I-80 & I-215 RENEWED Salt Lake East

Online Public Hearing Live Chat Q&A Transcript
Aug. 19, 2020

#	Question	Project Team Response
1	Is there any plan to add an EB on ramp from 2300 S to I-215?	No, adding an eastbound on ramp at 2300 East is not part of the scope for this project.
2	Will the freeway be extended any further S and affect the new walking path?	An additional eastbound lane will be added as part of this project. There will be temporary impacts to the walking path during construction but there will be no permanent long-term impacts.
3	Under the Purpose and Need slide; what is the current Level of Service and what is the future LOS projected to be. I'm interested in this as well as the numbers provided. These neighborhoods are generally built out, so what contributes to the rise in use?	The current Level of Service (LOS) for eastbound I-80 is Level D. Eastbound I-80 is projected to become LOS F around 2035 without the additional lane. With the additional eastbound lane, the projected LOS in 2050 is C. General growth in the Salt Lake Valley and area contributes to the increase in traffic volume in the future.
4	With the increase in the lanes and increase in traffic, this road will only get louder. Semi's regularly use their air brakes in this area. Even thought this is against the law, I hear them several times a day. Will anything be done to stop trucks from using air brakes in a populated area?	The use of engine brakes by trucks is prohibited on westbound I-80 for a distance of 5 miles from a sign located about 0.25 mile west of the Foothill Drive overpass. Enforcing this restriction is the responsibility of local law enforcement, not UDOT.
5	What will be done to reduce the significant noise for neighborhoods North of I-80 from 1300 East to Foothill Boulevard?	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
6	It looks like no sound walls are being considered as part of the project plan. Have any other sound abatement measures been considered given that much of the impacted area already meets or exceeds the threshold for action?	No other noise abatement measures have been considered. Other measures that could be considered are reduction in traffic speed, but this is not feasible for I-80 or I-215.
7	The statement that the end result of this repaving project will be a less than a 1 dBA increase in noise seems difficult to believe. Based on my own experience of traveling on existing stretches of I-80 and changing from asphalt to cement or visa versa, there is a marked change in noise and vibration within the car itself. I would like to know how that was calculated, and the supporting evidence for that claim.	We use FHWA's Traffic Noise Model 2.5 to evaluate traffic noise, which uses pavement that is not degraded. Existing research shows that asphalt pavement can be quieter than concrete pavement in some circumstances and at some points in the overall pavement lifecycle. However, the existing research also shows that the noise benefits of using asphalt pavement decrease with time as the condition of the asphalt pavement deteriorates.

		We often see an improvement in noise levels when new pavement replaces aging pavement, regardless of the material used, and expect to see that in the case of this concrete reconstruction. Please see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page) for more information.
8	Will noise reducing concrete be used?	New concrete is an improvement from old, worn-out pavement, and will result in less noise and a smoother ride for drivers.
9	I would also like to know where the cement plant for the project would be erected? Several years ago when it was erected on the land between Wasatch Blvd. and I-215 it became a significant source of pollution, cement dust and diesel exhaust, for nearby residents and many of them suffered because of it.	UDOT will not allow for a concrete batch plant within the project limits. The contractor, which will be selected in early 2021, will be responsible for identifying and securing property for this purpose if needed, and may work with a private property owner to lease the land.
10	Yes. The noise on the north side is very loud. Even if there is no increase with the current project, the existing levels are too high. Mitigation measures needed.	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
11	I agree the noise is very noticeable even without the added lane. How was the noise level calculated to conclude no sound walls are needed?	We use FHWA's Traffic Noise Model 2.5 to evaluate traffic noise and potential noise mitigation measures. For more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
12	It's also very loud in Sugarhouse Park, around Highland High, and the neighborhoods East of that. Apparently barriers aren't practical, but a quieter road surface needs to be considered.	The area near Highland High is outside the project study area, and noise was not evaluated for this location.
13	When was the last time the wall construction costs were update for inflation and other causes of increased constructions costs?	The Department reviewed wall construction costs within the last two years.
14	Hi, my name is Steve Coleman, and I'm following your instructions, but I don't care the meeting. When I press one. I do have a question. If you go to concrete, where will the concrete be produced and Blended for the road work? Thank you.	UDOT will not allow for a concrete batch plant within the project limits. The contractor, which will be selected in early 2021, will be responsible for identifying and securing property for this purpose if needed, and may work with a private property owner to lease the land.
15	Is the noise study you are using for this project identical to the one for the Parley s Interchange Project?	No. Modeling from the Parley's Interchange EIS was used as a starting point, but we included the addition of one eastbound travel lane on I-80 between 1300 East and 2300 East. Additionally, the noise analysis extended to 1300 East (a little

