closer option. It would alleviate a lot of traffic through Farmington.	9.1.4 9.2.1
10022		Why not an SPUI here? The current design allows for easier flow of traffic on to 1-15, this seems less effective.	9.1.4
10023		There are pros and cons here. If there is a light here, it will allow for easier access trying to get to the other side of 1-15. Without it though, it will be a mess at certain times of day trying to get on and off of 800 west. With a light though, this area is going to back up with high school students trying to leave the school in the afternoon or after events since it is so close to the 2600 south interchange. And as one who frequently travels Eastbound on 2600 S and needs to get onto 800 West, the thought of going under 1-15 to turn at Wildcat way and then having to go through this intersection to go back under 1-15 seems like a long way to go to get there.	9.2.1
10024		I'm happy to see two turn lanes at the intersection, but it still doesn't seem enough. The current turn lane is always backed up blocking the straight lane because so many people have to turn here to get to the shopping center and high school. Now you add everyone trying to get into Woods Cross via 800 west and it is still going to back up with the two lanes, they need to be longer.	9.2.1
10025		So many people make a U turn at this intersection trying to get back to the shopping center! Can this area be configured like 123rd south in Sandy/Draper or up in Layton where there is U turn area? There is only one safe way to get into the shopping center and this would help the area. Even adding it further down Main Street by EOS so they can come back and turn at the light or before walgreens by Black Bear Diner.	9.1.4 9.2.1
10417	Cherish Clark	The decision to build an additional connection between the east/west side of SLC will have a generational impact that cannot be overemphasized. I believe the loudest voices being considered that are against the underpass live on the east side of the highway. I think that there is an underrepresentation of those who are for the underpass or would benefit from the underpass, mainly those living on the west side of the highway in Rose Park and Fairpark. I think concerns about crime/homelessness with an underpass are valid. However, we do not see this issue currently with the 300 N underpass. These concerns are solvable problems but if we choose to not have the additional connection through the I-15 then we lose an opportunity to improve our current east/west connectivity problem. The west side of Salt Lake City has historically been redlined, underinvested, and ignored. We deserve to access the amenities on the east side and to increase economic opportunities on the west side through additional connectivity. High-quality, qualitative research is necessary to evaluate all of the current and future needs of this area. We must consider the quality of life for all who are impacted, even those who don't live here yet. This area is changing dramatically and that cannot be ignored.	9.1.5
10418		Remove the blender zones on 600 N where cars changing into right turn lanes must cross a bike lane. The bike lane should be adjacent to the pedestrian path to increase cyclist safety.	9.1.4
10419		Cyclists and pedestrians need protection from cars to cross the ramps. In order to achieve this there should be a signal (or multiple signals) that pedestrians and cyclists can easily activate that would stop cars from turning onto the ramp so that these users can cross safely. Something like a lead pedestrian interval. Extra effort in the design should be applied to prevent cars from turning right on red in this situation. I think both of these recommendations are essential if the UDOT wants this to be a crossing people will actually use.	9.1.4
10420		Cyclists and pedestrians need protection from cars to cross the ramps. In order to achieve this there should be a signal (or multiple signals) that pedestrians and cyclists can easily activate that would stop cars from turning onto the ramp so that these users can cross safely. Something like a lead pedestrian interval. Extra effort in the design should be applied to prevent cars from turning right on red in this situation. I think both of these recommendations are essential if the UDOT wants this to be a crossing people will actually use.	9.1.4
10421		Cyclists and pedestrians need protection from cars to cross the ramps. In order to achieve this there should be a signal (or multiple signals) that pedestrians and cyclists can easily activate that would stop cars from turning onto the ramp so that these users can cross safely. Something like a lead pedestrian interval. Extra effort in the design should be applied to prevent cars from turning right on red in this situation. I think both of these recommendations are essential if the UDOT wants this to be a crossing people will actually use.	9.1.4
