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Logan 200 East Environmental Assessment Comments and Responses

An Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed for 200 East from 300 South to Center Street in Logan, Utah. The EA is attached and referenced herein. A public review and comment period for the EA was held from February 13, 2011 to April 1, 2011. A Notice of Availability was advertised in the Herald Journal and the Deseret News newspapers on February 13, 2011, and February 20, 2011 (See Attachment No. 1, Notice of Availability). Copies of the EA were made available at the Logan City Library, Logan City Hall, the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO), Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Region One Office, the UDOT Central Office, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Utah Division Office, and the project website. A public hearing was held on March 2, 2011, where oral testimony was documented by a court reporter. Written statements were accepted at the public hearing and also accepted by mail, and email. This submittal includes all of the comments received. The names of the commenters have been removed.

The purpose of this process is to consider the comments and determine if any of the comments identify considerations that may not have been known during the preparation of the EA, or if there have been any deficiencies in the EA. All of the comments contained in this document have been considered by the Project Team including Logan City, UDOT and FHWA. Responses have been prepared for each comment and are shown next to the corresponding comment.

Responses to General Comments

Many of the comments had similar concerns and reflected common themes. The following section includes six general comments that were documented a number of times and the response to those general comments.

General Comment #1
Why is 200 East being improved?

Response:

Local and regional planning activities include evaluating population forecasts, employment growth, future land use, growth in residential areas, activity centers and employment areas. The Travel Demand Model (TDM) is used during local and regional planning efforts to assess existing and future travel patterns. The TDM evaluates where travel occurs, where trips originate, where they end, and the most likely paths for that travel. The CMPO maintains the TDM for the urban area within the CMPO’s boundaries. This TDM clearly identifies that there is a demand for north-south travel through the urbanized area east of Logan’s Main Street. This demand will grow over the next 20 years (Figure 1, CMPO 2035 Peak Hour Traffic Congestion under Existing Conditions and Figure 2, CMPO 2035 Peak Hour Traffic Congestion with Proposed Regional Transportation Improvements).

The CMPO develops and maintains a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) consisting of proposed improvements to the transportation system to address existing and anticipated demands. The RTP
includes a number of projects on north-south roads including 100 East, 200 East, and 600 East that responds to existing and future travel demands. 200 East is unique because it presents opportunities to address a need for regional connectivity for areas east of Main Street. There are other parallel corridors, but none are able to provide the through connectivity that 200 East does in Cache Valley’s urban areas. Regional connectivity is important for vehicles and also for non-motorized transportation.

During the public comment period, several comments were received that questioned why recent improvements on 100 East do not countermand the need to improve 200 East. Improvements along 100 East and the proposed improvements along 200 East are designed to work together to meet transportation needs. Logan’s transportation system is configured as a grid. Grid systems are a very efficient way to accommodate travel because they distribute the trips across the grid and provide redundancy. Logan’s grid is disrupted by various topographical constraints, such as the Logan River and bluffs. It is also constrained by man-made buildings such as schools, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS) temple, and Utah State University. These disruptions, or breaks in the grid system, prevent many of the north-south streets from providing continuous north-south connectivity e.g., 100 East ends at 800 North due to the presence of Mount Logan Middle School. Improvements to 100 East and 200 East are therefore necessary to meet the overall travel demand.

Some comments were made concerning whether recent developments south of the Logan River conflict with the ability to extend the corridor south on the 200 East alignment. The CMPO RTP offers a conceptual plan for the extension of 200 East. A corridor was reserved through the recent multi-family development, for 200 East to cross the Logan River on the south-side and combine with 100 East to meet the need for regional connectivity. This alignment is also in the plans of all the local jurisdictions. These connections are in the CMPO's 2030 RTP as well as the draft 2035 RTP that will soon be out for public comment.
Figure 1, CMPO 2035 Peak Hour Traffic Congestion under Existing Conditions
Figure 2, CMPO 2035 Peak Hour Traffic Congestion with Proposed Regional Transportation Improvements
General Comment #2
Community Character

Response:
Comments were received expressing concern about how increasing traffic on 200 East will affect the character of neighborhoods and possibly affect the value of properties on the corridor. Traffic is projected to increase throughout Logan particularly north-south travel. More specifically, demand for north-south travel, east of Logan’s Main Street, is expected to increase. As traffic increases throughout the community, residents want to maintain their community character and cohesion. During the public outreach activities, residents identified those attributes that are important for defining the character of the community including: tree-lined streets; pedestrian accessibility and connectivity; bicycle accessibility and connectivity; on-street parking; and moderate traffic speeds.

Traffic is expected to increase on 200 East as connections are made to provide regional connectivity. Traffic is expected to increase to the level of demand anticipated in the TDM and the presence of additional traffic would be felt by residents within the corridor. To maintain those features that residents identify with community character the Proposed Action includes specific elements including:

- Park strips behind the curb and gutter for separation from the street to the sidewalk. To be consistent with Logan City design standards, trees would be planted within all newly constructed park strips. While a few existing trees would be affected by the Proposed Action, existing trees would be protected to the fullest extent possible.
- Sidewalks would exist on both sides of 200 East throughout the proposed project area.
- Marked pedestrian crossings would be provided across 200 East and across side streets at intersections.
- A combined on-street parking and bicycle lane would be included on both sides of the street.
- Connections to trails and walkways would be installed.
- Pedestrian undercrossings would be installed under 200 East between Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park; and under Center Street to connect Merlin Olsen Central Park to a bike path extending up Boulevard Street.

The Gardeners’ Market is a regular event held at the Merlin Olsen Central Park and the Pioneer Parkway on Saturdays from May into October each year and has become an important part of the community. During initial public outreach, the project team coordinated with the organizers of the Gardeners’ Market. They identified that for the Gardeners’ Market to continue as it has, the organizers expressed that pedestrians should be able to travel between the two parks without crossing traffic. In direct response to this comment, a pedestrian underpass between the two parks was included to allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel between the two parks under 200 East without having to cross traffic. Also, additional parking would be available as street parking is included in the proposed new alignment of 200 East.
General Comment #3
Gardeners’ Market

Response:
The Gardeners’ Market is held at Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway on Saturdays from early May to mid-October from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm. Vendors set up booths prior to 9:00 am. Vendors typically park on 200 East or 100 South as they load and unload. During the event, vendors park away from the site to allow for visitors to park near the market. During the market, visitors park using on-street parking on the adjacent streets of 200 East, 100 South, and Pioneer Street. Pedestrians and bicyclists also walk or ride to the event. Vendors are located in both Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park. Visitors currently cross 200 East at-grade as they visit vendors in both parks. None of the streets are closed during the event.

There were numerous comments that the Proposed Action and increased traffic on 200 East will impact the Gardeners’ Market that is held at Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park. The Proposed Action includes the following elements and considerations that will be relevant to the Gardeners’ Market:

- Pioneer Street would remain in place but would end in a cul-de-sac before reaching 200 East. Parking will still be available on Pioneer Street.
- 200 East will be constructed from 100 South up to intersect Center Street. The roadway would slope to Center Street and the embankment would be held with retaining walls.
- The new section of 200 East between 100 South and Center Street would have on-street parking resulting in a net increase in available parking. People parking in this section would need to walk down the sidewalks to 100 South to access the parks.
- The Proposed Action includes a pedestrian undercrossing between Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park so pedestrians traveling between the parks would not need to cross traffic on 200 East.

During initial public outreach the project team coordinated with the organizers of the Gardeners’ Market. Primary concerns expressed during this outreach centered on the safety of pedestrians crossing 200 East traffic during the market. The pedestrian underpass between the two parks was included in part to address these concerns.

The Proposed Action would result in minor changes to the way the Gardeners’ Market functions. The following changes would occur:

- Pedestrians walking to vendors between the two parks would no longer need to cross 200 East traffic at-grade. They would cross under 200 East through a non-motorized underpass connecting the two parks. This underpass was added to the Proposed Action in direct response to a need expressed by the organizers of the Gardeners’ Market.
• Pioneer Street would be converted to a cul-de-sac so through traffic would not use that street. On-street parking would still be available on that street.
• The new alignment of 200 East connecting to Center Street would include on-street parking, increasing the amount of parking available for the event.
• Pedestrians and bicyclists would be able to access the event directly through a proposed underpass of Center Street, and by non-motorized facilities paralleling the new 200 East roadway.
• It is not anticipated that 200 East would need to be closed during the event.

General Comment #4
Noise

Response:
There were several comments questioning the noise evaluation. UDOT maintains a Noise Policy for the evaluation of noise and the consideration of noise abatement. A Type I Project classification is a project that constructs a road in a new location, increases the number of traffic lanes, or alters the horizontal or vertical alignment of the transportation facility. The Proposed Action meets the criteria of a Type I Project so a noise analysis was performed using the Traffic Noise Model (TNM). The factors considered in the TNM included the amount and speed of traffic, and the position of the roadway relative to adjacent noise receptors. In response to public comments received a revised noise analysis was conducted. Noise was modeled for 21 different locations throughout the length of the project. Noise measurements were taken at Merlin Olsen Central Park, Pioneer Parkway, and numerous residences throughout the length of the project limits. Three locations between 200 South 300 South (where the roadway would be widened) were included in the noise measurements. Revised noise analysis results are as follows:

Table 3.7-3, Traffic Sound Levels (Leq, dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>2030 No-Build</th>
<th>2030 Build</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_W_P_1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_W_P_2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_W_P_3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_W_P_4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_P_1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_P_2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_P_3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_P_4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_P_5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_R_1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_R_2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_E_R_3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UDOT’s Noise Policy contains criteria for noise abatement or measures to mitigate the effect of increased noise on sensitive receptors. This policy calls for noise abatement to be evaluated for noise levels of 66 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or above. Additionally, for any noise levels that are expected to increase by 10 dBA or more, noise abatement must be considered. According to the noise evaluation, none of the noise receptors would experience noise levels of 66 dBA or above, nor would any of the receptors see an increase of 10 dBA or higher. Noise levels are projected to increase due to the project, however these levels are not high enough to be considered an impact under UDOT’s Noise Policy, therefore noise abatement was not considered. Some of the noise receptors in either Pioneer Parkway or Merlin Olsen Central Park would experience noise decreases with the Proposed Action due to the fact that the grade of the proposed 200 East is raised above the level of these adjacent receptors.

General Comment #5
Air Quality

Response:
Comments were received on the evaluation of air quality. The following air pollutants were considered during the evaluation of the Proposed Action:

- **Ozone (O3)**
  O3 is a regional pollutant that cannot be analyzed at the project level because it is formed at a regional level and analyzed as part of the regional conformity determination. The Study Area is in attainment for O3.

- **Criteria Pollutants including Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2), Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) and Lead (Pb)**
  The Proposed Action is not likely to have an effect on these pollutants and the Study Area is in attainment for these criteria pollutants.

- **Carbon Monoxide (CO)**
  Based on exhaustive sensitivity testing done for the UDOT Hot Spot Manual, it was determined that future traffic volumes below 25,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) would not cause CO levels to violate the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) 1-hour or 8-hour standards in the Logan Urban Area. The anticipated future volumes for the Proposed Action are not expected to exceed 19,000 AADT within the residential areas. Nevertheless, the project team conducted a CAL3QHC hot spot analysis. This analysis showed that for 2030, the 1-hour CO
level is projected to be 8.8 parts per minute (ppm) which is below the NAAQS 1-hour standard of 35 ppm. This analysis also demonstrated that the 8-hour CO level is projected to be 6.2 ppm, which is below the NAAQS 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not have a project-level impact on CO.

- **Particulate Matter (PM10)**
  Since this project is located in Cache County, which is in attainment for PM10, there is no requirement for additional PM10 hot spot analysis. Included in the EA, however, is a discussion of future conditions under the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is not expected to have a project-level impact on PM10.

- **Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5)**
  Logan City has recorded a number of NAAQS exceedances for PM2.5 over the past 4 years. Cache Valley is designated as a nonattainment area under the new PM2.5 standard (35 μg/m³ or micrograms per cubic meter) that was established in 2006. The proposed project does not add additional through lanes, only a center turn lane and parking/bike lanes. The Proposed Action would not cause a substantial increase in diesel traffic. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established several control programs that will reduce emissions from most major sources of PM2.5 and its precursor pollutants. EPA’s Tier 2 light-duty vehicle regulations and 2007 heavy-duty vehicle standards, along with control of the sulfur content of fuels, are expected to reduce motor vehicle emission rates nationwide. EPA’s Non-road Engine Regulations (EPA 2004) that were implemented in 2008 are anticipated to reduce particulate matter and NO2 emissions from these vehicles by 90 percent by 2030. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not expected to have a project level impact on PM2.5. Furthermore, the CMPO’s RTP must demonstrate that it conforms to regional air quality standards. The CMPO’s RTP, which includes the proposed 200 East Project, has modeled all proposed transportation projects in the 2035 RTP. Based on this analysis, the CMPO 2035 RTP & TIP conform to EPA interim regulations for PM2.5 non-attainment areas. Therefore, all the transportation projects in Cache County included in the 2035 RTP including the Proposed Action are found to conform. This analysis compares projected future emissions to 2008 levels. Further information can be found at the website http://www.cachempo.org/conformity.htm.

- **Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)**
  For the proposed project, the amount of MSATs emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT). VMT along 200 East within the Project Area is not expected to increase substantially because the project would not add additional through traffic lanes - only a center turn lane and parking/bike lanes. The Proposed Action includes one 11-foot travel lane in each direction, an 11-foot center turn lane, and 11-foot parking/bike lanes as well as curb, gutter and sidewalk. Also, future emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA’s national control programs that are projected to reduce MSAT emissions by 57 to 87 percent between 2000 and 2020. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the Study Area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

Further information regarding air quality is contained in a response from the Bear River Valley Health Department to the Logan City Council. This text is located in Attachment 2.

**General Comment #6**

**Right-of-Way Acquisition**
Response:

The process of relocating residents whose properties are affected by the project will conform to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC /4601). These processes are in place to assure that each landowner is treated fairly and equitably. The major elements of the right-of-way process include an appraisal, an offer of “just compensation” and a negotiation. Compensation for the acquisition of property is based on “Fair Market Value”. UDOT will write a report performed by an independent appraiser to evaluate the effects of a road widening project on an individual’s home. This report will contain an opinion as to the value of a property and the reasoning leading to this opinion. Studies relating to property values after the road improvements are complete have been conducted; however the results were inconclusive due to the individual characteristics of each property and/or home that were evaluated.

Consideration for compensation for proximity damages is based on the assumption that the value of residential property is diminished as a direct result of proximity to a high traffic road. The appraiser shall perform a before and after value of the property to evaluate if proximity damages exist or not, due to the roadway widening.

General Comment #7

What is the Schedule of this Project?

Response:

Once the environmental process is complete the project can move forward into final design and right-of-way acquisition. The following schedule is contingent on the completion of the environmental process and a decision by the Federal Highway Administration:

1. Complete environmental process and FHWA approval – Late summer 2011
2. Begin procurement of a design consultant and a right-of-way consultant – Early fall 2011
4. Complete design of initial phases – Summer 2012
5. Begin construction of initial phases (contingent on right-of-way acquisition) – Summer 2012

The current estimate of probable cost for the project is roughly $10 million. The available funding for the project is only about $5 million, so the project must be completed in phases while more funding is sought. The following is a description of the anticipated phases of the project for completion:

Phase 1 – Acquire right-of-way necessary for the construction of the entire project.

Phase 2 – Build the connection of 200 East to Center Street, and construct the proposed 200 East and Center Street Intersection.

Phase 3 – Construct the widening of 200 East between 300 South and 200 South, and construct the intersection improvements at 200 East and 300 South.
Final design and market conditions at the time of construction will dictate how much of the proposed project can be completed with the $5 million. Under current conditions, it is anticipated that all of Phase 1 and most, if not all, of Phase 2 could be constructed with the existing funding.
Responses to Individual Comments

Responses have been prepared for each comment and are shown side-by-side with the comments.

Commenter ID #001

Things look good. I appreciate the thought put into the plan. PLEASE don’t put in the dinky trees like those (flowering pear?) that replaced the maples on 300 S. A more full-size tree like a ginkgo or hackberry would be better.

Response to Comment ID #001

Trees will be installed per the recommendation of the Logan City Arborist. The Arborist will recommend the species of tree for use on the project.

Commenter ID #002

Thank you for explaining more to me about the projects ahead. It was very informative. I can see how it would be beneficial for our growing traffic. Thank you

Response to Comment ID #002

Thank you for your comment.

Commenter ID #003

The 200 E Thru 300 South appears to go nowhere? Give the federal money back – already there are apartments built in Providence 100 East seemingly negating good planning.

Response to Comment ID #003

The [Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO)] Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) calls for the corridor to extend south. A corridor has been reserved by local planning efforts through the apartments referred to in the comment.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #004

You know, it's interesting. I know that there's monies earmarked for different things but it just makes you kind of question government, doesn't it? You know?

We're -- a lot of people don't even have jobs, and we're building new roads so we can get to our jobs just a little more conveniently? There's legal and there's right, and those aren't always the same things

This is a little off the subject, but I'm a, I'm a teacher in Idaho. And they, they mowed my classroom over. I've been in there for 12 years. They mowed the building over just so they could have parking. Good for them.

Response to Comment ID #004
**Commenter ID #004**

You know, it's interesting what our priorities are. You know? I've been in that home for 17 years? Sixteen, 17 years. And, and my environment is -- matters to me. It's not about making money. It's a matter of being asked to move out of a ward which I cherish.

And again, for the greater good you kind of just have to figure out some things. But it seems to me that that's, that's the least consideration here. You know? It seems like homeowners could have been told a lot more details about when, and where, and if, and how much.

And, and I think it's -- I'm not surprised that we've fallen through the cracks. It's one thing to do things for the greater good. At what cost to whom? For example, I don't know if any powers that be are giving up their home for the greater good.

And we're being asked to. And, and we're -- I feel like we're not treated with much respect. Eminent domain, for example, in my opinion is legalized theft. We're paying taxes on something we own to the same entity who's taking what we own away from us. Legal, but is it right?

**Response to Comment ID #004**

We recognize that the idea of being relocated by a project can be an uncomfortable prospect. There is a well-defined process overseen by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for the acquisition of right-of-way and for relocations. These processes are in place so to assure that each landowner is treated fairly and equitably. The major elements of the right-of-way process include an appraisal, an offer of “just compensation,” and a negotiation.

Right-of-way will be acquired through processes defined by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970.

The response to General Comment #6 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

**004-A**

Now, if they can compensate each one of the individual homeowners to help them be happy -- and I'm not talking about -- we're not a greedy bunch of people. I, I know these people really well. It includes the stake president of our fine stake. And our, our homes matter to us. And it seems like the laws that are set up aren't necessarily compensating.

And again, great, we have federal money. Who would want to waste that? I get that. But then we're gonna have to raise it? And nobody in this room even knew off the top of their head where that's gonna come from? You know?

What are we gonna do, have a half-finished done project? Anyway. Preston had to cut their budget by a million dollars at the district level. Just in that district alone. And
you know what their solution was?

And I know this is an unrelated topic, but it just kinda makes you wonder. Their solution was, Let's send the kids to school four days a week instead of five. That's great. You know what I'm saying?

It seems like money dictates a lot of things, and there's a few people who seem to have control over it. And sometimes I wonder if the government serves the people it's supposed to.

And I know that we're only a handful of people who own these homes. But again, it's right by some fantastic parks. What a beautiful view from the temple down there to see all those trees. It's just amazing. I think we got national attention a few years ago by having, you know, tons of trees. I know Smithfield included that and, you know.

What a shame this is gonna be. Just so people can leave their homes -- sleep in five minutes later and get to their job, you know? I think that's kind of a selfish thing, you know? And again, yeah, if things make sense, that's great. But, but until you can tell the homeowners what they're gonna be giving up, what the deal is?

I have a HUD loan on my home. That's a once-in-a-lifetime loan. I don't know that's gonna be taken -- I -- no one's told me anything about what that's gonna do.

Its one thing to say, Okay, you get X amount of money and you're given this. But there's interest rates. We are not choosing to move. I don't want my kids to give me one more excuse not to go to church. At least I'm living in the same ward they grew up in. And no matter how much we want to stay in this ward, what are you gonna do when seven other people are looking to do the same thing, you know?

Homes aren't just buildings. And our communities aren't just places that happen to have some roads in there that anybody can move through. Okay? We were here first. Look at those homes. They're really small, humble homes.