		farther west than the Parley's Interchange EIS analysis which ended midway between 2000 East and 2300 East).
16	Hi, my name is Stephen Dibble a resident in the area and I was wondering what the price of oil is low as it is why are they insisting on using concrete as a replacement finish when with the oil off concrete? It's a much lower noise generated noise seems to be the big issue along there. So it doesn't make sense that to me that they're trying to knock out that and anyway they can thank you.	On interstates with a high volume of truck traffic, concrete is used because it lasts substantially longer than asphalt and is more cost-effective over the long term. Concrete pavement typically lasts about 40 years before needing a full replacement, compared to the 15-to-20-year lifespan of asphalt. Asphalt requires significant maintenance and resurfacings approximately every five years to reach the full 20-year lifespan. While concrete also requires additional maintenance and care, it is more infrequent, resulting in fewer future traffic impacts to the interstate and fewer costs associated with those interruptions. New concrete is a significant improvement from old, worn-out pavement, and will result in less noise and a smoother ride for drivers.
17	Were any sound measurements taken in the residential areas north of the Country Club between 1700E and 2000E? These neighborhoods are very loud and should part of the discussion, but it looks like they were excluded from the study because they aren't directly adjacent to I-80.	A noise measurement was conducted at the County Club. The purpose of conducting field noise measurements is to validate the existing noise model, which is then used to develop a future Proposed Action noise model. The study team did not take noise readings at every location because the Proposed Action noise model was used to evaluate noise impacts and potential mitigation, rather than field noise measurements. For specific noise measurement locations see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
18	I have a few questions outlined below. 1. How high will the freeway wall be and where exactly will they be located? Mainly the location at the Sugar House Park area, from the south its is nice to have a view into the park and not a concrete wall. 2. Is there a plan with the bridges in the design to eliminate a shelf or ways to keep homeless from building camps under the bridge. 3. Will there be a plan in the design at the 1300 east off-ramp and on-ramp to build a continuous wall about 3 ft high to keep pan handlers from congregating at the light? If there was a continuation of the wall to the sidewalk going north and south it would help eliminate this issue. 4. What type of landscaping is planned? Zeroscape? Minimal vegetation? Seems there is minimal funds if any or wants to maintain	If you are referring to freeway noise walls, any existing noise walls that are impacted by the project will be replaced at the same height as the existing walls. If you are referring to roadside barrier, they are planned to be 3.5 ft tall. The "shelf" in front of the bridges is a constructability need and UDOT Standard. The no-access fence adjacent to the freeway will tie into the bridge fence to limit access. A wall has not been considered to deter pan handlers. Any vegetation and landscaping impacted by the project will be restored in kind.