10422		Cyclists and pedestrians need protection from cars to cross the ramps. In order to achieve this there should be a signal (or multiple signals) that pedestrians and cyclists can easily activate that would stop cars from turning onto the ramp so that these users can cross safely. Something like a lead pedestrian interval. Extra effort in the design should be applied to prevent cars from turning right on red in this situation. I think both of these recommendations are essential if the UDOT wants this to be a crossing people will actually use.	9.1.4
10423		Remove the blender zones on 600 N where cars changing into right turn lanes must cross a bike lane. The bike lane should be adjacent to the pedestrian path to increase cyclist safety.	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
10424		Right now my neighborhood (Fairpark) experiences sound pollution because the 600 N overpass lacks adequate noise abatement. The 600 N overpass needs to have noise barriers that are installed all along the ramps and the sloping portions of 600 N. This would be different from the current design which has noise barriers at a lower elevation bordering residential properties.	9.3.7 B
10425		Right now my neighborhood (Fairpark) experiences sound pollution because the 600 N overpass lacks adequate noise abatement. The 600 N overpass needs to have noise barriers that are installed all along the ramps and the sloping portions of 600 N. This would be different from the current design which has noise barriers at a lower elevation bordering residential properties.	9.3.7 B
10426		Right now my neighborhood (Fairpark) experiences sound pollution because the 600 N overpass lacks adequate noise abatement. The 600 N overpass needs to have noise barriers that are installed all along the ramps and the sloping portions of 600 N. This would be different from the current design which has noise barriers at a lower elevation bordering residential properties.	9.3.7 B
10427		A noise barrier needs to be added to the North Temple Bridge. Sound from this area also creates a great deal of noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10428		A noise barrier needs to be added to the North Temple Bridge. Sound from this area also creates a great deal of noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10429		The current policy for placing and measuring receivers for measure noise abatement impact is inadequate. My neighborhood (Fairpark) is unique from others in that we are completely surrounded by state highways. My entire neighborhood experiences extreme noise pollution, not just the areas adjacent to the highway. This is further exacerbated in the winter when cooler temperatures force sound waves in a downward direction, concentrating them to the floor of my neighborhood. Please visit my neighborhood on a weekday morning in the middle of winter and experience the roar we hear from these highways. There should be receivers placed throughout the neighborhood, at least a mile away from the highways. Receivers should be measured during multiple seasons, especially winter when the noise pollution is worse.	9.3.7 A
10430		We need soundwall all the way up the this hill to prevent noise pollution	9.3.7 B
10431		We need soundwall all the way up the this hill to prevent noise pollution	9.3.7 B
10432		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10433		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10434		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10435		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10436		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10437		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
()10438		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10439		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10440		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10441		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10442		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10443		We need sound walls all the way up this ramp to mitigate noise pollution.	9.3.7 B
10444		East side needs connectivity to west side. West side has amenities such as teh north west rec center, the jordan river trail, and Smith's grocery store on 600 N.	9.1.5

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
10445		I would prefer a pedestrian bridge over 600 N for east/west connectivity.	9.1.4
10446		Can we make a connection here between west side/ east side of SLC?	9.1.4
10447		Can we get pedestrian/cyclist connection between east and west side of i15 here?	9.1.4
10448		Please make the walls here attractive. The grey is SO SO ugly. People live and recreate here but the highway looks like a prison wall.	9.1.4
10449		Can we get east/west connection at 500 N? SLC is a grid system, let's take advantage of it.	9.1.5
10450		Can UDOT add connection to east/ west side and work with union pacific to add pedestrian bridges?	9.1.4
10451		We want bigger, more robust, and more attractive looking soundwalls. The west side of the i-15 is surrounded by highways and our quality of life is most impacted by this. Please spend more money on noise pollution mitigation.	9.1.4 9.3.7 A 9.3.7 B