People on the hills, they want to get to work faster. I'm sure they can afford to do something else about that, frankly. Okay

And I know this isn't -- again, this is a micro way to look at things. But again, just to sum up, there's legal and there's right. And if legal and right aren't together, then I think we need to look at that a little bit more clearly.

I'm not taking about just the homeowners. And again, I took my daughters there -- underneath one of those corridors from first dam over there. And my little gal was just scared to death. I thought it was kinda cute, as a dad, for the echo? Oh, isn't this fun, this echo? Ahhh, you know, she kind of got scared. It's kinda dark in there and things like that.

Thank you for your comments.


**Commenter ID #005**

**005-A**

Twelve years ago I met with UDOT and got a map. And they had made a straightaway to go from Smithfield to Milville all the way through on Second East. Just a straight line, all the way through. And that makes sense to me. To give up my home, that I've lived in since I was 18 years old. We bought it after we were first married. I've lived there for 42 years. And to give up my home for something that will help this community, I feel like I could do that. I could give up my home and move somewhere else.

But when I come here and I see now that it's not going straight through. And it's jogging right going just -- going right to Third South, and then it's gonna turn and go to First East. They're taking nine homes, just to bring that down to make a little wider street. I don't feel that that is a solution.

I feel like we're behind times. We should have done this 12 years ago. And it's put us through so much stress. So much agony. The City has controlled our life. And it's been very difficult to live year to year because we get so many different answers.

And I know it isn't any of your prob -- any of your fault that we get so many different answers. It's just that we're frustrated. I hope that we can have a line -- a deadline where we'll be known that you will start negotiating in this April or this July.

**005-B**

But we come here, we're told April, then we're told July, and now we're told next April. We have been told that for 12 years. We cannot keep being told that. I am sorry. But you're gonna put me in the nuthouse because I can't keep living that way. We have to be told. We need to move on.

**005-C**

And also, if you're going to build the underpass for the park, please put a surveillance camera there on it. We already have problems with graffiti and things like that. And I want it safe for children to cross and not be molested in there or not be vandalized. I want it to be safe.

---

**Response to Comment ID #005**

**Response to 005-A**

*The CMPO RTP does call for the corridor to be continuous from Millville to Smithfield. Cities within the CMPO are working to implement this plan.*

*The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.*

**Response to 005-B**

*The response to General Comment #7 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.*

**Response to 005-C**

*Your comment will be considered by the project team as the project progresses into final design. Public security is a concern of Logan City and will be addressed during final design. Appropriate and necessary measures for public security will be evaluated and if deemed appropriate, they will be integrated into the project.*
I have some questions that it seems like every time we ask different people, we get different answers. So I was hoping in this group we could get kind of one thing.

I would like to, if someone, I don't care who, I've had it explained to me in different things by different ones. But if we could have a timeline of what we're looking at between now and when actual construction would begin, so that we all have an understanding in that.

Once the environmental process is complete, Logan City will begin final design work and the right-of-way acquisition process. These portions of the project cannot begin until there is a complete environmental document and approval. It is possible that final design and right-of-way processes could begin later this year, but the estimated timing is not certain until the environmental process is complete.

The response to General Comment #7 describes the current schedule for the project. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

There currently is not adequate funding available to complete the entire proposed project. The project would then be phased. The project phasing will follow the priorities as follows:

1. Complete right-of-way acquisition. Purchase parcels and properties necessary for the entire project.
2. Construct the connection of 200 East at Center Street and the 200 East/Center Street Intersection.
3. Complete the widening of 200 East between 300 South and 200 South as well as intersection improvements at 200 East and 300 South.

When a full parcel is purchased during the right-of-way process it becomes the property of the project sponsors (Logan City). Since only a portion of properties are actually needed to construct the project, the remaining portions of the project will be the property of Logan City. Since the City does not have a long-term need to own all of this property, the parcel will be resold. Parcels can be resold to the current owner of the property through a “first right of refusal”. If the size and configuration of those remaining parcels are such that homes can be rebuilt on them compliant with current zoning regulations, then homes can be rebuilt on those remaining parcels.
Commenter ID #006

I guess that's probably my two main questions. If I could just have those answered, I would appreciate it.

The thing that I do not understand is originally the plan was we had -- Second East to go all the way through. We had First East that comes down.

Now all we're gonna do is at approximately 450 South, something to that, 475, once the river is there you -- the thing that concerns me is as you go to the bridge and you see how that starts to climb up, and it's actually almost -- it is elevated. And then you drop down the other side.

I, I drive that every day. And today as I come home, I stopped. Because I heard that the road was gonna -- as soon as it crossed the river is gonna almost follow the river. And it's gonna come down and join that road.

Now, you can say First East is joining Second or what, but you're actually gonna bring two roads that are simultaneously gonna run into each other.

Is there -- to me you're either gonna have to put a stoplight just almost on the bridge, to where people are gonna have to stop on the bridge and back up. And they're gonna join. And it, it's just foolish for that part.

To me, I do not understand why we're gonna bring two main arteries and crash into one. We talk about bottlenecks? To me, that is creating a huge bottleneck by having two main things, we have First and Second, and they're gonna join.

Somehow you -- if you -- in the planning you better plan for stoplights or something or you're gonna have wrecks galore where they, where they come together.

Response to Comment ID #006

The CMPO RTP includes a 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street. The CMPO RTP shows the 200 East Corridor combining with 100 East south of the Logan River. While continuing two corridors south of the Logan River would provide more capacity than one, north-south travel demand south of the Logan River is not expected to be as high as that for north of the Logan River.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Commenter ID #007

My name is [name removed]. I live on the block between Second and Third South on Second East, and so therefore my house is one of the houses that will be taken to do this project. And it's kind of an emotional thing for me.

As far as -- you know, that's why I was wondering about kind of the financial side of it. I'm kind of into accounting and things. But it just seems like there is so many things that are being cut right now out of our state budget and our federal budget and local budget that this just seems like a lot of money to spend on a project when we are losing Medicaid and Medicare, our grocery taxes are going up, our gas taxes are going up. That -- you know.

So, I mean, personally I'd like them to decide not to do it. And all the engineers know that. But that -- my thinking as, you know, being an accountant or bookkeeper, is just that I'm looking at the financial side of it.

I guess that's probably my two main questions. If I could just have those answered, I would appreciate it.

Response to Comment ID #007

All right-of-way acquisitions are compensated using the Fair Market Value of the property. During the right-of-way acquisition process an appraisal is performed for each property by an independent appraiser. This appraisal will be the basis for the offer and negotiation for the purchase of the property.
Additional benefits are available to compensate homeowners for certain costs associated with relocations.

Commenter ID #008

I just wanted to let you know that I appreciate all Langdon Group and J-U-B Engineering has done to work with me. I realize you were hired by the City of Logan and are doing your job. However, I would not be able to live with the outcome if I lost my home without a fight.

Response to Comment ID #008

Thank you for your comments.

Commenter ID #009

Significantly concerned over increased traffic flow, street is often overcrowded and there have been several accidents within the last several months. Cars drive too fast and children from the Middle School are all over the place and crossings are not marked well.

Response to Comment ID #009

Logan City is planning a project that would address pedestrian crossings for pedestrians accessing Mount Logan Middle School. That project is considering pedestrian crossing alternatives to promote safe vehicular speeds where pedestrian crossing will occur. That project is considering alternatives to improve driver awareness of pedestrian crossings, to provide better definition of pedestrian crossings, and to improve visibility of pedestrians. The speed limit in these sections of 200 East is currently 25 mph and is not planned to change. Enforcement of speed limits is the responsibility of the local police.
Commenter ID #010

As a resident of the island neighborhood I just wanted to voice my thoughts on the Logan 200 East project. I am not in favor of extending 200 East through Center Street. I agree with many of the dissenting points in the newspaper article from this morning, but wanted to reiterate one in particular. In these tough economic times, when we are cutting funding from established, worthwhile programs such as education for our children, it just doesn't make sense to spend millions on this type of project. I understand that Logan is growing at a rapid rate, and that infrastructure needs to keep up with that, but I feel the money could be spent much better somewhere else at this time, and that the costs to the character of the island neighborhood would far outweigh the benefits. I can't imagine a main thoroughfare running past the park and the weekend Gardener's Market where families, bikes, pets, and small children are in abundance.

Response to Comment ID #010

Response to 010-A

The justification for this project is explained in detail in the response to General Comment #1. As alternatives were considered, concerns were voiced about possible impacts to the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. Of particular concern is the safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East between the parks in general and during events such as the Gardeners’ Market. To respond to this concern, a pedestrian undercrossing is included in the Proposed Action for non-motorized connectivity between the two parks. The organizers of the Gardeners’ Market were consulted during the development of the alternatives and the pedestrian undercrossing was added to Proposed Action to address their concerns. The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Many roadways in the area, including roadways in the “island” neighborhood, will see worsening traffic congestion if transportation improvements are not met (As shown the graphics from the draft CMPO RTP under General Comment #1). Logan City’s and CMPO’s planning efforts identify a number of projects to address anticipated transportation problems. While individual projects have specific impacts, local planning efforts have identified the projects with the goal of maintaining the quality of life in the community. These projects also include improvements such as enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and landscaping features (i.e. landscaped parkstrips), so that community oriented elements are implemented with new projects.
I think that Logan can do a much better job of promoting alternative forms of transportation, which would alleviate some of the pressure on our road system. There are alternatives here, I don’t feel that this is a necessary project, and for what it’s worth, my vote would be no.

Response to Comment ID #011

Andy: I am happy to respond to your request for my thoughts about the Logan 200 East road improvements. My name is [name removed] I am a life-long resident of Providence, Utah and have spent most of adult life in Cache Valley. I have served in small town politics for several years and as Mayor of Providence. Like so many others I have been concerned with the transportation situation that has developed over the years in the Logan area. The new gateway road on 100 East has been a great improvement in easing the traffic on Logan’s main street. I have read about the possibility of extending the 200 East road from Center Street South. Several years ago the old Boy Scout property was acquired for just such a movement. I travel from Provident to Logan real often and have tried several routes to stay away from main street traffic.

Response to 010-B

Addressing alternative forms of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian traffic, was an element of the Purpose and Need for the project. The Proposed Action includes facilities for non-motorized travel and connections to Logan’s non-motorized transportation network. The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s Transportation Master Plan.

In developing the RTP, the CMPO considers the contribution of other transportation modes to reduce the growth of traffic demand. One element of the need for this project is the growth of travel demand estimated by the CMPO Travel Demand Model (See Response to General Comment #1). This model accounts for the use of transit and non-motorized travel, and the continued investment in those travel modes in the urban area. This proposed project addresses travel demand needs based on the assumption that planned transit and non-motorized improvements are made.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Response to Comment ID #011

Thank you for your comments.

Response to Comment ID #012

Response to 012-A

Logan City, UDOT, and the project team considered the presented alternative. The following is a summary of those considerations:

- The presented alternative does avoid impacting the homes that the Proposed Action would impact on 200 East between 200 South and 300 South.
- The CMPO projects that north-south travel demand between 300 South and Center Street will be high enough that one north-south (2-lane) street will meet the demand.
- To meet the combined travel demand for 100 East and 200 East, both corridors are needed. If one or the other were eliminated as shown in the presented alternative, additional north-south capacity would need to be addressed by adding more through lanes or other parallel facilities.
- The widened road would impact additional homes and properties beyond the three identified in the comment.
- The presented alternative involves substantial impacts to parks,
Commenter ID #012

012-B

Also, it would be nice to bring walkways down the hill south from the intersection of Center Street and 2nd East along both sides of the roadway next to the retaining walls. Pioneer Avenue would need to dead-end at the retaining wall of the new roadway. A small utility access road would need to be installed next to the retaining wall crossing the canal to the substation, however, this should not be a major issue for our Light & Power Department. To compensate for some of the lost parking lots at the apartment complex at the end of Pioneer Avenue, UDOT may have to purchase the empty vacant lot on the north side of Pioneer Avenue just below the hill, to give residents additional parking.

Please discuss this alternative with UDOT and your engineering team to see if it may have merit versus the significant impact that will be created for the residents if the proposed alternative at 300 South is developed. Thanks for your time and consideration,

Response to Comment ID #012

particularly Pioneer Parkway. It is not clear that the park lands could be replaced with this alternative.

Response to 012-B

Sidewalks from Center Street down to 100 South near the elevation of the adjacent Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park are included in the Proposed Action.

Commenter ID #013

013-A

The alternatives listed in Table 2.3-1 assume that extending 200 East South is the only option for regional connectivity i.e. that is set in stone. The geometric and operational deficiencies require altering 200 East, so it's no surprise that alternatives that don't conform to that fail.

100 East was just opened up from 300 S onward, changing the character of that road significantly. Another two part option would be to:

1. Put a stop light at 200 East and Center to manage the LOS better than a stop sign can. A traffic light might have the capability to manage the LOS to a more acceptable standard - moving from an F to a D isn't a major jump and a stoplight might fix it.

Response to Comment ID #013

A traffic signal at 200 East and Center Street would be an improvement over the current stop sign configuration, but the connection of 200 East to the south is also necessary to address the north-south travel demand east of Main Street. The difference between LOS D and LOS F can be dramatic. For a signalized intersection operating at LOS D the average delay ranges between 35 to 55 seconds per vehicle. At this level there is congestion, but traffic is still moving. When average delay exceeds 80 seconds (LOS F), traffic flow is characterized as “gridlock”.

Response to 013-A
Commenter ID #013

2. Use 100 East as the corridor south of center and 200 East as the corridor north of center. Traffic would have to make two turns, but I suspect this is a peak period problem for 1 hour in the morning and 1 hour in the evening for a few hundred cars. Are we permanently altering the scope of a neighborhood, using eminent domain, and removing green space and walkable neighborhoods at an extremely high and disruptive cost for a problem that is actually quite small in practicality?

Where you have people make that turn from 200 E to 100 E (going south and vice versa going north) - on center or 400 N, or in between - is flexible.

I would strongly recommend that the analysis include this alternative rather than presuming 200 East is the only option south of center. Take a step back and look at the bigger picture.

Response to Comment ID #013

Response to 013-B

These suggestions were considered in the Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative described in the Environmental Assessment (EA). This alternative included intersection improvements without changes to roadway alignments. It included a number of low cost and low impact improvements, with the intent to improve the transportation network in as close to the same configuration as it exists today. The TSM Alternative does not meet needs identified in the EA such as providing local connectivity, providing regional connectivity, correcting geometric deficiencies, or improving operational deficiencies. The alternative does not address or meet the expected travel demand for north-south travel as identified in the CMPO TDM. To address travel demand the existing 100 East and another continuous north-south corridor will need to be in place.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #014

I've looked closer at the map on page 2 of Chapter 1 and it appears that traffic will be routed over to 100 E on 300 S to cross the river going south? Then 100 S will be the continuation of the regional arterial to Nibley? If that's the case, I really don't see why routing them over on 400 N or Center isn't the preferred alternative. Why take out houses and widen the street on 200 E to go 3 more blocks south, when the same thing could be accomplished without this action? It doesn't make sense from a lot of perspectives - economic, quality of the neighborhood, etc.

Response to Comment ID #014

The CMPO RTP does show 200 East and 100 East combining to one corridor to the south. This would address the north-south travel demand in this section of the community. In the project area (300 South to Center Street) both facilities must be in place to meet projected travel demand. Additionally, 200 East is the only corridor that can extend north through the length of Logan.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #015

015-A  
I don't think we should expand or lengthen 200 E. 100 E already accomplishes this goal. I have noticed that red lights in downtown Logan are very poorly timed for traffic movement, esp East/West traffic. Right now the lights on the north side of 100 E encourage more traffic onto 200 E. East/West traffic ends up at odd places, like Center, even though it dead ends into 600 E, simply because there are few stops and lights West of Main. Perhaps the Main St, and 100 E traffic flow should be improved with better timed lights for Main and 100 E. Perhaps remove some lights on Main to encourage traffic to the desired corridors and strategically add additional lights on the south section of 100 E. Be thoughtful about traffic flow on the 10th West expansion, look for some good East/West corridors and have their lights better timed. Rather than having all of our streets gridlocked and ill suited for residences and recreation, make better use of the roads we have.

015-B  
If you end up completing the 200 E expansion, please include a nice trail/bike path next to it with trees between the trail/path and the road. In time this will make the road more attractive. Think instead of doing another project that only helps a little, how about a large boulevard that is a more permanent solution?

Response to Comment ID #015

Response to 015-A  
Traffic signals are evaluated and optimized in Logan to the extent possible every few years; however, on two-way corridors there is limited possibility to optimize signal timing. Enhancing signal configuration on Main Street may help traffic move more smoothly on Main Street, but will not preclude the need for another continuous transportation corridor east of Main Street.

Response to 015-B  
Provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel along 200 East as well as connection to the community’s non-motorized transportation system are included in the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action includes, combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s Transportation Master Plan.

Commenter ID #016

It seems very costly in terms of time, resources funding and impact on people’s lives to acquire 3 blocks of improved roadway. If traffic ends up on 100 East anyway what is the benefit of those 3 blocks on 200 East being improved? I also believe we should be extremely careful about impacting people’s homes/lives.

Response to Comment ID #016

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

I was glancing through the project description and noticed one error and a couple of omissions that might but probably will not impact the study.

Chapter 3:14 it describes Garff Wayside Gardens but states there are no permanent amenities but the sidewalks. There's a bandstand.

The next page describes the southwest section of Merlin Olsen Park: "The acquisition of right-of-way would not impact the park’s amenities or any of the intended recreational uses of the park. The property to be acquired is within an area that is unimproved natural open space with sloping terrain to the south where only passive recreation occurs."

Granted, the 'intended recreational uses' of the park probably never included a farmers’ market or the end of the Top of Utah Marathon. The area is already impacted from the cars needing space to park during these occasions not to mention other activities such as The Bike Festival and perhaps others I don't know about. Most events are one day a year but the market runs from May through October - every Saturday. On those days at least a thousand people merge together on that corner for a community function that has existed there since 2006 (2006-7 Pioneer Park; 2007-present at Merlin Olsen). It's sad that so much parking will be eliminated when it is already in short supply. Since the city is already taking property away from homeowners who live there - creating homes just a few feet from the road, it would be nice if they considered taking property from non-resident land owners to create some parking space for the park.

Thank you for this clarification. The Garff Wayside Gardens is located in the study area, but it is not located within the project area. Garff Wayside Gardens is situated at least one block away from the Proposed Action, so the park and its amenities will not be affected by the Proposed Action.

As alternatives were considered, concerns were voiced about possible impacts to the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. Of particular concern was safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East between the parks in general and specifically during events such as the Gardeners’ Market. To respond to this concern, a pedestrian undercrossing is included in the Proposed Action for non-motorized connectivity between the two parks. The organizers of the Gardeners’ Market were consulted during the development of the alternatives and the pedestrian undercrossing was included in the Proposed Action to address their concerns. It is not anticipated that there will be a loss of overall parking. Parking will still be available on Pioneer Avenue, which is proposed to be terminated in a cul-de-sac.

The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Commenter ID #018

Please don't further corrupt Logan's hometown feeling. This project seems unnecessary and ugly. It also seems like it would be encouraging more driving, when Logan air quality needs us to be focusing money and resources more on public transportation - why not use this money to build more comfortable bus stops or extend the hours of service?

Response to Comment ID #018

Thank you for your comments, they have been noted.

Commenter ID #019

Why not just use 100 East that you've already extended? It seems wasteful not to. Also if people want a high speed, fast paced life, they move to a bigger city. I don't mind having to slow down a little and wait a little.

Response to Comment ID #019

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to the comment regarding 100 East being used in place of 200 East. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #020

Andy, I'm sorry I missed the public meeting last week re: 200 East. As a member of Cache County's Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board since its inception, I just wish to add my thoughts on taking advantage of upgrades to improve bicycle transportation in Logan. Specifically, this street has the following advantages for our burgeoning bike transportation network:

1. It provides a needed North-South corridor to compliment the initial East-West bike lane on 500 North. While "sharrows" (periodic share-the-road markings on road surface) are a useful addition to the system, they are no substitute for actual bike lanes. We are sorely lacking in clearly marked, complete, bike lanes in our current system.

Response to 020-A

The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. Space for on-street bicycle travel is included in the Proposed Action and conforms to applicable standards for on-street bicycle facilities. Due to the presence of on-street parking, delineated bike lanes were not included but an appropriate width (meeting design standards) for both parking and on-street bike use is included in the Proposed Action.