	anything. This creates overgrown areas that invite homeless camps and trash to the area.	
19	Were sound levels measured for extended (24 hr) periods or just spot checked? Only extended measurements would show high sound levels. Minute or even hour long measurements would not be sufficient. There is high variability in noise levels.	24-hour measurements were not required for this project. Noise measurements can be taken at any time of the day because noise measurements are not used to determine noise impacts. Noise measurements are used to make sure the modeling of roadways is accurate. Data is gathered during the noise measurement, including traffic volumes, vehicle mixes, speeds, and weather conditions. This data is input into a validation noise model that is used to compare modeled results with measured results. If the validation noise model is within 3 decibels of the measured results the noise model is considered representative of existing conditions. The existing and Proposed Action noise models are then developed using the greatest hourly traffic conditions likely to occur on a regular basis. These worst-case scenario noise models are used to determine noise impacts and the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures.
20	SEG It appears that the sound study analysis shows that Wall 4 has areas that are feasible and meet the requirements? Will this area as well the missing area between s wall 4 to the interchange be benefiting from a sound wall? If not, why not?	A wall in this location was evaluated at heights ranging from 8–20 feet. Evaluated wall heights were not acoustically feasible (did not provide a 5 dBA reduction for at least 50 % of front-row receptors). Please see Appendix D of the Noise Analysis for detailed information for Wall 4.
21	So, in other words, no, noise reducing concreate will not be used. We won't get any noise walls or noise abatement. As you can see noise is a HUGE issue to those of us who live by either of these freeways. Why was it decided that no further noise abatement will be done?	No noise walls met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. In accordance with the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy, several conditions must be met before traffic noise abatement is implemented. The mitigation must be considered feasible and reasonable. The factors considered when determining feasibility include engineering considerations, safety, and acoustic feasibility (5 dBA reduction for at least 50% of front-row receptors). Factors considered when determining if mitigation is reasonable include achieving the noise abatement design goal (7 dBA reduction for at least 35% of front-row receptors), cost effectiveness, and the viewpoints of property owners and residents. For more information see: https://udot.utah.gov/connect/public/noise-walls/
22	The noise has dramatically increased over the last several decades as travel has increased along I-80. It is now to the point that it has become almost overwhelming. Why do we seem to be having difficulty getting sound walls, when sounds walls were installed along much of I-215?	The UDOT Noise Abatement Policy changes over time to comply with federal regulations. In the current policy, several conditions must be met before traffic noise abatement is implemented. The mitigation must be considered feasible and reasonable. The factors considered when determining feasibility include engineering considerations, safety, and acoustic feasibility (5 dBA reduction for at least 50% of front-row

		receptors). Factors considered when determining if mitigation is reasonable include achieving the noise abatement design goal (7 dBA reduction for at least 35% of front-row receptors), cost effectiveness, and the viewpoints of property owners and residents. For more information see: https://udot.utah.gov/connect/public/noise-walls/
23	Will the project need to purchase construction easements?	No, the project will be constructed within the existing UDOT Right-of-Way.
24	If I read the report correctly, it concluded that noise levels exceed federal limits all along I-80, but UDOT has decided that because they can't make sweeping reductions across the whole project, that they won't try anything. Is this correct?	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. UDOT is required to comply with the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy which implements state and federal noise laws. This policy is applied equally to all state roads in Utah.
25	JEB Is this project funded by federal dollars or state dollars?	Federal funding
26	We live in the neighborhood East of 1700 East and North of I-80, and freeway noise is a constant disruption and it impacts what we can do outside our home. Noise pollution needs to be taken seriously as a part of this project.	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
27	To compensate for increased noise and reduce wear and tear on the road, speed limits should be reduced if UDOT refuses to use the option of asphalt for resurfacing in favor of cement.	Thanks for your comment.
28	ADOT has taken on a project to reduce noise throughout the Phoenix area. They are reporting 9dB reductions in sound by adding 1" of rubberized asphalt on top of the concrete base. Are alternative solutions like this being considered?	In accordance with UDOT policy, no alternative solutions are being considered as part of this project.
29	We're currently afraid to cross 1700 E bridge with my two young children because there is inadequate railing. Will the re-built bridges include improved pedestrian railing? If pedestrians and bikes are pushed further toward the edge by the proposed shoulder and concrete curb, it will be even more precarious.	The reconstructed bridge will have an 18’-0” multi-use trail separated from traffic by a raised curb adjacent to 1700E and fence mounted on top of a concrete barrier on the outside totaling 6’-0” tall.