10452		We should be burying this highway and spending our money on improving our quality of life by reducing the reliance on cars.	9.1.1 9.1.2 9.1.3 9.1.4
10453		How much easier will it be for our legislators to commute to work from Davis county? That's why we're doing this, right?	9.1.7
10454		Build a pedestrian/cyclist bridge separate from the interchange to make this the best east/west connection in the state. Something like Lehi's ped/cyclist crossing at route 92/i15 interchange.	9.1.4
10455		I would prefer you make it easier for me and my family to use the front runner than to spend money on widening the i15. This is truly the wrong direction for our state to go. We should lead the nation in innovation when it comes to our impact on the environment and quality of life for residents.	9.1.2 9.1.3
10456		Can we get more front runner stations between woods/cross and layton? There's a whole 20 miles inbetween these stations. I am suprised this isn't our primary solution to dealing with David County commuters.	9.1.2 9.1.3
10817	Kevin Carlson	Love the soundwall extending North here. I did hear that it will be a concrete surface freeway and not the sound deadening material. The noise is really bad between the freeway and mountain in this whole area. The sound wall will be a big help, but quieter road material would be huge as well.	9.1.6
10818	Kevin Carlson	This option for Glovers Lane is much better and safer for the area. Thank you!	9.2.2
10819	Benjamin Wood	I support making 1000 North and 2100 North more attractive to trucks, but it won't matter unless 600 North actively discourages commercial traffic. These plans make improvements, yes, but they still maintain car-supremacy with their double-turn lanes and dangerous blender zones. Reducing to sing turn lanes would drmatically kneck down the crossings while adding incentive for larger vehicle to continue north to 1000.	9.1.4
10820	Benjamin Wood	These blender zones negate the effort you're making to enhance safety. It doesn't matter that the central portion is protected if you can safely reach that section. These bike lanes should be safe enough for children to use and this current design still puts our familes in harm's way in unnecessary ways that prioritize drivers over neighborhood quality of life.	9.1.4
10821	Benjamin Wood	There should be a hard barrier between cars and bikes in this section, as there's no need for drivers to cross into the bike path	9.1.4
10822	Benjamin Wood	A pedestrian/cyclist underpass at this location would create a needed connection between Guadalupe Park and Jackson Park, and the broader Guadalupe and Fairpark neighborhoods. This crossing should prioritize people, if not exclude cars entirely, and it should be built as a an attractive parklet with amenities to promote maintream use and to deter criminality. If not this location, another crossing should be cut between these neighborhoods, in a way that prioritizes pedestrians and cyclists over drivers. Even with the improvements on 600 North, the high number of lanes and the slope of the interchange makes it too stressfull for vulnerable users.	9.1.5

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
10823	Benjamin Wood	Special consideration should be made at this location regarding the aesthetics of the highway. This junction will become increasingly important as Salt Lake's trails and transit networks improve, and plans to build a park and daylight city creek underneath these overpasses warrant effort by UDOT to build something that is, at least, not hideous and, preferably, actually nice to look at. This could include murals or landscaping or other treatments, but it should be designed with the underlying parks, trails and trains in mind. A thriving community was located here before the freeway (see: the Nettie Gregory Center), making this one of the places most devastated by suburban car-centrism. UDOT has an opportunity to heal some of the wounds of its previous actions by putting extra effort into this location.	9.1.4 9.1.6
10824	Benjamin Wood	(This same comment was erroneously placed at 300 South. It is intended to refer to this area above the Folsom trail). Special consideration should be made at this location regarding the aesthetics of the highway. This junction will become increasingly important as Salt Lake's trails and transit networks improve, and plans to build a park and daylight city creek underneath these overpasses warrant effort by UDOT to build something that is, at least, not hideous and, preferably, actually nice to look at. This could include murals or landscaping or other treatments, but it should be designed with the underlying parks, trails and trains in mind. A thriving community was located here before the freeway (see: the Nettie Gregory Center), making this one of the places most devastated by suburban car-centrism. UDOT has an opportunity to heal some of the wounds of its previous actions by putting extra effort into this location.	9.1.4 9.1.6