Response to 020-B

200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP). This portion of 200 East will fit within the overall plans for non-motorized transportation as identified in the CMPO RTP and the Logan City TMP.
Commenter ID #020

3. 200 East provides a key network opportunity because of its proximity to the Transit Center, 500 North bike lane, 1800 North bike lane, and Logan’s downtown shopping/dining/recreation offerings.
4. Finally, bike lanes offer traffic calming advantages that are appropriate for established residential, such as Logan’s 200 East neighborhood.
Thanks for your consideration of my thoughts on this matter.

Response to Comment ID #020

3. 200 East provides a key network opportunity because of its proximity to the Transit Center, 500 North bike lane, 1800 North bike lane, and Logan's downtown shopping/dining/recreation offerings.
4. Finally, bike lanes offer traffic calming advantages that are appropriate for established residential, such as Logan's 200 East neighborhood.
Thanks for your consideration of my thoughts on this matter.

Commenter ID #021

I am strongly against the 200 East road project that would extend 200 East south of Center Street in Logan.

Response to Comment ID #021

The commenter does not identify which progressive alternatives should be considered, but the commenter may be suggesting investment in other modes of transportation such as mass transit or non-motorized transportation. Various transportation modes combine to address overall transportation needs. Local planning efforts identify improvements for transit, and non-motorized travel in addition to roadway improvements to address the overall transportation needs. In developing the RTP, the CMPO considers the contribution of other transportation modes to reduce the growth of traffic demand. One element of need for this project is the growth of travel demand estimated by the CMPO Travel Demand Model (See Response to General Comment #1). This model accounts for the use of transit and non-motorized travel, and the continued investment in those travel modes in the urban area. This proposed project addresses travel demand needs based on the assumption that planned transit and non-motorized improvements are made.
Commenter ID #022

022-A

In the EA, it states that 200 East from Center to 300 South is too narrow, creating geometric deficiencies. However, looking at GIS imagery there are numerous 'bottlenecks' along 200 East, which currently acts as a 'major collector' that would necessitate expansion and seemingly demand expansion before the lower section. Why aren't these sections the priority, based on the present traffic levels?

-200 East from 500 N to ~850 N is approximately 45 feet wide.
-200 East from 1000 N to 1250 N is ~ 45 feet wide.

Response to 022-A

200 East is identified as a continuous north-south corridor from Millville to Smithfield in the CMPO RTP. Communities have been working to implement the plan to address travel demand east of Main Street. Logan City evaluated 200 East from 300 South to 1450 North and identified priorities. The section of 200 East from Center Street to 300 South was determined to have the highest priority.

There are other improvements needed to 200 East shown in both the CMPO RTP and the Logan City TMP. All of the planned improvements are necessary to respond to projected travel demand.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to some of the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

022-B

Both of these locations are near Logan Middle School, where frequent traffic problems are encountered, largely due to the poor condition of the street and blatant lack of a center turn lane. There appear to be two 40 foot bottlenecks on 200 East between 1400 N and the terminus at 1800 N. These are also dangerous areas that demand upgrading before the section of 200 East from Center St to 300 South. There are obvious offset intersections concurrent with these bottlenecks as well.

Response to 022-B

Logan City recognizes that there are other needs in the corridor and is working on a project with local funds to address intersection improvements at 200 East and 500 North; intersection improvements and pedestrian improvements at 200 East and 700 North; pedestrian improvements near the Mount Logan Middle School; intersection improvements at 200 East and 1000 North; and installation of a center turn lane from 1000 North to 1250 North.

Response to 022-C

The reason for the 200 East study is to continue 200 East from Smithfield to Millville. Correct?

I looked at the new apartments at approximately 100 East and 500-600 South. How will 200 East continue past 300 South and into the apartment complex? Please provide detailed drawings and explanations, as there appears to be no space for the road to pass by the apartment buildings.

-100 East was recently completed, at great expense. The road from 300 South to 100 North in Providence is 55 feet wide, meeting the specifications of a major collector, correct? Why isn't this recent and costly improvement going to factor into the north-south major collector?

Response to 022-C

The CMPO RTP shows the 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street. The CMPO RTP also shows the 200 East Corridor combining with 100 East south of the Logan River. While continuing two corridors south of the Logan River would provide more capacity that one, north-south travel demand south of the Logan River is not expected to be as high as that for north of the Logan River.

As the referenced apartment complex was developed, local planning preserved a corridor to accommodate 200 East and 100 East connections through the apartment complex. Detailed plans are not available;
Response to Comment ID #022

however, the CMPO RTP shows a planned configuration.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to some of the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 022-D

To meet the combined travel demand for 100 East and 200 East, both corridors are needed through this area. If one or the other was eliminated as shown in the presented alternative, additional north-south capacity would need to be addressed by adding more through lanes or other parallel facilities.

Response to Comment ID #023

Connectivity and provisions for bike travel were elements of the Purpose and Need. Space for on-street bicycle travel is included in the Proposed Action and conforms to applicable standards for on-street bicycle facilities. Due to the presence of on-street parking, delineated bike lanes were not included, but an appropriate combined width is proposed.

The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s TMP.
Commenter ID #024

I've lived in -- on First South by the Wilson School for over 45 years. When we bought our home they said you're -- the bank, when we tried to get the loan, they said. You're trying to buy a home in a dying neighborhood. There's no room for growth. And we couldn't get enough to even do some remodeling on the home. But we liked the area.

I have -- I lived on Fourth West, just off from Center Street, as I was growing up. And I said I'd never live on the island. But that's where we decided we wanted to live. And we bought our home.

And the thing that I, that I'd like to mention on the overall is that it takes so long. And not only do people buy homes in that area, but they have bought -- multiple people have bought homes, not knowing that this was going through.

And I feel like, just like sister -- [name removed] said -- it's not church -- that this was suggested a long time ago. Years, and years, and years ago. And yet we have seen buildings built in the right-of-way throughout this whole area, from Melville to Hyde Park. And not just one building, but a whole bunch of them.

And I feel like when that corridor was decided upon, that there needed to be something -- and, and it still could be done -- so that somebody else doesn't have what's happening to, to that one street and to us that are off from it a little ways, but -- and throughout the whole valley, that that's not gonna happen again.

That that right-of-way is taken and some way or other that there's a legal-type thing put on it and people don't -- it doesn't change hands. It is bought as it comes up for sale and that type of thing so that it can be put in through there.

And not all of a sudden, after someone has been in their home 10 years, they say, Well, 20 years ago we made this designation.

Tenth West was a bypass. And people forgot about it, practically. And now it's finally coming to the -- coming along to what it was set up for years and years ago. And, and they have allowed subdivisions to be built right on that corridor so -- on Tenth West.

We don't want that to happen on this now. And so my idea is that we need to have -- if it's gonna go through, then stop construction in North Logan, and Hyde Park, and in Smithfield, and in Melville, and in Providence.

And don't let the City Councils in those areas say, Oh, there's two lots here. We're gonna take and let them be -- have a business built on them. And then the road can't go through there, it's gotta have a jog. Just like Mrs. Hobbs said.

Those things have changed, and I don't want to see that happen again. This road I think for future generations will be good because there are gonna be more people here all the time. We know that. And they're gonna be living on the east side.
Commenter ID #024

And I know [name removed], wherever you are now, that's something that we've, we talked about a whole bunch. And so the pollution is going to affect there. But this has done the same thing in Salt Lake. It's on that east side there too.

So whatever you can do in trying to get a dedicated right-of-way and save it. Protect it. And don't let schools be built it. This -- the Tenth West was designated before a grade school was built on it. And now they've closed the gates on

Response to Comment ID #024

Thank you for your comments.

Commenter ID #025

Thanks for allowing me the opportunity to address this, this subject. I'm gonna do so and put it more in a context of environmental assessment. And I'm particularly interested in the environmental impacts on the neighborhood.

Currently you can stand on Third East and you've got a three-block sight line through three connected parks in Logan. It is the largest publicly-owned open space, with the exception of the soccer fields up at the middle school, on the east side of town.

The First East project, just completed, $12 million. Supposedly it was the CMPO's mantra of mitigating traffic on Main Street. Brand new, open. If what I saw on tr -- on Main Street last Friday afternoon was mitigated traffic, I perish the thought of what a traffic jam looks like.

This will be the third -- Center Street, Third South, and First East, three major transportation projects on the island. Each one of those has dramatically changed the character of the neighborhood.

The island is getting hammered with these projects, just because it's simply down in a low spot and allowing for folks who are living farther away from their workplace and their, and their place where they like to play, they can drive through the neighborhood.

We are establishing a capacity increase of the transportation policy when, in my view, 21st Century America is not gonna be depending on single occupied motor vehicle coming to and from home place, workplace, and what have you.

I think that the, the pollution, air pollution needs to be addressed in -- because of these projects. These are major corridors. And once again, it's a low spot down there and that pollution comes down and hangs on the island. Not like it does uptown.

Response to Comment ID #025

Response to 025-A

Numerous projects are needed to meet growing travel demand in the Cache urbanized area including the recent 100 East Project, the Proposed Action on 200 East, as well as several other projects. Without these projects, many streets around “the island” will experience high levels of congestion.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to some of the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 025-C

The response to General Comment #5 speaks in detail to air quality concerns raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #025

025-D
I think this is a boondoggle. I think I would agree with all my friends here who’ve talked about the cost. I think the cost-benefit ratio needs to be established here. I think this is a real waste of federal money, which means it’s our money. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Response to 025-D
A cost-benefit ratio was not calculated for this project; however, to do so the costs of congestion and lost opportunity for non-motorized connections would need to be considered. If improvements are not made to this and numerous other projects included in the CMPO RTP, then many streets within Logan will be congested. The cost of this congestion will be from time lost in traffic, additional congestion related emissions (CO), and possible safety impacts stemming from driver frustration. If non-motorized facilities and connections are not completed, it may be that fewer bicyclists and pedestrians will travel by non-motorized modes. The response to General Comment #1 provides a detailed justification for this project. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 025-E
The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s TMP.

Thank you for your comments.
Commenter ID #026

To the Study Team,

I would like to voice my opinion as a long-time citizen of Logan on the proposed plan to expand the south end of 200 East in Logan. I frequently walk, bike, and drive in this neighborhood so I am very familiar with the current degree of traffic. I also am very familiar with the beauty and quiet provided by the park and green space that would be destroyed by punching 200 E through past Center St. The enormous expense to change this road and make the incline safe is a huge waste of money. This would end up making this section of Logan less pedestrian-friendly and increase the feeling of traffic congestion.
Please record my vote to NOT support this endeavor.
Thank you for your attention.

Response to Comment ID #026

Thank you for your comments.

Commenter ID #027

I think you all forgot about the gardener’s market that is there every Sat. in the summer. 100-200 people come every week, so it is not an unused part of the park. The project seems like a over kill since you just widened 100 east.

My vote is to leave it alone. I live on the Island and work on 100 North 55 East, so I travel that direction every day. Maybe a stop light is all that is needed.

Response to Comment ID #027

The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to concerns raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #028

028-A

I am a concerned citizen in the Logan area. I am very concerned about the expansion of 200 East through the Merlin Olson Park. Currently, the Cache Valley Gardener's Market uses this area on Saturdays. This is one of the biggest attractions to the area throughout the weekends in the summer.

028-B

If this project goes as planned, the Gardener's Market will be temporarily displaced with the possibility of not being able to re-attain its current location. The Market is a significant contributor to the community in Logan and should be taken into SERIOUS consideration when planning this project. Over 100 vendors are there each week with 1000's of citizens attending. I have visited many farmer's markets throughout the USA, and the one in Logan is one of the biggest/best attended I have ever seen for such a small area.

Response to Comment ID #028

Response to 028-A

The Proposed Action would not run through Merlin Olsen Central Park. The proposed connection of 200 East to Center Street is on an existing road right-of-way The only effects to Merlin Olsen Central Park would be to connect trails and non-motorized transportation to the park. These connections were included as a part of the Proposed Action in direct response to public comment received, and in response to needs identified by the organizers of the Gardeners’ Market. There would be no acquisition of park land. The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to concerns raised by this comment about the Gardeners’ Market. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Response to Comment ID #028

028-C  In my opinion, the Market is the best attraction in Logan and if nothing else, parking should be planned into this so they still have as many parking spaces as they currently have. Another consideration, is making a parking lot for the market since many people have to park blocks away, hence parking throughout the neighborhood.

Response to Comment ID #029

029-A  I am a resident of the Island in Logan and a merchant at the Cache Valley Gardener’s Market. I am writing to express my concerns about the Logan 200 East widening project. The Gardener’s Market takes place in Merlin Olsen Park from May through October. Hundreds of people come every Saturday to buy produce, food, and crafts and listen to live music. The project would displace the market possibly permanently.

029-B  The island is a nice quiet neighborhood of Logan. The city just widened 100 East and it connects to Providence now. I don’t think it is necessary to widen another street in the island.

Response to Comment ID #030

Please take the Cache Valley Gardener’s Market into consideration. Merlin Olson Park is the location of the market and is a huge highlight of Logan during the whole market season. The road (200 East) between the parks is very busy with bikes, cars and pedestrians during market hours. And the experience of the small town

Response to Comment ID #028

028-C  The Gardeners’ Market is not expected to be displaced as a consequence of this proposed project. The commenter mentions concern that the market could be temporarily displaced. The final design and construction requirements will address the function of the market during construction.

Response to 028-C  The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to concerns raised by this comment about parking. The proposed project is not expected to reduce the amount of available parking. In fact, there is expected to be more parking available on the proposed new leg of 200 East between Center Street and 100 South. Constructing a new parking lot may be a useful improvement, but it would not be necessary as a result of this proposed project.

Response to Comment ID #029

029-A  The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to concerns raised by this comment about the Gardeners’ Market. Please see that response at the beginning of this document. The Gardeners’ Market is not expected to be displaced as a consequence of this proposed project.

Response to 029-B  The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to some of the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to Comment ID #030

The response to General Comment #3 speaks in detail to concerns raised by this comment about the Gardeners’ Market. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #030

road on the same grade (with no fences) between the two parks is important for the character of the market and the quiet Island neighbor that hosts it. Making this road a major thoroughfare would possibly oust the gardener’s market and the pleasant nook of space down there in the parks. A large number of people use these parks once per week for about 5 months per year. This is the only large, grassy, civic space in downtown Logan. Putting a large road through it might make it hardly used.

A park isn’t just a patch of grass with no buildings on it that has a sign that says “Park.” (As we unfortunately have in other areas of Logan).

I'm not saying it's impossible to retain a useful and used park with a widening of 200E, I just think it really needs to be a thoughtful transition. The drawings look very urban, which is fine if that's what downtown Logan is becoming. But I ask that you add the Market to the plan. Just plan it in...Because we've been coming in larger and larger droves every year, and we will keep coming as long as you include us in the future. Think about a few hundred people milling around throughout the day with baskets and bikes, children in hand, coming to and from Main Street, watching live performances in the park. Plan us in. It's important to the quality of life in Logan.

Thanks for your good work

Response to Comment ID #030

Response to Comment ID #031

After reading the Environmental Assessment, I am submitting some comments for consideration regarding the proposed 200 East project in Logan. It seems that 200 East is currently the only option considered south of Center St. in the analysis. 300 S is already busy and feeding more traffic through there would not help, so other viable short-term (and less invasive) options seem to be:

031-A

-- Stop light to manage high traffic volume at 200 E and Center
-- Stop light to replace stop signs to manage high traffic volume at 100 E and 300 S
-- Re-evaluate traffic flows at other intersections --not just 200 E and Center--for longer-term solutions:
  - 400 N/100 E, 400 N/200 E
  - Center/100 E, Center/200 E
  - 300 S/100 E

From a resident of this neighborhood, thank you for considering these comments.

Response to 031-A

Some of these suggestions were considered as part of the Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative described in the EA. The TSM Alternative included intersection improvements without major changes to roadway alignments. The alternative did not meet the needs identified in the EA such as; providing local connectivity, providing regional connectivity, correcting geometric deficiencies, or improving operational deficiencies.
Commenter ID #032

032-A

I am so disappointed to hear not of another road project to eliminate traffic, but of solutions to the transportation that cost far less. Why must the city continue to only think with a car? The bike lanes are dismal here and walking across Main Street for shopping can make you wait for minutes just to get 20 seconds to get across 7 lanes of traffic. The air quality is pathetic in the winter. Gas is going up and people keep complaining about no money. Why can't Logan take a forward thing initiative and think outside the car. I read in the paper by one of the city engineers that there easy solution now....why are we not promoting carpooling, the bus (free in fact, which is staggering in this day and age) bike and foot. Logan is quite compact and people can and should be rewarded for these other ways of alleviating congestion. I bike...it saved money in gas, keeps me fit and gives my mood a boost. It’s cheaper for not only me, but for the city and tax payers.

Response to Comment ID #032

032-B

Another concern is the usefulness of such a project. 100E was just improved to handle more flow and now we need more? And how does getting to 300S help flow anyways.

I'm against using my tax dollars to do a project the city employee says can be solved in different ways.

Response to 032-B

The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to some of the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #033

033-A

We, the undersigned, have reviewed the Environmental Assessment for the Logan 200 East Minor Arterial, Project No. HPP-LC05 and present the following comments for inclusion into the official public hearing transcripts.

1. On page 1-1 in the second paragraph of the EA, it states “These local plans call for a continuous transportation corridor from Millville to Smithfield along 200 East.”; however, due to new housing construction, geographic (hilly terrain) features, and the quality of existing homes already built in the area south of the Logan River along the 200 East corridor into River Heights, this Environmental Assessment describes a project that is impractical if not impossible to construct. In addition to the aforementioned statement in the EA, the 200 East Project has always been explained in meetings and open houses to the general public as a continuous thoroughfare from Millville to Smithfield.

Thus, it is not ethical to ask the general public and other stakeholders to buy into and approve an EA that is different from what they were told and not representative of real-world conditions. The continuous 200 East Project from...
Response to Comment ID #033

Millville to Smithfield corridor is mentioned several times throughout the EA, and each time it is referenced it outlines a deficiency in the EA.

033-B
2. With the lack of Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) shown in Appendix K, this EA can only be considered as a “proof of Idea”. This EA needs to have all the supportive information and legal documentation, i.e., deeds, right-of-ways, Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs), financial arrangements, etc. to ensure the project will be considered as a “Proof of Capability”. Without “Proof of Capability” there is no assurance the 200 East Project will ever be built to fulfill the supposedly goo intentions that were sold to the general public and stakeholders. Both the public and other stakeholders have a legitimate and legal right to know the project they approved will be built as planned without deviation and unexpected surprises.

Response to 033-B
There have not been any right-of-way agreements or deeds created for this project. The right-of-way process cannot begin without the environmental process being completed. There has been one property acquired to address a hardship for a particular landowner. That acquisition was completed by Logan City, separate of the proposed project and is in no way related to the final decision of this environmental process. Logan City performed that acquisition with the knowledge that the environmental process would continue unaffected by the property acquisition. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) referenced by this comment is an MOA between UDOT, FHWA, SHPO, and Logan City detailing the specifics mitigation for impacts to 4(f) resources. The EA and final decision are done so in full knowledge of the impacts. It is a standard part of the process that this MOA is completed once the environmental process is complete, but before the project is implemented.

Response to 033-C
The Logan City project on 200 East from 450 North to 1250 North is a city project being performed to address concerns about the safety of intersections, the safety of driveways, and the safety of pedestrians. The project is in the very preliminary stages and was initiated in direct response to comments given by the public about specific “spot” concerns. All of the improvements in this City project are “spot” improvements and do not increase through traffic capacity. The project will address the following specific items:
- 500 North and 200 East: Intersection congestion and safety for pedestrian crossing the intersection.
- 700 North and 200 East: Safety for pedestrians crossing east-west at this intersection.
- Mount Logan Middle School Area: Safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East, and access management to address congestion and safety related to drop-off and pick-up of students.

3. Paragraph 3.6 on Air Quality states, “Specifically, the LRTP must demonstrate that the Proposed Action, when analyzed regionally with all other proposed transportation improvement projects, conform to the air quality control strategies and emissions levels outline in the LRTP.” The EA as written, has not fulfilled the intent or the requirements of this federal mandate. The 200 East Project from Center St. to 300 South, Southward, and from 1400 North, Northward, are being funded with federal monies, which require an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. The 200 East Project from 450 North to 1250 North, however, has no federal funding and, therefore, no Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement is required. It is mandatory, therefore, to include a detailed Air Quality Assessment regarding how the Center Street to 300 South Project will effect Air Quality and Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) emissions from 450 North to 1250 North.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #033

1000 North and 200 East: Intersection congestion and safety for pedestrians crossing the intersection.

1000 North to 1250 North: Accessibility and safety for traffic turning left into and out of driveways, and provision for on-street bicycle travel.