30	Regarding the noise study for this project compared to the Parleys Interchange Noise study -- I understand that the MODELING is different, but was the UNDERLYING NOISE LEVEL DATA the same noise level data that was gathered for the Parleys Interchange project?	Three additional noise readings were taken as part of this noise analysis. We used five noise readings taken as part of the Parley's Interchange EIS in the noise analysis. See Section 3.3 in the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page) for more information.
31	Will this chat stream (questions and answers) be available after tonight? If so, how do we access it? How long will it be available?	No, the chat will be disabled at 6:30 PM tonight and the responses will not be available after that time. The study team does have a record of the chat. If you would like your questions and responses sent directly to you after the meeting, please email saltlakeeast@utah.gov.
32	I would also like to know if that noise increase estimation includes taking into account the anticipated increased traffic of 27,000 vehicles per day by 2050 which this project will facilitate. Further, I would like to know if this modeling included a trend toward electric vehicles that are heavier than combustion engine vehicles, and does it also include the massively increased truck traffic that would be the result of building an inland port in the NW Quadrant (70,000 truck trips per day)?	The noise analysis did include the anticipated increase in traffic, including truck volumes. We used FHWA's Traffic Noise Model 2.5 to evaluate traffic noise.
33	why can asphaltic concrete not be considered since noise is a critical item and that would significantly reduce the noise and with oil prices significantly reduce construction costs	On interstates with a high volume of truck traffic, concrete is used because it lasts substantially longer than asphalt and is more cost-effective over the long term. Concrete pavement typically lasts about 40 years before needing a full replacement, compared to the 15-to-20-year lifespan of asphalt. Asphalt requires significant maintenance and resurfacings approximately every five years to reach the full 20-year lifespan. While concrete also requires additional maintenance and care, it is more infrequent, resulting in fewer future traffic impacts to the interstate and fewer costs associated with those interruptions.
34	Will there be a pedestrian traffic signal where the Parleys Trail crosses 17th East. This would increase safety for those continuing on the trail.	A pedestrian traffic signal at 1700 E is not in the scope of the project. The project does include other safety improvements for the 1700 E trail crossing such as widening the trail to 18 ft wide and including 6 ft high fencing on the barrier.
35	Despite brief measurements, noise study does show multiple areas that are too high. In one section (2000 to 2300 East) a reduction is recommended but wall is too high/expensive. Is there a section of the study that addresses concrete to asphalt as a possibility? Is there a cost analysis on that? Also curious about dB reductions in relation to wall height. Can we get more detail on that?	Please see Appendix D in the Noise Analysis for detailed wall analyses and noise reduction levels. Existing research shows that asphalt pavement can be quieter than concrete pavement in some circumstances and at some points in the overall pavement lifecycle. However, the existing research also shows that the noise benefits of using asphalt pavement decrease with time as the condition of the asphalt pavement deteriorates. We often see an improvement in noise