10825		Half Ramp option here works well with low average daily traffic on Warm Springs Road. Additionally, This option has minimal ROW takes opposed to others	9.2.2
10826		Straightening Warm Springs and eliminating 90 deg curves is beneficial to what currently exist in terms of safety. Over the years working in this area ive seen multiple accidents including pedestrian / vehicle related incidents.	9.2.2
10827		Appears you have provided a good option for Pedestrian / Bicycle traffic access onto Warm Springs Road here.	9.2.2
10828	Tyler Christensen	Underpass— please build a large, open, and well lit underpass at 500 north and reconnect the Jackson and Guadalupe neighborhoods. This could create an actual community asset, and at least offset some off the damage expansion would bring.	9.1.5
11217		Basically everyone in North Salt Lake uses this off-ramp. Removing it will increase vehicle emissions by increasing travel time of NSL residents and snarling traffic at 2600. Please keep this off-ramp.	9.1.4
11218		Keep this section of 8th West so people don't have to deal with the traffic from the high school.	9.2.1
11219		Traffic backs up from the frozen custard shop, which is unsafe. Please add an additional westbound lane on this block to mitigate the issue.	9.1.4
11220	Daniel T Brewer	Consider adding ped/bike access to the overpass from 600 west	9.1.4
11221	Daniel T Brewer, SMART Transportation Union	Consider a grade separated SUP instead of at grade crosswalks at this location	9.1.4
11222	Daniel T Brewer, SMART- TD Union	It would be better to have the SUP connect to Rpsewood Park, with a bridge connecting to Swede Town and Beck Street	9.1.4
11223	Daniel T Brewer, SMART-TD Union	This SUP will encourage trespassing into the railyard. Please consider rerouting the paths to avoid putting people in harm's way.	9.2.1
11224	Daniel T Brewer	This overpass should have a SUP that connects the Beck Street SUP to the Jordan River SUP	9.1.4
11225	Daniel T Brewer, SMART-TD Union	This railroad crossing needs to be eliminated. Trains block this crossing for hours everyday. It is not a safe location for a SUP.	9.1.4
11226	Daniel T Brewer	Consider and underpass for the SUP here.	9.1.4
11227		The SUP should have underpasses at all intersections.	9.1.4
11228	Daniel T Brewer	The Center Street Overpass @ 300 West Railroad Crossing should be completed prior to I-15 expansion in this area	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
11229		SUP grade separation needed here	9.1.4
11230		The crosswalks should have tunnels going under the streets so that kids dont have to cross thru traffic or wait for the light	9.1.4
11231	Daniel T Brewer	The sidewalk needs to be separated at grade from the on ramps and off ramps	9.1.4
11232		I would like to see Pages lane underpass removed completely, and an overpass at Porters lane and 1000 N built over the freeway	9.1.4
11617		Incorrect street name: this is Orchard Drive	9.4 A
11618		The cul-de-sac should end here and a pedestrian/trail connection should be made to the hwy 89 trail	9.1.4
11619		Traffic signal at this intersection is necessary	9.1.4
11620		NSL has a planned trail along this right of way to connect Eagleridge Dr/Hwy 89 to Hatch Park, has this been taken into consideration? Grants for the project have been approved.	9.1.4
11621		Crossings of trails at streets and driveways, the trail should be the priority surface and the car surface be secondary to signal to the driver that the they are crossing a pedestrian facility	9.1.4
11622		There is an existing sidewalk here that is not shown on your aerial nor accounted for in the design and realignment of Overland Drive	9.1.4
11623		The aerial shows the old Village Inn, a new credit union has been built here. How does this impact the improvements made on the frontage?	9.4 A
11624		You need to update your aerial images to show the existing businesses and improvements.	9.4 A
11625		the pedestrian improvements are needed along 2600 south but you are not showing any landscaping buffer between the existing parking lot and the new sidewalk	9.1.4
11626		this is 400 East not Onion Street, you need to update your street info and aerials	9.4 A
11627		city code requires 10' landscape buffer between parking lots and front property line/ROW	9.1.4
11628		For such long crossings pedestrian islands (safe zones) should be added.	9.1.4
11629		There is a very nice decorative sound wall here, that also has landscaping in front of it and a grass strip. This makes this area a nice place to be and is VASTLY preferred to the large precast walls with nothing but weeds in front of them that are along this road past 1350 South. PLEASE leave this wall in place and don't destroy it with the expansion. If it has to come down, we would like the opportunity to weigh in on the options and anything that came back should be an equivalent level of quality and aesthetics. It would be a real slight to this Farmington section of the road if this were reduced in aesthetic quality.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
