

From: Keller, Kevin <Kevin.Keller@hdrinc.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 10:56 AM
To: Wayland, Joshua
Cc: mmckee; Floyd, Kathryn K.; Crawford, Amanda L.; 10145616_7CountyCoalitionUBR TO1; Brian Barton; Robe, Kyle; Perkins, Michael; Klaumann, Anthony; Magiera, Doree; Dobbs, Catherine; Nichols, Karen; Kuehne, Kenneth; Tzioumis, Travis; Krogman, Glen T.
Subject: Informal information requests

Hi Josh. Based on our telephone conversation yesterday, I've got some responses for you. See below.

1. Do we show the stream relocations on our GIS files and did we account for the roadway realignment in Willow Creek in our stream relocation figures?

I confirmed with our folks that we provided STB with the rail alignments, cut fill lines, the stream lines identified during the field work, and point files for bridge and culvert crossings. While we did not provide a point file for the stream relocations, the stream relocations can be identified by overlaying the provided project cut/fill lines with the provided field work stream lines.

Stream relocations identified are places where the rail alignment is parallel to a stream and the cut/fill line impacts the stream channel. There will be grading at every box culvert to provide a smooth transition from the box culvert to the stream channel, but these areas are not considered as stream relocations. The stream impacts due to grading at bridges and box culverts will be accounted for, but the grading design and layout has not been completed at this time.

The roadway realignment and Willow Creek crossing along the Indian Canyon alignment is a special case, and will require considerable design effort because the crossing is at a confluence of two channels and the large amount of rail embankment fill. Conservative assumptions were made to define the impacted area, since the design of this site has not been completed.

2. A question came up about the Echo canyon alternative – how hard did we look at it?

During the 2014 UDOT study, as well as our latest screening, the Echo canyon alternative failed the first level of screening, which was to provide a connection to both UPRR & BNSF. Also, there was concern about how close the route came to the Park City residential and commercial areas, as well as requiring a very long tunnel.

Hopefully these responses help.

Kevin

Kevin Keller, PG
Vice President/Senior Professional Associate

HDR

10450 Holmes Road, Suite 600
Kansas City, MO 64131-3471
D 816.347.1183 M 913.638.2571
kevin.keller@hdrinc.com

hdrinc.com/follow-us