		levels when new pavement replaces aging pavement, regardless of the material used, and expect to see that in the case of this concrete reconstruction.
36	Can you speak to how UDOT and SLC are working together to solve the larger systemic issue....this entire interchange (Foothill and Parleys intersections with 215 and 80 need to be fully rebuilt)? It seems like all of your work to reduce noise levels is with great intent.....but a bit of bandaid. With the amount of traffic through this 80 and 215 corridor and the increasing traffic from all sides, the entire interchange and 80 needs to be streamlined. We have so much space to work with, yet the highways are breaking apart created 5-6 turns, multiple slow down and up hill variations, etc. Beyond noisy, this is an environmental hazard with all of the up, down, side, and then the other side...for autos and trucks. Rebuild the entire thing right down the middle and have a nice elevated lane series of ramps to connect all of the main roads And, if the walls don't work....why can I notice a HUGE difference when I am sitting the backyards of those who have them....I don't understand. Everywhere in the US (including here) we have implemented walls...all of those implementations are for nothing? No use?	UDOT has worked closely with SLC to develop solutions. UDOT implements projects as defined in the Wasatch Front Regional Council's Regional Transportation Plan. Please see WFRC.org for more information about planned and future projects. UDOT has recently completed the Parley's EIS that outlines improvements in the I-80/I-215/Foothill area. Please see parleyseis.com for further information. The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
37	All the comments so far suggest concern about noise levels.I would like to know what we can do to have the noise levels be taken into account when making decisions on this project. It seems like the wrong decisions has been made to exclude noise barriers. Furthermore it seems like the materials used for the freeway will do nothing else but increase noise, rather than reduce noise. There must be an error somewhere. What am I missing? Studies suggest that noise levels are too high but stakeholders decided against noise barriers? Why?	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).
38	Agree with the noise comment. I am also concerned that UDOT and SLC are not working together...I have been on the phone and one blames the other all the time. I have heard that someone in UDOT is handling Parleys planning, yet they aren't familiar with any studies or	UDOT has worked closely with SLC to develop solutions. There are regularly occurring meetings between the two agencies to discuss transportation issues and problems.

	changes happening on Foothill...left not talking to the right will end up in spent money, with no incremental value	
39	Will the federal government pay for asphalt for this project?	The project is federally funded and is planned to be concrete pavement.
40	Living at the 1300 East exit ramp, what hours are the construction going to be? Will there be construction lights pointed toward the homes?	Until a contractor is on board, specific details of construction will not be known.
41	This project, according to your ppt designs is not addressing the true problems....the intersection east of this new plan is the problem...the highway splits and the noise generated by the inefficient layout. Most of the noise problems you are solving are next to some commercial space and a park...what about up closer to the 215 connection?	UDOT has recently completed the Parley's EIS that outlines improvements in the I-80/I-215/Foothill area. Please see parleyseis.com for further information.
42	Has consideration been given to extending the Parleys Trail under the 17th East structure, similar to the 23rd east section?	Not at this time. There are ROW limitations and added bridge costs.
43	Procedure for removal of a noise barrier states that a third party measurement can be used. Can a similar third party measurement be used for noise barrier construction?	This only applies to removal or alteration of constructed noise barriers. See Section D Removal or Alteration of Construction Noise Barriers in the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy accessed at https://udot.utah.gov/connect/public/noise-walls/
44	Can we get a full transcript of all the chat questions and answers, or just our own questions?	We will complete any unanswered questions and publish the full report to the project website along with the recorded meeting.
45	Hello, we're a concerned family in the parleys neighborhood, north of I80 and west of the salt lake country club golf course. We have noticed a considerable uptick in the noise over the past few years. The mornings and evenings are when we notice it the most. It's so severe at times that at dinner we are reluctant to eat outside on the patio - it's hard to talk to one another. While we do not live on parleys terrace or parkway avenue, the closest streets to I80 in our neighborhood, we still get a considerable amount of noise and it effects the way we live. It should be noted that we live near the church on the corner of 21st East and Parkway Ave and the noise can fluctuate drastically depending on where you're at in the neighborhood. In our area it's particularly bad. We would like the following questions addressed: 1. We would like to know what sound study you	A new noise study was completed for this Environmental Study. Noise measurement locations are found in Table 2 in the Noise Analysis. According to the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy, a front row receptor is a noise-sensitive receptor whose property abuts the transportation facility. Please see Appendix D of the Noise Analysis for receptors that were identified as front-row receptors. Existing research shows that asphalt pavement can be quieter than concrete pavement in some circumstances and at some points in the overall pavement lifecycle. However, the existing research also shows that the noise benefits of using asphalt pavement decrease with time as the condition of the asphalt pavement deteriorates. We often see an improvement in noise levels when new pavement replaces aging pavement, regardless of the material used, and expect to see that in the case of this concrete reconstruction. New concrete is an improvement from old, worn-out pavement, and will result in less noise and a smoother ride for drivers. According to the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy, the Department may construct and maintain noise abatement measures along