11630		Approximate end of existing decorative sound wall. PLEASE LEAVE IN PLACE!	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
11631		Approximate start of existing decorative sound wall. PLEASE LEAVE IN PLACE!	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
11632		There is a very nice decorative sound wall here, that also has landscaping in front of it and a grass strip. This makes this area a nice place to be and is VASTLY preferred to the large precast walls with nothing but weeds in front of them that are along this road past 1470 South (near West Davis Corridor overpass). PLEASE leave this wall in place and don't destroy it with the expansion. If it has to come down, we would like the opportunity to weigh in on the options and anything that came back should be an equivalent level of quality and aesthetics. It would be a real slight to this Farmington section of the road if this were reduced in aesthetic quality.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
11633		Continuing the sound wall through this area to Glover and even beyond would be a nice addition. It could help with the freeway noise that extends into this area up to 200E. Having some sort of sound deadening characteristic/quality would be a big help. We also need to be sensitive to the scale and aesthetics of it as well though since anything too stark will materially diminish the character of the neighborhood. Please take this into account.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
11634		It seems like it would be a better idea to have this intersection at grade with the direct frontage road access as the bridge. Why not consider that setup here?	9.2.1
11635		It does not appear the grade was taken into account with the widening of this road and placement of this sidewalk. There is at least a 6-8' grade difference from the existing sidewalk to the base of the sound wall that backs all the homes to the east of this road. By moving the sidewalk halfway up the slope, it makes for some difficult grading here. Plus the grass strip that exists is a significant amenity for the neighborhood. Please look at this and see if you can keep it more like the existing.	9.2.1 9.2.2
11636		Turn lane here serves no purpose but to waste space. No northbound left turn possible along this road! And there is a high price to pay with losing the green space along the east of the road to the sidewalk being pushed further in. Not to mention there is a significant drainage ditch along the sidewalk to the east.	9.1.4
11637		Turn lane here serves no purpose but to waste space. No northbound left turn possible along this road! And there is a high price to pay with losing the green space along the east of the road to the sidewalk being pushed further in. Not to mention there is a significant drainage ditch along the sidewalk to the east.	9.1.4
11638		There is a significant drainage channel along this road where the sidewalk shows being moved to. That may not work, and it seems unnecessary accommodating a turn lane that can't be used to turn left while traveling north.	9.1.4
11639		The benefit of the south turning lane for left turn to the east at this area is offset by the negative impacts of moving the sidewalk into the existing green space and closer to the residential lots. This is probably not necessary or desirable. It also not a very busy road for those left turns where there is any sort of queuing issue to mitigate.	9.1.4 9.2.1 9.2.2
11640		This turn lane that is being added to the frontage road really needs to be considered. Maybe there is some spots that it is needed (for southbound left turns certain spots), but to take up the space along the whole road given that there are never any northbound west turns seems like a wast of space and money. Please consider adding turn lanes only in select areas to make southbound east turns but don't widen the whole road from Parrish to Glover. Also note that there are no southbound left turn queuing issues that need to be mitigated. Given the limited developed area to the east there are simply not that many cars making these movements and there never will be because there is no more development area to the east.	9.1.4
11641		This turn lane that is being added to the frontage road really needs to be re-considered. Maybe there are some spots where it may be useful (for southbound left turns in certain spots), but to take up the space along the whole road given that there are never any northbound west turns seems like a waste of land and money. Please consider widening and adding turn lanes only in select areas (minimal) to make southbound east turns but don't widen the whole road from Parrish to Glover. Also note that there are no southbound left turn queuing issues that need to be mitigated that I have observed in driving this road daily for 8+ years. Given the limited developed area to the east there are simply not that many cars making these movements and there never will be because there is no more development area to the east.	9.1.4
