

4.0 Summary and Conclusions

The lead agencies re-evaluated and updated their findings regarding the D&RG regional corridor. To develop the specific information necessary to evaluate the D&RG corridor, UDOT created five conceptual alignments within this corridor and evaluated them using a methodology similar to the one used in the Final EIS to evaluate the regional corridors (but with a much greater level of detail). The five alignments were evaluated based on costs, wetland impacts, and impacts on existing development, which include relocation impacts; impacts to community cohesion (including impacts to schools and churches); impacts to travel patterns, accessibility, and walkability; noise and visual impacts; and impacts to environmental justice populations.

Table 4-1 below, Summary of Impacts, summarizes the quantifiable elements of the D&RG evaluation. As shown in the table, all D&RG conceptual alignments would have substantially greater impacts on existing development, as well as higher costs, than Alternative E. The costs of the D&RG alignments range between \$515 million and \$611 million (\$99 million to \$195 million more than Alternative E).

The D&RG alignments would require relocating between 149 and 279 residential and commercial properties, compared to 18 relocations for Alternative E. The relocations for the D&RG alignments would be between 3% and about 10% of the total residences in Woods Cross and West Bountiful, respectively. Alternative E would not impact any residential properties in these communities. For properties that would not be relocated but would remain along the alignments, the impacts would also be substantially greater with the D&RG alignments. Because the D&RG alignments traverse directly through developed, established neighborhoods (as opposed to the western edge of development with Alternative E), they would have considerably more impacts to community cohesion (such as requiring between 8 and 17 cut-off roadways, compared to 4 for Alternative E).

Similarly, the D&RG alignments would have far greater noise and visual impacts (for example, between 89 and 129 residential properties would remain fronting the freeway, compared to 7 residential properties with Alternative E). The length of noise walls and retaining walls—two additional indicators of noise and visual impacts to remaining development—would likewise be substantially greater with the D&RG alignments.

The impacts in Links 2 and 3 are the only differences between the D&RG alignments and Alternative E. In Link 3, Alternative E would have between 3.5 and 7.4 more acres of wetland impacts than the conceptual D&RG alignments.

The D&RG alignments have an estimated cost of \$98 million to \$116 million more than the estimated cost of Alternative E in this link. Residential relocations in Link 3 would range between 124 and 189 for the D&RG alignments compared to 0 for Alternative E. Business relocations would range between 7 and 24 for the D&RG alignments compared to 1 for Alternative E in this link. As shown below in Table 4-1, the number of relocations for any of the D&RG alignments would be substantially higher than for Alternative E in Link 3.

In Link 2, only DRG1 and DRG2 differ from Alternative E. Within Link 2, DRG1 would have 51 business relocations and DRG2 would have 11, compared to 2 relocations for Alternative E. DRG1 would have 2 less acres of wetland impacts compared to Alternative E (9.2 acres) at a cost of about \$81 million more than Alternative E in this link. DRG2 actually has more wetland impacts (18.0 acres) than Alternative E and would cost about \$79 million more than Alternative E in this link.

The anticipated wetland impacts within the D&RG regional corridor are more similar to the impacts within the Great Salt Lake regional corridor as presented in the Final EIS (see Table 1-2 above, Results of the Regional Corridor Screening in the Final EIS). Therefore, if the same type of regional corridor analysis process was used for the Supplemental EIS as was conducted in the Final EIS, the lead federal agencies might rank the wetland impacts of the D&RG corridor as “medium,” the same as the Great Salt Lake. As stated in the Final EIS, the D&RG regional corridor was eliminated from further consideration due to its “high cost” and “high impact on existing development.” Based on the refined cost estimates and detailed information concerning development impacts provided in this evaluation, the conclusions of the Final EIS remain valid.

Table 4-1. Summary of Impacts

Alignment	Cost	Wetlands		Impacts on Existing Development							
	Total Cost (millions)	Footprint (acres)	ROW (acres)	Relocations			Travel Patterns		Noise and Visual Impacts		
				Residential (parcels)	Business (parcels)	Total	Number of Bridges (Cross Streets)	Number of Cul-de-Sacs and Cut-Off Roads	Residential Properties Adjacent to ROW	Length of Noise Wall, m (ft)	Length of Retaining Wall Not Including Termini Interchanges, m (ft)
Alternative E	\$416	97	113	4	14	18	4	4	7	0 (0)	500 (1,640)
DRG1	\$611	86	105	193	86	279	12	14	125	10,270 (33,694)	4,921 (16,145)
DRG2	\$608	93	114	196	46	242	12	17	129	11,990 (39,337)	4,921 (16,145)
DRG3	\$532	90	111	129	39	168	10	9	115	5,930 (19,455)	3,829 (12,562)
DRG4	\$516	89	110	128	21	149	10	8	89	5,600 (18,373)	3,773 (12,379)
DRG5	\$515	86	106	139	20	159	10	8	114	6,120 (20,079)	3,149 (10,331)

Based on the information provided in this evaluation, the D&RG conceptual alignments are not practicable and the impacts to development would be significant and adverse. The Clean Water Act defines practicable as “available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes” (40 CFR 230.3). The fact that the D&RG alignments would cost between \$98 million and \$194 million more than Alternative E and would require 149 to 279 displacements (compared to 18 for Alternative E) makes the DR&G alignments impracticable from a cost standpoint given their significant adverse impacts.

Moreover, based on more refined wetland identification, the 86 to 93 acres of wetland impacts within the footprints of the D&RG conceptual alignments (compared to the 97 acres for Alternative E) and the 105 to 114 acres of wetland impacts within the right-of-way (compared to 113 acres for Alternative E) would *not* now be characterized as “low” compared to the wetland impacts from the Great Salt Lake regional corridor, which was characterized as having “medium” impacts in the Final EIS. Highway facilities in both corridors are likely to result in similar levels of wetland impacts. Given the high cost and high impacts to existing development, and considering the relatively modest difference in wetland impacts, the D&RG alignments are impracticable under the Clean Water Act.

In closing, this evaluation confirms the conclusion of the Final EIS and prior agency decisions that the D&RG regional corridor is not reasonable or practicable due to high costs and impacts to existing development. Furthermore, the Supplemental EIS analysis affirms that nothing has changed since the previous analysis that would lead to a different conclusion.

5.0 References

HDR Engineering, Inc. 2004. Legacy Parkway Technical Memorandum: Right-of-Way Issues. November.

U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit. 2002. *Utahns for Better Transportation et al. v. United States Department of Transportation et al.* No. 01-4216.

[UDOT] Utah Department of Transportation. 2000. *Legacy Parkway Final Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f), 6(f) Evaluation.* June.

[WFRC] Wasatch Front Regional Council. 1998. Western Transportation Corridor Major Investment Study. January.

This page is intentionally blank.