	used to determine the decibel levels for the neighborhood? We have heard that you used the parleys interchange sound study. Is this true? And if so, were any changes made to this study in the form of data or analysis? 2. Can you please tell us the locations where the sounds studies were conducted? 3. Please describe in better detail how a "front row receptor works" 4. Why are are you planning on re paving the section between 1300e-2300e in concrete and not asphalt? Based on research we know that concrete omits more sound than asphalt and we would respectfully ask that you consider using asphalt. 5. If the neighborhood was willing to help fund a sound wall would you be willing to re consider putting a sound wall in?	state highway right-of-way in cases where citizens, adjacent property owners, developers, or local municipalities provide the cost for the noise abatement. However, the abatement must meet the other feasible and reasonable criteria. None of the walls evaluated for this study met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy.
46	I echo the noise concerns (pardon the pun). I'm surprised how many of the measurement sites are already above the NAC. This is an opportunity to improve the existing issues and certainly to avoid making it worse. I'd like to understand more about noise-absorbing materials that can be used on walls (wall types). And of course, paving with asphalt. And perhaps there are other creative ideas to help reduce current noise issues.	Pavement type is one variable that research has identified as having an effect on highway noise. Other variables, including pavement age, condition and surface texture also influence noise levels. Existing research shows that asphalt pavement can be quieter than concrete pavement in some circumstances and at some points in the overall pavement lifecycle. However, the existing research also shows that the noise benefits of using asphalt pavement decrease with time as the condition of the asphalt pavement deteriorates. We often see an improvement in noise levels when new pavement replaces aging pavement, regardless of the material used, and expect to see that in the case of this concrete reconstruction. New concrete is a significant improvement from old, worn-out pavement, and will result in less noise and a smoother ride for drivers. The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy.
47	You're worried about air quality due to construction and other environmental concerns....but nowhere in this deck have you listed the environmental impact of leaving the highway the way it is.....forcing traffic going east to split, go up hill, turn right over a hill, slow down for a left hand turn and then turn left again going up, before headed up to Park City is so terrible for the environment.	UDOT has recently completed the Parley's EIS that outlines improvements in the I-80/I-215/Foothill area. Please see parleyseis.com for further information.

48	Will unanswered questions in this chat get answered so that the public (we, the chatters) can see them, or do we have to try to contact the other chatters?	We will complete any unanswered questions and publish the full report to the project website along with the recorded meeting.
49	Can you explain why the sound survey was done at the quietest time of the day instead of during morning or evening rush hour. Also, the sound walls from 1-6 did meet the requirement, but were not considered just because of cost. How can this be swept off the table so easily when the sound levels even now are above the recommendation limits by the Federal sound limits?	Noise measurements are taken during free flowing traffic conditions. Noise measurements are not used to determine noise impacts and are used to make sure the modeling of roadways is accurate. Data is gathered during the noise measurement, including traffic volumes, vehicle mixes, speeds, and weather conditions. This data is input into a validation noise model that is used to compare modeled results with measured results. If the validation noise model is within 3 decibels of the measured results the noise model is considered representative of existing conditions. The existing and Proposed Action noise models are then developed using the greatest hourly traffic conditions likely to occur on a regular basis. These worst-case scenario noise models are used to determine noise impacts and the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures. Walls 1–5 failed to provide a 5 dBA reduction for at least 50 % of front-row receptors, or meet the noise abatement design goal (7 dBA reduction for at least 35% of front row receptors). Wall 6 was evaluated at heights ranging from 8–20 feet. Walls ranging in height from 8–14 feet tall were not acoustically feasible (did not provide a 5 dBA reduction for at least 50 % of front-row receptors. Walls ranging in height from 16–18 feet tall did not meet the noise abatement design goal (7 dBA reduction for at least 35% of front row receptors). A wall 20 feet tall was not cost reasonable. None of these walls met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. UDOT is required to comply with the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy which implements state and federal noise laws. This policy is applied equally to all state roads in Utah.
50	I live in the Beverly Hills neighborhood and we can hear the traffic (both east and westbound on 80) and including Foothill and Parleys roads all hours of the night with windows closed. With further development at the university this is going to get worse. What is your systemic plan? What is your specific plan to help this neighborhood...it is like living next to a Nascar	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. For specific evaluated noise wall locations, and more information on the analysis, see the Noise Analysis (accessed via the link in the Documents Section on this page).