11642		Thank you for not putting an interchange in this location that would kill the residential character of this neighborhood and not make any sense given the circumstances.	9.2.2
11643		Is it really necessary to add sidewalks to both sides of Glover? It really functions fine as is with sidewalks on the north only. Easy to cross and use that sidewalk that goes past the high school. Not much else on the south side that would need to be covered by a south sidewalk.	9.2.2 9.3.5 C
11644		This pedestrian bridge is a nice potential addition, albeit a bit of a boondoggle. Might want to consider its real necessity.	9.1.4 9.2.2 9.3.5 C
11645		Let's please continue to try and use the excess land in the median between north and south before we take land from residential neighborhoods and streets to the east.	9.1.6
11646		This direct access lane to frontage road off the freeway is a nice feature.....	9.2.2
11647		During peak traffic times (5:00 PM) this may benefit from having a traffic light, otherwise there may be significant backup, but I would doubt other times would justify it. Since the parrish traffic coming onto this road does have a light, maybe that would be sufficient to create space for these left turners here. Either way we would probably benefit from both a left and right turn lane though.	9.2.1
11648		Maintaining traffic flow through construction along frontage road is going to be critical.	9.3.12 A

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
12017		This is a very nice decorative sound wall here and it has been here many years. But I feel that aesthetics were considered more the quality when it was built. Compared to centerville there is a sound decibel difference. Please build it taller. I feel that with the added traffic in the past 7 years, it has outrun its purpose. The wall only is like 6ft tall or so. The houses are 2 story which are easily over 25-30 ft especially if you sleep on the second floor. A new sound wall should take its place. The sound of the traffic and train can be easily heard over the wall. Not to mention the construction for 2 years now. I would consider a much taller sound wall. Yes the taller sound walls have weeds and dirt but I feel that Farmington will be creative and will decorate beautifully. Yes a new sound wall is expensive but the current one is outdated. Please consider building it taller, there is a construction phase going on, might as well take care of it now. Or at least put it in to consideration.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
12018		This is a very nice decorative sound wall here and it has been here many years. But I feel that aesthetics were considered more the quality when it was built. Compared to centerville there is a sound decibel difference. Please build it taller. I feel that with the added traffic in the past 7 years, it has outrun its purpose. The wall only is like 6ft tall or so. The houses are 2 story which are easily over 25-30 ft especially if you sleep on the second floor. A new sound wall should take its place. The sound of the traffic and train can be easily heard over the wall. Not to mention the construction for 2 years now. I would consider a much taller sound wall. Yes the taller sound walls have weeds and dirt but I feel that Farmington will be creative and will decorate beautifully. Yes a new sound wall is expensive but the current one is outdated. Please consider building it taller, there is a construction phase going on, might as well take care of it now. Or at least put it in to consideration.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
12019		This is a very nice decorative sound wall here and it has been here many years. But I feel that aesthetics were considered more the quality when it was built. Compared to centerville there is a sound decibel difference. Please build it taller. I feel that with the added traffic in the past 7 years, it has outrun its purpose. The wall only is like 6ft tall or so. The houses are 2 story which are easily over 25-30 ft especially if you sleep on the second floor. A new sound wall should take its place. The sound of the traffic and train can be easily heard over the wall. Not to mention the construction for 2 years now. I would consider a much taller sound wall. Yes the taller sound walls have weeds and dirt but I feel that Farmington will be creative and will decorate beautifully. Yes a new sound wall is expensive but the current one is outdated. Please consider building it taller, there is a construction phase going on, might as well take care of it now. Or at least put it in to consideration.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