None of the proposed improvements will add additional through travel lanes or additional capacity. This city project is consistent with the CMPO RTP and the Cache County State Implementation Program for air quality, and will therefore not affect air quality or Mobile Source Air Toxics.

The response to General Comment #5 speaks in detail to air quality items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to Comment ID #033

- The commenter is adding the total traffic volumes for three corridors which is not how the guidance is applied. The commenter implies that by not accumulating the total of three roadways, the UDOT Hot Spot Manual was not followed. The UDOT Hot Spot Manual guidance citation of 25,000 AADT for future traffic volumes is in reference to a single corridor. Even though a Hot Spot analysis was not required by this guidance an analysis was still conducted for the proposed project. That analysis still showed that CO levels will not increase to the point of violating NAAQS, therefore the commenter’s claims are incorrect.

- The lack of Air Quality/MSAT analysis in the Center Street to 300 South Project EA regarding the 450 North to 1250 North Project Air Quality/MSAT impact constitutes a deficiency in that EA which needs to be corrected.
Commenter ID #033

The section beginning on page 3-29 relative to the discussion included in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations regarding incomplete or unavailable information is deceptive to the general public reading this EA. The EA indicates the FHWA express views, opinions, and concerns about reaching conclusions regarding health impact from highway emissions, thus misleading the reader to think the FHWA is an authoritative voice regarding Health, Safety, and Environmental issues when, in fact, EPA and OSHA are the regulatory agencies regarding health, safety, and environmental matters.

Another deceiving statement is on Page 3-36, second paragraph, last sentence, which states, “For many of the MSATs reviewed, HEI concluded that there is insufficient data for an assessment of ambient exposures on human health.” The words “For many” is deceptive because it completely draws the reader’s focus away from those MSATs that are really harmful to human health and the environment.

The entire section from pages 3-29 to 3-37 needs to be written to more accurately reflect what the Health effects Institute HEI really concluded in the Executive Summary of the Gaps and Recommendations section with respect to uncertainties as well as to certainties. To be upfront, honest, fair, and ethical to the general public the EA should devote as much time and space to those MSATs that are harmful to human health and safety and the environment as those that are not.

Thank you for considering our comments for inclusion into the official public hearing transcripts.

Response to Comment ID #033

Response to 033-E

As the Federal Agency that is responsible for this decision, FHWA is also the agency that is responsible for the preparation of this environmental document. While FHWA is not the authority for all health, safety, and environmental issues, it does comply with the applicable requirements and regulations that the applicable agencies are responsible for. FHWA acts in cooperation with each of these agencies including EPA and OSHA and is subject to their rules and regulations.

The response to General Comment #5 speaks in detail to the items regarding MSAT’s raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #034

I am writing to express my deep disapproval of the proposed 200 East expansion project based on several grounds:

034-A

1. I live at 126 S 200 E. The project will disrupt my neighborhood and lower my property value.

2. Urban development should be contained and channelized, rather than expanded. 100 E has already become a major thoroughfare through town with the new bridge across the Logan River, and the massive powerline poles along the street. Logan city should contain development to places where it has already occurred and leave quiet neighborhoods like 200 E alone, in order to preserve the small-town feel that places

Response to Comment ID #034

Response to 034-A

The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
like the Island possess.

3. There will be a tremendous fragmentation of the Island community and the feel of the neighborhood. There is already so much development throughout much of Logan City, the Island actually feels like a quiet neighborhood and a true community. This is rare in Logan, which seems to be leaning more toward suburban development and tacky houses that are so incredibly ugly and unappealing to people like myself. The Island retains this feel partly because main traffic veins are confined to other locations, and partly because Merlin-Olson park feels like a true community center. Making a massive through-street out of 200 E will dramatically change the aesthetic of the park, the safety, and the convenience of having the Island be completely walk-able.

Response to Comment ID #034

Response to 034-B

Community cohesion and character was considered and discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the EA. While the project will be a change for the neighborhood, it is not anticipated that the project will change the character or land use patterns as has been demonstrated on other corridors in Logan. There are elements of the Proposed Action that will make connections within the community possible including improved connections to other bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Proposed Action would not directly affect the features or function of the park. There would be no loss of land from either park, and none of the park features would be affected. There would be the construction of a retaining wall to contain the roadway fill within existing right-of-way of 200 East as it approaches Center Street. This retaining wall would be visible from both parks. It is depicted in Figure 4.6-3, Proposed Roadway Profile, in the Environmental Assessment. This retaining wall would be about 15 feet tall at the highest point. The height of the wall would increase gradually from the intersection with 100 South to the north and the intersection of Center Street. Some trees would be affected adjacent to the park where this retaining wall is proposed to be constructed, but all of the trees that would be affected are situated on existing roadway right-of-way and not within neither Pioneer Parkway nor Merlin Olsen Central Park. Accessibility to both parks would be enhanced by the addition of non-motorized path connections to a bicycle/pedestrian path that exists on the Boulevard Street right-of-way. The connection would be made by a new undercrossing of Center Street, so that bicyclists and pedestrians would no longer need to cross the traffic on Center Street. There would also be an undercrossing of the new 200 East alignment connecting the two parks so that bicyclists and pedestrians can travel between both parks without crossing traffic. Connections would also be made to the sidewalks paralleling 200 East, which would provide a direct connection to the parks that does not currently exist for pedestrians traveling from the north on 200 East. Additional parking for users of the parks will become available with the conversion of Pioneer Street to a
4. Merlin-Olsen park will be changed. Merlin-Olsen park is the best park in the city of Logan in my opinion for several reasons. The park serves as a community meeting-ground not just for people who live in the neighborhood, but for the entire city of Logan, primarily because of the farmer's market. Have you actually been to the market on a Saturday in July? If you have, you would NOT be considering turning 200 E into a major roadway. For me, the park, and the feel of the farmer's market is what makes Logan a place I want to live. The planned expansion of 200 East will destroy this. Likewise, think of how many events take place in this park, from Top of Utah marathon to the Wasatch Back race. Will these events be able to block traffic on 200 East to the finish of the marathon after the planned expansion? The whole area will be changed for the worst.

5. What can we do to stop this from happening??? Please do NOT let expansion and greed corrupt you. Do the right thing for Logan city and its residents and do NOT proceed with the 200 E expansion plans.

Please respond and let me know that someone actually read this and that my attempts to get someone to see beyond expansion and development are not futile.

Response to Comment ID #034

cul-de-sac, and the addition of more on-street parking along 200 East on the new alignment connecting directly to Center Street. Noise would change in both of the parks as a result of the Proposed Action. Some of the locations in the park would experience less noise as a result of the roadway grade being raised above the level of the current roadway and park, some of the locations would experience more noise as a result increased traffic. Noise would not increase to a level described as “substantially exceeded” in UDOT’s Noise Policy or 10 dBA as a result of the Proposed Action.

The response to General Comment #2 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 034-C

As alternatives were considered, concerns were voiced about possible impacts to the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. Of particular concern was safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East between the parks in general and specifically during events such as the Gardeners’ Market. To respond to this concern a pedestrian undercrossing is included in the Proposed Action for non-motorized connectivity between the two parks. The organizers of the Gardeners’ Market were consulted during the development of the alternatives and the pedestrian undercrossing was added to the Proposed Action to address their concerns. The Gardeners’ Market is not expected to be displaced as a result this of this project. Groups planning the Top of Utah Marathon, and the Wasatch Back Race make year-to-year adjustments based on a number of factors including construction activities. While there may be temporary impacts during construction, future modifications to these events are not expected as a result of the implementation of this project.

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed road development on 200 East in Logan, Utah. I believe that the original assessment of the proposal failed to take into consideration several important factors, and that other factors have changed since the original assessment was conducted.

I am a resident of the section of 200 East that is slated for the first round of development, but was not aware of the proposed work when I purchased the property in 2009. I have not been able to attend any of the planning sessions that have taken place since I have lived here because I frequently work out of the state, and because, oddly, I was not made aware of the most recent meeting, which took place at the beginning of March. I would like to have been more involved in the planning process, had I been notified about opportunities to participate. As it was, I had a hard time finding out how to even send in these comments.

I believe that there are numerous reasons that Logan City should pursue Build Alternative 1: Expansion of 100 East, rather than Build Alternative 2 or 3. Below, I have listed several of the primary reasons:

1. Build Alternative 1 will benefit local businesses. 100 East is already a heavily used and commercially developed street. Focusing traffic onto this road will benefit the existing businesses by channeling more traffic past local businesses such as Sunrise Cyclery and the Old Gristmill.

2. Build Alternative 1 will save Logan City a tremendous amount of money. Creating a thoroughfare of 100 East will enable the City to make use of existing bridge, numerous stop lights, and other infrastructure that already exists on the street, rather than having to rebuild entire blocks, add numerous stop lights, and re-route existing traffic.

3. Contrary to findings in the EA, Build Alternative 1 already does and can further establish regional connectivity. Many people already use 100 East to travel between River Heights/Providence and Logan. This existing use should be used to establish a thoroughfare linking the Southern end of the valley with the northern end. Connectivity could continue past Center simply by having the route jog up to 200 East to move around the school on 800 North. Many cities are able to create major throughways that jog 1 or 2 blocks over and still successfully establish working patterns.

Response to Comment ID #035-A

In response to Comments 1 through 3 about Build Alternative 1, further improvements to the 100 East Corridor would not fully address the anticipated travel demand. The CMPO’s planning work indicates that there is a need for north-south travel and that 100 East will not carry all of the anticipated travel alone. Another continuous north-south corridor is needed. In response to the jogging of throughways it is possible, however, that intersections and connecting roadways would need to be upgraded and widened to accommodate the traffic patterns. If 100 East were the solution, then it would need additional travel capacity. The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
4. Although residents in the study area were polled about pedestrian and bicycle travel preferences, actual pedestrian and bicycle use on 200 East does not appear to have been measured. What the EA fails to recognize is that 200 East is already an important connecting route for cyclists and walkers. If anyone had bothered to sit on my front porch for a single morning, they would realize that 200 East is a heavily traveled route for people NOT driving cars. This WILL be compromised if the development takes place. Although the proposed development plan includes pedestrian and bicycle walkways, it also admits that pedestrian comfort is decreased in areas with heavy car traffic, and similarly, cyclists avoid heavy automobile traffic on their commuter routes, which is what will result from the proposed bicycles daily, and these were only people polled within the study area. I have personal knowledge of at least 7 households (1-3) people that use this route for travel between Providence, Millville, or River Heights and downtown Logan or the University. These people were never polled, and this use was not quantified in the assessment. This non-motorized travel will be negatively impacted by converting 200 East into a major automobile thoroughfare, forcing pedestrians and cyclists to use 300 East or other roads further east, further compromising non-motorized connectivity and once again forcing the people that actually don’t contribute to Cache Valley’s air pollution problem further into the margins.

5. Use of Merlin Olsen Park ranked the highest importance for people polled about the neighborhood. The character, aesthetic, and safety of Merlin Olsen will deteriorate dramatically if the proposed 200 East plan goes through. Merlin Olsen is one of the best, if not the best, park in Logan. It is heavily used both in the winter and summer, and this use is concentrated on the South East and West sides of the park. The North side of the park, which is bounded by busy Center Street, gets very little use, probably because of the traffic on Center Street. If the 200 East development takes place, the park will shrink even more, and will be far less pedestrian-friendly. If the proposed development goes through, where will all the great events that take place in Merlin Olsen – and bring in important revenue for the city take place? These events include the Top of Utah marathon, the Ragnar Relay, and numerous other picnics, reunions, and parties that take place in the park.

Response to Comment ID #035

Response to 035-B
The comment infers that if more traffic is present, then non-motorized travelers will not use the corridor. The need to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections was identified in the early public involvement outreach. Public input suggests that there is currently a lack of connections for both cyclists and walkers. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s Transportation Master Plan. The Proposed Action is consistent with these plans to improve facilities and connectivity for non-motorized travel.

The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. Each of these elements of the Proposed Action is to be designed using applicable design standards for safe use by non-motorized travelers.

Response to 035-C
In response to Comments 5 and 6, as alternatives were considered, concerns were voiced about possible impacts to the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. Of particular concern was safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East between the parks in general and specifically during events such as the Gardeners’ Market. To respond to this concern a pedestrian undercrossing is included in the Proposed Action for non-motorized connectivity between the two parks. The organizers of the Gardeners’ Market were consulted during the development of the alternatives and the pedestrian undercrossing was added to the Proposed Action to address their concerns. Neither the Merlin Olsen Central Park nor Pioneer Parkway will shrink as a result of this project. Additional construction will take place within the parks to construct connections to non-motorized trails and pedestrian undercrossings. This construction will convert approximately 500 square feet to non-motorized trail connection and is consistent with the park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter ID #035</th>
<th>Response to Comment ID #035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>035-D</td>
<td><em>use and will not affect the function of the park.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035-E</td>
<td><em>The response to General Comment #2 &amp; 3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035-F</td>
<td><em>In response to Comment 8, currently accepted design standards and practices were used in developing the Proposed Action. The proposed grades do not represent a hazard nor are there any sight distance problems that would contribute to a hazard.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035-G</td>
<td><em>The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Commenter ID #036 | I am writing to express my concern regarding the 200 East Project in Logan. I am a resident of the neighborhood and feel strongly that the project is not a good idea given that it will have a large negative impact on the neighborhood and community. |
Commenter ID #036

The neighborhood south of Central Park is very nice, relatively quiet, and a great place to live. The beautiful and spacious Central Park is one of the great attributes of the neighborhood. The park provides a great space for recreational activities, picnics, and the Gardener's Market that attracts people from all over the valley.

Extending and widening 200 East would be very detrimental to the quality of life in the neighborhood and even the quality of life throughout Logan due to potential impacts to the Gardener's Market. Additional traffic through 200E and the island would disrupt the quiet life in that part of the Island. I live on 200 South and 300 East and I already feel like the traffic on 100 E effects my life. A busier 200 E would add noise, traffic and commotion to a peaceful area.

Given that 100 E has already been developed to allow a high volume of traffic from Logan to Providence, it seems unnecessary to modify 200 E. Maintaining beautiful and quiet historic neighborhood in Logan is of great importance. 200 E in the Island is not the right place to attempt to accommodate traffic given the importance of Central Park to the neighborhood and the community and the value of the surrounding neighborhood as-is.

Thank you for your time.

Response to Comment ID #036

The response to General Comment #1 and #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see those responses at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #037

I am writing to express my concern for the proposed road project on 200 East in Logan, Utah. I live on 300 East and would probably move if such a proposal went through on the street I live on. I think the No Build alternative is a good idea, or at the very least use 100 East since it already connects over the river. The idea of bringing that kind of increased traffic into my neighborhood does not sound pleasant. I do not want to live on Main for a reason, and I don't want to see 200 East become the next Main. I don't like riding my bike on main for fear of the traffic, and the farmer’s market at the park by 200 East is one of my favorite biking destinations. Please do not bring this upon the people who like the quiet, non highway like part of Logan we live in.

Response to Comment ID #037

Thank you for your comments.

Commenter ID #038

Dear Mr. Neff, I am very much opposed to the 200 East project. I am a vendor at the gardeners market. This project will kill the market at this wonderful site. This is a unique site with the park like setting to ram a 4 lane street through would destroy the character. As it is now it's a pretty safe biking area because 200 east is not really a through street. Poor planning. All to get traffic off main street. Also the cost .I thought we we're all supposed to tighten our belt and do with less. You do know what a great park this is .Thank you

Response to Comment ID #038

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Response to Comment ID #039

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to Comment ID #040

In response to comments received, modeled noise levels were re-evaluated per the Traffic Noise Modeling (TNM). Revised results are provided in Response to General Comment 4. The revised noise analysis did not identify any increases to noise as a result of the Proposed Action that would be considered an impact requiring mitigation under UDOT’s Noise Policy.

The response to General Comment #4 speaks to the items raised by this comment regarding noise. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

With regard to the Environmental Justice, the Proposed Action would not disproportionately impact populations meeting the definition of low-income or racial/ethnic minorities. The project team met one-on-one with each of the potentially displaced residents.

With regard to non-motorized crossings, as alternatives were considered, concerns were voiced about possible impacts to the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. Of particular concern was safety for pedestrians crossing 200 East between the parks in general and specifically during events such as the Gardeners’ Market. To respond to this concern a pedestrian undercrossing is included in the Proposed Action for non-motorized connectivity between the two parks. The organizers of the Gardeners’ Market were consulted during the development of the alternatives and the pedestrian undercrossing was added to the Proposed Action to address their concerns.
The EA states that “Although the traffic volumes will occur incrementally over a period of 25 years, this increase in traffic is not anticipated to create isolation amongst segments of the community, alter the interactions between groups or individuals, or change social relationships within the Study Area.” This is a faulty finding. Increased traffic will directly, physically and emotionally cut the neighborhood in half. As it is right now, my neighbor’s kids freely ride their bikes in the street. This will become very dangerous. I lived on 200 East North of Center and the feeling between these two neighborhoods is drastically different. This issue is not addressed appropriately and realistically. I currently can walk across the street to talk with my neighbors at any time. If the traffic increases even half of the proposed traffic, this will drastically change and alter the feeling of my neighborhood. This issue has never been openly discussed directly with the people who live on this street.

The city plan is to relocate my neighbors living one block South. The homes on one side will be bought and the people relocated. The EA states that the new property will still be used for residential buildings and can be developed as such. This is not explained how it will be redeveloped or how this development will change the character of the community. Will they be rentals? They are currently single-family home owners who have lived there for many years. The EA states, “The corresponding property would also be redeveloped for continued residential use.” Without a clear plan proposed for how that property will be redeveloped, we have not been clearly informed about how the character of our neighborhood will change. Most of the houses in our neighborhood are large lots, family homes, with long term families living in the homes. How will they maintain this characteristic when they develop these lands after removing the historic houses currently on the land?

The EA never looks at how the neighborhoods North of Center and South of Center differ. Most likely, my neighborhood, south of Center will end up looking and feeling more like the neighborhoods North of Center street on 200 East. These have a drastically different feel to them. This is because 200 East is quite a bit more busy North of center. Once the throughway is made, both sides will be even busier. The findings that state the neighborhood will not change, is false. This has not been clearly explained to the public.

**Response to Comment ID #040**

_The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document._

_Comments noted._

**Response to 040-B**

_The process of relocating residents whose properties are affected by the project will conform to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC /4601). The City would relocate residents and acquire the property so structures can be removed that will be affected by the project. The parcels needed for right-of-way would be retained as such and remaining land would be re-sold to private individuals._

_The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document._

_Comments noted._
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Response to Comment ID #040

Response 040-C
There will be perceived changes in the feeling of the neighborhood resulting from the Proposed Action, however, the Proposed Action is not expected to affect land uses in the Study Area. The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response 040-D
The project cannot compensate property owners for properties that are not directly affected. The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response 040-E
Even though there were individuals that did not respond to the survey, it is certain that the Proposed Action would not disproportionately impact populations meeting the definition of low-income or racial/ethnic minorities. The project team met one-on-one with each of the potentially displaced residents.
Commenter ID #040

Not all alternatives were included. In fact, one of the major alternatives not listed is using Pioneer Park to connect 200 East to 100 East. The city could easily build the same ramp, but angle it along Pioneer Park towards 100 East. The current proposal assumes that the project would have to remove all the houses along Poplar (100 East). This is not true if they cut into Pioneer Park. The ramp could curve up towards Center street skirting the power station and the rock fireplace. This would direct traffic back down to where a new bridge was already built and save the city money. Also, it would preserve the Park from high traffic, would save the Farmer’s Market area, and could help provide a better walking path to downtown through the parks. The city would also not have to relocate the families…most whom do not want to move from their homes. Also, none of the plans address how pedestrians walk ways should connect Pioneer Park to Garff Wayside Gardens. The connection between Garff Wayside Gardens and Pioneer Park is quite dangerous. This alternative would provide room to build an underpass or overpass for pedestrians connecting Garff Wayside Gardens. This alternative was not looked at. By doing this, less homes would need to be removed, if any homes, and it would connect with 100 East which already has the bridge.