	track most hours of the day...we need sound barriers	
51	How will the proposed multi-use trail on 1300 East connect to other bicycle facilities along 1300 East? The design does not show any connection or how someone riding a bike would exit the multi-trail since it is only on one side of the roadway.	The project team worked closely with Salt Lake City to make sure that active transportation improvements will be compatible with the City's future reconstruction plans. The new 1300 East bridge over I-80 will feature a 17-foot-wide multi-use trail, separated from traffic by a shoulder and concrete curb.
52	Many important questions/concerns regarding the noise issue are repeatedly expressed by the citizens of this area. Please help us get this addressed in an appropriate way. We represent many voices who do not have the ability to voice their concerns in this electronic format. Thank you,	The study team evaluated 15 different noise walls at heights up to 20 feet along I-80 and I-215 but none of them met the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The analysis found that the evaluated noise walls did not provide meaningful noise reduction for most receptors located within the study area. The walls did not meet the requirements of the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. UDOT is required to comply with the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy which implements state and federal noise laws. This policy is applied equally to all state roads in Utah.
53	Again, I appreciate this effort and the country club area is noisy, BUT look at the placement of the Beverly Hills neighborhood....country club, at least, has 1-2 fairways between their homes and the highway...we are butted up right next to it....yes, the pavement is a huge issue and due for change....but Beverly Hills needs a wall to deflect the noise. PLEASE. Yes, the truck brakes are terrible....but it is the normal traffic that pulses through our house every night.	Comment noted.
54	We have lived at our home on Preston St. for more than 35 years. Between my house and I-80 are half a dozen houses, Parkeys Canyon Blvd. a church and the golf course. The freeway is easily 1/2 mile away yet the noise in my backyard is an uncomfortable roar. For many years the freeway noise was a minor annoyance sometimes. However as the surface concrete on the freeway has deteriorated this noise has become more and more invasive. When the Parleys Trail was paved and the retaining walls built the noise from the freeway became markedly louder to the roar that is is now. Asphalt would quiet the whole thing again. And asphalt is what was supposed to be installed according to a verbal commitment at the Highland High meeting a few months ago. This	Pavement type is one variable that research has identified as having an effect on highway noise. Other variables, including pavement age, condition and surface texture also influence noise levels. Existing research shows that asphalt pavement can be quieter than concrete pavement in some circumstances and at some points in the overall pavement lifecycle. However, the existing research also shows that the noise benefits of using asphalt pavement decrease with time as the condition of the asphalt pavement deteriorates. We often see an improvement in noise levels when new pavement replaces aging pavement, regardless of the material used, and expect to see that in the case of this concrete reconstruction. New concrete is an improvement from old, worn-out pavement, and will result in less noise and a smoother ride for drivers.

	feels like we've been totally ignored. Its' very frustrating.	
55	We just moved from MSP and the 35W interchange is a perfect example of how to build a complex interchange in a conjested area honoring noice levels. Milwaukee also has the Marquette interchange....are you considering a larger solution (maybe even light rail up to the U) in your multiyear plan?	The long-range plan can be found on the Wasatch Front Regional Councils website wfrc.org. It includes roadway, transit, and active transportation projects.