12020		Feels like waaay too much traffic here. WX High and other traffic all together, down to the original one-lane past the high school. The current configuration gets all jammed up, this one doesn't seem to solve the issue. Not liking this.	9.2.1
12021		Agreed, keep this 800 west traffic available to use to avoid High School traffic. There is too much traffic in this area to shut down this small stretch of 800 west, access is better.	9.2.1
12022		Still not enough volume available to handle the rush traffic. Hard problems, we know.	9.2.1
12023		Agree...traffic issues at Nielsen's have GOT to be handled better!	9.1.4
12024		Going west-bound on 2600 across 89 is a little unclear from two lanes WB to 3 across an intersection. Makes for uneasy crossing because you don't know what lane you should be in, but you know it's not the one in front of you, so lots of SB-R turn questions as everyone shoots for the right lane across the intersection.	9.2.1
12025		taking too much of public property ... is this really necessary to widen into private home-owner property? Am I seeing this correctly? If so, not in favor.	9.1.1 9.1.4 9.1.6
12026		This long exit lane would be much better than the current short lane... as people are often going under 60 mph on the freeway now to exit...would mean freeway speeds ""could"" be kept before exiting.	9.2.2
12027		Can negotiations for a drive entry here, bend into Neilsen's then cross this apartment access? Seems like this access is unnecessary, could go east then right to the light then right. Who is the hold out here?	9.1.4
12028		Nice fix for the unclear actions at this current location.	9.2.2
12029		As a long-time resident of WX, I don't want to fight traffic near Smith's to get to 800 west when I'm on the way home from SLC. PLEASE allow a left exit, with a right turn onto 800 west at least. It would be nice to get on the freeway from 800 west SB and NB also, but I see the issue... are you sure there isn't a way to keep that too?	9.2.1
12030		These are hard issues. Thanks to UDOT for all you do to keep us save, minimize wait times, keep traffic moving! We appreciate and take for granted the availability of all our roads and ease of travel. Thank you! Stay safe.	9.2.2
12031		Widen this further north to avoid congestion with lights!!	9.1.4
12032		Can light poles be relocated to elongate this lane? Now that you add all the 800 West traffic, this will be bonkers busy.	9.1.4 9.2.1
12417		Adding my voice for the need for a Northbound onramp and Southbound offramp. Needing to travel to and through Station Park to get on/off the freeway takes about 10-15 mins from this location.	9.1.4

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
12418		This road seems pointless and would just add more congestion for people skipping the intersection.	9.2.1
12419		These turn lanes are really not need. There's rarely a backup on traffic flow trying to turn left from all directions.	9.1.4
12420		There's really no need for these turn lanes. There's rarely a backup on traffic trying left from any direction.	9.1.4
12421		These sound walls need to be taller. Higher noise from the bridge, more traffic, and increase train sounds, it feels like the current walls don't do anything.	9.1.4 9.3.7 B
12817	James Domingo Madrigal	The underpass at this location adds nothing to "east/west connectivity" and will increase the time, expense, and impact rebuilding the highway will have on the surrounding community. The underpass will have very little use for west siders attempting to "connect" to the east because 4th N leads directly into train tracks that are often in use, forcing bicyclists and pedestrians to use 3rd N anyway, where a \$6.6 million bridge has just been completed for this very purpose. Even when trains are not stalled on those tracks, pedestrians will be forced to deal with 400 W and 300 W, neither of which have stop lights on 400 n (but 300 N already does). Yet another reason this underpass makes no sense is that the City is already in the advanced planning stages to revamp 300 N with additional bike lanes and pedestrian services. An underpass at this location (a mere block away from one that's already there!) is a ridiculous idea. It's like building an access road into a dead end.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
12818	James Domingo Madrigal	I am extremely concerned about my neighbors in this neighborhood. It appears to me an almost impossible task that the freeway widening will not permanently impact these homes, despite UDOT's assurances. I fear we will not know the full impact of the construction until it is much too late.	9.1.6
13217		Where is the noise wall for this area!!	9.3.7 B
13617		I'm ready to sell my home. Who do I talk to.	9.1.6
13618		No need for extra pedestrian access under I-15. This is plenty and lots of money has been spent already for a pedestrian bridge over the tracks. Whoever made the comment of access to amenities on this side of I-15 is blind. There are no grocery stores on this side. Harmons is the nearest grocery store and that's on state street. We shop at Rancho or Smiths on the westside.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