Response to Comment ID #040

Response to 040-F

The alternative described by the commenter is developed to avoid impacts to properties along 200 East, but it does not address the transportation needs identified. This proposed alternative does not address projected travel demand for the corridor, and results in an overall reduction of north-south travel capacity. Additionally, it includes some of the same connectivity limitations as other alternatives that were evaluated. It does not provide regional connectivity since the 100 East corridor is not continuous through the urban area. The most relevant elements of this suggested alternative were considered with other alternatives in the EA namely “Build Alternative 1: 100 East”. The suggested alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the project and including it does not correct geometric deficiencies at the intersection of 200 East and 200 South; it does not correct geometric deficiencies along 200 East between 200 South and 300 South, it would not improve operational deficiencies at the intersection of 200 East and Center Street, and it would not improve operational deficiencies at the intersection of 200 East and 300 South. Additionally, the Proposed Alternative would have an adverse impact on a Section 4(f) resource (Pioneer Parkway) and would likely include impacts to other historic resources in the area (i.e. historic homes located along the 100 South). The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 040-G

The noise analysis follows accepted practices and uses the Traffic Noise Modeling (TNM) to model projected noise levels.

The response to General Comment #4 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Lastly, the graphs in the proposal show future sound conditions as being the exact same as current sound conditions. This is misleading. The tables are inaccurate. Future sound levels will obviously increase. To get a real idea of how much, sound levels off Main street and sound levels off 200 East North of Center should be provided to compare the noises. Also, sound levels should correlate with the amount of traffic that passes on the roads during that time. If the research showed noise levels alongside how much traffic, cars, per hour, then we could get an accurate read on noise levels and be able to predict future noise levels. Once this research is clearly done, citizens could get an accurate read as to how much noise will increase in their homes. This is a misleading research design with inaccurate data. After living on 200 East north of center, I can vouch for the difference in sound levels. They are all predicted to go up, and the biggest change in sound levels will be in the section of neighborhood I live in.

One last side note is that Farmer’s Market is a big part of this project. Nowhere in Assessment did anyone set up a booth at Farmer’s Market or get opinions from people who attend Farmer’s Market. One possible proposal would be to agree to close 200 East for Farmer’s Market. Many cities close major streets for a few hours. Farmer’s Markets are increasing across the United States. Logan Farmer’s market has increased over double since this study. It is a place for the community to gather on the weekends. It supports the agricultural community and agrarian history of this community. The fact that this was never once brought up in any aspect of the plan shows the lack of concern and care this project has for the community it is supposed to serve.

I am not completely against building; however, I do not feel the city has made a wise decision in making 200 East a major collector. First, the city should look at making Main Street traffic flow better. They should reduce left hand turns, time lights better, and possibly create center dividers to create one way traffic flow. Second the city did not look at all possible alternatives to connecting 200 East to 100 East without losing historic buildings ruining old and established neighborhoods in Logan. As it is, Logan is serving the people outside of the city rather than make life better for the people who live in Logan. Rather than maintain our neighborhoods, they are increasing noise, increasing traffic, and making our neighborhood more dangerous so that Millville and Smithfield residents can drive through Logan faster. The Environmental Assessment did not measure noise levels accurately and it did not measure environmental justice accurately. Both of these were flawed research designs. I would like to see all of these issues addressed before I would be willing to accept that 200 East should become a major collector. I would prefer to see the city conduct the research better and respond to these issues so that this does not have to go into litigation. Please feel free to call or email me at any time for further questions.

Changes in noise level may be perceived but the modeled noise levels per the TNM did not result in measurable changes from existing noise levels.

The response to General Comment #4 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Traffic signals are periodically optimized in Logan to the extent possible; however, on two-way corridors there is limited possibility to optimize signal timing. Optimizing traffic signals on Main Street helps traffic flow on Main Street, but it does not eliminate the projected travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street. Enhancing signal configuration on Main Street will not preclude the need for another continuous transportation corridor east of Main Street.
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Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Response to Comment ID #041

Commenter ID #041

Neighborhood Questions & Concerns Regarding Proposed Modifications to 200 East Street between Center Street & 300 South:
Logan residents living in the area of 200 East Street south of Center Street have made many comments to me including questions and concerns they have regarding the impacts of the proposed changes to the existing roadway through their neighborhood.
I have been approached, in my capacity as Neighborhood District Chair for the Wilson neighborhood, a neighborhood which will be heavily impacted by this work, to request your attention and reflections with regard to the following comments, questions, and concerns.

041-A  * Is there a purpose for this project at this time?
River Height City has expressed little interest and no timetable for the extension of a road to connect to 200 East in Logan at any time in the near future due to the high costs of road and bridge construction. So the question becomes, what is the point of Logan's involvement in this project at this time?
Does Logan have the funds or the desire to put another bridge over the Logan River at this time?
Shouldn't River Heights City's portion of the project be completed, or at least a timetable established, before Logan City proceeds with its portion of the project?

041-B  * Isn't this a project which will only benefit those living in communities to the south of Logan at the expense of neighborhoods in Logan?
Won't the only beneficial results of this particular project be a shortening of drive times between people who work in Logan but choose to live in outlying communities to the south?
Is it really in the best interest of Logan City to promote and encourage the movement of individuals with good paying jobs to live in outlying communities at the expense of higher infrastructure and maintenance costs for those who have chosen to live in Logan?
Wouldn't it be a better idea for Logan City to encourage the building of larger homes (with their higher property tax values) in Logan City rather than disrupting Logan's neighborhoods as it encourages the building of new neighborhoods in outlying communities?

Response to 041-A
The CMPO RTP includes a 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street.
Funds are not currently identified for a project to construct another bridge crossing of the Logan River; however, it does remain on the CMPO RTP to meet north-south travel demand.
Projects will be completed to implement the CMPO RTP as funds are identified.

Response to 041-B
The proposed project responds to needs in the project area as well as addresses project travel demand for the corridor.
The Proposed Action does not respond to specific individuals, but addresses needs identified by CMPO and Logan City. The Proposed Action responds to anticipated travel demand and does not distinguish which individuals contribute to that travel demand. The CMPO and Logan City identified that there is a need for additional north-south capacity east of Main Street. The 200 East Corridor is identified as the corridor that would meet those needs.
The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Commenter ID #041

* Do the resident's of Logan have any real voice in the decision making process that so directly effects their lives with regard to this or other City projects?

Many individuals who have attended City meetings regarding this project over the years have been told that their concerns, ideas, and recommendations will be given serious consideration.

Unfortunately, many I have spoken with don't believe that their expressions of concern or ideas for improvement have had any impact on the progress or design of this project which will directly impact their futures.

The design process should be transparent to city residents and should be as much as possible, a collaborative process between the City and its residents so that both will be satisfied with the results.

The City's role should be to determine the future needs of the city and the Citizens should be REAL partners in the decision-making process by which those needs will be met.

As things stand at present it seems to some that the city engineering department goes through the motions of involving citizens in projects as required by law, but then proceeds with its internally predetermined design solution without ever really considering the input or concerns expressed by the public.

Further, the public has the feeling that they cannot identify and speak with the individual or individuals who are actually making the decisions. This feeling has generated cynicism on the part of the public with regards to their involvement in city projects in general, and frustration toward the city and its engineering department regarding this project in particular.

Comments and Question Regarding:
The INTERSECTION @ CENTER STREET & 200 EAST

It is true that every community needs a competent road system to tie the community together.

It is true that a well designed road system is one of many functional needs of any community's infrastructure.

But a community's road system should NEVER be allowed to DICTATE the development of a community.

Beyond serving the limited function of moving vehicles from place to place, it contributes little to the civic life and vitality of a community.

No one will ever move to Logan, or remain in Logan, based on their

Response to 041-C

Logan City and the CMPO have conducted extensive public involvement as part of community planning as well as part of this specific project.

Even though there are individuals who express opposition, the City is proposing to address transportation needs with the proposed project. The City included both project specific elements and new projects to respond to public input. Non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street were included in this project to respond to public concerns about non-motorized connections. Additionally, Logan City is planning a locally funded city project to respond to concerns about vehicular and pedestrian safety in other areas of 200 East.
Commenter ID #041

admiration of our asphalt covered streets with our vast collection of our-way stoplights.
But they will move to, and remain in Logan, if they see a community which values livability and shows civic pride through public works which transcend the mundane and ordinary.
Such projects are seen as an indication of a community's character and a reflection of a community's pride in itself.

In Logan, Center Street and Main Street from the skeletal framework around which Logan was settled and from which it has grown. These are the two streets from which Logan measures distance and determines its direction. They form the structural loom upon which the fabric of Logan has been woven.

In short, those two streets are fundamentally important to Logan's past and indispensably linked to its future. Projects which impact any aspect of development on those two streets must receive the most thorough and probing consideration.

Because of its importance to Logan the decision that will determine the intersection at Center Street and 200 East requires the most serious and thoughtful deliberation!

Logan is in the process of creating a grand north-south boulevard which will link our valley in a new way. Its route should be marked and celebrated by a series of focal points along the way. The intersection at Center Street and 200 East should be developed as one of those focal points. This intersection represents an opportunity for Logan to show its civil pride and it is an opportunity that Logan must not squander.

Give Logan and Center Street the grand solution it deserves and desires! Do not settle for the minimal effort that computer software has guesstimated it will require. Begin the writing of Logan's future in capital letters at Center Street and 200 East with a monumentally historic and beautifully appointed Round-About!

Response to Comment ID #041

A roundabout was considered at Center Street and 200 East; however, it was determined that a roundabout would not sufficiently accommodate the projected travel demand.
Commenter ID #041

* Do we really need a four-way stoplight at Center Street and 200 East?
I believe that the general traffic volumes projected in the Environmental Assessment are probably as close a guess as to what the future might hold as we can get from 20 years distance. But, I also believe that the idea that anyone can develop an analysis of the resulting traffic patterns and can accurately project the resulting traffic volumes at any specific intersections twenty years in the future is an impossible task based on the following:

1) The traffic projections used to calculate the need for a four-way stoplight at the intersection of Center Street and 200 East are based on the belief that 200 East will cross the river at approximately 350 South and that it will carry high traffic volumes between Logan and other communities. Since the extension of 200 East south to River Heights is unlikely to occur in the near future, and may not ever occur, the traffic volumes used for the projected needs of an intersection at Center Street and 200 East may well be inaccurate and overestimated.

2) Since 200 East is planned to connect to 100 East on the south side of the Logan River, I expect that the future traffic projections are based on the assumption that drivers traveling north on 100 East will shift from 100 East to 200 East at the junction of the two roads and that they will proceed to the intersection at Center Street and 200 East. But, the reality of the driving experience is that drivers are very savvy about determining and modifying their driving routes and will vary them based on individual driver’s destinations, tasks to be accomplished during the course of their drive, personal preferences, deadlines, driving experience, driver’s desire for variety, and the day’s traffic flow. Further, drivers traveling north or south through the valley will be able to choose to make the shift between 100 East and 200 East at any intersection between 800 North and 400 South. That means that they have the choice of 13 possible intersections at which to make the one block shift. But only ~ out of those 13 choices would route them through the intersection at Center Street and 200 East.

Any analysis of the possible traffic patterns used to guesstimate the traffic volumes at the intersection of Center Street and 200 East from twenty years distance must be acknowledged to be, at best, only an educated guess. Further, that analysis must acknowledge the reality of at least 13 possible driving options that will be available to drivers. For that reason I believe that the stated need for a four-way stoplight at Center Street and 200 East is, in all probability, overstated.

Response to Comment ID #041

Response to 041-E
The best tool for estimating travel demand on a transportation network is a travel demand mode (TDM). The TDM estimates where travel will occur based on anticipated land use, the trips that those land uses are expected to generate, and the path that those trips will likely follow. Local planning efforts, including the CMPO RTP, identifies that a continuous north-south corridor will be needed to accommodate travel demand east of Main Street. Additionally, the CMPO RTP identifies the 200 East corridor as part of a system to meet travel demand. The TDM estimates the traffic that will use the corridor. The projected travel demands of 200 East and Center Street combined are such that a roundabout would not sufficiently carry the traffic. A signalized intersection is identified as the best configuration to address those intersecting traffic flows.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
3) In the Environment Assessment of the "Round-About" option it is determined that a roundabout fails to meet required standards in only one category out of six categories. The one category in which it failed to receive a passing mark is based on a projection which is based on a guess as to the traffic volumes and traffic patterns seen twenty years in the future. As noted above, the traffic volume may or may not be accurate, but the analysis of the traffic patterns is most likely faulty based on the number of driver route options. If a review of the analysis of future traffic patterns were made using a more expanded view of driver's options I believe it would be found that a round-about would pass all six categories and would be found to be an acceptable solution to the future traffic volumes found at Center Street and 200 East.

4) The idea of installing yet another set of four-way stoplights at this very important intersection is a dull and unimaginative solution to traffic flow. Another set of stoplights in Logan would result in yet another unremarkable and immediately forgettable intersection in a community filled with unremarkable and immediately forgettable intersections. It would amount to the squandering of an important opportunity to create something memorable within our community. Another set of four-way stoplight would show that, even though Logan is developing this great north-south boulevard, it is not interested enough, or imaginative enough, to make it a grand expression of Logan's future and is willing to settle for yet another functional but sterile intersection.

*Why not create the solution that the people of Logan want, and, at the same time, the solution that Center Street deserves? Those individuals who have expressed an opinion on the future of the intersection at Center Street and 200 East have replied with a clear voice. They believe that Center Street is important to this community and that it deserves a better fate than becoming just another street defined by its series of stoplights and stop signs. They believe that the intersection at Center Street

Response to Comment ID #041

Response to 041-F

Travel demand projections are estimated by use of CMPO’s Travel Demand Model (TDM). The use of this model is more fully described in the response to General Comment #1. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 041-G

The installation of a traffic signal at Center Street and 200 East has several advantages including:

- It accommodates projected travel demand.
- It provides for signalized pedestrian crossing with protected pedestrian phases with the use of a push button.
- It meets all of the needs for travel demand and non-motorized travel without impacts to adjacent homes and park land.

A roundabout is a useful intersection improvement in many circumstances. It has advantages for certain locations. A roundabout is not well-suited for use at this location because it does not accommodate the projected travel demand. It is conceivable that a roundabout could carry the project travel demand, but it would need to be so large that it would greatly impact adjacent homes and city parks.
and 200 East should be and could be an expression of civic pride. The people of Logan want a ROUND-ABOUT! They want a grand expression of the importance of Center Street to Logan's past and a point from which the vision of Logan's future can radiate. The people of Logan want a grandly monumental expression of community pride, not just another meaningless four-way stoplight. A round-about filled with art and landscape will say to visitors and residents alike that Logan sets a high standard and places a great value on celebrating its past and its future.

A monumental round-about at Center Street and 200 East will be immediately noted and remembered by all who pass by as a landmark in Cache Valley. Center Street and 200 South will immediately become a focal point in the community and an anchor on the new north-south boulevard. A focal point from which distance, time, and direction are measured. A landmark that will matter to the people of Logan, and a place which points the way toward Logan's future self.

General Question Regarding:
Proposed Layout of 200 EAST between 200 SOUTH & 300 SOUTH

* What will happen with the surplus property the City plans to purchase to widen the road?
In several cases the resulting surplus property will be too small to allow for the creation of new building lots. If that is the case, what will happen to the property and who will be responsible for its maintenance?

The Logan City General Plan states in the "General Plan Policies" section that, "All capital improvement projects must be consistent with the General Plan." It is the contention of those in the Wilson neighborhood that this project is not consistent with the General Plan for the following reasons:

Response to Comment ID #041

Response to 041-H

The process of relocating residents whose properties are affected by the project will conform to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC /4601). The City would relocate residents and acquire the property so structures can be removed that will be affected by the project. The parcels needed for right-of-way would be retained as such and remaining land would be resold to private individuals. If remaining lots are too small for new building lots the lots may be combined or reconfigured so parcels can be useful.

The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter ID #041</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>041-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * In the Guiding Principles section of the General Plan it states, "Our vision of Logan is... (to be) a place where a person or family, once established in a neighborhood can be happy remaining through all phases of life"
| Yet this project will remove home owners from their homes because although their homes comply with all city building codes with relation to their placement on 200 East the City has decided that it must correct a "Geometric Deficiency" of its own creation by removing those individuals from their homes. It seems as though the City believes that at any time, the layout of any given street trumps the needs of the people who have invested their lives in a home located on that street. |
| 041-J             |
| *Executive Summary section of the General Plan states. " ... these new tools will help to maintain the momentum for growth within the City and will help prevent sprawling growth from covering our countryside."
| It is believed that the only result of this project will be continued sprawl up and down the valley with its associated increase in valley air pollution and higher traffic volumes through Logan's residential neighborhoods. Is it really in the best interest of Logan's economic health to promote and encourage the idea that people with high paying jobs in Logan to live in other communities and Logan will subsidize their choice to live elsewhere by building a road system through our neighborhoods so that those individuals will have shortened drive times between home and work? Logan City will through this project, be promoting, encouraging, and subsidizing the movement of families with higher incomes away from Logan and into outlying communities by building a system of quick and easy routes from their home to their jobs. |
| 041-K             |
| * The General Plan states, " ... an increase in rentals in neighborhoods causes homeowners to leave and will destabilize the existing population. Neighborhood deterioration will result. Many homeowners remain in these neighborhoods because they like where they live and they want to stay. Citizens should have the ability to choose to remain in their neighborhoods..."
| The proposed removal of home owners and the retention of rental units directly contradicts the stated goals and direction espoused in the General Plan. It seems that the proposed street layout was selected simply because it represented the easiest engineering design solution and that little or no regard was placed on the resulting destabilizing influence and deteriorating impacts it would have on the neighborhood. |

Response to Comment ID #041

Response to 041-I

**The project will result in the acquisition and relocation of nine homes.**

Those landowners will be compensated based on the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended, (42 USC /4601) which requires that compensation be based on the Fair Market Value. Additionally, there are relocation benefits available to defray the certain costs of relocation.

The removal of these homes will be apparent to the neighborhood until the time that these properties are landscaped and redeveloped. This project is not expected to change the land use for the area.

Response to 041-J

This comment claims that continued “sprawl” will result from this Proposed Action. One of the needs for this project is in part to meet projected travel demand. This travel demand is based on the individual land use plans for each municipality within the CMPO. Those individual land use plans are each community’s expectation of how they will grow. The combined land use plans become the basis for the travel demand model and its travel demand projections. As a result, the need for the proposed project is in response to the demands resulting from the projected growth.

Response to 041-K

When considering alternatives, this project must consider right-of-way impacts, relocation impacts, impacts to Section 4(f) resources, etc. It cannot make decisions to impact one type of resident or another (e.g. renters or owners). One of the driving factors for identifying a Proposed Action was the evaluation of Section 4(f). 4(f) resources include public parks and recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic properties. Chapter 4, Section 4(f) Evaluation of the EA considered alternatives to avoid impacts to 4(f) resources. That evaluation considered an alternative to shift the alignment to the west. That evaluation indicated that impact to properties considered to be 4(f)
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #041

041-L * The General Plan states, "First, the Logan housing stock exhibits a high percentage of rental property. Second, only 41% of housing within the City is detached single family homes while 49% are multi-family structures." Later it states, "...it is the City's goal is to increase home ownership opportunities and housing diversity for all family sizes and income levels."

The planned removal of single family homes is not in keeping with the stated goals of the General Plan. A stated goal of the General Plan is to create a more balanced mix of single family homes and multifamily structures. In addition, the island area has a significantly higher percentage of rental units to owner occupied homes than is found in the rest of the city. Therefore the removal of single family homes and the retention of rental units runs counter to the General Plan and to the development of a quality community.

041-M * The General Plan states, "Logan's residents desire neighborhood stability and the enhancement of overall neighborhood quality. The older single family neighborhoods of the City are deteriorating to the point where young families no longer desire to make their homes in these areas." Later, it states, "erosion of the single family residential base always follows the conversion of single family homes to mixed residential development" and that, "Restoring these neighborhoods is complicated and costly."

With regard to the Wilson neighborhood in particular, the General Plan states, "The island neighborhood was in decline for several years, but is now being reinvigorated by the movement of young couples and families buying homes that were previously rentals."

It is believed that the planned removal of home owners and the retention of rental units on 200 East will be a significant and costly step backwards for the island neighborhood which is a troubled but slowly improving part of the city. On the other hand, if the widening of the road were accomplished through the removal of rental units it would be an important step forward in traffic flow while providing a significant and important improvement in the character of the neighborhood.

Response to Comment ID #041

properties could not be avoided. Shifting the roadway alignment to west would result in the relocation of ten homes that qualify for 4(f) protection (one more than the preferred alternative). This alternative would also require strip takes from nine homes that qualify for 4(f) protection, resulting in 5 more relocations than the Preferred Alternative.

