



## Identification of Alternatives

### Summary of Comments on Study Purpose and Need

Overall, about two-thirds of online meeting participants voiced some type of agreement with the Purpose and Need statement. The remaining third were split equally between comments that were not clearly supportive/non-supportive, and comments that were not supportive of the purpose statement.

Among the participants' reasons for support of the study's Purpose and Need, there was strong agreement that:

- **Congestion** on SR-224 is an issue that should be addressed (this was unanimous).
- Whatever solution moves forward, it's important to protect the **natural resources** and **character of this mountain community**.
- The proposed solution should **discourage single-occupant vehicle use**.
- Current and future **growth** needs to be addressed.

Participants had moderately strong agreement that:

- SR-224 should **not** be **widened**.
- However, roughly 20 percent of participants, feel very strongly that widening SR-224 will solve congestion problems.

Participants expressed a mixed reaction to:

- **Improving transit service**. About two-thirds of participants believe better service and better transit options will help solve issues in the area, while one-third believes that a transit solution will not be supported by the public or will not work.
- **Parking**. While many participants feel that parking should be addressed, there were differences in opinions on how. Some believe parking options should be increased while others feel parking should be dis-incentivized or eliminated.
- **Land use**. Those who supported the land use aspect of the Purpose and Need statement felt that the community needs a transportation network that supports current and future development. Those who did not support this aspect of the statement felt that improvements to the transportation network would encourage more growth, which they oppose.

Participants' reasons for not supporting the Purpose and Need:

- Some feel the study should address the **broader** transportation network, especially **SR-248** and connections from the **Salt Lake Valley to Kimball Junction/Park City**.
- Some participants oppose additional growth in the community and feel that improvements to the transportation system will encourage more growth.

### Comments on Transit Technology Options

Participants ranked each potential technology option on a sliding scale of 1 to 5. A rating of 1 means the technology would not fit the Purpose and Need at all; a rating of 5 means the technology would fit very well.

Averaged together, participants' ratings were as follows:

- Hybrid bus/BRT: 3.2
- Streetcar/light rail: 3.1
- Aerial: 2.0
- Monorail: 1.9
- AGT: 1.8
- High-speed rail: 1.5

Additional feedback on the technology options:

- Many comments on making **transit service more convenient and appealing**, otherwise it might not be supported. Several participants also commented on the need to have parking options that work with the technology.
- **Hybrid bus/BRT** seems like the obvious and economical choice to many participants. Some liked its low impact, non-permanent infrastructure requirements. Others liked that it is scalable.
- To some participants, **light rail or streetcar** seems more publicly appealing than buses. They like the fact that light rail can run in inclement weather. Their concerns with light rail are cost and time to implement.
- Participants are split on **aerial** transit. Some feel that it would be a "signature item" that would set Park City apart from other destinations and fit in with the ski culture. Others feel that it would impact the view shed.
- Some feel that **high speed rail** would be a better solution for connecting to the Salt Lake Valley than from Kimball Junction to Park City. Several feel that the high speed options do not fit the size and character of the community.

#### **Comments on Improving SR-224**

Many participants commented both for and against widening SR-224 and/or thought that additional roadway, interchange and traffic signal improvements were necessary, such as:

- Improve the signals on SR-224 at Kimball Junction and I-80
- Build an overpass from SR-224 with a direct connection to I-80 (rather than signalized)
- Consider low-cost, low-impact and short-term solutions
- Address parking issues
- Work with employers to develop solutions for commuter traffic
- Tax vehicle/single-occupant use
- Increase patrol and enforcements

#### **Conclusion**

While the data shows differences between participant groups in typical mode of travel and preference of technology options, participants appear to agree on many points. Congestion is widely recognized as an issue that should be addressed. Whether participants support or oppose continued growth in Summit County, growth is also an issue that should be managed to protect natural resources and maintain the character of the community.