13619		This property was just sold to UDOT. Nice move Mr. Johnson. The inevitable end.	9.4 A
13620		Tear this place down. Drugs and other crime happen here regularly	9.3.2 B
13621		According to this interactive map this is potential impacted area. Construction maps rarely color in the lines. Is it safe to assume that all of these residents will lose access to their homes? Will UDOT make relocation arrangements? or just a buyout? Sad all the way around. A resident that lives on Argyle ct. shared their experience from the last time the freeway was expanded just before the olympics, a nightmare. Structural damage to their home and neighbors' and around the clock construction.	9.1.6 9.3.12 B
13622		Do you live in the neighborhood? This connection makes no sense. This would turn into another homeless encampment site as many already use the parks for their staging as well as the walls of the freeway. 300 N. is plenty. I bought my home on the other side of this because of the low traffic and dead end.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
13623		This point is not about East/West connectivity. The residents on the eastside of this wall do not consider themselves eastside residents. We are Guadalupe residents. We enjoy the quiet low traffic street we live on. If this area opens up it will be another road where cars speed to get access to the freeway when trains prevent them from crossing. Ask any resident that lives on 300 North what that's like during school hours and during commuting timeframes. If this opens up all of the new residents that live at the apartments east of 600 west will use this route to speed to the on ramp on 600 N. Leave it closed.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
13624		Hard no! No vehicle/pedestrian access.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
13625		300 North is the access point.	9.1.5 9.3.5 C
13626		Semis use this intersection daily to access businesses on 600 West. Either Google maps has failed them that they end up on our residential roads or they're just lost. The corners of this intersection now have boulders to encourage safer driving instead of cars climbing the curb and often running pedestrians off the sidewalk.	9.4 A
14017		Please just remove this road it's pointless	9.2.1

(Continued on next page)

Appendix 9A: Reproductions of Comments on the Draft EIS and Response Matrix

Comment ID	Name	Comment	See Response in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS
14417	Whitney	I feel like this is going to cause a bigger problem? It gets so backed up through here with all the fast food places. Why can't this be moved to Chase Lane and put a light in? If this is all Farmington traffic, why can't it be moved closer to Farmington?	9.2.1
14418	Lindsay Duncan	Hello. My mom owns this home. You're proposing taking it for the frontage road access. This is a VERY poor design and from growing up here I can tell you this is a horrible plan. There is no way putting in a 3 way light (because there would need to be coming off the freeway into already south and northbound frontage road traffic) for an access point right there is a good idea. If Centerville hates the traffic west at the existing light this is not going to solve ANYTHING and people will just go through the neighborhoods and speed and there will be more kids hurt from the school on Chase. You need to move this down to and interchange at 200 in Farmington. This is a nightmare waiting to happen. Please don't do this. There will be nothing but accidents and people hurt. And a walking path? Come on Centerville City I know you're not that dumb.	9.1.6 9.2.1 9.3.5 C
14419	Whitney	Why would an interchange not work for this? It would alleviate so much traffic from Centerville and take a lot of Farmington Station's congestion away.	9.1.4
14420	Whitney	This blind corner is already a disaster. Then add all trucks and big rigs that park on the street to access the food places.	9.2.1
14421		People coming from Lagoon never yield. They run you over. Can we do something about that.	9.2.1
14422	Isaac Moore	\$1.6 billion for a project that will only accommodate less than half of the projected traffic in 2050. You say this expansion is necessary because all other transit options have been considered, yet widening the highway still won't fix the problem so you'll have to expand public transit anyway. You may as well do it right now with the billions of dollars you're planning to blow on this, instead of just an afterthought as it usually is. For example, the Rio Grande Plan and free fare transit are two proposals that were not accounted for in this study, yet are gaining traction and at some point will likely be implemented. You're the Utah Department of Transportation, not the Utah Department of Cars. Start acting like it.	9.1.2

This page is intentionally left blank