Response to 041-L & 041-M

When considering alternatives, this project must consider right-of-way impacts, relocation impacts, impacts to Section 4(f) resources, etc. It cannot make decision to impact one type of resident or another (e.g. renters or owners).
Comments on Final EA for Logan 200 E. Minor Arterial
June 14, 2011

Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Response to Comment ID #041

* The General Plan states, "The City must ensure transportation improvements preserve neighborhood character and quality." It states also that, "street design (must be) compatible with quality neighborhoods."

The proposed layout of 200 East between 200 South and 300 South was not determined based on preserving neighborhood character or quality and that the proposed street layout does not consider the quality of the neighborhood it will leave in its wake. Since these issues are incorporated in the City's General Plan they must be taken into account when making the road layout selection. With that being the case it is appropriate and necessary that this issue be addressed by the City Planning Department, Engineering Department and in the Environmental Assessment document.

Response to 041-N

New transportation projects are a part of all local plans to respond to expected travel demand. To propagate those elements that Logan identifies as necessary for community character, Logan City applies standards for new street construction. The elements of the Proposed Action that help maintain community character and consistency with existing neighborhoods include:

- Park strips behind the curb and gutter for separation from the street to the sidewalk. To be consistent with Logan City design standards, trees would be planted within all newly constructed park strips. Existing trees would be protected to the fullest extent possible.
- Sidewalks would exist on both sides of 200 East throughout the proposed project area.
- Marked pedestrian crossings would be provided across 200 East and across side streets at intersections.
- A combined on-street parking and bicycle lane would be included on both sides of the street.
- Connections to trails and walkways would be installed.
- Pedestrian undercrossings would be installed under 200 East between Pioneer Parkway and Merlin Olsen Central Park; and under Center Street to connect Merlin Olsen Central Park to a bike path extending up Boulevard Street.

Response to 041-O

WHAT CRITERIA WAS USED TO DETERMINE THE PROPOSED STREET LAYOUT of 200 EAST between 200 SOUTH and 300 SOUTH?

It is acknowledged and understood that both single-family occupied property owners and rental income property owners have equal rights to retain their property under the law. With that having been said the question becomes what criteria was used to determine which set of property owners would lose their homes and which would remain?

Initially someone in the City made the decision that the property owners on the east side of the street would bear the brunt of this project. The rational behind that decision has not been discussed or explained. Rather it was assumed that the reasoning behind the decision was simply understood as being the only reasonable choice available. But the justification for the decision to remove some property owners while others remain must be based in response to this and several of the comments above regarding why certain properties are proposed to be impacted, the driving environmental issue identified in the EA was Section 4(f) which involves requirements for transportation projects with regard to potentially historic properties or public recreation properties. All of the alternatives evaluated in the Section 4(f) evaluation involve impacts to a number of Section 4(f) properties of similar or greater magnitude than the Proposed Action. It was determined that to meet the needs for the project, some impacts would occur and there were no alternatives meeting the Purpose and Need that did not impact similar numbers of 4(f) resources. Additionally, the commenter correctly points out that the
on some criteria larger than the simplest roadway layout option. If both groups have equal rights to retain their property, then a legally defensible explanation must be given to justify the decision to deny one set of property owners their rights while upholding the rights of others. The decision used to remove property owners from their homes must not be based on the simplistic and completely arbitrary decision to base the proposed street layout on that which is easiest to engineer. It is not acceptable to remove a collection of individuals from their homes simply because engineers have decided that something as trivial as a "geometric deficiency" trumps those individual's rights to their property. Yet that appears to be exactly what has happened in this situation! The justification for the removal of families and couples from homes in which they have lived for multiple generations must be based on the answers to larger questions such as: what is best for those living on the street, what is best for the larger Wilson Neighborhood, and what is best for the Logan community at large. The "de minimus" standard is an unbiased means of determining answers to those questions. As such it must be included in the analysis of road layout options when it results in a decision as fundamentally important as which property is retained and which is lost.

The "DE MINIMUS" STANDARD versus The PROPOSED LAYOUT of 200 EAST between 200 SOUTH to 300 SOUTH

The Environmental Assessment refers to the "de minimus" principle as a part of its assessment of the impacts of this project. The term refers to the idea that one should do as little harm as possible in the accomplishment of one's goal. The Environmental Assessment clearly states that the proposed engineering solution of running 200 East directly south from the intersection at 200 South violates the principle in every case in which a home is slated to be removed. I believe that this standard should have been applied during the design process as one of the criteria used to determine the best design solution, rather than determining whether or not the standard has been met after a design solution has been selected. The fact that the Environment Assessment states that the proposed road layout fails to meet the de minimus standard in every case in which it is applied indicates that meeting the de minimus standard was not considered an important criteria during the design process.

While the engineering department did explore street layout options involving the removal of homes on the east side and the west side of the street, they didn't apply the de minimus standard as one of the criteria used in selecting the best option.

Response to Comment ID #041

project cannot make value judgments between renters or owners. Consequently, the Proposed Action plans a configuration that promotes the best consistency through the corridor for alignment, cross-section, and intersection alignment.

Response to 041-P

The proposal in this comment does not reduce the number of impacted 4(f) resources as stated. Since 4(f) resources exist on both sides of the street in roughly equal numbers, the impacts are essentially the same with either shift as presented. Since impacts occur regardless of where the alignment is located, the Proposed Action best meets the transportation needs including meeting operational needs and meeting geometric needs. Again, the commenter correctly points out that the project cannot make value judgments between renters or owners. Consequently, the Proposed Action plans a configuration that promotes the best consistency through the corridor for alignment, cross-section, and intersection alignment.
If the de minimus standard were applied as a part of the design process it would help determine which layout represented the lowest cost to the community, the least impact to its residents, and the minimum disruption to the neighborhood?

*In an effort to determine the most cost effective and least harmful layout option (the option which most closely meets the de minimus standard and the stated goals of Logan's General Plan) the following is offered as a summary of impacts caused by the two proposed street layouts (removal of structures from the east side of block versus the removal of structures from the west side of block):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removal of Homes from East Side of Block</th>
<th>Removal of Homes from West Side of Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homes removed which qualify for Historic Homes removed which qualify for Historic Designation under NRHP guidelines</td>
<td>Homes removed which qualify for Historic Designation under NRHP guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NRHP = National Register of Historic Places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate Cost of Purchasing 9 Structures for Demolition $1,262,360
Approximate Cost of Purchasing 6 Structures for Demolition $726,910
(Potential Project Cost Reduction $535,450)
(Approximate -Cache County Property Tax Valuation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Property Tax Paid per Year</th>
<th>County Property Tax Paid per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,650</td>
<td>$4,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Potential County Tax Income Lost per Year $3,670)</td>
<td>(Approximate -Cache County Property Tax Valuation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of the demolition of 9 structures 100%
Cost of the demolition of 6 structures 67%
(Potential Project Cost Reduction 33%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homes involved in &quot;Taking&quot; of Property</th>
<th>Homes involved in &quot;Taking&quot; of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (Cost of &quot;Taking&quot; property 100%)</td>
<td>3 (Cost of &quot;Taking&quot; property 75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Response to Comment ID #041

Commenter ID #041
(Potential Project Cost Reduction ............... 25%)

Owner Occupied Homes Removed 9    Owner Occupied Homes Removed 3
Renter Occupied Units Removed 0    Renter Occupied Units Removed 3

It is hoped that this analysis of the effects of the proposed road layout options may assist in the determination of the solution which would most closely meets the intent of the de minimus standard and would result in the least harm to the neighborhood and the greatest benefits to the community.

A Better Street Layout Proposal for 200 East Between 200 South and 300 South:
If it is determined that the least impactful and therefore the best result would be achieved by laying out the street to the west side of the block, the question becomes how can a street layout to the west be accomplished while achieving the goal of continuity of vehicular movement at 200 E. & 200 S.

The answer to that question is that, the BEST road layout is not found in a straight line. The best solution is not found in the street layout to the east or the west side of the block, but rather a hybrid layout of the two choices.

The best design solution would involve lining up the streets at the intersection of 200 East and 200 South. The layout would proceed south for a short distance before swinging to the west side of the block and then swinging again to the south and proceeding to 300 South. The resulting layout would be easily driven, simply engineered, and elegantly livable. A layout like this would be easily engineered with the application of large radii in its two curving arcs and the adherence to and application of current road safety engineering standards.

It is understood that there would be two concerns to be considered when proposing that the layout of 200 East swinging to the west. The first major concern might be that the resulting street would deviate from the normal street alignment found in Logan. It wouldn't run straight north-south or east-west. This is not a serious concern for the following reasons:

1) The majority of roadways in Logan are made up of straight streets which form a grid. While that layout is convenient for determining direction and distance to various locations, it is nevertheless a very boring layout from a driver's prospective. Drivers enjoy variety and curving streets generate more interest than straight streets. Drivers enjoy the new extension of 100 East because it curves and seems more like a parkway than a street. In addition, the

Response to 041-Q
The suggestion described by the commenter was evaluated in the EA in Chapter 4. This alternative resulted in more impacts to homes and more impacts to Section 4(f) resources than the Proposed Action.
future layout of 200 East from 300 South to River Heights will incorporate a multi-curving layout. For that reason a curving layout of 200 East between 200 South and 300 South would not be seen as an anomaly.

2) Curving streets tend to increase driver awareness of road conditions and would therefore result in increased pedestrian safety.

The second concern might involve the fact that 200 East would not align with the cul-de-sac on the south side of 300 South. The argument against this being an important concern is that the intersecting street on the south side of 300 South is a very short cul-de-sac that generates little traffic. Therefore, the problem resulting from the non-alignment of those two streets would be limited to those very few individuals who live in the cul-de-sac. The few residents impacted would quickly adapt to the situation and it would result in limited difficulties. In addition, the non-alignment of streets would be an issue of short term duration. The concern will be eliminated when 200 East is extended to River Heights. When that occurs the cul-de-sac will require widening and its access would be re-configured to match with 200 East on the north side of the intersection. As a result the non-alignment issue at the intersection will be corrected and the problem of non-alignment will be eliminated as a concern.

CONCLUSION: The Logan City General Plan states, "To achieve a great community there must be a relentless commitment to the preservation and creation of a quality community. This commitment realizes that Every project matters! Every building matters! Every decision matters!" This project matters to the affected residents of the island neighborhood and to the future community that Logan will become. It is my hope that the fundamental statement of belief found in the General Plan will be reflected in the decisions made regarding this project and that Logan will be a more enjoyable and a more livable community because of the choices made.

Thank you again for your attention to these thoughts, questions, and ideas.
Comments on Final EA for Logan 200 E. Minor Arterial
June 14, 2011

Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #042

I own one of the houses that will be taken in this project. We bought the home planning to fix it up and retire in it. Not only will we lose our home, but we probably won’t qualify to buy a new one because my husband was laid off and out of work for 9 months. We have 5 children and don’t want to lose the home we LOVE! We’d also hate to see the negative impact on the park with bringing 200 E through. Also reconnecting with 100 E will be a major traffic hazard. Why go forward with this project when you don’t even have the funds to complete it?!

Response to Comment ID #042

Funding for project construction will be allotted as the planning and design phases of the project are completed.

Commenter ID #043

I am concerned about buying a new home. I made a lot more money when we bought this home. The value has gone down. Now I’m being forced to sell in a bad market and a bad time for my family. I hope this is taken into consideration when my home is purchased by the government.

Response to Comment ID #043

It is not possible in these comment responses to comment on the specifics of individual property acquisitions, however, some general information can be provided.

When property is acquired for right-of-way it is a requirement of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC /4601) that Fair Market Value be offered. The Fair Market Value is an appraised value of the property and is not affected by other current dynamics such as “short sales”.

The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the right-of-way process raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Commenter ID #044

I would like to submit comments for the Logan 200 East Project. I think that we should not “improve” 200 East for several reasons:

It is yet another old neighborhood sacrifice for increasing automobile traffic - we should not be ruining old neighborhoods for the sake of getting people from one place to another more quickly in automobiles. Doing so just makes it easier to drive, which encourages more driving and then yet more road construction through valuable residential areas; the Island area is already taking too much of a beating with Center street becoming a thoroughfare rather than a neighborhood street and 100 East becoming a busier street.

Response to Comment ID #044
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #044

There is already a busy through street only one block to the west of this road. This is not a good use of scarce money.

Response to Comment ID #044

This would wreck a park area, including cutting through a popular Saturday Gardener’s Market; putting a busy street between the parks along 200 East would put children and other park users at risk.

Response to 044-A

During initial public outreach the project team coordinated with the organizers of the Gardeners’ Market. Primary concerns expressed during this outreach centered on the safety of pedestrians crossing 200 East traffic during the market. The pedestrian underpass between the two parks was included in part to address these concerns. Additionally, uniform sidewalks are on each side of the road are included as are pedestrian crossings at each intersection.

Response to 044-B

Thank you for your comment, however, the Proposed Action does meet the goals of the CMPO RTP to improve facilities and connections for non-motorized travel. It includes facilities for bicycles and pedestrians and includes connection to other non-motorized facilities in Logan.

Commenter ID #045

Would like to address the costs and benefits of the proposed 200 East Minor Arterial Project in Logan, Utah as follows:

Response to Comment ID #045

Costs:
- Degraded neighborhood values in what is currently a quiet community, due to increased traffic and road width.
- Reduced property values for all of the homes along 200 East, due to increased traffic and minimal front yards.
- Loss of trees, with subsequent loss of shade, degraded neighborhood values, and reduced property values.
- Safety concerns for homeowners who must back out of driveways into increased traffics.
- Safety concerns for children playing in the neighborhood or walking to the parks at 200 South and 200 East.

Response to 045-A

The response to General Comment #6 speaks to the items raised by this comment regarding degradation of property values as a result of increased traffic. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

The only trees that will be affected by the proposed project are those that exist on property that will be acquired as right-of-way. Trees in front of properties, where there is no right-of-way acquired, will remain in their current condition.
Response to Comment ID #045

As traffic increases on 200 East it will become more difficult to back out of driveways. The inclusion of a two-way center turn lane will make it easier to access driveways without blocking the through lane of traffic. The Proposed Action includes shoulder space that is wide enough to accommodate on-street parking and bicycle traffic. This space will be available to wait in while motorists gauge gaps in traffic.

To address the pedestrian connection between Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway, a pedestrian undercrossing of 200 East is included. The Proposed Action also includes sidewalks on both sides of the street, and pedestrian crossings at each intersection.

Response to 045-B

Local plans, including the CMPO RTP, have identified a need for additional north-south travel capacity east of Main Street.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment and describes why improving 200 East is necessary and why the recent 100 East project does not meet all of the transportation needs. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 045-C

The CMPO RTP includes a 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street. The CMPO RTP shows the 200 East Corridor combining with 100 East south of the Logan River. While continuing two corridors south of the Logan River would provide more capacity that one, north-south

---

Commenter ID #045

- Degraded recreational opportunities, with Pioneer Park separated from Merlin Olsen Park by a major street.
- Millions of dollars that could be spent on more effective transportation projects.

Benefits:
- ????

Questions:
Why does 200 East between Center Street and 300 South need to be widened to carry more traffic when the neighborhoods along 100 East just paid the price for that street to carry more traffic with the intention of reducing congestion on Main Street?

045-B

Since very little additional traffic is generated on the east side of Main Street between Center Street and 300 South, how is 200 East going to be anything but a route through to Providence and points south? And isn’t that what 1—East is intended to be? Doesn’t that make 200 East south of Center Street redundant?

045-C

Since 100 East was turned into a major arterial connecting Logan to Providence, traffic on that street has not become congested. Why, then, is yet another major street needed only one block away?

200 East is going to have to connect to 100 East at some point. Why not spend the money to make the connection at 400 North or Center Street in the commercial zone from which the traffic is generated instead of degrading a neighborhood?
Continuing 200 East to the south, with the objective of eventually connecting to 100 East at approximately 600 South will create a dangerous bottleneck at that intersection, with the driveway for a 200+ unit apartment complex, the exit for a parking garage, the entrance to a large hotel, and two arterial roads (100 East and 200 East) all converging in one place. In addition, this scenario will also destroy additional neighborhoods between 300 South and the Logan River, will further fragment the riparian zone along the river, and will cost millions more dollars for a new bridge and roadway. None of these costs and impacts would be necessary if 200 East and 100 East were connected at 400 North or Center Street where the major contributions of east-west traffic already occur. What overwhelming benefit is expected to accrue from extending these parallel arterials that would justify these costs and impacts?

With the recent completion of 100 East between 300 South in Logan and Providence Lane, which has yet to fulfill its promised potential to reduce traffic on Main Street and improve air quality, it is difficult to understand what possible benefit the enlargement of 200 East from Center Street to 300 South could provide. Either 1) the 200 East arterial will be redundant to the 100 East arterial; or 2) 200 East will take traffic from 100 East, making 100 East redundant; or 3) the roads will share the traffic that currently doesn’t even begin to use 100 East to its capacity, with the result that both roads will be unnecessarily oversized and both neighborhoods along 100 East and 200 East will have been degraded for no good reason. It is possible that 100 East could operate closer to its capacity to move traffic with minor improvements, including a traffic light at 100 East and 300 South, as well as synchronizing traffic lights at 100 East and 200 East where they cross 400 North and where they intersect with Center Street so that north/south traffic could be efficiently transferred between 100 East and 200 East.

As frequent reviewers and commenter’s with regard to proposed projects by Logan City, we are no strangers to the disingenuous use of data to support an outcome desired by City officials or commercial developers in favor with City officials. For example, during the environmental analysis of the 100 East project, we were informed that there would be no increase in noise at our home less than ½ block from this major arterial because, instead of comparing noise impacts of the new 100 East to then-current conditions as required by the NEPA process, the analysis compared those impacts to noise impacts of 200 East as if it were already part of current conditions. With this and other experience as to the contortions that the City and its consultants will go to in order to justify a pet project, I have lost any motivation to consider the Environmental Assessment for the 200 East Minor Arterial Project in detail. But if it is true, as I

travel demand south of the Logan River is not expected to be as high as that north of the Logan River.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

If these improvements are not made, increasing congestion will be present on more and more roads in the area. This project, as well as other projects identified in the CMPO RTP, is needed to alleviate the growing congestion that will take place on many of these roadways. Please see the graphics in the response to General Comment #1 which identifies the roadways that will be congested if these improvements are not made.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

The 200 East traffic projections assume that the 100 East project is completed. It also assumes that all other projects identified by the CMPO RTP will be completed. The CMPO Travel Demand Model identifies enough travel demand that all of the projects in the RTP are necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter ID #045</th>
<th>Response to Comment ID #045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suspect and have heard from others who have studied the EA, that the purported benefits of the 200 East expansion project have been calculated using the same traffic numbers that were used to justify the 100 East project, but with no consideration as to whether the completed 100 East project has changed the traffic scenario at all, then the analysis is fatally flawed and misleading. Spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers’ money and degrading a neighborhood should only be considered as a last resort to solve serious and insurmountable traffic problems that have been documented with hard data and for which no other solution is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045-G</td>
<td>Please reconsider whether an objective analysis of the traffic situation in Logan between Center Street and 300 South justifies the degradation of a neighborhood and the expenditure of millions of dollars IF that analysis includes the CURRENT condition of 100 East and its potential to accommodate additional traffic with minor improvements. Also, please consider performing an objective analysis with real data as to whether the building of a parallel major arterial (i.e., 100 East) actually accomplishes the objectives of reducing traffic congestion (on Main Street) and improving air quality. This analysis should make it clear whether building yet another parallel arterial (i.e., 200 East) can be justified at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter ID #046</th>
<th>Response to Comment ID #046</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed 200 East project seems totally off the mark. We finally have a HUGELY successful farmers’ market in Logan along 200 E between Merlin Olsen and Pioneer Parks. Furthermore, parks attract children. The currently proposed plan is anti-children and anti-families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046-A</td>
<td>It is so pleasant to have the weekly local market here, and the current configuration of streets encourages residents to park on the nearby streets with cars and bikes, linger and chat, and see friends and favorite vendors. Blasting a wide thoroughfare through this wonderful community space seems like a serious crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046-B</td>
<td>With the very-widening of 100 East, and the plans for finally establishing a 10th West Bypass, the current 200 East bypass seems to fit the definition of a “boondoggle,” which will adversely affect development of the community, local agriculture, developing a sense of neighborhood, and protecting our children. The Logan 200 East project will adversely affect the intersection of Center Street and 200 East. Center Street is THE major access road from downtown Logan to the Cliffside neighborhood and Canyon Road. Currently, traffic is not a huge problem at the Center/200 East intersection because 200 East terminates at Center Street. Continuing 200 East south of Center would require a traffic light, pedestrian underpass, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to 045-G

To meet the travel demand needs both projects are needed. The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 046-A

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 046-B

The intersection of 200 East and Center Street was evaluated for traffic operations. The Proposed Action improves traffic operations at the intersection and also accommodates the projected traffic volume. The Proposed Action includes a traffic signal and a pedestrian underpass as suggested in the comment.
Commenter ID #046

046-C Why does extending 3 blocks to 300 S, with huge impacts to the parks area, solve the “regional connectivity problem”? This seems like a huge amount of money and a great disruption to one of the “gems” of Logan for something that will have little impact on the actual flow of traffic “in the region.” The basis for this project seems old (older CMPO models) and narrow-minded.

