1. Develop multimodal & capacity transportation solutions for the Kimball Junction area

2. Funded by Summit Co & UDOT
   - **Amount:** $350,000
     - UDOT - $250,000
     - Summit County - $100,000
   - **Schedule:** Nov ’19 to Feb ’21
   - **Current step:** Public Survey & Level 2 Screening

3. Stakeholders include Summit County, Park City, Public, and Mountainland Association of Governments
Schedule & Level 1 Screening

LEVEL 1 SCREENING
The initial tier of Level 1 screening determines if the solutions have any of the following fatal flaws:

- Does the alternative cause irreconcilable environmental impacts?
- Does the alternative cause irreconcilable community impacts?
- Is the alternative impractical and infeasible?

The second tier of Level 1 screening includes addressing the problems and opportunities by asking the following questions:

- Does the alternative improve interchange area capacity and vehicle mobility to/from I-80 and to/from S.R. 224 through the Kimball Junction area?
- Does the alternative maintain or improve multimodal travel options, health, and safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users in the area?
- Does the alternative support operation and reliability of the Valley to Mountain (S.R. 224) Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) both-side running Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)?

Potential solutions with a fatal flaw will be dismissed from further study.
Next Steps

Early February:
- Survey open until February 12  
  [https://kimballjunctionareaplan.com/](https://kimballjunctionareaplan.com/)
- Refinement of alternatives
- VISSIM micro-level modeling of alternative that pass Level 2

Late February:
- Draft Area Plan
Level 2 Solutions: Alternative 1 – One Way Frontage Roads

ALTERNATIVE 1
West Half with HOV Ramps

- Proposed half-diamond interchange with new bridge over I-80
- Proposed tight-diamond interchange with thru movements and Texas U-turns
- Proposed one-way frontage roads

Existing two-way frontage roads
Proposed transit/HOV-only ramps
Proposed one-way frontage roads

Legend:
- Existing Trail
- Existing Road
- Proposed Road
- Proposed Bridge
- Or Tunnel
- Transit/HOV-only
Level 2 Solutions: Alternative 1 – One Way Frontage Roads

ALTERNATIVE 1
East Half with Additional SR224 Improvements

- Proposed tight-diamond interchange with thru movements and Texas U-turns
- Proposed half-diamond interchange with new bridge over I-80
- Proposed one-way frontage roads with right-in/right-out access driveways and roads
- Proposed dual left-turns at Ute Blvd and Olympic Parkway
- Proposed pedestrian tunnel on S.R. 224 at Ute Blvd
- Proposed northbound and southbound widening on S.R. 224 from Ute Blvd to Olympic Parkway
Level 2 Solutions: Alternative 2 – Transit/HOV Bypass
Level 2 Solutions: Alternative 3 – Convert to interchanges
Level 2 Solutions: Alternative 3 – Convert to interchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>Expand I-80 eastbound on-ramp for transit/HOV only. Triple northbound left turns at I-80 interchange for general traffic use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-7</td>
<td>Dual left-turn lanes at Ute Blvd and Olympic Parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-9</td>
<td>Triple northbound left-turn lane at I-80 interchange. HOV/Transit only. Replaces Alternative D-1 general turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-10</td>
<td>Pedestrian tunnel under S.R. 224 at Ute Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-11</td>
<td>Northbound lane widening on S.R. 224 from Olympic Parkway to Ute Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-12*</td>
<td>Southbound lane widening on S.R. 224 from Olympic Parkway to Ute Blvd. (Optional: HOV-only lane. An extension of the lane shown in D-15.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-14</td>
<td>New connection and possible traffic signal at Bear Cub Dr. (See report text for full diagram.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-15</td>
<td>Transit/HOV-only right-turn lane from eastbound I-80 off ramp to Ute Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-16</td>
<td>Extend westbound to northbound right turn lane on Newpark Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-16A</td>
<td>Close left turns to McDonald’s and Library to extend left turn from Ute to S.R. 224.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Council Conversation Themes

**In general:**
- Further analysis to confirm these alternatives mitigate future conditions/redevelopment
- Concern about open space and active transportation connections
- Look at combining elements of Alt. 4 (short-term) and Alt. 3 (long-term)
- Lowest preference for Alt. 2

**Specific by alternative:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros:</strong></td>
<td>Doesn't require significant behavior change</td>
<td>Parkers would get direct access to Ecker PnR</td>
<td>Makes biggest improvement</td>
<td>Good short-term options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connects KJ neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like connection from Olympic Blvd. to Bear Cub for transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons:</strong></td>
<td>Appears very complicated</td>
<td>Encroaches on the Conservation Easement</td>
<td>Can we go underground from I-80 to Walmart-area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially moves the problem to other locations</td>
<td>Strong opposition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't connect the KJ neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't give thru-traffic an expeditious route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not address traffic issues at lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>