Response to Comment ID #046

Response to 046-C
The Proposed Action makes a necessary connection to 300 South so it does have independent utility. In addition, this project is one improvement of many identified in the CMPO RTP to address north-south travel demand east of Main Street. This proposed project is one incremental improvement among a number of transportation projects that are all needed to keep pace with increasing travel demand.

Commenter ID #047

047-A It was with a great deal of regret, and even sadness, that I reviewed the document and appendices regarding the proposed 200 East/Center Street/300 South project. I have been actively engaged in the review of 200 East for several years. While I was unable to attend the most recent public meeting, I had the illusion that this project would reflect the public input expressed at every other public meeting I attended.

While I appreciate and understand the connectivity issues, it was my understanding that other alternatives had been presented to you (one way streets, a stronger use of 100 East for examples) that merited more than a passing glance before plowing ahead with your original plan.

The complete and utter decimation of a historic neighborhood will cause irreparable damage to the island and the individuals who have long (by you standards even) called this home. The stark removal of the visual character of 200 East from 100-300 South will not be restored in our children’s lifetimes. Logan City has just completed new zoning ordinances which emphasize the value of neighborhoods. This plan seems to fly directly into the face of that concept.

Response to Comment ID #047

Response to 047-A
The EA does consider public input. It also considers the needs of the community, and the impacts of the Proposed Action. While the Proposed Action tries to accommodate and address public input, it must address the travel demands of the whole community. Unfortunately, addressing those needs does involve impacts that may not be universally accepted by stakeholders.

047-B Across the river from 350 South, a brand new housing development has just been completed which effectively removes any aligned connectivity to Providence or Millville. It was my understanding that the plan was now to utilize the 100 East corridor instead of 200 East south of the river. If indeed that is the case, why are we destroying a beautiful neighborhood instead of making that connectivity at Center Street?

Response to 047-B
The CMPO RTP includes a 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for north-south travel east of Main Street. The CMPO RTP shows the 200 East Corridor combining with 100 East south of the Logan River. While continuing two corridors south of the Logan River would provide more capacity than one, north-south travel demand south of the Logan River is not expected to be as high as that for north of the Logan River.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
**Commenter ID #047**

047-C  
I had hoped that Logan City and CMPO would make changes to the intersection of 200 East and Center FIRST. From the numbers in your own study, there is VERY little traffic from 100-300 South and even fewer accidents in the section of the roadway that is of the greatest concern in your study (200-300 South). That is also the area which would destroy 9 historic homes and permanently alter the character of the island.

047-D  
I find the disregard by the engineers and CMPO for the input of citizens to be remarkable. I know that you will say that you listened to the public and that is why you have a pedestrian tunnel into the project. It seems to me that our traffic issues could be easily solved by signaling 200 East and Center and moving traffic from there onto 100 East. While your “connectivity” is not perfect, you have spared a lovely and historic neighborhood from ruin.

**Response to Comment ID #047**

Response to 047-C  
The intersection of 200 East and Center is a part of the Proposed Action. The proposed project extends from 300 South to Center, thereby providing the Proposed Action independent utility and meeting transportation needs.

Response to 047-D  
Throughout the process the project team attempts to accommodate and address public input, while developing alternatives that meet the project Purpose and Need. Unfortunately, addressing those needs does involve impacts that may not be universally accepted by stakeholders. The suggestion to install a traffic signal at the current configuration of 200 East and Center, in addition to other improvements, while keeping the roadways in their current configuration was considered in the EA as a Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative. This alternative did not address the projected travel demand nor did it address all of the elements of the Purpose and Need.

**Commenter ID #048**

For the most part I like the proposed project (like everyone I cringe at the need to increase traffic through neighborhoods but........) my one concern is that as we add to the trail system I want to ensure that the different trail feel like a cohesive system. We really are connecting 3 trails with the 2 proposed underpasses. We have the Blvd trail, the trail that goes behind the power station and along the canal from 200 E to 100 E, and then we have the trail that goes through Garff Wayside Gardens (where the Gardner’s Market used to be behind the Old Tony Roma’s building). I don't feel like these trails seem connected as one travels from one to the next they each seem like separate trails and I think we have the chance with the underpasses to help strengthen those connection. I would also like to bring awareness of the other great trails Logan has that many people don't know exist, such as the golf course trail. If one is traveling West down the existing Blvd trail and wants to continue into town it seems counter intuitive to head East to get to the underpass(es) in order to continue on the existing trails to town. I think that some signs showing the trails routes and connections to them would help as well as keeping the walkway the same width and material as the Blvd trail as it wraps down to the underpass would help, as well as continuing the fencing or a landscaping feature (such planting bed) around the bend would help tie the Blvd trail to the underpass. I believe

**Response to Comment ID #048**

The proposed project makes a number of connections for non-motorized transportation, including:

- **Sidewalks on both sides of 200 East.** These sidewalks connect to sidewalks on each intersecting street. Pedestrian crossings would be created at each intersection. This includes a new connection of the south leg of 200 East to Center Street.

- **200 East is identified as a designated Bicycle Route on CMPO’s Bicycle Master Plan,** therefore, space for on-street bicycle travel is included in the Proposed Action. As the other 200 East projects are implemented, 200 east will become a bicycle facility that links north-south through the Cache urban area.

- **The Proposed Action includes a non-motorized underpass of 200 East between Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway.**
that as Logan continues to increase its trail system the continuity between trails will continue to be somewhat fuzzy, especially where, in some cases, we will be using sidewalks as connectors from one trail to another. If we come up with some ideas that work on this connection we could hopefully use these same ideas with future trails.

The Proposed Action includes a non-motorized underpass of Center Street connecting Merlin Olsen Central Park to the Boulevard Trail.

Response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
### Commenter ID #049

| 049-B | “Currently 100 East is continuous between 300 South and 800 North and provides adequate right-of-way width to accommodate a three-lane roadway facility meeting Logan City’s standard for a major collector.” Page 4-38. Fact: Once again, 100 East is continuous from 800 North to Providence Lane (100 North), in Providence. |

The analysis in the EA is also flawed due to its failure to include traffic counts and post construction analysis of the success/failure of the stated goals of building 100 East (less traffic on Main Street, better air quality, better pedestrian access, better bicycle access, etc.) Prudent wise use of federal funds would dictate that now that 100 East is completed that planners engage in what medical doctors call watchful waiting. Let some time pass, collect data, and see if 100 East lives up to its goals before spending millions on another road. Ignoring the 100 East project to justify the need for 200 East is disingenuous.

### Response to Comment ID #049

**Response to 049-B**

The statement that the travel demand projections assume that all proposed projects in the CMPO RTP are constructed indicates that completion of all of the other projects in the plan (including 100 East) do not fully address travel demand needs for north-south travel east of Main Street. Therefore, improvements to the 200 East corridor are still needed even if all of the other planned projects are constructed.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Commenter ID #049

049-C  
The 200 East EA dismisses what would certainly be a less expensive and more reasonable project, which is “Build Alternative 1:100 East, improvements from 800 North in Logan to 300 South, where the newly widened 100 East begins its reach to the City of Providence.” This alternative is quickly dismissed by saying, “Build Alternative 1 was eliminated from further evaluation because it does not meet all of the screening criteria based on the project’s purpose and Need.”

The primary justification for 200 East is because the long term plan is for 200 East to run from Smithfield (north) to Millville (south). This is why, it seems, the EA dismisses the 100 East alternative in favor of the 200 East alternative.

A corridor from Smithfield to Millville is not possible on 100 East because a public school blocks the extension of 100 East to the North at 800 North. The 200 East corridor, however, is now blocked to the south by the new Falls at Riverwoods apartment complex. There is no longer an open corridor for 200 East to run from Smithfield to Millville, without connecting to the existing 100 East long before reaching Providence. The 200 East EA does not bother to mention this fact.

The irony that a new development (e.g. the Falls at Riverwood) was permitted to block the 200 East corridor at the same time the homeowners between 200 South and 300 South are expected to make a sacrifice for the so called greater good is not lost on me. It seems developers and commercial interests continue to have more say in planning issues than homeowners and neighborhood groups.

The long run plan is for 200 East to extend south for a mere 1.5 blocks after the Logan River Crossing, before it would turn west to connect to 100 East. This intersection would be adjacent to a huge apartment complex, a parking garage, an office building, and a hotel/conference center. That will make for one horrible intersection, creating more problems than it will solve.

Response to 049-C

100 East will not meet the anticipated travel demand and does not provide regional connectivity since it ends at 800 North. 100 East would need to be further widened to meet travel demand.

The CMPO RTP includes a 200 East corridor extending from Millville to Smithfield to meet travel demand for North-South travel east of Main Street. The CMPO RTP shows the 200 East Corridor combining with 100 East south of the Logan River. While continuing two corridors south of the Logan River would provide more capacity that one, north-south travel demand south of the Logan River is not expected to be as high as that north of the Logan River.

As the referenced apartment complex was developed, local planning preserved a corridor to accommodate 200 East and 100 East connections through the apartment complex. Detailed plans are not available; however, the CMPO RTP shows a planned configuration.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 049-D

The 200 East corridor is planned to extend from Millville to Smithfield. That corridor may not exactly line up with the existing 200 East for the entire length of the alignment.

The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

049-D  
Why does the 200 East EA make numerous statements about the long term plan for 200 East to run from Smithfield to Millville, when this is no longer possible? For example, page 1-3 in the EA, says, “Both the CMPO and Logan City identify 200 East as becoming a regional facility for Cache County between Millville and Smithfield.”

200 East in the Study Area:
The goal of Logan City and the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) is to move automobiles rather than people. With an average of one person per car, this solves no problems. The residents of 200 South through the island area of Logan, however, will lose much under the 200 East plan. The quiet and tree lined street between 200 South and 300 South will be replaced with something more like an airport runway than a neighborhood street. A quiet neighborhood to walk through will become a place to avoid.
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Response to Comment ID #049

049-E

100 East:

Past performance is a predictor of future results. One-hundred East, one block west of 200 East, was recently completed and is now in service. Homeowners on 200 East will most likely suffer from the same frustrations that those of us living near 100 East experienced and continue to experience with the new highway. Here are three examples where the construction of 100 East failed to live up to its promises:

One. Safety and Pedestrian Access: The Environmental Impact Statement EIS for 100 East says, “When the proposed project is coupled with other past, present, and future improvements, users of pedestrian and bicycle facilities would have increased access and safety within the Project Area.”

The sidewalk on both sides of the new bridge over the Logan river was covered in deep snow, thrown there by snowplows, from early December until mid March. Logan City never cleared the snow off of the sidewalks on the bridge this past winter. Worse, they moved the snow from the street onto the sidewalks. Logan City failed in its responsibility to keep the sidewalks on both sides of the bridge clear of snow.

I walked over that bridge twice daily (or more) all winter. I had to walk in the pavement next to the fast moving cars. Likewise, the railing on the north side of the bridge was damaged last November, making a gap in the railing with a four foot fall on the north-east side of the bridge. It has been like this for over four months. Somebody put “Police Line Do Not Cross: tape across the gap months ago and the debris from the railing is still lying on the sidewalk.

How is this safer? How does this promote pedestrian facilities?

Before Logan spends another penny planning 200 East, they should fix the railing on the 100 East bridge.

Two. Air Quality: The EIS East says, “Congestion reduction resulting from the Proposed Project would reduce the number of idling vehicles at stop lights on south Main Street (US 89/91), particularly at 300 South Street, with an attendant reduction in localized pollution concentrations in the Project Area.” Have you done any follow up on this?

The Utah Division of Air Quality has recently reported that Cache County’s air quality is still bad. Moving more people with better public transportation, rather than providing an infrastructure for more automobiles, is the only solution for improved air quality if Cache Valley.

What data do you have to show that 100 East has improved or will improve air quality in Cache Valley? Likewise, what data do you have to show that 200 East will improve, or at least not worsen, the air quality?

The Proposed Action is not expected to change air quality. Monitoring has not specifically correlated air quality benefits to the completion of the 100 East project. The 100 East EIS is correct that idling vehicles reduce air quality particularly for Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions. A reduction in traffic delay would consequently reduce the amount of CO emitted.

The response to General Comment #5 speaks to the air quality items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Comments noted.
Comments on Final EA for Logan 200 E. Minor Arterial
June 14, 2011

Responses to Public/Organization Comments

049-F

Three. Light Pollution. The EIS for 100 East says, “In an effort to diminish light pollution generated by streetlights in the proposed project area from the new 80 East Street north to the Logan River, “full cut-off” streetlights will be used (full-cutoff lights do not emit light above 90 degrees). Mast heights will be limited to the extent practicable to ensure safety and limit light pollution in the 500 South area. Street lights along the new transportation corridor could be designed using “full cut-off” lighting, which would diminish light pollution generated from those sources.”

One-hundred East is adding to light pollution, not diminishing it. The lights may not emit light above 90 degrees, but they place excessive and unneeded light on the front yards and into windows on the east side of the street. The street light on the south side of Logan River bridge illuminates most of the front yard of the nearest house, far beyond the road surface. I don’t want excess light on my property anymore than I’d like my neighbors car parked in my front yard.

Take a walk down the east side of 100 East, between 300 South and 500 South after dark. Take a book or a newspaper with you. Stand in the front yard of one of the houses away from the streetlights. You will have no problem reading the book or newspaper.

As the winner of the Allen Stokes Conservation award in 2001 (from the Bridgerland Chapter of the National Audubon Society) for my work on light pollution in Cache Valley, this is exasperating. It is possible to light only the sidewalk and the street without shining light onto adjacent yards and into windows. I made this crystal clear in my comments about 100 East. My comments, judging by the increased light pollution, were ignored. Will 200 East suffer the same fate?

Response to 049-F

Lighting has not been designed and will be designed during final design. It is expected that lighting will only be installed at intersections that are constructed, therefore, the only locations that are expected to be lighted are intersections.

049-G

Conclusion:
The public is now responding to the third road project in the Island area of Logan: Center Street, 100 East, and now 200 East. Why is there so much focus on roads and only roads? Why is 200 East needed now that 100 East is done? How can you justify spending millions of dollars on this project? Why are three major roads (Main Street, 100 East, and 200 East) needed that are one block apart from each other?

Your focus should be on public transportation. Imagine if the next bus always arrives within the next ten minutes Then you could get anywhere in Logan quickly and easily on the bus. That would do more to reduce congestion on Main Street than more road building. Four million dollars would be better spent on public transportation that on 200 East.

My closest friends and nearest neighbors are moving. They are moving away because they can no longer stand living by the noise, traffic, commercial developments, and light pollution caused by 100 East. They are tired of writing letters and attending public meetings to argue for progressive and reasonable planning in which neighborhoods take precedence over road projects and commercial development. So am I.

Please take steps to improve and preserve neighborhoods rather than running

Response to 049-G

Using the existing street network does not meet the projected travel demand in Logan. Several improvements as identified by the CMPO RTP will be needed including the Proposed Action to address the projected travel demand. The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

The travel demand projections assume that travel is split between vehicular, transit and non-motorized travel. This model does account for the use of transit and the continued investment in transit within the urban area. This proposed project addresses travel demand needs based on the assumption that planned transit are made.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #049

highways through them. Remove 200 East from the long range plan transportation plan. Spend the money on public transportation instead. That would be a better use of the money.

Response to Comment ID #049

Commenter ID #050

To whom it may concern,

I had the chance to review the Impact Assessment for the 200 East Expansion Project in Logan, UT and I am grateful to have this forum to submit my comments to you.

I understand that the traffic analysis suggests that an additional north-south thoroughfare must be developed in Logan to alleviate the predicted increase in traffic over the course of the next 30 years.

However, extending 200 E from Center, next to Merlin Park, and southward would, I believe, disrupt several important cultural characteristics of Logan and potentially endanger them entirely.

Firstly, the Community Impact Assessment shows that the residents of the Island area value the open space of Merlin Olsen park, and greatly value the ability to walk and ride their bikes safely. Increasing traffic on 200 E would diminish residents' ability to walk and ride their bikes safely. Furthermore, increasing traffic from Nibley to North Logan along 200 E (as the project eventually plans) might further discourage biking and walking at all in Logan, as 200 E and Boulevard are popularly traveled routes by bikers and pedestrians, even outside the surrounding neighborhood.

This is a particular disgrace because the current and future traffic problems in Logan would be greatly alleviated if the city of Logan more greatly encouraged its citizens to bike, walk, or use public transportation. As such, endangering the emerging culture of bikers and walkers in Logan is highly counterproductive.

In addition to encouraging more biking and walking within the city, the city of Logan could encourage the use of motorized routes that are already established, such as 100 E, which has been recently extended to access Providence and further south. Traffic could be shifted from 100 E to 200 E at 500 N for example, where public transportation passes, and where traffic already tends. Using these streets that are already established would promote a culture of using what we have, as well as a local culture that preserves undeveloped routes such that alternative forms of transportation can travel safely.

Many thanks for your consideration of these thoughts.

Response to Comment ID #050

Response to Comment ID #050

Response to 050-A

Improving facilities and connectivity for non-motorized travel was a key component of this project. The Proposed Action includes combined on-street parking and bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, non-motorized undercrossings of both 200 East and Center Street, and a connection to the Boulevard Street bike path. 200 East is identified as a bike facility in the CMPO RTP and in Logan City’s TMP.

Response to 050-B

Using the existing street network does not meet the projected travel demand in Logan. Several improvements as identified by the CMPO RTP will be needed, including the Proposed Action, to address the projected travel demand. The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Logan, UT and own property on the "island" about two and a half blocks east of the site of the planned 200 East construction project. After reading over the environmental assessment I believe that this project is unnecessary and would cause detrimental impact on the neighborhoods of the "island", and especially Merlin Olsen Central Park. The plan to make 200 East a regional transportation corridor is not necessary. The city already extended 100 East, which can now be used to access Providence and other towns south of Logan. In addition, commuters are able to access River Heights and communities further south using 100 East, 400 East, and 1000 East. Why do you need a fourth major thoroughway for people to travel north and south between Logan and Providence or Millville?

By connecting the portion of 200 East that is north of Merlin Olsen Central Park with the portion of 200 East that is adjacent to Merlin Olsen Central Park, it will require fragmenting the park by either building an elevated road or by converting part of the green space in the park to asphalt. It is well known that park space within cities is valuable for aesthetics, quality of life, and adds economic value to the surrounding properties. The increased traffic that 200 East will cause will decrease the quality of future park experiences. A city park is important as place for residents to escape the urban landscape where they live, and enjoy natural beauty and quietude while recreating, or picnicking, or strolling. The increased traffic will detract from these experiences if 200 East is turned into a regional transportation corridor, and especially if this regional corridor will be converted into a four land road in the future.

Merlin Olsen Central Park is the site of the gardener’s market, which takes place every Saturday between May and October. The gardener’s market is a well attended community event, which connects people of Logan with the farmers who supply their food and also is an opportunity for community members to meet and their children to play. Today, food is become more expensive as a result of the increase in the cost of petroleum, and mass produced food is of poor quality and contains harmful chemicals. The Cache Valley Gardener’s Market offers an alternative to the mass produced, genetically modified food sold in large grocery stores across town by providing produce, dairy, and meat food products that are sustainably grown without the use of chemicals. A regional transportation corridor would detract from the "neighborhood feel" at the market, and the significant increase in the noise level from cars travelling on 200 East would interfere with the music and arts which take place at the market. In addition, the increased traffic on 200 East would detract from the market by decreasing the enjoyment that people have while buying locally grown food. Do you ever walk along Main Street in downtown Logan and think about how noisy is the traffic and “wow I don’t really like to walk here because the traffic is so noisy.” Well, people at the market would experience this type of feeling if 200 East were transformed into a regional corridor and likely detract people from wanting to attend the market.

Response to Comment ID #051

Response to 051-A

To address the total travel demand, both the recent 100 East improvements and the improvements to 200 East are needed. The response to General Comment #1 speaks in detail to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

Response to 051-B

The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment regarding the Gardeners’ Market. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.
Responses to Public/Organization Comments

Commenter ID #051

051-C

The city of Logan should shift their emphasis on providing transportation to communities further from downtown to revitalizing downtown and strive to keep downtown a place for the community to congregate, and a place for local businesses to thrive, a place for recreation, and a place for arts and culture. By investing in wide transportation corridors, the city is indirectly contributing to deterioration of air quality and water quality in Cache Valley and decreasing the economic value of downtown. When people live far away from where they work they must use unsustainable energy (petroleum) for transportation which contributes to the already poor air quality in Cache Valley. For example, during winter inversions, air quality in Cache Valley can be the worst of any city in the entire United States. This poor air quality probably affects the health of Cache Valley’s residents and especially the children’s health. Economically, the 200 East project would decrease the economic vitality of downtown Logan by decreasing property values within the vicinity of an expanded roadway. Who wants to live or raise children on a street with lots of traffic? I sure don’t. So please think more deeply about your plan to transform 200 East into a regional transportation corridor and consider my comments.

Response to Comment ID #051

Response to 051-C

As demonstrated in the Alternatives chapter of the 200 East EA, transit and alternative transportation options alone do not address the transportation needs and traffic demands identified in the CMPO RTP, The Logan City TMP, and in this EA. There is still a need to accommodate travel demand, correct deficiencies, and provide connectivity for all travel modes. The travel demand projections assume that travel is split between vehicular, transit, and non-motorized travel. This model accounts for the use of transit and the continued investment in transit within the urban area. This proposed project addresses travel demand needs based on the assumption that planned transit improvements are made.

Commenter ID #052

052-A

To whom it may concern, I am writing to you with interest in the proposed 200 East Project.

In accordance with the initial website guidelines, I am submitting my public comment on the proposed 200 East Project to aneff@langdongroupinc.com by April 2. I see now that the email option and the date have been changed on the website without any other notification. There are plenty of individuals as well as the website’s history that can and will support the fact that the deadline was April 2, 2011.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the following comments:

- The 200 East EA is lacking in an acceptable cumulative affects analysis. The document fails to address the possible effects of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. For example, within the EA, the ultimate goal to eventually extend 200 East southward over the Logan River and into River Heights is discussed. This would be a reasonably foreseeable project and therefore, should be addressed in the EA under cumulative effects. This reasonably foreseeable project would result in the loss of additional homes, additional river habitat (which would be added to the loss of habitat as a result of the 100 East project), and another quaint neighborhood street that is currently a dead-end. Also, the project failed to address the affects of the proposed action in combination with the affects of the improvements conducted along 300 South. As a result of the 300 South improvements, all older growth trees were lost, the street was widened, and now suffers increased traffic at higher speeds. The same effects would be expected to result from the 200 East project. The combination of the two projects would result in significant cumulative effects.

Response to Comment ID #052

Response to 052-A

While 200 East is planned to extend from Millville to Smithfield, the CMPO RTP cumulative impacts analysis evaluates only committed projects or projects with identified funding. Since the Proposed Action meets the needs of independent utility, a cumulative analysis of all projects in the plan is not appropriate for this evaluation. While future extension of 200 East is included in the CMPO’s RTP, currently there are no funds identified to extend the corridor across the Logan River into River Heights, so it is not considered in the evaluation of cumulative impacts.
The improvements on 300 South were done to facilitate a waterline replacement by Logan City between Main Street and 400 East in a couple of phases with the most recent phase completed over 4 years ago and prior to this Environmental Assessment. As part of the 300 South project, the pavement, curb and gutter, and sidewalks were replaced to fix broken or heaved sections. Some trees that were heaving curb and gutter or sidewalk were removed. New trees conforming to Logan City standards were planted in the parkstrip. There were no traffic capacity additions and the project was constructed within the existing street right-of-way.

The commenter seems to indicate that impacts that may be cumulative are the loss of trees. Since the project did not include additions to capacity and was constructed within the existing street template, and trees were replaced to meet Logan City standards, there are no impacts that would be cumulative as a result of the previous 300 South and proposed 200 East projects.

Response to 052-B
The alternatives that were evaluated were considered so that the Project Team could fully ascertain if there were other practical alternatives to meet the transportation needs. These alternatives were screened out either as not meeting the Purpose and Need of the project, or resulted in greater harm to the community and environment. The Proposed Action meets the Purpose and Need of the project with the least impact on environmental and community resources.

Response to 052-C
The response to General Comment #3 speaks to the items raised by this comment regarding the Gardeners’ Market. Please see that response at the beginning of this document.

-As a result of the 200 East project, parking and traffic patronizing the Cache Valley Gardener's Market would be greatly affected. This was not addressed at all in the EA, and in fact, the land use on the southwestern corner of Merlin Olsen Park and the southeast corner of Pioneer Park was completely minimized. Gardener Market patron parking currently overflows on to Center Street via Water Street. Affects to this well utilized resource should be addressed in the EA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter ID #052</th>
<th>Response to Comment ID #052</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>052-D</strong></td>
<td>Currently there is no posted speed limit through the 200 East project area; however, the speed limit for this portion of the roadway is 25 mph. Logan City is not proposing to increase the speed for this project. Although the roadway will be designed with standards for a 35 mph speed, it is not planned to be posted as such. The Proposed Action includes the pedestrian undercrossing of 200 East between the Merlin Olsen Central Park and Pioneer Parkway. It also includes pedestrian crossings at each of the other intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>052-E</strong></td>
<td>The needs to be addressed by this Proposed Action are not the same as those met by the 100 East project. Both projects are needed to meet overall travel demand needs. The response to General Comment #1 speaks to the items raised by this comment. Please see that response at the beginning of this document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>052-F</strong></td>
<td>A significant adverse visual impact would only occur when the effects of design, distance, intervening topography, vegetation, and context do not minimize the visibility of an object, and the visibility significantly detracts from the public’s enjoyment of a resource. No significant visual resources as defined by the community are known to be affected by the Proposed Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>052-G</strong></td>
<td>An EA was conducted because it was believed to be the appropriate level of environmental document. An EA evaluates all of the same areas of impacts as an Environmental Impact Statement. The FHWA will determine if the document is sufficient to substantiate a decision for this project before it can move forward. Additionally, the analysis showed that no significant impacts will occur as a result of the Proposed Action. For any impacts that do occur (including temporary construction impacts), mitigation measures are proposed. For a full list of anticipated project impacts and proposed mitigation measures please refer to Table 3.20-1, Mitigation Measures in Chapter 3 of the EA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Commenter ID #052

I appreciate you taking the time to review and consider my comments on the 200 East project. I think there are a number of other viable alternatives that would satisfy the purpose and need of the project with less impact that were not examined. These have been suggested via other public comment letters that I have had the opportunity to read.

Response to Comment ID #052
Attachment 1

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
AND AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
AND AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
For the Logan 200 East Minor Arterial
From Center Street to 300 South
Project No: HPP-LC05

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), in coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), herewith advises all interested persons or groups that it proposes transportation improvements to approximately 0.38 miles of 200 East between Center Street and 300 South in Logan, Utah. The proposed action includes connecting 200 East south of Center Street, constructing a signalized intersection at 200 East and Center Street, improving the 200 East and 300 South intersection by adding turn-lanes, and widening 200 East from 200 South to 300 South. The proposed action would enhance transportation connectivity for both vehicular and non-motorized transportation, to correct geometric deficiencies, and to improve operational deficiencies along 200 East.

The public is further advised that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for this project that defines the scope of the project, alternatives, potential environmental impacts, and mitigation measures that might relieve potential impacts. The EA may be reviewed at the following locations during regular office hours:

- Logan City Hall, 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah;
- Logan City Library, 255 North Main, Logan, Utah;
- Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization, 179 North Main, Ste. 305, Logan, Utah;
- UDOT Region One, 166 West Southwell Street, Ogden, Utah;
- Calvin L. Rampton Complex, 4501 South 2700 West, Salt Lake City, Utah; and
- FHWA, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A Public Hearing conducted by UDOT will be held on March 2, 2011, at Wilson Elementary, 89 South 500 East, Logan, Utah. The public hearing will include an open forum (4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) for the public to review illustrative materials and discuss the proposed project with project team members. A formal presentation on the project will take place from 6:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Following the presentation the public hearing will be open to public comment. Throughout the duration of the hearing, verbal and/or written comment will be received from all interested persons or groups, with a formal public comment period directly following the presentation from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Any person or group unable to attend the public hearing, but wishing to give comments pertinent to the aforementioned project, may do so in writing. Comments may be submitted to: Logan 200 East Project Team, c/o J-U-B Engineers, Inc., 2875 S. Decker Lake Dr., Salt Lake City, UT 84119. For inclusion in the official public hearing transcripts, comments must be postmarked no later than April 1, 2011.

Further information about the project can be obtained by contacting Ed Woolford, FHWA Environmental Program Manager. 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, UT 84118,
(801) 955-3524; or Rod Terry, UDOT Region One Project Manager, 166 West Southwell Street, Ogden, UT 84404, (801) 622-1581. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) should notify Vic Saunders, UDOT Region One Public Involvement Coordinator, 166 West Southwell Street, Ogden, Utah 84404, (801) 620-1641, no later than April 1, 2011.
Attachment 2

Air Quality
Bear River Valley Health Department
From: sjredd@comcast.net
To: "Herm Olsen" <herm@hao-law.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2011 11:00:20 AM
Subject: Re: Logan Council Agenda

Herm,

The National Children's Study is a longitudinal multi-year study of children's health and factors that affect their health. The study is nation-wide in design and looks at multiple environmental factors such as prenatal maternal exposures, diet, exercise, environmental toxins, (lead, mercury etc), air pollution, second-hand smoke, alcohol etc. It has its own design data collection methods and plans. I am not aware that it would consider local specific projects such as looking air pollution hot spots as is apparently being requested by [name removed] but I do not know this as factual and a representative from the study could better address this question.

I talked with [name removed] approximately 2 years ago about his environmental concerns with air pollution hot zones around schools. Specifically, my recollection is that he is concerned about Logan City's plans of making 200 East a major North-South traffic pathway and that children exercising out on the grass near the corner of 10th North and 200 East would be exposed to excessive amounts of PM2.5 due to the increased traffic if 200 East is built into a major road. He seemed more concerned about the effect of increased ambient traffic and resultant “hot spot” air pollution than he was about idling cars and students being picked up and dropped off. He approached the Health Department and wanted us to do some PM2.5 sampling on 200 East to see if there was increased levels of pollution related to increased traffic. He was particularly upset about Logan’s plans to make 200 East into a one-way street or high traffic venue. He seemed hopeful that we could do a study on local PM2.5 levels on 200 East and stop Logan City from developing this into a high-traffic corridor. We did not have any financial resources with which to address his concerns or actually study his hypothesis.

My responses to his concerns were/are:
1. Studies done by the EPA and others on School Air Pollution "hot zones" are typically done on schools located adjacent to major interstates or Freeways where there are thousands or 10's of thousands of vehicles passing by every hour. Second East in Logan is a far cry from that much traffic. To request limited local public-health financial resources to study the health effects of traffic on Second East is not justifiable based on studies that have already been done on schools located adjacent to much larger transportation venues.
2. Most (80-90%) of the wintertime particulate in Cache Valley is secondary particulate, meaning that it is not emitted directly from the exhaust pipes of cars but forms later due to secondary chemical reactions in the atmosphere. This secondary particulate reaction is driven by cold temperatures and high relative humidity. Because of this, during wintertime inversions, there are no "PM2.5" hot spots in Cache Valley. Dr. Randy Martin from USU has already studied this and has shown that winter time inversion PM levels are relatively uniform throughout the valley, whether you measure them in down-town Logan during rush hour or out in Amalga.
3. Rush hour traffic occurs at 7-8:30 AM and 4-5:30 PM. There are no outdoor school-sponsored activities at these times (even if there were an actual problem with 200 East Hot spots).
4. Elevated wintertime PM levels are mostly an outdoor problem between December and early March. There are not a lot of outdoor activities at Mount Logan Middle School during this time period (too cold).
5. The air pollution dose experienced by children is a function of pollution concentration,
duration of exposure, and minute ventilation (volume of air inhaled per minute). There is no excessive or prolonged physical exercise during the relatively short time that children leave school and wait for their parents to pick them up, hence the exposure dose would be relatively small.

6. Pollution (carbon monoxide, VOC’s, NOx, metals, and primary particulate) emitted by a small number of vehicles (relative to LA freeways) moving on 200 East (and Main Street and 10th West) is diluted a great deal by immediate vertical and horizontal mixing and air currents. In other words, the pollution does not remain confined to some identifiable area but spreads far and wide in a short amount of time. An example of this diffusion is the smell of a dirty diaper in a large room. It does not take long for the smell to drift around and fill the whole room. If you were to do a study on air pollution levels in and around Mt Logan Middle School, how would one know if the pollution you were measuring was coming from cars on 200 east or cars on Main street? To claim that there are adverse health effects in children at Mount Logan Middle School due specifically to increased traffic on 200 East will always be a long shot because you can never factor out the effects of cars on Main Street not to mention the enormous variability in direction and intensity of daily air currents and breezes and the known health effects of ambient chronic long-term pollution exposure.

7. If we are to accept the Mount Logan Middle School 200 East exposure argument as valid, in addition to school children exercising outdoors on the North-East side of Mt Logan Middle School, we should also be very concerned about Woodruff Elementary School which is located next to a lot of heavy truck traffic on 10th West. We should also shut down Main Street since the outdoor activity area west of Mount Logan Middle School is closer to Main Street than it is to the area of [name removed] concern which is the corner of 10th North and 200 East

Vehicle emissions of concern from gasoline-powered cars idling at schools when kids are getting dropped off or being picked up are going to be mostly carbon monoxide and VOC's and perhaps a smaller amount of NOx. Diesel vehicles put out very little carbon monoxide but may produce more NOx and some primary diesel particulate. With the advent of markedly improved emissions control devices on newer vehicles, the actual amount of these emissions from gasoline and diesel vehicles in congested traffic near schools is dropping as older inherently dirty vehicles are being replaced with ultra-low emission vehicles (2007 and newer).

As far as carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions "spewing from cars" are concerned, CO2 is also a human emission and does not build up long-term in the body or have a cumulative effect like PM2.5 has. CO2 is continually produced by the body and expelled in the breath when we exhale. The partial pressure of CO2 in the breath that we exhale (our own emissions) is about 40mm of Hg or 5% CO2. Exhaust gases from internal combustion engines have about 12 % CO2. The partial pressure of CO2 in the earth's atmosphere is about 0.3 mm of Hg, 0.039%, or or about 100 times less than what we exhale. For CO2 to be poisonous you have to be exposed to significant levels for a long time or to very high levels for a shorter time. For short-term (under ten minutes) exposure, the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and American Conference of Government Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) limit is 30,000 ppm (3%). NIOSH also states that carbon dioxide concentrations exceeding 4% are immediately dangerous to life and health although physiological experiments show that such levels can be tolerated for some time. (Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Chemical Sampling Information: Carbon Dioxide. http://www.osha.gov/dts/chemicalsampling/data/CH_225400.html ; Glatte Jr H. A., Motsay G. J., Welch B. E. (1967). "Carbon Dioxide Tolerance Studies". Brooks AFB, TX School of Aerospace Medicine Technical Report ).

Because of air currents, diffusion, and dilution of CO2 emissions due to Brownian motion and air
movement, it would be highly doubtful that ambient CO2 levels on school playgrounds near busy highways or pick-up areas would ever come close to approaching the NIOSH short-term exposure level of 3%. I do not want to minimize pollution or the health effects of pollution. I think we should take every practical step possible to lower exposure to PM 2.5 and other air toxics, but one would almost have to kneel down and inhale the exhaust close to an exhaust pipe to get that kind of a CO2 exposure that would result in exceeding HIOSH short-term CO2 standard. Other exhaust toxins like carbon monoxide would likely poison an individual before CO2 had a significant effect if someone tried to inhale automobile exhaust.

As far as reasonable practical interventions are concerned, we should at least consider encouraging increased use of school bus transportation, reduced use of private vehicles to get kids to school, and consider establishing no-idling zones at school pick-up and drop-off areas to encourage parents not to allow their cars to idle longer than 60 seconds or some other reasonable amount of time. This may have some very modest effect on short-term pollution exposures of children when they are getting picked up and dropped off. Whether these interventions would translate into measurable beneficial health effects is difficult to know, but such interventions are not too expensive or painful and are not likely to result in unforeseen negative effects. If we are going to specifically restrict traffic on 200 East ([name removed] idea) to protect school children's health, then we better be ready to shut down Main Street and 10th West as well. Based on my understanding of Cache Valley's air pollution, health effects of air pollution, physics, Brownian motion, pollution dilution etc, I do not think that there is a science-based reason to specifically limit traffic on 200 East as an intervention to prevent a "hot spot" as is being promoted by [name removed] (based on my recollections of my discussion with him several years ago). There may be other valid reasons to specifically limit traffic on 200 East and not on Main Street or 10th West, but claiming that 200 East traffic makes Mount Logan Middle School a "hot spot" while ignoring the effects of much larger quantities of traffic on Main street (1 block to the West) does not appear to me to be scientifically sound. Doing "studies" of air pollution on 200 East is likewise not likely to increase our current understanding of air toxics and their effects on children's health.

I have not communicated with [name removed] recently. Perhaps he has other concerns at this time which he did not have last time that I talked with him.

I hope this is helpful

Ed Redd

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Herm Olsen" <herm@hao-law.com>
To: "[name removed]"
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 10:06:39 AM
Subject: FW: Logan Council Agenda

Paul and Ed,

Let me know what you think of this lady and her study. Thanks.

H.

HERM OLSEN
Attorney at Law
Amy,

After talking with Paul, it may also be good to talk with Dr. Ed Redd, the medical director for the Bear River Health Department. I don't know if Dr. Redd and [name removed] ever talk, or agree on whether there is a problem with our children's health and the air they breathe, but it would be worth touching base with both. Then let's see if a June presentation to the Council would be appropriate.

If there is a tie between these guys issues and concerns and the things you're studying, I'd think the Council would be very interested. At least I would be. Anyway, let me know. H.

HERM OLSEN
Attorney at Law

From: Amy Zadeik Anderson [mailto:amy.z.anderson@usu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 8:31 PM
To: Herm Olsen
Subject: RE: Logan Council Agenda

I am sorry, but I thought my predecessor had made contact with the City Council. Thanks for your reply. I'll look forward to speaking with Paul.

Sent from my MOTOROLA BRAVOT on AT&T
-----Original message-----

From: Herm Olsen <herm@hao-law.com>
To: ‘Amy Anderson’ <amy.z.anderson@usu.edu>
Cc: [name removed]
Sent: Tue, Apr 26, 2011 23:18:15 GMT+00:00
Subject: RE: Logan Council Agenda

Amy,

If I knew about this study, I’d forgotten about it.

I’m curious, does the health study deal with air quality and it’s effects on children? We have a 2.5 pm issue during inversion days in the winter. Do you guys study the effect of that on children? [name removed] has raised an issue of "hot zones" or something along those lines re: immediate proximity to schools with vehicles spewing CO2 into the atmosphere in the very area where hundreds of kids are being dropped off and picked up. Is that part of your study?

If you don't mind, I'd like to put you in touch with Paul so you and he can jointly educate me about these issues. Thanks so much. I will check on the availability of a June city council presentation. Please keep in touch. H.

HERM OLSEN
Attorney at Law

595 South Riverwoods Pkwy, Suite 100
Logan, Utah 84321
e-mail herm@hao-law.com

---

From: Amy Anderson <mailto:amy.z.anderson@usu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 11:44 AM
To: herm@hao-law.com
Subject: Logan Council Agenda

Dear Mr. Olsen:

I am one of the Community Liaison's for the National Children's Study and would appreciate an opportunity to give the council a brief - 3-5 minute - update on the status of the Study here in Cache County. Would it be possible to attend the meeting on June 7th?

To remind you - the National Children's Study will help us learn more than we've ever known about how the environment and genetics affect children's health and development. We are here in Cache County through USU and have been enrolling participants since December 2010. We would love to share our success to date!
Thanks for your consideration.

Amy Z Anderson
Community Liaison
The National Children's Study - Cache County
Research & Evaluation Division
Utah State University.
6580 Old Main Hill
Logan, Utah 84322-6580